

From: [Margaret Foley](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [neighborhoodsunitedsf@gmail.com](#); [Hillis, Rich \(CPC\)](#); [Braun, Derek \(CPC\)](#); [Ruiz, Gabriella \(CPC\)](#); [Koppel, Joel \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Diamond, Sue \(CPC\)](#); [Imperial, Theresa \(CPC\)](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Please Support Board President Peskin's Amendments to Form Based Density / Please also read the attached article
Date: Monday, March 4, 2024 11:14:23 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors, Land Use Committee,

We are all for creating more housing, especially affordable, but please support the proposed amendments to FBD.

In addition, building / upzoning along major arteries already besieged with gridlock (Lombard, Park Presidio and 19th Avenue) is sure to create nightmare commutes for those passing through San Francisco from Marin and the Peninsula let alone we who live around those major arteries.

Please also consider this cautionary tale from scientists researching subsidence on the east coast.

Critical Infrastructure Is Sinking Along the US East Coast

Up and down the Atlantic Coast, the land is steadily sinking, or subsiding. That's destabilizing levees, roads, and airports, just as sea levels are rising.

Read in WIRED: https://apple.news/AnQLt9Q_vOyGEXGoz1SEprg

The time to act is now, Shirzaei emphasizes. Facing down subsidence is like treating a disease: You spend less money by diagnosing and treating the problem now, saving money later by avoiding disaster. "This kind of data and the study could be an essential component of the health care system for infrastructure management," he says. "Like cancers—if you diagnose it early on, it can be curable. But if you are late, you invest a lot of money, and the outcome is uncertain."

Thank you for your consideration,

Margaret Bradley
District 2 Resident

From: [Tyler Stowell](#)
To: [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Board File 230734 (Density Decontrol - Item #5)
Date: Monday, March 4, 2024 11:55:01 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors Melgar and Preston,

Removing numerical lot-based density is something we promised to do in our Housing Element and is critical piece of change needed to reach our housing goals. **Please pass the legislation as drafted now**, before any amendments offered by Supervisor Peskin that will render it useless. Disallowing use of State Density Bonus, or putting onerous requirements on “additional units”, is a poison pill not meant to actually produce housing (affordable or otherwise), but rather kill any housing from being built at all.

Keeping lot-based density anywhere only ensures fewer, larger units are built, and larger units come with higher price tags. Allowing more abundant homes at smaller sizes is one piece of the puzzle that will help us bring down housing prices long term.

Thank you,
Tyler Stowell, AIA
Architect

kerman morris architects LLP
139 Noe Street
San Francisco,
CA 94114
T: 415.749.0302
C: 713.823.2025
kermanmorris.com

From: [George Wooding](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: ozz
Date: Monday, March 4, 2024 12:05:59 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mr Carroll,

I support Supervisor Aaron Peskin's plans to introduce amendments allowing form-based density (FBD) if a developer DOES NOT USE the State Density Bonus Law (SDBL) (Gov. Code 65915-65918 et seq.)

During a February 26, 2024 presentation to the West of Twin Peaks Central Council (WTPCC) the Director of San Francisco Citywide Policy Joshua Switzki stated, "that the city Planning Department has the ability to determine base zoning heights for each part of the city. Base zoning height increases will be determined in a continuum from 0' to 240'+'. This applies to file number 230734, Density Calculation in RC, RTO, NC, and certain named NCDs. [The map of impacted areas is linked here](#) San Francisco does not need the States help or developers help to add height.

Base Density

SDBL allows projects to receive up to 50% additional residential density over the maximum allowable residential density. To determine the maximum allowable residential density, Planning Department staff must calculate the principally permitted density under current controls ("base density"). Hence the Arron Peskin amendment to SDBL.

Residential density regulations in San Francisco vary by zoning district. In some districts, residential density is regulated by a ratio of units to lot area, such as one unit per 600 square feet. In these districts, base density is the maximum number of units allowed by the zoning district.

Other districts use form- based density, where residential density is regulated by the permitted building volume – either the maximum floor area ratio (FAR) or a maximum building volume controlled by height, bulk, and setback controls ("form-based zoning"). In areas with form-based zoning, the base density is the maximum residential gross floor area principally permitted under current zoning and any additional requirements. Plannings past FAR forecasts have been reprehensible--read severely inflated.

Developers will also be able to develop competing FBDs to San Francisco Plannings.

Please support the Peskin amendments.

Respectfully,

George Wooding

415 695-1393

From: [Katherine Petrin](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Farrah, Michael \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Lori Brooke](#); [Hillis, Rich \(CPC\)](#); [Braun, Derek \(CPC\)](#); [Ruiz, Gabriella \(CPC\)](#); [Koppel, Joel \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Diamond, Sue \(CPC\)](#); [Imperial, Theresa \(CPC\)](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Horrell, Nate \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Mike Antonini](#); [Richard Brandi](#); [Craig Sargent](#); [Sharada Vadlamani](#); robert.lunbeck@gmail.com; [Monica Morse](#); [Lisa Napoli](#); jamespherlihy@gmail.com; [Marc Norton](#); [Courtney Damkroger](#); [Sandy Gandolfo](#); [Joe Garrity](#); [Renee Lazear](#); [Bridget Maley](#); [Woody LaBounty](#)
Subject: Not a Form Letter - OPPOSE Mayor's Proposed Density Calc Ordinance (FILE 230734) SUPPORT Peskin Amendments
Date: Monday, March 4, 2024 1:00:44 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Chair Supervisor Melgar, Supervisor Peskin, Supervisor Preston,

My neighbors and I in **District 7** strongly **oppose the Mayor's proposal** to eliminate density controls in Commercial Areas. Specifically, we are concerned about the **potential impacts to West Portal Avenue**, now a healthy neighborhood commercial district. We wonder why the City promotes policies that will lead to demolition when the neighborhoods are thriving and downtown languishes.

Though some City officials tout the re-making of Upper Market (under the Market Octavia Plan) as a success, we see new inappropriately-scaled condo buildings (not fully occupied) and empty new storefronts. The destruction of small commercial buildings on Upper Market has led to higher commercial rents unaffordable to previous small business owners. They have been replaced in large part by gyms, vacancies, and other businesses that **not neighborhood-serving**.

As a model for what could happen on West Portal, we are not reassured. Yes, there are a number of great sites for new, inappropriately-scaled, affordable residential buildings on West Portal. But the current upzoning plan that sweeps all of West Portal Avenue parcels PLUS form based density PLUS State Density Bonus projects will lead to yet more over-scaled new construction that does not serve those of us who need affordable housing.

Form-based density, coupled with upzoning as being proposed, will lead to large-footprint projects that will ruin our neighborhood commercial areas.

We **support Supervisor Peskin's amendments** to keep established height limits in check.

Finally, it is **taxing for your constituents** to try to keep track of an onslaught of changes among the ever-changing package of housing mandates, de-controls and upzoning. We ask for common sense and plain language policies to be able to understand changes which seem to have potential for destruction of healthy residential and commercial neighborhoods.

Sincerely,

Katherine Petrin
D7 Resident
D3 Business Owner

From: [RL](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Hillis, Rich \(CPC\)](#); [Braun, Derek \(CPC\)](#); [Ruiz, Gabriella \(CPC\)](#); [Koppel, Joel \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Diamond, Sue \(CPC\)](#); [Imperial, Theresa \(CPC\)](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); neighborhoodsunitedsf@gmail.com
Subject: NOT A FORM LETTER - Support of Board President Peskin's Amendment to Form-Based Density Legislation - March 4, 2024 Meeting Agenda Item #5
Date: Monday, March 4, 2024 1:25:26 PM
Attachments: [Screen Shot 2023-05-15 at 7.07.38 PM.png](#)

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear President Peskin & Supervisors Melgar & Preston,

On behalf of SON-SF ~ Save Our Neighborhoods SF, we strongly **SUPPORT** the amendments proposed by Board President Peskin to the Form-Based Density Legislation proposed by Mayor Breed and Supervisor Melgar.

Form-based density such as being proposed in the legislation, especially when combined with a State Density Bonus, would allow supersizing of building heights and massing, resulting in luxury towers at double or triple current height limits. However, we do not support the current or any future density/upzoning laws or ordinances.

Creating more Density or Upzoning is not a urban myth, it's happening now. Full of unintended & future consequences to the neighborhoods & the community.

Already individual large scale / luxury towers are being proposed in the Sunset/Parkside D4 as well as plans for piling form-based densities and State Density Bonuses on one another.

Here is one such project being proposed by developers (see below) & others. If these certain parties have their way the entire area will end up being another Miami/Manhattan. Is that really what you want San Francisco to look like?

If not, please support President Peskin's amendments.

We **support Supervisor Peskin's amendments** to keep established height limits in check.

Thank you,
Renee Lazear
D4 Resident & 5th Generation Californian

SON-SF ~ Save Our Neighborhoods SF

2700 SLOAT BLVD.



From: [rbrandi](#)
To: [Katherine Petrin](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Farrah, Michael \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Lori Brooke](#); [Hillis, Rich \(CPC\)](#); [Braun, Derek \(CPC\)](#); [Ruiz, Gabriella \(CPC\)](#); [Koppel, Joel \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Diamond, Sue \(CPC\)](#); [Imperial, Theresa \(CPC\)](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Horrell, Nate \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Mike Antonini](#); [Richard Brandi](#); [Craig Sargent](#); [Sharada Vadlamani](#); [robert.lunbeck@gmail.com](#); [Monica Morse](#); [Lisa Napoli](#); [jamespherlihy@gmail.com](#); [Marc Norton](#); [Courtney Damkroger](#); [Sandy Gandolfo](#); [Joe Garrity](#); [Renee Lazear](#); [Bridget Maley](#); [Woody LaBounty](#)
Subject: Re: Not a Form Letter - OPPOSE Mayor's Proposed Density Calc Ordinance (FILE 230734) SUPPORT Peskin Amendments
Date: Monday, March 4, 2024 2:03:10 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Chair Supervisor Melgar, Supervisor Peskin, Supervisor Preston,

I oppose the Mayor's proposal to eliminate density controls in Commercial Areas. Specifically, I am concerned about the impacts to West Portal Avenue, now a healthy neighborhood commercial district. Why promote policies that will lead to demolition of a neighborhood that is thriving, with the hope that many years later new business will move in. Recent examples prove that commercial areas that are thriving should not be jeopardized. Those that are failing are ripe for experimentation.

Hayes Valley is booming but the new buildings are in-fill leaving older buildings with commercial businesses intact or change due to normal market conditions. The large new buildings along Upper Market from Guerrero to Sanchez displaced small business with gyms, banks, walk-in medical clinics, and still vacancies after 10 years. Ocean Avenue from Brighton to Harold near City College had been languishing for years with a long-abandoned Safeway store. Whole Foods is an anchor tenant and the other storefronts cater to college students -- coffee, ice cream, Poke take out. The new buildings are 4 stories over commercial by the way, not 8-16 stories plus the bonus density. I could go on.

Local conditions are crucial for the life of commercial areas. Yes, there are a number of great sites for new, tall, affordable residential buildings on West Portal. Those can be developed with existing tools. It would be better to streamline cumbersome city permitting, rules, requirements, procedures, and appeals than to sweep all of West Portal Avenue parcels under the upzoning plan PLUS form-based density PLUS State Density Bonus that will destroy a thriving zone. Have we learned nothing from urban renewal?

The thriving neighborhoods (and not all are thriving) take on greater importance as downtown languishes.

I support Supervisor Peskin's amendments to keep established height limits in check.

Sincerely,

Richard Brandi

D7 resident

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Strongly OPPOSING Land Use and Transportation Committee Meeting March 4, 2024 Agenda Item #5 [Planning Code - Density Calculation in RC, RTO, NC and Certain Named NCDs] File #230734
Date: Monday, March 4, 2024 10:38:18 AM

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the below email regarding File No. 230734.

File No. 230734 - Ordinance amending the Planning Code to allow form-based density in Residential-Commercial (RC), Residential Transit Oriented (RTO), Neighborhood Commercial (NC), and certain Named Neighborhood Commercial Districts (NCD), except for specified lots located in the Priority Equity Geographies Special Use District; amending the Priority Equity Geographies Special Use District; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; and making public necessity, convenience, and welfare findings under Planning Code, Section 302, and findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1.

Thank you,

Eileen McHugh
Executive Assistant
Office of the Clerk of the Board
Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689
Phone: (415) 554-7703 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: aeboken <aeboken@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 4, 2024 12:32 AM
To: BOS-Supervisors <bos-supervisors@sfgov.org>; BOS-Legislative Aides <bos-legislative_aides@sfgov.org>
Subject: Strongly OPPOSING Land Use and Transportation Committee Meeting March 4, 2024 Agenda Item #5 [Planning Code - Density Calculation in RC, RTO, NC and Certain Named NCDs] File #230734

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

TO: Land Use and Transportation Committee members and full BOS

FR: Eileen Boken, President
Sunset-Parkside Education and Action Committee (SPEAK)

RE: Planning Code - Density Calculation in RC, RTO, NC and Certain Named NCDs File #230734

Position: Strongly OPPOSING

SPEAK is strongly OPPOSING allowing developers to density double dip by using both form-based density (FBD) and State Density Bonus (SDB).

SPEAK is supporting President Peskin's amendment to allow FBD only if the developer does not use SDB.

###

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

From: [T.Flandrich](#)
To: [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Horrell, Nate \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Item #5 Board File # 230734 Density Calculations (Breed/Melgar) IN SUPPORT of PESKIN AMENDMENTS
Date: Monday, March 4, 2024 9:51:38 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

3. March 2024

Dear Chair Melgar, Vice Chair Preston & Supervisor Peskin,

I am writing today to ask for your support of President Peskin's amendments which addresses this "one size fits all" approach proposed in this legislation. Our neighborhood communities have worked with SF planners over the years to create, maintain livable neighborhoods and circumscribe heights, we should not have to destroy in order to build. I also ask you to consider the real impact this legislation, in its current form, will have on communities throughout our city and work on a plan to mitigate the unintended consequences.

Consider the timing of implementation, is this immediate or by 2026?

Is now the time to do this particular type of rezoning, directly impacting small businesses-those who somehow made it through the pandemic and are only now starting to feel firmer ground beneath them? And the tenants living above the commercial space, where will they go? Nowhere in the current legislation today do I see the word "affordable" nor do I see anything that mentions the obvious, that the tearing down of existing buildings with

small businesses and residential units would necessarily mean displacement, and the rebuilt commercial space - who knows for how long-would inevitably come back as unaffordable. Permanent displacement is more likely than not. Not only for the small businesses but also the residents.

What is the plan in mitigating displacement of small businesses, employment loss for San Franciscans and tenant displacement?

What is the plan in ensuring that projects are also affordable, that they are not just luxury condos?

Will there be "a use it or lose it" clause that ensures the rapid rebuilding rather than a developer's choice of getting entitlements, evicting all tenants, then choosing to delay the project for years.

We know, you know, that this happens, let's be honest.

Please support these common sense amendments and work on a plan to **mitigate the known** unintended consequences.

Thank you for your consideration,
Theresa Flandrich
North Beach Tenants Committee

From: [Lori Brooke](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: CHA Supports Amendments to Form-Based Density Legislation
Date: Monday, March 4, 2024 8:04:08 AM
Attachments: [CHA Letter to Land Use Supporting Form-Based Density Amendments.pdf](#)

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear BOS Land Use Committee,

Please find attached the letter from CHA expressing support for the amendments to the form-based density legislation.

Best regards,

Lori Brooke President, Cow Hollow Association



March 4, 2024

Board of Supervisors, Land Use Committee
1 Dr Carlton B Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Support of Board President Peskin's Amendment to Form-Based Density Legislation

Dear Supervisors Myrna Melgar, Aaron Peskin, and Dean Preston,

The Cow Hollow Association (CHA) supports Board President Aaron Peskin's amendments to the Form-Based Density (FBD) legislation proposed by Mayor Breed and Supervisor Melgar.

Representing 1,100 households in District 2, the CHA advocates for housing measures—local and statewide—that address San Francisco's affordable housing shortage affecting various essential workers.

The Form-Based Density legislation, focused on Commercial Corridors Districts, when combined with the State Density Bonus (SDB), grants developers significant building height and density bonuses, resulting in towering luxury condos that double or triple current height limits. This fails to address our affordable housing needs. Moreover, these laws restrict residents' rights to contest the adverse impacts of excessive upzoning and density decontrol on small businesses, renters, and property owners.

Instead of our City succumbing to developer demands that prioritize profit over neighborhood well-being, we urge you to support these sensible amendments as a responsible approach to the rezoning question. This will provide SF citizens with a clear understanding of how their community can grow while safeguarding its established essence and livability.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Lori Brooke', written over a white rectangular background.

Lori Brooke
President, Cow Hollow Association

cc:
CHA Board
SF Planning Commissioners
Planning Department, Director Hillis
Mayor London Breed

From: [Jean Barish](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Hillis, Rich \(CPC\)](#); [Braun, Derek \(CPC\)](#); [Ruiz, Gabriella \(CPC\)](#); [Koppel, Joel \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Diamond, Sue \(CPC\)](#); [Imperial, Theresa \(CPC\)](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); neighborhoodsunitedsf@gmail.com
Subject: LUTC Meeting - March 4, 2024 - Agenda Item #5: Planning Code - Density Calculation in RC, RTO, NC, and Certain Named NCDs]
Date: Sunday, March 3, 2024 11:19:06 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear President Peskin and Supervisors Melgar and Preston:

I am writing to urge you to amend the *Planning Code - Density Calculation in RC, RTO, NC, and Certain Named NCDs*, which is Item #5 on the March 4, 2024, LUTC Agenda.

I support amendments which would only allow form-based density if the state density bonus program is not used, and which would require buildings stay within the established height limits in the relevant district. Allowing both the state density bonus as well as a form-based density bonus will have unacceptable impacts on neighborhood commercial districts.

Please do not pass this outrageous legislation unless it is properly amended so that unreasonable and undesirable upzoning will not be permitted throughout San Francisco.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Jean

Jean B Barish

jeanbbarish@hotmail.com

From: [Kathy Howard](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Hillis, Rich \(CPC\)](#); [Braun, Derek \(CPC\)](#); [Ruiz, Gabriella \(CPC\)](#); ael.koppel@sfgov.org; [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Diamond, Sue \(CPC\)](#); [Imperial, Theresa \(CPC\)](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: neighborhoodsunitedsf@gmail.com
Subject: BOS Land Use Committee: Item 5. 230734 Support AMENDMENTS proposed by BOS Pres. Aaron Peskin
Date: Sunday, March 3, 2024 8:31:04 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors,

I support the amendments proposed by BOS President Peskin that would only allow form-based density if a developer does **not** use the state density bonus program and stays within established height limits.

I oppose Supervisor Melgar's proposal to eliminate density controls in our commercial areas. Under this proposal our thriving neighborhood commercial districts, full of legacy businesses and often with lower-income residents living above the businesses, will be demolished in the name of 'progress.' This is what happened with urban renewal – and we all know how well that worked

Without President Peskin's amendments, the BOS will be giving privilege to State Density Bonus projects (which give away height, density, and all other zoning requirements) without additional affordability requirements or any protections to our small businesses.

The BOS should **not rush** to make these piecemeal changes without careful consideration of all the whole package of de-controls and upzoning and without strong small business protection.

Thank you for your consideration.

Katherine Howard

Outer Sunset

From: dianataylor50@gmail.com
To: [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Barbary Coast Neighbors](#)
Subject: FW: Letter in support of amendments to proposed Density Calculation Ordinance (File 230734)
Date: Sunday, March 3, 2024 6:54:57 PM
Attachments: [Ltr SUPPORT Peskin Amendments Density Calculations BCNA LUT BOS Comm 03042024.pdf](#)
Importance: High

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

RESENDING EARLIER MESSAGE DUE TO POSSIBLE TRANSMISSION ERRORS

Dear Supervisors' Melgar, Preston & Peskin,

On behalf of the Barbary Coast Neighborhood Association's Board of Directors, we submit the attached letter regarding Item 5 on tomorrow's Land Use and Transportation Committee agenda (File 230734)

Thank you for your consideration,
Diana

Diana Taylor
President, Barbary Coast Neighborhood Association
P.O. Box 2045
San Francisco, CA 94126
(415) 517.6926
Email: dianataylor50@gmail.com
<http://www.bcnasf.org/>



BOARD OF DIRECTORS

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

David Albert
Philippe Sonne
Diana Taylor

MEMBERS AT LARGE

Dawn Agnew
Bob Harrer
Michele Hennessey
Karen Keese
Xander Peterson
Lee Robbins
James Seff

March 3, 2024

Via Email

Members of the BOS Land Use & Transportation Committee:
Supervisor Myrna Melgar myrna.melgar@sfgov.org
Supervisor Dean Preston dean.preston@sfgov.org
Supervisor Aaron Peskin aaron.peskin@sfgov.org

RE: SUPPORT Board President Supervisor Peskin's Amendments to Proposed Density Calculation Ordinance (FILE 230734)

Dear Supervisors Melgar, Peskin & Preston:

We are writing to strongly oppose the proposed ordinance (file no. 230734) concerning form-based density, which will be heard by the Land Use and Transportation Committee on March 4. Wide-spread use of form-based density in large swaths of the City will have both significant and unpredictable consequences. It is far too premature to rush such a dramatic changeover in zoning rules. These amendments will allow significant increases in new housing while avoiding blockbusters and the displacement of small businesses.

The problem is that form-based density enables projects to completely circumvent existing height limits when using state bonus programs. This will inevitably supercharge new building heights, as seen in several recently-proposed Sansome Street projects on the edge of our neighborhood. The luxury project at 955 Sansome proposes a 24-story tower over three times the height limit on a parcel zoned for 84 ft. Another proposed condo project at 1088 Sansome envisions a 17-story project over 200' high on a parcel zoned for 65'. A third project could add up to 14 stories at 875 Sansome. These towers would be located in one of the City's oldest designated historic districts. Lying on 3 consecutive blocks, they would form the backbone for an imposing wall of high rises, while destroying the fabric of an historic district featuring buildings of 6 stories or less.

It is also nonsensical to apply form-based density to the two areas falling within the [Barbary Coast Neighborhood Association area \(BCNA\)](#). The two RC-4 areas already feature hundreds of existing mid-rise and high-rise housing structures with condominiums, rental units, and affordable housing. Furthermore, these two areas are NOT classified in the Priority Equity Geographies SUD.

Founded in 2006, BCNA, a non-profit California corporation, serves the residents and businesses in the historic NE waterfront along the Embarcadero from Clay Street to Bay Street, encompassing the foot of Telegraph Hill and along Sansome St into Jackson Square. We have been strong advocates for housing and have participated in the construction of 700 units of affordable housing in our neighborhood that were built within the current numerical zoning rules.

We urge more consideration of this drastic change and support Supervisor Peskin's common sense amendments.

On behalf of the BCNA Board of Directors...

Sincerely,

Diana Taylor

Diana Taylor
President, BCNA
415.517.6926



CC: mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org;
rich.hillis@sfgov.org; derek.braun@sfgov.org; gabriella.ruiz@sfgov.org; joel.koppel@sfgov.org;
kathrin.moore@sfgov.org ; sue.diamond@sfgov.org; theresa.imperial@sfgov.org ; john.carroll@sfgov.org

From: [Stan Hayes](#)
To: [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Rich Hillis](#)
Subject: SUPPORT - Board President Peskin's Amendments to Form-Based Density Legislation
Date: Sunday, March 3, 2024 4:45:14 PM
Attachments: [image.png](#)
[image.png](#)

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors Melgar, Preston, and Peskin,

On behalf of the Telegraph Hill Dwellers, we strongly **SUPPORT** the amendments proposed by Board President Peskin to the Form-Based Density Legislation proposed by Mayor Breed and Supervisor Melgar.

Form-based density such as being proposed in the legislation, especially when combined with a State Density Bonus, would allow supersizing of building heights and massing, resulting in luxury towers at double or triple current height limits.

This is not theoretical. It's happening now. Full of unintended consequences.

Already luxury towers, piling form-based densities and State Density Bonuses on one another, have been proposed at the foot of Telegraph Hill, two of which are in a historic district. A 267-foot tower is proposed at 955 Sansome, a 206-foot tower at 1088 Sansome, and a 140-tower at 875 Sansome.

You can see how that looks in the AFTER figure below. Is that really what you want San Francisco to look like?

If not, please support President Peskin's amendments.

Thank you,

Stan Hayes

President
Telegraph Hill Dwellers

AFTER



BEFORE



From: [Thomas Schuttish](#)
To: [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [PeskinStaff \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Hillis, Rich \(CPC\)](#); [Diamond, Sue \(CPC\)](#); mooreurban@aol.com; [Braun, Derek \(CPC\)](#); [Imperial, Theresa \(CPC\)](#); [Koppel, Joel \(CPC\)](#); [Neighborhoods United SF](#)
Subject: LUT 3/4/2024 Board File No. 230734 [Planning Code - Density Calculation in RC, RTO, NC, and Certain Named NCDs]
Date: Sunday, March 3, 2024 2:20:47 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Chair Melgar, President Peskin, Supervisor Preston and Mr. Carroll,

I attended the October 26, 2023 hearing when this legislation was at the Planning Commission. And I read the Staff Report for the legislation.

No one ever mentioned or possibly imagined the potential unintended consequences of his legislation using Form Based density and the SDB combined. I just rewatched the hearing on SFGOVTV and this potential issue never came up.

Not the Planning Staff, not the Commission, not the proponents of the legislation, not the public, no one ever made the connection of this unintended consequence ever happening.

This is a potential nightmare for the City and is not in line with what has been proposed under the Rezoning in all the many public forums on the Rezoning.

Apparently President Peskin will be presenting amendments to this legislation tomorrow. Any amendments need a thorough discussion. From the information I have received from NUSF Alliance, President Peskin will be proposing very reasonable amendments to this legislation.

Additionally a full discussion is needed as to how existing business along our thriving commercial corridors (Clement Street and Irving Street for example) will be protected from a speculative frenzy *as this is a worry that has been expressed frequently and correctly by the Planning Commission.*

Sincerely,
Georgia Schuttish