

**From:** [MARY MCFADDEN](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Comment for land use meeting March 7, 2021  
**Date:** Monday, March 07, 2022 10:11:03 AM

---

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

To the committee:

### **Eliminating single family housing will do nothing good and will do harm.**

Building more and destroying homes will not create more affordable housing any more than adding freeways has eased traffic. This is because quantity has nothing to do with pricing and because the more you have, the more people use it.

Supply & demand is not a consumer economic theory; it is Ronald Reagan's simplistic explanation of capitalism. Even if it were real, it would be invalid given that the influx of highly compensated people is fueled by the many billions in tax breaks and subsidies the city and state have given to companies importing those workers, and to the real estate developers and speculators that cater to them.

Home prices in San Francisco increased 217% between 2010 and 2020. The population has not doubled, so it is not demand. What has more than doubled is the wealth gap. That economic distance between laborers - teachers and plumbers - and tech and finance employees has deepened and broadened so much that those willing to offer twice the market price are setting a new exorbitant baseline. With tech workers making salaries plus stock options that give them income five to twenty times what teachers make, there is no housing policy that can bridge that distance.

In Noe Valley a shell of a house was listed at \$900K but sold for \$2m. That means that after another \$1m in remodeling, it will be a \$3m to \$4m house or, more likely, two \$4m units. This sets the comparable price of all homes in the area at \$4m. Anyone who came to San Francisco after 2000 is the problem they're complaining about.

### **Affordability is not related to quantity, but to income levels.**

All our policies to provide homes inevitably create a perpetual underclass. Because the home must be sold back into the affordability pool at a very, very small increase (3% over purchase price compared to the 13% rise in market rate housing) affordable home buyers lose equity and economic standing. They may be able to buy up within the affordability pool, but there are many restrictions in size, the quality of the housing is usually poor, and the locations are often dangerous, sometimes due to toxic waste or simply poor workmanship or to the neighborhood. Affordable homes cannot be inherited by children, so there is no generational wealth, no long term financial security. People slide down rather than rise up.

**Density works to a point, then it becomes environmentally damaging.**

San Francisco is now the 5th hottest heat island in the United States. Density, the thing advocates claim as ecologically beneficial, is doing damage, is raising global temperatures. High rises and huge homes create 4X the radiant heat surfaces that single family homes do. No amount of roof gardening will relieve the heating effects of multi-story walls and windows.

The loss of open space has not just been parks and streetscapes, but backyards. NASA reports that the 3°F rise in Bay Area temperatures and the loss of water in the aquifer over the last twenty years is directly related to the loss of backyards which were the largest green space in urban areas. There is no water in California, and there will be less.

Adding people and buildings, both commercial and residential, will only make things worse. Any prospects for desalinization or other "solutions" require lots of power and all create vast amounts of toxic waste. In the case of desalinization, twice as much toxic waste as potable water and power requirements equal to the yearly output of a nuclear reactor.

**Ultimately we cannot build out way out of a problem created by tax policy.**

I'm willing to be that few on this committee know that Apple, a company worth \$700 billion, is given sales taxes from Santa Clara County or that Fresno city budget gave Amazon \$30 million and line item and final approval over the city budget and an official advisory role in the mayor's office. Policies like eliminating single family homes cater to those who are creating the problem they're complaining about. Removing single family homes will allow the destruction of history for huge profit by real estate speculators and developers, but little social gain.

Perpetual growth is unfeasible and deadly. All our housing and tax policies support those industries and those people who should be supporting society by participating in morally just and socially reinforcing policy. The only things that grow without restriction are cancer and kudzu; both kill their hosts. Creating zoning that undermines community is fertilizing predatory businesses.

Mary McFadden  
San Francisco, CA

From: Thomas Schuttish  
To: Major, Erica (BOS)  
Cc: Jennifer Fisher; Smaillie, Kyle (BOS); Hepper, Lee (BOS); Bintliff, Jacob (BOS); Lovett, Li (BOS); Jones, Ernest (BOS); Hansystaff (BOS)  
Subject: LUT Hearing on March 7, 2022 Items no 4, 5 and 6 Board Files No.210866; 211234; 211202  
Date: Sunday, March 6, 2022 11:27:48 PM  
Attachments: 311 Plans - 23 74th Ave.pdf.pdf  
IMG\_8932.PNG  
March 6 Chron R.E. ad.pdf

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

Dear Ms. Major:

Good morning.

There are three attachments with this email as part of comments **on all three of the proposed Ordinances on the Agenda for the LUT on Monday, March 7, 2022.**

The three Ordinances that are before the LUT seem to want to deal not only with the "housing crisis" but are also a local response to SB-9 which went into affect on January 1, 2022. As of last week there were ten applications using SB-9/SB-330 according to the Planning Department.

All three proposed Ordinances are well intentioned, most particularly Supervisor Mar's Ordinance, because this Ordinance confronts the housing affordability issue, which is really what the "crisis" is about.

However in the past, the City has failed to use the tool it already has to preserve existing housing which is more relatively affordable housing, and perhaps even increase the existing housing stock. The Planning Staff has declared my neighborhood, Noe Valley, "the epicenter of de facto Demolition". *An epicenter reverberates out.* The increase in price for both rental and "for sale" housing in the past decade since the Great Recession, which is cited in the Findings for two of the proposed Ordinances, not only in Noe Valley but throughout the entire City, *confirm that reverberation.*

The Planning Code Section 317 Demolition Calculations are a tool to be used to prevent Alterations from becoming Demolitions. And Planning Code Section 317 (b) (2) (D) allows for the *adjustment of the Demo Calcs in order to preserve more of an existing structure as needed to "implement the intent of this Section 317 to conserve existing sound housing and preserve affordable housing"*. That adjustment has never happened. *If it had happened, more housing could have been preserved rather than being "de facto" demolished and replaced by much more expensive housing that is beyond the financial reach of most San Franciscans.*

Additionally the parking requirement has been eliminated from the Planning Code, yet major Alterations and other new projects in the RH neighborhoods continue to include garage space.

Whether categorized as a "housing crisis" or an "affordable housing crisis", it is fair to say that housing in San Francisco in the RH and RM neighborhoods has become a commodity, with speculation running rampant and with entitlements often being sold prior to any construction.

San Francisco is stuck...for now...with SB 9.

*Until the Board and the Planning Commission can better preserve existing sound housing and/or expand the amount of housing that is within the economic reach of most San Franciscans, this upzoning of the City, whether from Sacramento or self-imposed by local decision makers, is not going to solve the "affordable housing crisis. And that is what we have: An Affordable Housing Crisis.*

The attachments below are just a little slice of San Francisco's affordable housing crisis and are three "real world" examples:

#### Description of Attachments:

**Attachments #1 and #2** below show a project in the Richmond District, located **on a 25' x 120' lot (3,000 sq.ft) zoned RM-1.** It was approved as an Alteration with a vertical expansion of two levels above an existing two level house in 2016.

The photo below shows the work during construction under an Alteration Permit in **October 2017.** **There are no published Demolition Calculations per Section 317 for this project.** This unfortunately is often the case for projects in the years following the passage of Planning Code Section 317 by the City in 2008. Years which coincidentally parallel the price increases since the Great Recession as cited in the Findings for both the Mandelman/Haney Ordinance and the Mar Ordinance.

The attached **311 Plans** for this project, show that there were likely two units existing on the site, as there are two kitchens noted on Sheet 2. However, looking at the Google Earth photo from **October 2017,** it seems reasonable to say that it defies logic to think this project was an Alteration, and not a Demolition...de facto or in fact.

This Richmond District project was completed in 2020. The smallest unit (825 sq.ft) sold for \$998K, a four bedroom unit (2,301sq.ft) sold for \$2.290 million in 2020; and currently the third unit (2,374 sq.ft) is for sale asking \$2.5 million. Previously prior to the start of construction, the entitlement for this project sold in **June 2017** for \$1.960 million according to Redfin. According to Zillow, the **June 2013** sales price *prior* to the City bestowing the entitlement on the original house that appears to have two units...or at least two potential individual living spaces each with a kitchen...was \$997K.

**Here are two questions regarding the project in Attachments #1 and #2:** Is this scenario, the sale of the entitlement with a million dollar increase, an apparent illegal Demolition, three expensive new units where two units could have previously existed, what the Board wants? And how likely is a similar scenario throughout the City under the three proposed Ordinances?

**Attachment #3** is from the March 6th **SF Chronicle** Sunday Open Homes Section, page L3. Two "open homes" are circled, one on **Fair Oaks Street** and the other on **29th Street.**

The property on **Fair Oaks Street** seems to be the type of housing (*the missing middle*) that the three Ordinances want to be built. It is zoned RH-3. It is four units, three of them one bedroom apartments and one two bedroom apartment per the ad. The lot is very large at 30' x 117.5' (3,524 sq.ft) and is a through lot to **Quane Alley** that allows for parking and good egress. (This size lot is very conducive for multi-units and is not the typical RH lot.) The asking price for this four unit building is \$2.440 million. Apparently all four apartments have been or currently are vacant.


The property on **29th Street** is two flats and has an asking price of \$2.199 million on a RH-2 zoned lot of 25' x 101.5' (2,535 sq.ft) and is stated to be "delivered vacant".

**The questions for the housing in Attachment #3 are:** What will happen to these two properties once sold? How long have the **Fair Oaks Street** apartments been vacant? Do tenants live in the **29th Street** flats that are to be "delivered vacant"? How will the property on **29th Street** be "developed" and how much will it sell for in its new version? What is the potential speculative development value of both the **Fair Oaks Street** apartments and the flats on **29th Street**? **And finally:** How will the proposed Ordinances affect the cost of this housing that is now for sale?

Sincerely,  
Georgia Schuttish

**Attachment #1**

**Attachment #2**



Attachment #3



# Home Guide

→ SFGATE.com/Re

## SAN FRANCISCO

**Cathedral Hill** \$749,000 1 Daniel Burnham Ct #401 Sun 11-1  
NEW PRICE. Remodeled 1 bdrm, hdwd, balcony, pkg, pool, spa,  
gym. Jeannie Anderson #00955951 Compass 415-271-6887

**Delores Heights** \$2,440,000 30 Fair Oaks St. By Appointment



Investment Opportunity in top SF location! Meticulously maintained, fully detached fourplex in the heart of the Liberty Hill Historic District w/ 5 parking spaces! 98 WalkScore - three 1BR/1BA units and one 2BR/2BA unit. Fully renovated in 2007. Laundry, structural, plumbing and electrical upgrades. Call Jessica Branson.com 415-341-7177 for more information.

**LakeSIDE** \$2,295,000 8 Lagunitas Drive 12-2pm Sat & 2-4pm Sun Rarely available detached 4BR/3BA home on 3 spacious light-filled levels featuring LR w/ frpc, formal DR, remodeled kitchen & 2-Car Garage. Incredible estate-size lot with beautiful landscaped front & rear garden. Fabulous floorplan. Chris O'Connor 415-246-9764

## SAN FRANCISCO

**Noe Valley** \$1,995,000 569 Diamond St. Sat 10-12 & Sun 11-1



Lovely 20VL, 3BR, 2BA Victorian home in the heart of Noe. 94 WalkScore! Original floors, coved ceilings, picture molding, wainscoting, built in cabinetry. Renovated chef's kitchen, french doors open to deck & beautiful garden. Two car garage. Wow!

**Noe Valley** \$2,199,500 580-582 29th St. Open Sat/Sun 2-4  
2 Noe Valley Units, 5,000+ Sq Ft. Upper 7+rooms on 2 levels with Updated Kitch. & Ba. Lower 4-rooms. Units will be delivered vacant. Tim Curran #00969619, Compass, 415-551-0777

**North of Panhandle** \$1,585,000 "Fresh Price!" 614 Broderick,  
Sun. 1 - 3pm. NoPA remodeled 4BR 1BA, 1PKG,  
one blk to Divisadero. "No sign, ring bell".  
www.6148rodenick.com S. Clark 415-309-0003

**PACIFIC HEIGHTS** \$599,000 2415 Van Ness #501 Sun 2-4  
Beautifully remodeled studio, same view, hdwd, great building!  
Ideal 1051 exchange prop, 1st buy, pied-a-tere, rental unit.  
JEANNIE ANDERSON 415-271-4887 COMPASS #00835151

## SAN FRANCISCO

**Sea Cliff** \$8,795,000 625 El Camino Del Mar By Appointment



Only A magnificent example of early 19th century glorious Mediterranean Spanish architecture, 625 El Camino Real embroders the same classic features of a Spanish Caste. The property was built in 1927 and designed by renowned architects, Hyman and Appleton. The lovely home spans over 3 levels, including 7 Bedrooms including a wood-paneled Office, 6.5 Bathrooms, Rotunda library, Wine Room, Formal Living and Dining Rooms, Breakfast Room, Family Kitchen, 2 car Garage with 2 exterior parking spaces and an elevator servicing all 3 levels. 6154 sq ft + 1425 unwarranted. Please call, text or email Mary Toboni at 415-317-4255 or Mary@toboni-co.com to schedule a private showing.

## ALAMEDA COUNTY EXCLUDING OAKLAND/BERKELEY

**San Leandro**, \$948,888, 14618 Cypress St, Sat 1-3 & Sun 2-4  
Gorgeous 3bd/1ba contemporary rancher style home in the highly sought after Washington Manor-Bonaire neighborhood. Featuring Beautiful hardwood floors, updated kitchen w/quartz counters And SS appliances, attached 2 car garage and spacious yard. Near shopping & dining, BART and more!  
www.14618Cypress.com  
Hanna & Sunny w/ Winkler Real Estate Group 510-348-5702

San Francisco Chronicle

FOOD

SFCHRONICLE.COM/  
NEWSLETTERS

DATEBOOK

Your guide to Bay Area  
arts & entertainment  
DATEBOOK.SFCHRONICLE.COM

**Berkeley** \$1,933,000

**Berkeley** \$1,425,000  
4 bdr, 3 ba  
details near  
www.1425M  
MONICA R

**Berkeley** \$1,233,000  
kitchen, breez  
Codornices R  
& transport.

Claremont

T

Design  
Claremont  
Bay view  
high ceilings  
glass wall  
a full-height


STAMP:

TITLE:  
**EXISTING AND PROPOSED SITE PLANS**


REV: PRINTING: DATE:

JOB NO: 13041 - 423 24th Ave.  
 DRAWN BY: G.B.  
 CHECKED BY: Y.A.  
 PRINTED: 1/14/16  
 SHEET:

**SHEET 1**




**2 PROPOSED SITE PLAN**  
 SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"




**1 EXISTING SITE PLAN**  
 SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"

**WALL LEGEND**

	EXISTING WALL CONSTRUCTION TO REMAIN.
	EXISTING WALL CONSTRUCTION TO BE REMOVED
	PROPOSED 1-HR WALL CONSTRUCTION
	PROPOSED 2-HR RATED WALL CONSTRUCTION
	ADJACENT BUILDINGS



**2 (E) SECOND FLOOR PLAN**  
SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"



**1 (E) FIRST FLOOR PLAN**  
SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"


WALL LEGEND	
	EXISTING WALL CONSTRUCTION TO REMAIN
	EXISTING WALL CONSTRUCTION TO BE REMOVED
	PROPOSED 1-HR WALL CONSTRUCTION
	PROPOSED 2-HR RATED WALL CONSTRUCTION
	ADJACENT BUILDINGS

SUBJECT PROPERTY  
**24 th. AVENUE**


**24 th. AVENUE**




**4 (E) EAST (FRONT) ELEVATION**  
SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"




**3 (E) WEST (REAR) ELEVATION**  
SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"



**5 (E) WEST-EAST BUILDING SECTION**  
SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"



**2 (E) SOUTH (SIDE) ELEVATION**  
SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"



**1 (E) NORTH (SIDE) ELEVATION**  
SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"



STAMP:


TITLE:  
**PROPOSED FLOOR PLANS**

REV: PRINTING: DATE:

JOB NO: 13041 - 423 24th Ave.  
 DRAWN BY: G.B.  
 CHECKED BY: Y.A.  
 PRINTED: 1/14/16  
 SHEET:


**SHEET 4**

SHEET 27 OF 29 © Y.A. studio 2013




**2 PROPOSED SECOND FLOOR PLAN**

SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"




**1 PROPOSED FIRST FLOOR PLAN**

SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"



**2** PROPOSED FOURTH FLOOR PLAN  
SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"




**1** PROPOSED THIRD FLOOR PLAN  
SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"

STAMP:


TITLE:  
**PROPOSED FLOOR PLANS**

REV: PRINTING: DATE:

JOB NO: 13041 - 423 24th Ave.  
DRAWN BY: G.B.  
CHECKED BY: Y.A.  
PRINTED: 1/14/16  
SHEET:




**5 (N) PROPOSED WEST-EAST BUILDING SECTION**  
SCALE: 3/32" = 1'-0"




**4 (N) PROPOSED SOUTH (SIDE) ELEVATION**  
SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"



**2 (N) PROPOSED WEST (REAR) ELEVATION**  
SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"



**3 (N) PROPOSED NORTH (SIDE) ELEVATION**  
SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"



**1 (N) PROPOSED EAST (FRONT) ELEVATION**  
SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"

REV.	PRINTING:	DATE:

JOB NO: 13041 - 423 24th Ave.  
DRAWN BY: G.B.  
CHECKED BY: Y.A.  
PRINTED: 1/19/16  
SHEET:

**From:** [Christopher Pederson](#)  
**To:** [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Land Use & Transportation Committee agenda items 4 (file # 211300), 5 (file # 211234), 6 (file # 211202)  
**Date:** Thursday, March 3, 2022 9:25:30 PM

---

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

Dear Chair Melgar, Vice Chair Preston, and Supervisor Peskin:

I urge the Committee to support Supervisor Mandelman's proposed ordinance to rezone all RH-1 zoning districts as RH-2 zoning districts, to allow four units on mid-block lots in RH-2 districts, and to allow six units on corner lots in RH-2 districts. I urge the Committee to table Supervisor Mar's and Supervisor Safai's proposed ordinances that would make additional density in RH districts contingent on various affordability requirements.

California and especially San Francisco are in the grip of a longstanding housing crisis. The entire world faces a climate crisis, the consequences of which the IPCC reminded us all just days ago.

Supervisor Mandelman's proposed ordinance is a necessary but modest first step in San Francisco's efforts to address both of those crises. The large portions of the city currently zoned as RH-1 have contributed little new housing supply in recent decades. That failure has contributed to skyrocketing housing prices, prices that are excluding and displacing low- and mid-income households from the city.

Given San Francisco's mild climate, walkability, extensive public transit network, and dense concentration of jobs, it is the most appropriate location for additional multi-family housing in the entire state. When San Francisco restricts multi-family housing, it drives households out to other areas that are more automobile dependent and energy intensive. That undermines the city's oft-proclaimed determination to be a leader in addressing the climate crisis.

Supervisor Mar's and Supervisor Safai's proposed ordinances might superficially appear to address the housing and climate crises as well, but they would be ineffectual. As the Planning Commission found, the various proposed affordability requirements make it highly unlikely that either ordinance would encourage a meaningful amount of new housing.

Although I strongly support Supervisor Mandelman's proposed ordinance and urge the Committee to support it, it is only a first step. The Committee should follow up support for Supervisor Mandelman's ordinance by pursuing additional legislation to address the many other factors that impede the construction of new "missing middle" housing in San Francisco's lower density neighborhoods.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Sincerely,

Christopher Pederson  
District 7 resident