From:	patricia_inez@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Patrice Thompson
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Tuesday, November 25, 2025 9:13:04 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

The Land Use Committee, on a vote of 2-1, has blocked Supervisor Chan's amendments and its Chair declined to invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Committee must advance these compliant amendments for the protection of sound housing, historic resources, and our coastline to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparent and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Patrice Thompson
San Francisco, CA 94121

From:	mark@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mark Hanlon
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Wednesday, November 26, 2025 9:45:25 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a long-time San Franciscan whose family has lived her for generations, both as renters and home-owners, I care deeply about the character and livability of our neighborhoods. I write to express my strong opposition to Mayor Lurie's current upzoning proposal. As written, the plan incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displaces renters and small businesses, and risks turning diverse residential areas into corridors of luxury high-rises that most San Franciscans cannot afford.

I'm asking you to:

Substantially scale back the Mayor's proposed upzoning maps

Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

These maps would create permanent and irreversible land-use changes across the city, far beyond what state or regional requirements demand — and with no meaningful affordability commitments. In practice, they clear a path for widespread demolition and large luxury developments that largely serve investors rather than the communities they reshape.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning that protects existing residents, supports small businesses, and ensures genuine affordability — not displacement packaged as progress.

Thank you for your attention to this critical issue.

Sincerely,
Mark Hanlon
San Francisco, CA 94118

From: Justin Truong
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Thursday, November 27, 2025 11:23:55 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Justin Truong
justintruong56@gmail.com
33 Junior Terrace
San Francisco, California 94112

From:	Jen Reck
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff
Subject:	Public Comment: Land Use and Transportation meeting December 1st
Date:	Monday, December 1, 2025 11:52:15 AM

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

Dear Land Use and Transportation Committee Members:

I am writing regarding an agenda item on your meeting today regarding the Mayor's upzoning plan. I am an Executive Co-Chair of the Castro LGBTQ Cultural District Advisory Board and an associate professor of Sociology at San Francisco State University with an expertise in queer urban development, homelessness, and the built environment.

I strongly support amendments to the plan that will protect rent controlled units from being destroyed as part of the development allowed by the upzoning plan. While streamlining development and the building permit processes will help San Francisco comply with the requirements of the state housing element, it is vital that we pursue these actions with equity in mind and ensure that existing residents can stay in place even as we seek to build more units of housing.

Protecting rent controlled units is a vital part of San Francisco's culture and commitment to access and equity. Please vote to strengthen rent control protections and disallow demolition of any rent control buildings., as well as removing all rent control units from the local bonus.

Rent control units are a housing protection in San Francisco that have probably done the most to counter gentrification and prevent displacement of San Francisco renters. I respectfully request that you help preserve the cultural heritage of San Francisco by protecting those who live here, particularly because many of them are only able to remain living here due to their access to rent controlled housing.

Thank you,

Jen Reck

--
Jen Reck, PhD
Executive Co-Chair
Castro LGBTQ Cultural District
San Francisco, California

pronouns: she / they

From:	D M LaPointe
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS)
Cc:	Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Wtpcc Delegates; Wtpcc Officers; MelgarStaff (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Submission of WTPCC Letter to the Land Use & Transportation Committee
Date:	Monday, December 1, 2025 11:20:45 AM
Attachments:	WTPCC-LU-upzoning - 12-1-25.docx

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

Dear Chair and Clerk,

Please find attached the West of Twin Peaks Central Council's letter regarding the Family Zoning Plan for consideration by the Land Use & Transportation Committee. We respectfully request that this letter be entered into the official record for the upcoming hearing.

Thank you for your attention.

--
Denise M. LaPointe
President
WTPCC

West of Twin Peaks Central Council

A Resource for Neighborhood Organizations West of Twin Peaks in San Francisco since 1936

PO Box 27112
San Francisco, CA 94127

http://www.westoftwinpeaks.org/

December 1, 2025

Chair and Members of the Land Use & Transportation Committee:

On behalf of the West of Twin Peaks Central Council and the thousands of homeowners and families we represent, we register our firm and unequivocal opposition to the Family Zoning Plan unless it is substantially amended.

We believe in housing. We believe in growth. And we have proved it - approving and welcoming thousands of new homes at Stonestown, Parkmerced, Balboa Reservoir, and throughout our corridors. Our neighborhoods have done our part and remain ready to do more.

But this proposal is not real planning. It is paper compliance masquerading as progress, shifting the costs and destabilizing impacts onto the very neighborhoods that have kept San Francisco livable, stable, and resilient.

The City's own financial analysis makes one fact unavoidable: only mid-rise redevelopment pencils out. That means this plan incentivizes the demolition of existing homes - not on transit corridors already upzoned by SB 79, but deep inside long-standing, middle-class neighborhoods. SB 79 is already the law. Local zoning will be overridden in 2032. The City should be defending its residents - homeowners and long-term residents alike - not eliminating their remaining protections through density decontrol.

Density decontrol must be removed. Without that amendment, the plan reads as a teardown blueprint, not a family housing strategy.

A central flaw in the proposal is the assumption that so-called "well-resourced neighborhoods" should absorb the city's unmet housing goals, even though these areas do not have the infrastructure capacity to support significant added density. This approach contradicts the City's own service and transit data. Effective equity planning pairs new housing with targeted investment in under-served communities - expanding transit, upgrading utilities, and improving public services where it will meaningfully reduce disparities. Concentrating demolition incentives in stable neighborhoods while leaving actual inequities unaddressed is not sound planning and does not advance the City's stated equity goals.

WTPCC therefore urges the Committee to adopt these essential changes:

Eliminate density decontrol.
It is unnecessary, inequitable, and guaranteed to trigger speculative demolition pressure.

Protect small businesses and merchant corridors.
West Portal, Taraval, and Lakeside cannot absorb displacement without losing the local merchants who define them.

Restore design review, public notice, and protection of historic resources.
Residents - especially longtime homeowners - have the right to transparency. Eliminating due process is unjustifiable.

Guarantee strong protections for existing homeowners and long-term residents.
Middle-class families, whether they rent or own, are the backbone of San Francisco and deserve respect, stability, and a meaningful voice.

At the same time, WTPCC and its members are committed partners in real solutions -and we are sounding this alarm now because the unintended consequences of this plan will be profound and irreversible if the City does not course-correct. We stand ready to help the City unlock and incentivize the more than 70,000 approved units already in the pipeline - homes that can be delivered now, without destabilizing established neighborhoods or erasing neighborhood identity.

Our stable, historic, family-oriented neighborhoods are not obstacles - they are the civic bedrock and democratic center of gravity of this city, composed of taxpayers who keep San Francisco running. To ignore this constituency and insist that one community upend its way of life to cover for years of government failure is not equity - it is a fundamental injustice. No credible planning effort punishes families and homeowners for problems created by City Hall.

If the City is serious about housing, it will focus on the 70,000 units already approved - not dismantle the neighborhoods that sustain the city.

Amend this plan. Protect homeowners and tenants, small business and historic resources. And prove that San Francisco can grow without sacrificing the very neighborhoods that make it worth fighting for.

Sincerely,

Denise LaPointe
President | WTPCC

Cc: Mayor Daniel Lurie
Supervisor Rafael Mandelman, President, Board of Supervisors and Members
WTPCC Delegates

From:	Tina Aguirre
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff
Cc:	Sucre, Richard (CPC); Jen Reck; Wyatt Robertson; Joshua Ochoa; Michael Karavolias; Shayne Watson; M Rocket; Alexandre Fellous; Andrew Gutierrez III
Subject:	Protect rent control units from getting demolished by developers
Date:	Monday, December 1, 2025 10:39:38 AM

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

Dear Land Use and Transportation Committee Members:

As the Castro LGBTQ Cultural District Director, I respectfully ask that you help protect rent control units in San Francisco. The Castro LGBTQ Cultural District supports amendments to the Mayor's Upzoning Plan to protect rent control units from getting demolished by developers. Protections should be strengthened to disallow demolition of any rent control buildings. We also support removing all rent control units from the local bonus.

Rent control units have helped counter gentrification and displacement of LGBTQ+ community members since its inception in 1979. Please help preserve the cultural heritage of San Francisco by protecting its most important element: the people who live and thrive here.

Thank you,

Tina Aguirre

copy: Rich Sucre, Planning
Castro LGBTQ Cultural District Advisory Board Members

Mx. Tina V. Aguirre
Cultural District Director
Castro LGBTQ Cultural District
pronouns: they/them/theirs

From: Eileen Hirst
To: Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject: Family Zoning Plan
Date: Monday, December 1, 2025 10:07:21 AM

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

As the Land Use and Transportation Committee again considers Mayor Lurie's upzoning plan, I urge you to listen to the Planning staff, the City Economist and the hundreds of San Franciscans who are telling you that this plan will not result in the workforce housing needed to encourage families to stay in San Francisco, nor will it meet the state's artificial housing requirement.

I urge you to reject this plan and direct the Planning Department to identify parcels ripe for affordable, family-appropriate housing now, and I urge you to direct the appropriate city agencies to work with housing developers to finance that housing and streamline the permitting process to make it happen now, because now is when we need it.

If you insist on passing this misbegotten scheme, I urge you to adopt the common sense amendments offered by Supervisors Connie Chan and Chyanne Chen.

I urge you to retain the 40-foot height limit on more than 30 alleys, some as narrow as 11 feet wide, on Russian Hill.

I urge you to retain the 40-foot height limit on the blocks bounded by Hyde, Vallejo, Filbert and Larkin Streets.

You cannot have the Family Zoning Plan both ways. If, in fact, Planning staff and the City Economist are correct that this plan will not produce the required housing, there is no reason to pass it to the full Board. If, as some maintain, the plan will result in tens of thousands of housing units, passing it without provisions for necessary accompanying infrastructure and requirements for affordable, family-appropriate housing is reckless and irresponsible.

You have one chance to get this right. Have the courage to send it back to the drawing board and not allow San Francisco to be bullied by the state. Have the courage to stand up for San Francisco and demand a plan that will really work.

Thank you,

Eileen Hirst
Resident of Russian Hill

From:	James Lloyd
To:	Chen, Lisa (CPC); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Supervisors; ChanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); MahmoodStaff; MandelmanStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Cc:	Carroll, John (BOS); Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC); Cityattorney
Subject:	public comment re Family Zoning plan for today"s Land Use Committee meeting
Date:	Monday, December 1, 2025 9:16:53 AM
Attachments:	CFH v BH - 2023-12-21 - Judgment.pdf San Francisco - Family Zoning Plan - BoS Land Use Committee 2025.12.01.pdf ucb-examining-local-law-policy-planning-practice-on-development-in-sf-using-cales.pdf

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

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

The California Housing Defense Fund and Californians for Homeownership submit the attached public comment (and referenced attachments) for today's Land Use Committee meeting regarding the Family Zoning Plan, agendized as items 2 through 9.

Sincerely,

James M. Lloyd
Director of Planning and Investigations
California Housing Defense Fund
james@calhdf.org
CalHDF is grant & donation funded
Donate today - https://calhdf.org/donate/

Electronically Received 10/27/2023 11:58 PM

FILED
Superior Court of California
County of Los Angeles
12/21/2023
David W. Slayton, Executive Officer / Clerk of Court
By: M. Mort Deputy

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

CALIFORNIANS FOR HOMEOWNERSHIP, INC., a California nonprofit public benefit corporation,

Petitioner,

v.

CITY OF BEVERLY HILLS,

Respondent.

Case No. 23STCP00143

[~~PROPOSED~~] JUDGMENT

Assigned for all purposes to:
Hon. Curtis A. Kin (Dept. 82)

On September 12, 2023, the Court held a hearing on Petitioner's Verified First Amended Petition for Writ of Mandate. After considering the parties' papers and oral argument, the Court issued the decision attached hereto as Exhibit A.

NOW THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED:

1. Judgment is entered in favor of Petitioner on the Verified First Amended Petition for Writ of Mandate.

2. A writ of mandate shall issue pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 1085 and Government Code section 65754 (a) requiring Respondent to bring the housing element of its general plan into substantial compliance with state law within 120 days of the date of this judgment, (b) requiring Respondent to bring its zoning ordinance into consistency with the housing element of its general plan within 120 days of the amendment required by (a), and (c) requiring Respondent to

file a return to the writ within 250 days of the date of this judgment.

3. Pursuant to subdivision (a)(1) of Government Code section 65755, the Court hereby suspends the authority of Respondent to issue building permits pursuant to Division 13 (commencing with section 17910) of the Health and Safety Code, and all other related permits, except for permits that create new residential bedrooms or units, and except for permits subject to subdivision (b) of Government Code section 65755, until the City has substantially complied with the requirements of Article 5 of Chapter 3 of Division 1 of Title 7 of the Government Code (commencing with Government Code Section 65300).

4. The Court hereby declares that Respondent City of Beverly Hills has not adopted a substantially compliant general plan housing element

5. Petitioner is entitled to recover its reasonable and legally-authorized costs pursuant to a memorandum of costs to be subsequently filed with the Court.

Dated: 12/21/2023

Curtis A. Kin/Judge

Hon. Curtis A. Kin
Judge of the Superior Court

Respectfully submitted this 27th day of October, 2023
CALIFORNIANS FOR HOMEOWNERSHIP, INC.

Matthew P. Gelfand

Attorneys for Petitioner CALIFORNIANS FOR HOMEOWNERSHIP, INC.

EXHIBIT A

FILED
Superior Court of California
County of Los Angeles
SEP 12 2023
David W. Slayton, Executive Officer/Clerk of Court
By: M. Mort, Deputy

Superior Court of California
County of Los Angeles

CALIFORNIANS FOR HOMEOWNERSHIP, INC., Petitioner, vs. CITY OF BEVERLY HILLS, Respondent.	Case No. 23STCP00143 **RULING ON VERIFIED FIRST AMENDED PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE** Dept. 82 (Hon. Curtis A. Kin)

Petitioner Californians for Homeownership, Inc. petitions for a writ of mandate directing respondent City of Beverly Hills to adopt a revised housing element pursuant to Government Code § 65754.

I. Factual Background

The State of California requires each city to have a "comprehensive, long-term general plan for the physical development" of the city. (Gov. Code § 65300.)[1] Each general plan must have a housing element. (§ 65302(c).) The housing element consists of 'standards and plans for housing sites in the municipality that 'shall endeavor to make adequate provision for the housing needs of all economic segments of the community.' [Citations.]" (*California Building Industry Assn. v. City of San Jose* (2015) 61 Cal.4th 435, 444; *see also* § 65580 [legislative findings concerning housing element law].)

"A municipality must review its housing element for the appropriateness of its housing goals, objectives, and policies and must revise the housing element in accordance with a statutory schedule." (*Martinez v. City of Clovis* (2023) 90 Cal.App.5th 193, 222, citing § 65588(a), (b).) "The interval between the due dates for

[1] All statutory references are to the Government Code, unless otherwise specified.

the revised housing element is referred to as a planning period or cycle, which usually is eight years." (*Martinez,* 90 Cal.App.5th at 222, citing § 65588(e)(3), (f)(1).)

"A revised housing element's assessment of needs must quantify the locality's existing and projected housing needs for all income levels, which includes the locality's proportionate share of regional housing needs for each income level." (*Martinez,* 90 Cal.App.5th at 223, citing § 65583(a)(1).) "The projected regional housing needs for a planning period are determined by the HCD [Department of Housing and Community Development] in consultation with regional 'councils of government.'" (*Martinez,* 90 Cal.App.5th at 223, citing §§ 65584(a) & (b), 65584.01, 65588(e)(3).) "Based on the HCD's regional housing needs determination, each regional council of governments adopts a 'final regional housing need plan that allocates a share of the regional housing need' among the cities and counties within its region." (*Martinez,* 90 Cal.App.5th at 223, citing § 65584(b).)

For the 2021-2029 planning period, the City Council of respondent City of Beverly Hills ("City") adopted a housing element on October 12, 2021 and submitted it for review to HCD. (JR 776.) On January 14, 2022, HCD determined that the housing element did not fully comply with the housing element law and provided necessary revisions. (JR 1309-16.)

On September 28, 2022, the City submitted a revised housing element to HCD. (JR 776.) On November 28, 2022, HCD determined that the revised housing element did not fully comply with the housing element law and provided necessary revisions. (JR 1318-24.)

On February 21, 2023, after having revised the September 2022 housing element, the City adopted the revision. (JR 5.) On February 21, 2023, petitioner Californians for Homeownership, Inc., who monitors local compliance with the housing element law, sent a letter to the City asserting that the revised housing element was inadequate for reasons identified by HCD and petitioner. (JR 1584-85.) On May 12, 2023, HCD determined that the housing element does not substantially comply with housing element law. (RJN Ex. B.)

II. Procedural History

On January 18, 2023, petitioner filed a verified petition for writ of mandate. On May 24, 2023, pursuant to stipulation, petitioner filed a verified first amended petitioner for writ of mandate.

On June 22, 2023, during the trial setting conference, the Court set the hearing on the instant petition for September 12, 2023.

On July 14, 2023, petitioner filed an opening brief. On August 15, 2023, respondent filed an opposition. On August 31, 2023, petitioner filed a reply.

III. Request for Judicial Notice

Petitioner's requests for judicial notice are ruled on as follows:

- Exhibit A (September 15, 2017 Assembly Floor Analysis of AB 1397 (2017-2018 Session)) – GRANTED (Evid. Code § 452(c); *Wood v. Kaiser Foundation Hospitals* (2023) 88 Cal.App.5th 742, 751, fn. 4)

- Exhibit B (May 12, 2023 Letter from HCD to City) – GRANTED (Evid. Code § 452(c))

- Exhibit C (Staff Report for June 22, 2023 Meeting of Beverly Hills Planning Commission) – DENIED

- Exhibit D (Minutes of June 22, 2023 Meeting of Beverly Hills Planning Commission) – DENIED

- Exhibit E (Resolution No. 1907 of Beverly Hills Planning Commission) – DENIED

- Exhibit F (2022 Form 10-K for Creative Media & Community Trust Corporation (Excerpts)) – DENIED

- Exhibit G (June 10, 2020 Memorandum of the California Department of Housing and Community Development, Entitled "Housing Element Site Inventory Guidebook") – GRANTED (Evid. Code § 452(c))

- Exhibit H (City of Gardena's 2021-2029 Housing Element, Table C-1) – GRANTED (Evid. Code § 452(c))

With respect to denying the request for judicial notice of Exhibits C, D, E, and F, the Court notes these exhibits are extra-record evidence petitioner presents to demonstrate that certain sites listed in the sites inventory of the housing element are improperly included. For the reason stated in section V.C below, this is improper. The exhibits are accordingly irrelevant. (*Mangini v. R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.* (1994) 7 Cal.4th 1057, 1063 ["Although a court may judicially notice a variety of matters (Evid. Code, § 450 *et seq.*), only relevant material may be noticed"].)

IV. Standard of Review

CCP § 1085(a) provides: "A writ of mandate may be issued by any court to any inferior tribunal, corporation, board, or person, to compel the performance of an act which the law specially enjoins, as a duty resulting from an office, trust, or station, or to compel the admission of a party to the use and enjoyment of a right or office to

which the party is entitled, and from which the party is unlawfully precluded by that inferior tribunal, corporation, board, or person."

"Any action brought by any interested party to review the conformity with the provisions of this article of any housing element or portion thereof or revision thereto shall be brought pursuant to Section 1085 of the Code of Civil Procedure; the court's review of compliance with the provisions of this article shall extend to whether the housing element or portion thereof or revision thereto substantially complies with the requirements of this article." (§ 65587(b); *see also* § 65751.) Substantial compliance means "actual compliance in respect to the substance essential to every reasonable objective of the statute, as distinguished from mere technical imperfections of form." (*Martinez,* 90 Cal.App.5th at 237, internal citations omitted.)

"[A] city's adoption of a housing element is a legislative enactment, something which is generally entitled to some deference." (*Fonseca v. City of Gilroy* (2007) 148 Cal.App.4th 1174, 1191.) "If the municipality has substantially complied with statutory requirements, we will not interfere with its legislative action, unless that action was arbitrary, capricious, or entirely lacking in evidentiary support." (*Ibid.*) The challenging party has the burden to demonstrate that the housing element is inadequate. (*Ibid.*)

V. Analysis

A. This Dispute is Not Moot

As a preliminary matter, respondent asserts that the City anticipates adopting a revised housing element in November of this year to address concerns about the current housing element. (Wiener Decl. ¶ 2.) However, there is no guarantee that a revision will be completed by November or that the City will adopt a revision at that time, or at any time thereafter. The Court can only rule based on the current housing element. The instant petition is entitled to preference. (§ 65752.) Further, if the Court were to enter judgment in favor of petitioner, the housing element law provides deadlines for the City to address the deficiencies in the housing element and to submit the revision to HCD. (§ 65754(a).) If respondent were to appeal, the appeal would be given preference also. (§ 65752.) Accordingly, there is no reason to delay ruling on the merits of the operative first amended petition.

B. Whether Sites Inventory Meets Statutory Requirements

1. Realistic Development Capacity

The inventory in a housing element must "specify for each site the number of units that can realistically be accommodated on that site and whether the site is adequate to accommodate lower income housing, moderate-income housing, or above moderate-income housing." (§ 65583.2(c).) For a city that does not require a

minimum residential density,[2] the city "shall demonstrate how the number of units determined for [each] site...will be accommodated." (§ 65583.2(c)(1).) As part of the calculation, " [t]he number of units calculated...shall be adjusted as necessary, based on the land use controls and site improvements requirement identified in paragraph (5) of subdivision (a) of Section 65583, the realistic development capacity for the site, typical densities of existing or approved residential developments at a similar affordability level in that jurisdiction, and on the current or planned availability and accessibility of sufficient water, sewer, and dry utilities." (§ 65583.2(c)(2).)

An "assessment of housing needs and an inventory of resources and constraints relevant to the meeting of these needs" shall include an "analysis of potential and actual governmental constraints upon the maintenance, improvement, or development of housing for all income levels...including land use controls, building codes and their enforcement, site improvements, fees and other exactions required of developers, local processing and permit procedures, and any locally adopted ordinances that directly impact the cost and supply of residential development." (§ 65583(a)(5).)

To demonstrate that its inventory is adequate, respondent relies on a Mixed Use Overlay Zone ("Overlay Zone") adopted by ordinance on November 17, 2020, where the maximum residential density within the zone was increased from 0 in commercial areas to 79.2 units/acre. (JR 200, 209.) The Overlay Zone spans the length of the City from east to west and partially north to south, along its largest commercial corridors, including Wilshire Boulevard, Robertson Boulevard, Olympic Boulevard, South Doheny Drive, and South Beverly Drive. (JR 125; *see also* JR 213 [map of Overlay Zone].) In the housing element, the City describes the purported benefits of the Overlay Zone: "This wide-scale rezoning allows for the creation or conversion of non-residential space into residential units, and therefore will create all net new housing, since it does not involve the displacement of any existing occupied housing/residents." (JR 125.)

Respondent argues that the maximum residential density exceeds the minimum 30 units per acre that is statutorily deemed appropriate to accommodate housing for lower income individuals. (§ 65583.2(c)(3)(B)(iv).) Respondent also argues that existing commercial buildings in the Overlay Zone may obtain a permit to convert to a mixed-use building and obtain relief from having to comply with standards concerning parking requirements, loading facilities, outdoor living space, commercial-residential transitional setbacks, or height limits if compliance is physically infeasible. (JR 1636; *see also* Chen Decl. Ex. G [Beverly Hills Municipal Code ("BMMC") § 10-3-1888].) The vacancy rates for commercial buildings also purportedly create an incentive for commercial building owners to convert their buildings to mixed-use projects. (JR 201.)

---

[2] It is undisputed Beverly Hills does not mandate a minimum residential density.

For commercial properties listed in the sites inventory of the housing element that were designated for conversion or indicated as having conversion potential (JR 229-34), to calculate the total number of units on the site, the City multiplied the total parcel size by the maximum allowable residential density.[3] However, the total parcel size listed in the sites inventory refers to land area, not the square footage of the existing building that can accommodate residential units. Contrary to respondent's contention, the sites inventory does not account for floor area capacity; the sites inventory lists the height limit of the building, not the number of stories to be converted to residential use. (*See, e.g.*, JR 229 [column name is "Height Limit (stories)," 233 [8500 Wilshire Blvd. described as "8 story building – conversion," but height limit is 3 stories].) As a result, for buildings to be converted to mixed use, the housing element does not demonstrate how the number of units indicated in the sites inventory will be accommodated, as required by section 65583.2(c)(1).

Moreover, as petitioner points out in the reply, most of the sites in the City's sites inventory are not designated as conversions or potential conversions. (JR 229-34.) For sites not indicated as conversions, any construction of residential units is subject to land use and building controls. For example, multi-family developments are subject to height limits from three to five stories. (JR 153-54.) Any building in the Overlay Zone must include commercial uses on the ground floor, and residential uses on the first floor within the first 40 feet from the street are prohibited. (BMMC §§ 10-3-1877(C), 10-3-1879.) Moreover, each multi-family development must have at least 200 square feet for each dwelling unit, excluding front yards, balconies, and pedestrian accessways. (BHMC §§ 10-3-1886, 10-3-2803.)

The sites inventory contains no adjustment based on land use controls for new construction, as required by section 65583.2(c)(2). Rather, like the sites designated as conversions, the number of units for each site is calculated based on the land area multiplied by the maximum residential density. Moreover, the housing element contains no meaningful consideration and analysis of the governmental constraints on the development of housing, as required by § 65583(a)(5). Rather, the City relies on prior approved and proposed developments in arguing in conclusory fashion that "the current standards are not inhibiting development of housing." (JR 158-159, 203-04.) Accordingly, the housing element, including the sites inventory, fails to account for the realistic development capacity for the sites listed in the inventory.

With respect to respondent's contention that the maximum residential density exceeds the density set forth in section 65583.2(c)(3)(B)(iv), this only means that the

---

[3] For example, for 8730 Wilshire Blvd., the parcel size is 11,863 square feet. (JR 233.) There are 1/43,560 acres in one square foot. (*See* https://www.britannica.com/science/acre-unit-of-measurement [43,560 square feet in 1 acre].) 11,863 square feet multiplied by 1/43,560 acre per square foot is 0.27 acres. 0.27 acres multiplied by 79.2 units per acre is approximately 21 units.

City does not have to provide an analysis demonstrating how its adopted density accommodates its share of the regional housing need for lower income households. (§ 65583.2(c)(3)(A-B).) However, the City still must adjust the number of units for each site based on the realistic development capacity of the site under section 65583.2(c)(1) and (c)(2) and provide an "analysis of potential and actual governmental constraints upon the...development of housing for all income levels" under section 65583(a)(5).

Petitioner also argues that the City designated the majority of the sites on the sites inventory as 100% low-income or 100% moderate-income housing without explaining the basis for such designation. (OB at 10:6-7.) Petitioner further argues that the City did not adjust the unit counts based on "typical densities of existing or approved residential developments at a similar affordability level in that jurisdiction," as required by section 65583.2(c)(2). (OB 10:7-8.)

Petitioner, however, does not reference any statute that requires an explanation for the basis for the low-income or moderate-income housing designation. The housing element law only requires that the City specify "the number of units that can realistically be accommodated on that site and whether the site is adequate to accommodate lower income housing, moderate-income housing, or above moderate-income housing" and demonstrate "how the number of units determined for that site...will be accommodated." (§ 65583.2(c), (c)(1).) The sites inventory indicates the total number of units for each site. (JR 229 ["Total Units" column].) By indicating the number of units that are designated as low-income or moderate-income housing, the City also indicates "whether the site is adequate to accommodate lower income housing [or] moderate-income housing." (JR 229 ["Lower" and "Mod" columns].) While the City did not explain how the total number of units will be accommodated for the reasons stated above, the designation of housing as low-income or moderate-income is not deficient.

Nevertheless, it is not apparent from the sites inventory whether the City adjusted the numbers for low-income and moderate-income housing based on "typical densities of existing or approved residential developments at a similar affordability level in that jurisdiction." (§ 65583.2(c)(2).) By multiplying the land area by the maximum residential density of 79.2 units per acre and designating all housing as low- or moderate-income housing, the City assumes that all units built on the site will be low-income or moderate-income housing. The City does not account for the possibility that only a certain percentage of the housing on the site will be designated for residents with low- or moderate-income. A revised housing element would need to contain an adjustment based on typical densities at similar affordability levels.

In sum, with respect to realistic development capacity, the housing element is deficient for the following reasons: (1) for conversions, the sites inventory calculates the total number of units based on a product of land area and the maximum residential density without accounting for the floor area of the building; (2) the sites

inventory does not contain any adjustments based on land use controls for new construction; (3) the housing element contains no analysis of the governmental constraints on the development of housing; and (4) the sites inventory does not contain any adjustments based on typical densities of existing or approved residential developments at similar affordability levels in the City.

2. Nonvacant Sites

For nonvacant sites, the housing element law imposes the following additional requirement:

> [T]he city or county shall specify the additional development potential for each site within the planning period and shall provide an explanation of the methodology used to determine the development potential. The methodology shall consider factors including the extent to which existing uses may constitute an impediment to additional residential development, the city's or county's past experience with converting existing uses to higher density residential development, the current market demand for the existing use, an analysis of any existing leases or other contracts that would perpetuate the existing use or prevent redevelopment of the site for additional residential development, development trends, market conditions, and regulatory or other incentives or standards to encourage additional residential development on these sites.

(§ 65583.2(g)(1).)

Petitioner argues that the City does not explain how its methodology relates to the sites it has included or excluded in the sites inventory. For underutilized nonvacant sites, respondent explains that it selected sites that were more likely to be redeveloped or converted based on evidence of a lack of investment in the property, such as a lack of maintenance or lack of recent upgrades and improvements; parcels with underutilized improvements; and parcels with existing commercial buildings that are higher than 3 stories but whose floor plan is conducive to residential conversion. (JR 202-03, 210-11.) Respondent also explains that existing uses do not constitute an impediment to additional residential development because the creation of the Overlay Zone creates opportunities for residential development; conversion from non-residential to residential use costs less than new construction; and high residential property values in the City create financial incentives for residential development. (JR 209-10.) However, respondent discusses its methodology for determining development potential generally, without engaging in any site-specific analysis.

Respondent contends that it need not engage in an analysis of the methodology of the development potential for each site. The Court disagrees. Section

65583.2(g)(1) states that, for nonvacant sites, "the city or county shall specify the additional development potential for each site within the planning period and shall provide an explanation of the methodology used to determine the development potential." Reading the subdivision as a whole, the City is required to provide an explanation of the methodology for each site in the sites inventory. Among the factors that the methodology must consider are "the current market demand for the existing use" and "an analysis of any existing leases or other contracts that would perpetuate the existing use or prevent redevelopment of the site for additional residential development." (§ 65583.2(g)(1).) These factors necessarily relate to specific sites and cannot be discussed generally. Because the Legislature included these factors, the Legislature surely intended that the City provide "an explanation of the methodology used to determine the development potential" for each site.

Without a site-specific analysis, it is unclear how the methodology was applied. For example, as petitioner points out in the opening brief, the City purports to have excluded commercial buildings that contained medical uses and car dealerships from the sites inventory. (JR 210.) However, the sites inventory includes medical buildings and car dealerships. (*See, e.g.*, JR 229-30 [153 S. Doheny Dr., 239 S. La Cienega Blvd., 8833 W. Olympic Blvd., 8845 W. Olympic Blvd., 9134 W. Olympic Blvd.].) The City does not explain how the existing use does not serve as an impediment to residential development.

For the foregoing reasons, with respect to section 65583.2(g)(1), the housing element is deficient because the City did not provide an explanation of the methodology used to determine the development potential for each site, including a discussion of the factors probative of likelihood of redevelopment set forth in section 65583.2(g)(1).

Further, the sites inventory shows that the City is meeting all of its share of the need for lower-income housing through nonvacant sites. Accordingly, section 65583.2(g)(2), quoted below, is implicated:

> In addition to the analysis required in paragraph (1), when a city or county is relying on nonvacant sites described in paragraph (3) of subdivision (b) to accommodate 50 percent or more of its housing need for lower income households, the methodology used to determine additional development potential shall demonstrate that the existing use identified pursuant to paragraph (3) of subdivision (b) does not constitute an impediment to additional residential development during the period covered by the housing element. An existing use shall be presumed to impede additional residential development, absent findings based on substantial evidence that the use is likely to be discontinued during the planning period.

(§ 65583.2(g)(2).)

For nonvacant sites, the "Field Notes/Existing Conditions & Analysis for Keeping/Removing" column in the sites inventory only indicates the existing use of the site and whether the site is designated for conversion or has conversion potential. (JR 229-34.) The City does not engage in any discussion of occupancy rates, lease terms, viability of the business operating at the sites. Nor does the City present any other discussion demonstrating that the existing use for each site "does not constitute an impediment to additional residential development during the period covered by the housing element." (§ 65583.2(g)(2).) Without any evidence concerning the existing use of each site, the existing use is presumed to impede additional residential development. (*Ibid.*)

Respondent maintains that Culver City and Gardena obtained HCD approval based on a chart similar to its sites inventory. However, unlike Beverly Hills, Gardena's sites inventory sets forth the existing use of each site and why the existing use is likely to be discontinued during the planning period. (Reply RJN Ex. B; cf. Chen Decl. Ex. B at 71 [listing criteria used in selection of sites].) With respect to Culver City, the sites inventory does not set forth the reason why the existing use is likely to be discontinued. (Chen Decl. Ex. A at Appendix B.) However, elsewhere in the housing element, Culver City discusses sites that present opportunities for development based on positive responses from property owners and developers. (Chen Decl. Ex. A at B-9 to B-10.) Unlike Beverly Hills, Culver City discussed how the existing use at certain sites would not impede residential development. Beverly Hills did not engage in any site-specific analysis concerning how the existing use would not impede additional residential development.

Respondent contends that the Court of Appeal in *Martinez v. City of Clovis* (2023) 90 Cal.App.5th 193 determined that no site-specific analysis concerning the methodology used to determine development potential and additional development factors is required. This is not quite accurate. In *Martinez*, the Court of Appeal found that section 65583.2(g)(1) "does not mandate the City 'specify the additional development potential for each [nonvacant] site within the planning period and ... provide an explanation of the methodology used to determine the development potential' *in the housing element itself.*" (*Martinez*, 90 Cal.App.5th at 248-49, emphasis added.) While specification of the additional development potential for each site does not have to be part of the housing element, the City still must demonstrate the additional development potential for each site. In *Martinez*, for example, the City of Clovis provided evidence outside of the housing element to demonstrate the development potential of a nonvacant site. (*Id.* at 249-51.)

Here, there is no analysis of the additional development potential for each site listed in the sites inventory in the housing element or elsewhere. Further, the housing element does not contain findings based on substantial evidence that the existing uses of nonvacant sites are likely to be discontinued, as required by section 65583.2(g)(2).

In sum, with respect to nonvacant sites, the housing element is deficient for the following reasons: (1) the City did not provide an explanation of the methodology used to determine the development potential for each site in the sites inventory, including a discussion of the factors probative of likelihood of redevelopment set forth in section 65583.2(g)(1); and (2) the City fails to demonstrate with substantial evidence that the existing use for each site in the sites inventory does not constitute an impediment to additional residential development during the period covered by the housing element.

C. Specific Sites

Petitioner also contends that certain sites were improperly included in the sites inventory. (OB at 15:6-17:1.) Petitioner maintains that the City did not make the findings based on substantial evidence that are required to rebut the presumption under section 65583.2(g)(2) that the existing use will impede additional residential development. (Reply at 4:13-14.)

However, in contending that additional residential development is not possible on certain sites, petitioner relies on extra-record evidence. For example, for 55 North La Cienega, the sites inventory indicates that the property will have 70 low-income units. (JR 229.) However, petitioner presents a Planning Commission Report and meeting minutes to assert that the City's Planning Commission approved development on the site with only 11 units of very low-income housing. (Gelfand Decl. Exs. C at 1, D at 3-4.)

"[W]here the scope of review of factual findings is substantial evidence, review limited to the administrative record is appropriate because extra-record evidence is irrelevant to whether the agency's decision is supported by substantial evidence." (*Cinema West, LLC v. Baker* (2017) 13 Cal.App.5th 194, 208.) Petitioner cannot challenge the inclusion of sites in the inventory based on extra-record evidence. Ironically, petitioner would have the Court consider the propriety of certain sites based on extra-record evidence, but then bar respondent from presenting extra-record evidence to rebut petitioner's argument. (Reply at 4:18-5:13.)

With respect to sites which petitioner contends are unlikely to disappear based on their existing use (OB at 16:21-17:2; JR 1557-58), the Court already finds that respondent did not make findings based on substantial evidence that the existing use for each nonvacant site in the sites inventory is likely to be discontinued. The City must make such findings in revising the housing element.

VI. Conclusion

The petition is GRANTED. Pursuant to Local Rule 3.231(n), petitioner shall prepare, serve, and ultimately file a proposed judgment and proposed writ of mandate.

Date: September 12, 2023

HON. CURTIS A. KIN

23CV-21063

CALIFORNIANS FOR HOMEOWNERSHIP

CAL HDF

Dec 1, 2025

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
49 South Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94103

Re: Housing Element Implementation

By email: Lisa.chen@sfgov.org, Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org, bos@sfgov.org, bos-supervisors@sfgov.org, ChanStaff@sfgov.org, ChenStaff@sfgov.org, DorseyStaff@sfgov.org, Jackie.Fielder@sfgov.org, MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org, MandelmanStaff@sfgov.org, MelgarStaff@sfgov.org, SauterStaff@sfgov.org, SherrillStaff@sfgov.org, Shamann.Walton@sfgov.org

Cc: john.carroll@sfgov.org; sarah.dennis-phillips@sfgov.org; cityattorney@sfcityatty.org

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

The California Housing Defense Fund ("CalHDF") and Californians for Homeownership ("CFH") write in advance of the Land Use and Transportation Committee meeting scheduled for December 1, 2025 at 1:30pm. We write to warn the Committee, as well as the larger Board, that certain elements of the proposed Family Zoning Plan violate state law. Specifically:

1. The City's proposed rezonings will not produce sufficient new housing. This violates commitments the City made when it adopted its Sixth Cycle Housing Element.

2. The City's proposed rezonings add new constraints on housing production. This, again, violates commitments the City made in its Sixth Cycle Housing Element and independently violates the Housing Element Law.

3. The "Housing Choice - San Francisco" program seeks to exempt San Francisco from certain state housing laws. That is illegal.

If the City does not correct these problems, CalHDF and CFH will challenge the City in court. As a result of the lawsuit, the City would, potentially, fall out of compliance with the Housing Element Law and face exposure to the "builder's remedy." (See Gov. Code, § 65589.5,

subds. (d)(5), (d)(6).) CalHDF and CFH urge the City to avoid such needless litigation and instead comply with the law in the first instance.

The City's Proposed Rezonings Are Inadequate

The Housing Element Law (Gov. Code, §§ 65580 et seq.) establishes a clear process for the evaluation, planning, and enactment of the City's housing policy. That process has a two-part structure. In the first part, the City must adopt a housing element on a specified timeline and that meets certain requirements. In the second part, the City must implement the programs promised in its housing element. Crucially, the second step relies on the first step: what, precisely, the City must do in the second step has already been established by the housing element. (See Gov. Code, § 65583, subd. (c).) The second step is *not* a freestanding exercise in policymaking or policy analysis. (See *id.*) The policymaking and policy analysis are conducted in the first step, and the Housing Element Law leaves essentially no room to alter the results at the second step.[1]

San Francisco has completed the first step. It adopted a housing element on January 31, 2023, adhering to the substantive and procedural rules in the Housing Element Law. The California Department of Housing and Community Development ("HCD") also certified the City's adopted housing element as legally compliant, pursuant to its statutory authority. (See, e.g., Gov. Code, § 65585.) That housing element made numerous detailed commitments. These commitments include promises to rezone large areas of the City to accommodate housing growth necessary to meet demand and ease upward pressures on housing costs. (See Gov. Code, §§ 65583 [establishing standards for required rezonings]; 65583.1 [same]; 65583.2 [same].) The housing element, moreover, promised not only to rezone, but to engage in detailed analysis that would help shape the rezoning. (See Program 7.1.1 in San Francisco's Housing Element, available here.)

San Francisco is now at the second step of the process: implementing the commitments in its housing element. This includes the aforementioned rezoning and associated policy analyses. The City's proposed rezoning, however, fails to fulfill crucial aspects of housing element commitments – commitments that the City, as explained above, cannot renege on without going through a full amendment process for its housing element.

Program 7.1.1 of the City's housing element commits the City to implementing a rezoning program that "reasonably account[s] for sites' likelihood of development during the planning period using an analytical model." The housing element uses mandatory language, stating that the City "shall" build its rezoning program around such a

[1] If the City wishes to alter the policy analysis or programs promised by its housing element, it has an avenue to do that: it may amend its housing element according to the procedures set forth in Government Code section 65585. But the process remains a two-step process: the City must first amend its housing element, and only then can it proceed to the second step of implementing the promised housing element programs.

"probability-of-development" analysis. In sum: the City must rezone to an extent that the expected number of new units that will be built after the rezoning, calculated via a robust probability-of-development analysis, meets the City's projected housing need (i.e. the Regional Housing Needs Assessment, or "RHNA," allocation, plus a buffer specified in the housing element).

The current rezoning proposal does not do this. The proposal's failure is twofold. First, none of the methods the Planning Department has relied on to assess whether the proposal will satisfy San Francisco's rezoning obligation constitutes a probability-of-development analysis using an analytical model in line with Program 7.1.1 in the housing element. Second, when the City has conducted an analysis that meets the requirements of Program 7.1.1, the analysis shows the current rezoning proposal will not satisfy San Francisco's rezoning obligation.

With respect to the rezoning proposal's first failure: the City proposes three methods to project the number of new units the proposed rezoning can be expected to produce. None of the three methods measures up to the standards in Program 7.1.1.

1. The first method is the "soft sites" method, which is described in appendix B of the City's housing element. This method assumes that a site currently hosting a residential use has a two percent probability of being redeveloped with the rezoning's planned residential capacity and a site currently hosting a non-residential use has a seventy percent probability of redevelopment. Such rigid calculations based on uniform, citywide assumptions about the odds of development on thousands of very different sites are not an "analytical model" and do not "reasonably account for sites' likelihood of development" as required by Program 7.1.1. These assumptions, furthermore, are not reasonable and do not rest on any evidence. They are highly motivated guesswork, and highly motivated guesswork will not cut the mustard.

2. The second method rests on an economic model developed by a consultant. This model does not assess the likelihood of a given site's being developed under the rezoning proposal. Instead, it calculates how many units of housing are "financially feasible" on parcels throughout the City. This is not an "analytical model" that "reasonably account[s] for sites' likelihood of development" as required by Program 7.1.1. As the City well knows, property owners across the City submit permit applications for only a small portion of economically feasible new housing units, and not all of those permit applications ultimately produce actual housing units. The City attempts to address this problem by assuming – similar to the soft sites method – that two percent of sites with economically feasible new housing developments currently occupied by residential uses and thirty-five percent of other sites with economically feasible new housing developments will be developed. This is inadequate for the same reasons the soft sites method is inadequate. Moreover, this

method projects only 19,000 new units of housing over the planning period – far below the 36,282 units the City must accommodate.

3. The third method involves looking at "how much of the City's overall zoning capacity has gotten built out over the years." This – again – is not an "analytical model." Nor does it look at the sites slated for rezoning under the current rezoning proposal and assess the likelihood they will produce new housing. This method is further flawed because much of San Francisco's recent increase in zoned capacity, and much of the new housing that has been built, took place on vacant sites, whereas the proposed housing element rezoning covers a broad swath of the City and comprises mostly non-vacant sites. Other problems here include unrealistically low estimates of the City's residential zoning capacity in prior years (thus inflating the share of residential zoned capacity that has been built out) and the inclusion of residential projects built under development agreements, which do not correspond to rezonings, and which were separately counted towards the City's pre-existing residential zoned capacity in the housing element.

With respect to the rezoning proposal's second failure, analytical models that would satisfy Program 7.1.1 in the housing element demonstrate that the proposed rezoning will not produce anywhere close to the required number of new units. San Francisco's City Economist recently released an analysis of the City's proposed rezoning. This analysis relies on the exact approach that San Francisco's Housing Element pledged to use: an analytical model that assesses the probability of development. (Indeed, it is the exact approach HCD suggested the city use.) The results are damning. In the **best case scenario,** San Francisco's City Economist's analytical model found that the rezoning can only be reasonably expected to produce around **14,646 units by 2045**. Less optimistic assumptions produce a forecast of only 8,504 units by 2045. This indicates the rezoning plan falls far short of what is required: being shown by an analytical model to reasonably be expected to produce **36,282 units by 2031**.

Changes to the planned rezoning since the analysis was conducted have further reduced the amount of new housing that can be expected. The proposed rezoning – specifically, the "Housing Choice - San Francisco" program – has been modified to add new unit mix requirements (see pages 14-15 here) and historic preservation requirements (page 30). The Land Use Committee made these changes despite unambiguous evidence in the record that the changes would reduce new housing's feasibility and reduce the number of new units the rezoning can be expected to create. The problem, then, is *even greater* than what the City Economist's analysis shows.

These are not minor problems. Program 7.1.1 is central to San Francisco's compliance with the Housing Element Law. The City's housing element meets the requirements of the Housing Element Law *only because* it included Program 7.1.1's commitment to rezone based

on a realistic probability-of-development analysis. To be crystal clear: without Program 7.1.1, the housing element does not comply with Government Code section 65583.2, subdivision (g)(2). This is because the housing element relies on non-vacant sites to accommodate more than half of its RHNA allocation at the lower-income level, and thus the Housing Element Law requires its housing element to "demonstrate that the existing use [on each non-vacant site] does not constitute an impediment to additional residential development." (Gov. Code, § 65583.2, subd. (g)(2).) "An existing use shall be presumed to impede additional residential development, absent findings based on substantial evidence that the use is likely to be discontinued." (*Ibid.*) San Francisco's housing element does not demonstrate with substantial evidence that specific existing uses on specific sites intended to accommodate low-income housing will not impede additional residential development. Instead, the housing element commits the City, in Program 7.1.1, to rezoning in a manner that "shall reasonably account for sites' likelihood of development during the planning period using an analytical model." That commitment is the basis of the City's compliance with Government Code section 65583.2, subdivision (g)(2). Refusing to follow through on that commitment would leave the City without any basis for compliance with the Housing Element Law on this point.[2]

CalHDF and CFH urges the City to do as the law requires. The City must adopt a rezoning that an analytical model, such as the City Economist's, shows can reasonably be expected to produce 36,282 new units under current economic conditions, as required by Program 7.1.1. Alternatively, the City can increase the probability of sites' development (again, according to a realistic analytical model) by adjusting non-zoning policies that constrain housing production: the City could, for example, reduce transfer taxes for residential projects, impact fees for new residential construction, or inclusionary zoning requirements. The City should not – it cannot – rely on flawed and insufficient analyses to justify its planned rezonings. Doing so violates the law.

The City Must Reduce Constraints on Housing Production, Not Add New Ones

The City's planned rezoning, although on net it adds new capacity, includes constraints on housing development that do not exist under current zoning rules. Specifically, the proposal includes minimum office densities, caps on dwelling unit size, new limits on curb cuts, and lower parking maximums. Furthermore, the City's proposed local zoning bonus program, known as the "Housing Choice–San Francisco" ("HCSF") program, imposes new limitations on residential projects' eligibility for protections and benefits under state laws, including the Statewide Density Bonus Law.

[2] The City could address this issue by producing site-specific evidence that existing uses on non-vacant sites will not impede additional residential development, adding that evidence to a new draft of its housing element, and adopting the amended housing element. But – again – the City would have to do this before rezoning. The process of developing and adopting housing element commitments and then, separately, implementing those commitments remains a two-step process.

CalHDF and CFH also note that the HCSF program was amended in committee on November 17, 2025 to include additional constraints. The HCSF program now virtually excludes any site in a historic district (see page 30 here). The HCSF now also imposes additional unit mix requirements on new housing projects (see pages 14 and 15 here). With respect to the unit mix requirements, it is silly for San Francisco, a City defined by large, multi-bedroom homes, to require new housing to replicate the bulk of existing housing supply in its bedroom counts. If new housing proposals include fewer bedrooms per unit, on average, that is because San Francisco's existing housing stock is already dominated by multi-bedroom homes; it is natural that new housing will fill a niche that the current housing supply does not.

More importantly, the new unit mix requirements, as well as other new constraints on housing, pose a problem for two reasons.

First, the new constraints were not analyzed by the City's housing element. The Housing Element Law requires local governments to analyze governmental constraints on housing production. (Gov. Code, § 65583, subd. (a)(5).) The results of this analysis then inform the policies and programs in the housing element. (See *id.*; *id.* at subd. (c)(3); *Californians for Homeownership, Inc. v. City of Beverly Hills* (2023) Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCP00143, at p. 6, [finding planned rezonings for housing element site inventory must consider constraints identified by the housing element's constraints analysis] [opinion attached to this letter].) Because the new constraints attached to the City's rezoning proposal were not analyzed in the City's housing element, the City cannot rely on the rezoning proposal to produce as many units as it is required to unless the City analyzes the effects of the new constraints and offsets their impact on housing production.

Second, the City's housing element explicitly recognizes this and commits the City to refrain from adding new constraints. Program 7.1.1 states: "The rezoning program … shall not add government constraints that reduce project financial feasibility as determined by an analysis prior to the rezoning enactment." Program 8.1.6 states: "[A]ny City-adopted rezoning or development controls shall not impose any new governmental constraints to the development of housing unless those increased constraints are offset by the removal or reduction of other constraints." If San Francisco wishes to establish new governmental constraints to housing production (such as making new developments ineligible for the waivers and protections offered by State Density Bonus Law), it must concurrently reduce other constraints to a degree that maintains the overall viability of new residential construction, "as determined by an analysis prior to the rezoning enactment" that assess projects' "financial feasibility." Pursuing the new constraints without offsetting them by reducing existing constraints, however, would violate the commitments in housing element programs 7.1.1 and 8.1.6 and hence violate the Housing Element Law.

The Proposed Housing Choice–San Francisco Bonus Program Cannot Exempt San Francisco from State Law

The proposed HCSF bonus program provides additional residential zoning capacity for projects that meet certain criteria. Overall, this is good. However, one of the HCSF eligibility criteria poses a problem: the requirement, found in section 206.10(b)(5), that an HCSF project "not receive any density or development bonuses or relief from applicable Planning Code standards in any other State or local law or program." This requirement is unenforceable to the extent it pertains to state law, and, should it be enacted, developers will have the option to ignore it.

This is for four reasons. First, the City "cannot choose to forgo application of land use policies imposed by the Legislature." (*Ailanto Properties, Inc. v. City of Half Moon Bay* (2006) 142 Cal.App.4th 572, 595.) Second, just as the City cannot waive state law's application, project applicants cannot waive protections to which they are entitled under state law, since those protections are designed to serve the public interest. (See Civ. Code, § 3513 ["a law established for a public reason cannot be contravened by a private agreement"].) Third, the SDBL includes explicit rules for local density bonus programs: such programs must build on, rather than supplant, the SDBL. Finally, even if the first three points are ignored, the SDBL allows project applicants to waive the HCSF eligibility requirement forbidding the use of state bonuses. (Gov. Code, § 65915, subd. (e).) Legal interpretations from the California Department of Housing and Community Development ("HCD"), the state agency charged with interpreting and enforcing state housing law, support these conclusions.

Background

State law contains many provisions that grant rights and protections to proposed housing developments and applications for proposed housing developments. These include AB 2011, codified at Government Code section 65912.100 et seq., the SDBL, codified at Government Code section 65915 et seq., SB 35, codified at Government Code section 65913.4, and more besides. These laws accomplish a variety of pro-housing policies by, among other things, allowing proposed housing developments that meet certain criteria (such as the inclusion of affordable units) to reduce or avoid local zoning and other land use restrictions. In some cases, whether a project is eligible for state law protections and the extent to which it may reduce or avoid local rules depends on the generosity of the local zoning code. For example, the SDBL calculates density bonuses using a "base density," defined as "the greatest number of units allowed under the zoning ordinance, specific plan, or land use element of the general plan." (Gov. Code, § 65915, subd. (o)(6).)

The proposed HCSF program expands the San Francisco zoning code's accommodation for denser housing in much of the City. The aforementioned state laws then further expand the allowed range of housing projects, providing for even greater density and even more

forgiving standards for projects. But there is a catch: the HCSF program attempts to forestall these state laws, in section 206.10(b)(5). If not for proposed section 206.10(b)(5), housing project applicants would be able to propose projects under the HCSF rules and avail themselves of the full range of state law protections. Thus, the critical question is: does proposed section 206.10(b)(5) have any legal effect? As explained below, the answer is no. Developers may use both the HCSF rules and any state law bonuses or protections that apply.

The City Cannot Forgo the Application of State Law

State law preempts local law. (Cal. Const., art. XI, § 7.) This is a foundational constitutional principle, and it is no less true in the land use context than anywhere else. As a corollary to this principle, local governments "cannot choose to forgo application of land use policies imposed by the Legislature." (*Ailanto Properties*, *supra*, 142 Cal.App.4th at 595.) Proposed section 206.10(b)(5), however, attempts to do exactly that: it states, in effect, that state land use laws do not apply to projects proceeding under the HCSF program. The City is careful to word the section to dance around the point, perhaps in recognition of the legal consequences, but the section's intended purpose is unmistakably to "forgo application of land use policies imposed by the Legislature," as caselaw and the California constitution forbid. (*Ibid.*)

As explained above, numerous state laws – particularly the SDBL – grant certain housing projects legal protections. None of these state laws allows local governments to circumvent or opt out of these rules. The attempt to do so, in section 206.10(b)(5) of the proposed HCSF program, does not pass legal muster, and project applicants will be entitled to ignore it.

Project Applicants Cannot Waive State Law Protections to Which They Are Entitled

Just as the City cannot waive the application state land use and housing laws, neither can developers. "[A] law established for a public reason cannot be contravened by a private agreement." (Civ. Code, § 3513.) In other words, if a law is designed to accomplish a public benefit (possibly in addition to private benefits), the law's provisions cannot be waived. (See, e.g., *County of Riverside v. Superior Court* (2000) 86 Cal.App.4th 211, 220 [holding employment protections for public safety officers, although they benefitted individual officers, also served a broader public purpose and could not be waived].) The legislature has made clear that pro-housing laws serve the broader public interest.[3] (See, e.g., Gov. Code, §§ 65915, subd. (u); 65913.4, subd. (u); 65582.1; Stats. 2024, ch. 294, § 1; Stats. 2023, ch. 783, § 1.) The legislative history for these laws, moreover, confirms they are intended to serve the public by

[3] On one occasion, California courts found that a law establishing time limits for housing permit application processing primarily benefitted project applicants and not the general public, and hence project applicants could waive them. (*Bickel v. City of Piedmont* (1997) 16 Cal.4th 1040, 1049-1052.) The legislature immediately rebuked the Courts and overturned the *Bickel* holding through legislation. (See *Riverwatch v. County of San Diego* (1999) 76 Cal.App.4th 1428, 1439.)

expanding the supply of housing and affordable housing. (See *Doskocz v. ALS Lien Services* (2024) 102 Cal.App.5th 107, 115-116 [legislative history is relevant in deciding whether law serves a public purpose and hence cannot be waived].) Hence, project applicants have no authority to disclaim the application of these laws, as the City's proposed HCSF program would have them do.

Two additional reasons prevent project applicants from waiving their right to pursue state law protections.

First, as with all legal waivers, such a waiver must be voluntary. (*Harvey v. County of Kern* (1930) 107 Cal.App. 590, 597.) As currently framed, the HCSF program does not ask project applicants to voluntarily waive their state law rights. It instead makes waiver *mandatory* for any project applicant. No waiver can occur through such an ultimatum; to the extent that the issue is unclear, moreover, the ambiguity resolves against the existence of a waiver. (See *Perini v. Perini* (1964), 225 Cal.App.2d 399.)

Second, waiver requires "an abandonment of a right that could be enforced or a privilege that could be exercised." (*Estate of Goyette* (1971) 14 Cal.App.3d 224, 232 [internal citations omitted].) Thus, for an applicant to be able to waive the application of state law to an HCSF project, it must be the case that the applicant could, absent the waiver, enforce the application of the relevant state law. And it must be the case, from there, that the applicant could choose *not* to waive their rights and instead apply state law protections and bonuses to their project. In this way, the City faces a catch-22, and however it resolves the dilemma, developers will be able to use both the HCSF program and state law.

The State Density Bonus Law Creates Narrow Guidelines for Local Bonus Programs, Which the HCSF Program Does Not Obey

The SDBL does allow local governments to implement local bonus programs. It includes strict rules for such programs, however, which the proposed HCSF program does not meet. Local bonus programs must add to, rather than supplant, the SDBL. Government Code section 65915, subdivision (n), states: "nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit a city, county, or city and county from granting a density bonus *greater than* what is described in this section for a development that meets the requirements of this section" (emphasis added). By negative implication, local governments are forbidden from offering density bonuses that do not incorporate, at minimum, the bonuses allowed by the SDBL. Local bonus programs must add to the SDBL; they cannot displace it in favor of an entirely separate density bonus scheme. As described above, moreover, preemption principles prevent local governments from evading the SDBL, and this language in the SDBL confirms that outcome.

The SDBL includes stronger language too. Government Code section 65917 states:

> In enacting this chapter it is the intent of the Legislature that the density bonus or other incentives offered by the city, county, or city and county pursuant to this chapter shall contribute significantly to the economic feasibility of lower income housing in proposed housing developments. **In the absence of an agreement by a developer in accordance with Section 65915, a locality shall not offer a density bonus or any other incentive that would undermine the intent of this chapter.**

(Emphasis added.) In other words, if San Francisco wishes to offer a density bonus to developers, it must first allow them any protections they are entitled to under the SDBL. Only then can it offer a local bonus program. The law establishes a clear baseline: project applicants may avail themselves of any bonuses and benefits they are entitled to under the SDBL, and further local bonuses and benefits must come on top of the SDBL.

These rules are especially important in San Francisco. HCD has found that the SDBL is "critical" for developers navigating San Francisco's complex zoning rules and extensive procedural hurdles. (See "Examining Local Law, Policy, and Planning Practice on Development in San Francisco Using CALES," O'Neill et al., pp. 38-39 (available here and attached to this letter).) In some cases, HCD has issued Notices of Violation to San Francisco for impeding housing development by refusing to grant bonuses, incentives, and waivers allowed by the SDBL. (See, e.g., California Department of Housing and Community Development, Letter to Kate Conner, December 29, 2022 (available here).) These HCD findings and Notices of Violation confirm the SDBL's importance in producing housing in San Francisco.

The proposed HCSF program, by attempting to displace the SDBL entirely, violates the SDBL's explicit rules for a local bonus program. This violation carries particular significance for San Francisco, where project applicants often rely on the SDBL to navigate a complex zoning code and approval process. If San Francisco wishes to implement a local bonus program, it must stack that program on top of the SDBL. It cannot offer an "alternative" bonus program, such as the proposed HCSF program, that attempts to remove SDBL eligibility for projects that are eligible for SDBL protections.

In closing this section, CalHDF and CFH point out that HCD has weighed in on the question of whether local governments may enact zoning bonus programs that serve as alternatives to state law. In a letter to Menlo Park (available here), the Department wrote: "[T]he City's Affordable Housing Overlay states that the overlay will be an alternative to state density bonus law. **This is in conflict with state law and must be revised."** (Emphasis added.)[4] HCD's

[4] Separately, as explained later in this letter, HCD's Site Inventory Guidebook (available here) analyzes whether zoning overlays or other local zoning programs established by a city's housing element may supplant or displace the SDBL and firmly establishes that they cannot. (See pages 14-15 of the guidebook.) This analysis is more relevant to the question of how the HCSF program will affect the City's compliance with the Housing Element Law, but this analysis also underscores the specific point that the City may not wriggle out of state law.

view warrants substantial deference as the interpretation of a "technical, obscure, [or] complex" statutory scheme by the agency charged with enforcing it. (See *Boling v. Public Employment Relations Bd.* (2018) 5 Cal.5th 898, 911 [citing *Yamaha Corp. of America v. State Bd. of Equalization* (1998) 19 Cal.4th 1, 12]; *Hoffmaster v. City of San Diego* (1997) 55 Cal.App.4th 1098, 1113, fn. 13 ["We substantially rely on the Department of Housing and Community Development's interpretation [...] regarding compliance with the housing element law"].)

Even if the City Can Prohibit the Application of State Law, the Density Bonus Law Gives Project Applicants the Legal Right to Circumvent the City's Prohibition

Even if the above legal rules do not neutralize the City's attempt to avoid state law, any project eligible for the SDBL will be able to defeat the application of proposed section 206.10(b)(5). The SDBL states: "In no case may a city, county, or city and county apply any development standard that will have the effect of physically precluding the construction of a development meeting the criteria of subdivision (b) at the densities or with the concessions or incentives permitted by this section." (Gov. Code, § 65915, subd. (e)(1).) If a proposed project complies with the HCSF except for section 206.10(b)(5) – because it seeks benefits under the SDBL or another state law – and the application of section 206.10(b)(5) would physically preclude the project by eliminating its eligibility for the HCSF, then the City cannot apply that section to the project. To the extent the City doubts or intends to contest this, CalHDF and CFH remind the City that the SDBL, by its terms, "shall be interpreted liberally in favor of producing the maximum number of total housing units." (*Id.* at subd. (r).) Flouting the law on this point also carries severe penalties, including mandatory payment of attorney's fees to a project applicant who challenges the City in court. (*Id.* at subd. (e)(1).)

The HCSF Program Violates the Housing Element Law

Furthermore, the HCSF violates the Housing Element Law (Gov. Code, § 65580 et seq.). Rezoning programs enacted pursuant to a housing element, such as the proposed Family Zoning Plan and its component HCSF program, may not exempt themselves from state law's application, as HCD has explained in its Site Inventory Guidebook (available here – see pages 14-15). Pursuing the HCSF program as it is currently designed would violate this rule and risk the City's housing element compliance. This would expose it to a range of penalties, including the "builder's remedy."

The City Should Take Care to Comply with New Caselaw Concerning Housing Element Rezonings

Lastly, CalHDF and CFH warn the City to take care to ensure that the rezoning complies with housing element law requiring minimum residential density on low-income sites. The newly published Court of Appeal decision *New Commune DTLA LLC v. City of Redondo Beach* (Oct. 10, 2025, No. B336042) 115 Cal.App.5th 111 makes clear that in order to comply with

minimum density requirements, local zoning must require that all new development include a minimum density of residential use. Zoning "overlays" that allow for 100% non-residential development on a site fail to comply with housing element law. The proposed zoning includes many low-income sites that are given additional residential density on top of base commercial zoning. In order to comply with housing element law, the City should make clear that all new development of these sites must include the minimum density of residential use, and that 100% commercial development is prohibited.

As you are well aware, California remains in the throes of a statewide crisis-level housing shortage. New multifamily housing in San Francisco a public benefit: it will help satisfy demand for housing near jobs and transit, thereby reducing displacement pressure; and it will also cut down on transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions by providing housing in a major metro area, as opposed to farther-flung regions in the state (and out of state). CalHDF and CFH therefore urge the City to follow through on the commitments in its housing element, as the law requires, and obey state law in drafting and enforcing its land use regulations.

Sincerely,





Matthew Gelfand
Californians for Homeownership

Dylan Casey
CalHDF

Examining Local Law, Policy, and Planning Practice on Development in San Francisco Using CALES

Report in Support of San Francisco Policy and Practice Review

Written by:

Moira O'Neill (PI)
Vivek Adury
Eric Biber (Co-PI)
Deborah Le-An Tan
Laura Tepper
Ivy Wang

Prepared for the California Department of Housing and Community Development in partial fulfillment of contract #22-30-002.

Disclaimer: The statements and conclusions in this Report are those of the contractor and not necessarily those of the California Department of Housing and Community Development.

Acknowledgments:

The following students supported building the entitlement dataset and related data cleaning and analysis for this research during the 2022-2023 academic year: Claire Ching, Riya Chopra, Ryan Denker, Olivia Anne Drew Grimes, Rachel Kinzer, Riley Layman, Lily Roberts, Jackson Smith, and Jenny Tsing. Also, Tim Dodson supported data collection related to determining project intake and notification dates.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary *6*

Background: Why Study San Francisco? **6**

Research Questions and Approach **7**

Summary of Findings **9**

SB 35 fixes planning review for eligible housing developments but is not a complete process fix. 10

Unpredictable discretionary review processes create uncertainty and risk—even for code compliant development of any size in any location citywide. 12

Timeframes for discretionary approvals increased. 12

Local policy and practices are inconsistent with the goals of the Permit Streamlining Act, Housing Accountability Act, and Housing Crisis Act. 13

Subjectivity and variability persist in the post-entitlement process. 15

Stakeholders suggest local reforms must eliminate discretionary review on some housing or the city will not meet its RHNA or resolve long-standing inequities in land use. 15

Conclusion **16**

Introduction *17*

Methods, Data, and Limitations *18*

Overall Research Approach **18**

Ongoing Legal Research 19

Our Interpretation of State Law and Definition of "Full Implementation" of State Law 19

Unique Entitlement Dataset 20

2014 - 2017 Observations 21

2018 - 2021 Observations 22

Primary Source Documents 24

Regression Analysis 25

In-Depth Interviews and Meetings and Review of Public Hearings 25

Document Analysis 26

Study and Data Limitations 26

Findings *28*

San Francisco's local rules prevent full implementation of the goals and aims of state housing laws. **29**

San Francisco Planning fully implemented SB 35, but SB 35 is not a complete process fix. 30

SB 35 processing timeframes are fast—whereas discretionary building permits typically take years. 30

Developers report that SB 35 transformed planning approval pathways for affordable development. 32

SB 35 does not resolve post-entitlement opposition through appeals. 33

More developments relied on State Density Bonus Law as compared with prior years, but stakeholders disagree about how easy it is to use the state law. 36

There was no consensus among developers about how easily developers could use State Density Bonus Law in San Francisco. 38

Both developers and planners shared that State Density Bonus Law has been critical to helping developers manage requirements under local rules. 38

Local rules complicate application of the Housing Accountability Act. 41

Local rules require entitlement processes begin before the application—and navigate multiple hurdles along the way to approval. 41

Application intake processes were inconsistent with the PSA but improved marginally over time. 42

Planning policy relies on exemptions to comply with CEQA, but local rules require additional studies. 43
Risk of costly local appeals drives cautious environmental planning practices that limit the impact of the PSA. 46
Continuances—possibly meant to avoid later challenges through administrative appeal—are frequent.....51
Publicly Initiated Exceptional DR occurs frequently and may foster negotiations outside of public hearings. 51
Developers report that design guidelines are vague and invite subjective conditions of approval. ...53

Cumulative and unique procedural hurdles create comparatively long entitlement timelines. 54

Stakeholders report that San Francisco's policy emphasizes project-level adjudication to achieve equitable development outcomes, when what the city needs to achieve equitable development outcomes is zoning and planning reform.....56

Planners and developers believe San Francisco needs procedural reform that addresses discretionary review, but not all Commissioners and Supervisors agree. ..58

All stakeholder groups report persistent post-entitlement challenges.....61

Conclusion 62

Appendix A: Regression Supplement With Methods 66

Appendix B: Spatial Distribution of Developments....86

Appendix C: Analysis of Accuracy of Annual Progress Report Data on Entitlements and SB 35 Approvals 94

Table 1: Timeframes to Planning Approvals Issued in 2018 - 2021 Selected Pathways10
Table 2: Entitlement Data Counts by Project and Units Across Years 21
Table 3: Summary of Total Approvals and Unit Counts Across Study Period 28
Table 4: 2018-2021 Approval Observations and Units by Affordability and Process 28
Table 5: Entitlement Timeframe by Approval Pathway 2018-2021....31
Table 6: Median Project Size by Product Type and Approval Pathway....37
Table 7: Frequency of Use of Density Bonus (All Programs)[1] 40
Table 8: PPA to Application Timeframes 42
Table 9: Analysis of Application Status Notifications 43
Table 10: CEQA Compliance Pathways 45
Table 11: Total Time Spent on All CEQA Appeals 2015-2021 N=48 50
Table 12: Total Time Spent on CEQA Appeals 2015-2021 for CALES Observations ...50
Table 13: Total Cost CEQA Appeals 2015-2021 (N=48) 50
Table 14: Total Cost CEQA Appeals CALES Housing Only (N=19)....50
Table 15: Comparison of Entitlements Requiring CPEs Oakland-San Francisco 2014 - 2017 data....55
Table 16: Variation in Number of Approval Steps, by Process Categories, Non-ADU Discretionary Observations 2018 - 2021 (N=111) 72
Table 17: All Discretionary Non-ADU Observations 2018 - 2021 75
Table 18: Regression Using 100 CPE Observations 2014 - 2017....77

Table 19: Regression All Discretionary Non-ADU Observations 2014 - 2021 With Controls..... 79
Table 20: Regression Results, Dropping Approval Step Outliers (2014 - 2021 Data)... 80

Figure 1 Process Approval Pathway Timeframes..... 11
Figure 2 Comparison of Timeframes by Affordability Classification, All Years 13
Figure 3 Distribution of Affordable Units by Development Type 33
Figure 4 CEQA Milestone Timelines Categorical Exemptions Only (2018-2021)..... 47
Figure 5 CEQA Milestone Timelines Multiple Pathways (2018-2021) 48
Figure 6 Regression 2018-2021 Observations (No Controls)..... 69
Figure 7 Ordinary Least Squares Regression 2014-2017 Observations (N=140)..... 76
Figure 8 Regression All Non-ADU Discretionary Observations 2014-2021 (No Controls) 78
Figure 9 Correlation Heat Map for 2018-2021 Regression Data (N=111) with Affordability, Neighborhood, and Process Characteristics..... 82
Figure 10 Residual Plot and LOESS Line for Simple Regression (“No Controls” in Table 1) Using All 111 Non-Discretionary Non-ADU Observations 2018-2021 83
Figure 11 Residual Plot and LOESS Line for Simple Regression (“All Controls” in Table 1) Using All 111 Discretionary Non-ADU Observations 2018-2021..... 84

Executive Summary

Background: Why Study San Francisco?

San Francisco is the anchor city in the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) region, with one of the highest Regional Housing Needs Allocations (RHNA) statewide. Complex processes that lead to delayed housing development approvals leave open questions about whether San Francisco's local legal regime will allow the city to meet this housing production target.

In 2016, authors O'Neill, Biber, and students launched the Comprehensive Assessment of Land Use Entitlements Study (CALES) at the University of California, Berkeley, to understand how cities, including San Francisco, design and apply local and state law to proposed developments of five or more units approved in 2014 - 2017. In an earlier report,[1] we found San Francisco's local regulatory regime comparatively prohibitive, risking exclusionary zoning despite explicit policies to promote inclusion and fair housing goals through inclusionary housing programs, rent stabilization, and tenant protections. Among the 28 jurisdictions we studied, San Francisco was among the cities with more land zoned for dense housing, although that zoning was not equitably distributed citywide. But most notable, among all our study cities, San Francisco was an *extreme* outlier in process requirements and timeframes to approval. The city had a median timeframe to entitlement of over two years for code compliant multi-family housing that benefited from streamlined environmental review.

San Francisco's median timeframe was not only longer than its neighbors, it was longer than timeframes in neighboring cities with purportedly more difficult local law. Berkeley, for example, has complex rules that require a use permit[2] for all new housing development, and yet the median timeframe to entitlement was four months shorter for comparable multi-family housing. Moreover, once we parsed out our data to explore how environmental review streamlining might impact timelines, we found that Berkeley's median timeframe dropped to less than 10 months for apartment buildings, whereas San Francisco's remained at 24 months for the *same type of housing*. San Francisco exemplified how cities can write and implement procedural rules in a manner that creates uncertainty of approval. Uncertainty creates risk, and risk influences what developers will propose and build, as well as which developers will consider developing within a city. During our research, affordable developers who worked in neighboring cities explained they could not work within San Francisco because entitlement was too uncertain and difficult.

California's legislature has passed nearly 100 laws relevant to housing policy since 2016.[3] These laws seek to spur housing production across all income levels and promote equitable housing outcomes—namely increased housing production in high opportunity locations. Many important changes to state housing law target subjectivity in discretionary processes, like

---

[1] We refer here to our Report to the California Air Resources Board in fulfillment of Contract #3900-19STC005. MOIRA O'NEILL-HUTSON ET AL., EXAMINING ENTITLEMENT IN CALIFORNIA TO INFORM POLICY AND PROCESS: ADVANCING SOCIAL EQUITY IN HOUSING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS (2022). We also cross reference prior publications.

[2] Project proponents apply for a use permit, often referred to as a conditional use permit, when local rules allow for certain uses subject to approval—but not as a matter of right under the local zoning.

[3] *See* Ben Metcalf, Managing Dir., UC Berkeley, Terner Ctr. for Hous. Innovation, Presentation at the California Joint Oversight Hearing with Assembly Housing and Community Development Committee: Housing Production: Recent Legislative Actions and Outcomes (Feb. 28, 2023), https://shou.senate.ca.gov/node/21.

planning review,[4] and work towards quickening approval processes, particularly for multi-family housing. New law and policy aim to accelerate housing production in high opportunity areas, inviting important questions about how well San Francisco has implemented these laws and whether they effectuate production, affordability, and equity. To answer these questions, we expanded and extended CALES to explore San Francisco's local land use regulation in more detail and identify specific roadblocks to dense multi-family housing. This report details our methods, presents findings, and discusses their implications for the California Department of Housing and Community Development's (HCD) Policy and Practice Review.

Research Questions and Approach

HCD asked (1) whether San Francisco is fully implementing key state housing laws, such as the Housing Accountability Act, the Housing Crisis Act, the Permit Streamlining Act, Senate Bill 35 (SB 35), and State Density Bonus Law; (2) whether local implementation is allowing these state laws to achieve their intended effect of promoting housing production and affordability; (3) what causes delay in the entitlement process and how the city's discretionary review process impacts overall project timelines and the housing approvals pipeline.

To answer these questions, we used a spiraling mixed methods research design that joins legal research and qualitative, quantitative, and spatial analyses to understand San Francisco's local regulatory environment. This design helped our study overcome some of the limitations of each method and allowed us to adapt our research approach to the specific needs of studying San Francisco.

HCD's questions one and two require us to interpret our data and provide findings based on our interpretation of what state law requires of localities.[5] For example, we interpret the Permit Streamlining Act, Housing Accountability Act, and Housing Crisis Act as applicable to all multi-family housing approvals in San Francisco that do not require a local legislative action. We define "full implementation" of these state laws to mean that San Francisco both complies with state law, but also that local rules or planning practices do not effectively circumvent the purpose of the limitations imposed on cities by state law.

We built a unique and highly detailed dataset of 140 planning entitlements[6] of five or more units issued in 2014 - 2017. We added 144 observations of entitlements and SB 35 approvals issued

[4] For a discussion of what characterizes a discretionary action, see Friends of Westwood, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles, 181 Cal. App. 3d 259, 269-74 (1987). When city employees can set standards and conditions for many aspects of a proposed building, the approval process is discretionary. For a definition of a ministerial process in California law, see Prentiss v. City of S. Pasadena, 15 Cal. App. 4th 85, 90, 18 Cal. Rptr. 2d 641 (1993) (citing CAL. CODE REGS., tit.14, § 15268(b)(1) (2023)("'Ministerial' describes a governmental decision involving little or no personal judgment by the public official as to the wisdom or manner of carrying out the project. The public official merely applies the law to the facts as presented but uses no special discretion or judgment in reaching a decision. A ministerial decision involves only the use of fixed standards or objective measurements, and the public official cannot use personal, subjective judgment in deciding whether or how the project should be carried out.")). Importantly, ministerial decisions are exempt from environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act.

[5] We discuss this in the report; our analysis depends on some assumptions about what "full" implementation of state law would entail.

[6] We refer to "entitlement" as a process and "entitlement" as an observation of that process in the singular and plural throughout this report. Entitlement refers to the type of housing approval that a project proponent secures from the Planning Department, Planning Commission, or Board of Supervisors when

in 2018 - 2021 to this dataset.[7] Our approvals dataset captured detail on each application and approval step under local rules and state law (like the California Environmental Quality Act, or CEQA) and important project characteristics (like affordability, building size, and location). We gathered the detail for our dataset from source documents (application documents, planning staff reports, and motion and resolution documents) wherever possible. We analyzed our data using statistics and mapping.

We conducted in-depth interviews and used participant observation and primary document analysis to understand why San Francisco's approval process operates the way that it does. We analyzed more than 35 hours of confidential in-depth research interviews with 24 participants representing affordable and market-rate developers, former and current city personnel and staff that work on housing development, land use attorneys, and housing advocates.[8] We observed and analyzed notes and transcripts from another 33 meetings that HCD convened with approximately 146 stakeholders. Most were approximately one hour long. Twenty-five of the HCD-led meetings were very small, with one to three participants, in addition to O'Neill and one representative from HCD. The small meetings allowed participants to offer deep insights, much like research interviews. In all, we analyzed notes and transcripts from ~68 hours of research interviews and meetings with 14 individuals across the executive and legislative bodies within San Francisco, over 20 former and current planning staff, more than 60 development professionals (evenly split between affordable and market-rate developers), and 6 different housing advocacy groups. We analyzed materials to extract themes and looked for frequency of themes across stakeholder groups. We also cross-referenced written law, recordings from hearings, approval documents, and analyses from our entitlement data.

Limitations of Research Approach and Analysis

Each method and data point has some limitations. For example, each observation in our approval dataset represents a potential housing or mixed-use development that developers believed had a high enough probability of success that they were willing to pursue entitlement in the first place. There are no project denials in the database to allow for quantitative analysis, but we do have limited data on a few denials we examined during data collection. Gathering data on project denials in a systematic way (for quantitative analysis) would demand substantially expanding the scope of the research project, which was not feasible given the research timeframe. Further, defining a project denial for data collection and analysis is more complex than defining an entitlement. A denial includes what the city reports as a denial but should also include projects that the city effectively "denied" (where a political body denied a specific entitlement, for example) even though the project remains pending within the city's public portal

---

the local law reviews a proposal to build housing through a discretionary process. Discretionary review is a legal concept that means the city can set standards and conditions for many aspects of a proposed building and the approval process is discretionary. An entitlement typically precedes the building permit process, and it is a process that involves planning department review of a proposal to build housing and potentially requires an approval from a local elected or appointed political body. A ministerial process involves a public official applying law to fact without discretion or subjective judgment. Often, building departments issue ministerial approvals. Uniquely, state law creates a ministerial process that also involves planning review—which we discuss at length in the full report.

[7] Corrected Annual Progress Reports helped us identify 11 observations late in our research process. We were able to code essential characteristics for these 11 observations to include them in our summary statistical analyses only.

[8] Eighteen participants sat for interviews in 2022 - 2023, and several participated in more than one interview. We also analyzed transcripts from six interviews across the same stakeholder groups in San Francisco (affordable developers, planners, market-rate developers, and community-based organization advocates) that O'Neill conducted in 2017, where comparisons with prior years was useful.

or in its annual reporting. For the purposes of research, a denial could also include a project from which a developer appears to voluntarily withdraw after the city determines that it will not approve the project or will impose conditions that render the project infeasible. There also may be no documentation to verify whether a project that appears to be pending has effectively been denied. In our work, however, where we come across developments that have advanced in the entitlement process but are ultimately denied, we do discuss those developments.

All interview participants volunteered, as did all participants in HCD-led meetings. Voluntary participation in interviews and research meetings increases selection bias and limits the generalizability of findings.[9] We increased the number of interviews in each stakeholder group and triangulated data and methods to augment the overall reliability of our findings from interviews where possible. Some topics do not allow for this, however. For example, developers may discuss why they are unwilling to apply for entitlement, but there is no other data to explore to understand what deters applications beyond what the interview participants shared.

Summary of Findings

HCD asked whether the data indicates San Francisco has fully implemented state housing law intended to promote housing production and affordability. **All data generally indicates that the answer is no.**

San Francisco's local rules embed subjectivity and uncertainty into review processes that state law says should be objective, time constrained, and, in some cases, certain. The city's authority to apply discretionary review to any permit, and the ease with which project opponents can appeal planning approvals and permits (including post-entitlement permits) to the Board of Supervisors or Board of Appeals fosters planning practices that limit full implementation of the Permit Streamlining Act, Housing Accountability Act, Housing Crisis Act, and in some instances, SB 35 and State Density Bonus Law. Planning staff are concerned about whether planning review will survive scrutiny from local political bodies, not the courts. Planning staff anticipate local political bodies will ignore planning recommendations and extend review processes if that is what neighborhood-level politics demand. Planning practices reflect this assumption, and local policy reinforces it. Developers interpret this planning practice as requiring more than what the law "on paper" demands through negotiation outside of public hearings to satisfy neighborhood interests. Developers perceive all planning approvals as uncertain and risky, even if the proposed development conforms to all zoning and planning standards. Eight years of approvals data confirms these perceptions. The risk and uncertainty embedded into local law has driven some developers to leave the San Francisco market and has deterred other developers from entering the market entirely.

Below, we elaborate on what the data tells us about the direct effects of specific state housing laws on San Francisco's housing approval process, what all data tells us about San Francisco's implementation of different state laws, and the relationship between local rules, planning practices, and lengthy entitlement outcomes. The report that follows details each finding.

[9] Selection bias refers to research participants not being fully representative of the group to which they belong. This limits our ability to interpret what we hear as the perspectives of a particular stakeholder group, generally.

SB 35 fixes planning review for eligible housing developments but is not a complete process fix.

Data shows San Francisco Planning diligently implemented SB 35. Approximately 36 professionals who work on affordable development unanimously reported that SB 35's ministerial process "fixed" planning review for affordable housing developments because the state law created certainty of planning approval where none existed previously. Stakeholder perceptions are borne out in the planning approval data. Table 1 shows that the median timeframe for planning approval for developments that applied only under SB 35 was ~3.4 months and could take up to eight months. In contrast, code compliant discretionary developments[10] requiring only a building permit had a median timeframe of two years and could take as many as four years.

Table 1: Timeframes to Planning Approvals Issued in 2018 - 2021 Selected Pathways

Process Category	Timeframe (Months)			
	Minimum	**Median**	**Mean**	Maximum
SB 35 only (N=9)[1]	0.89	3.42	4.24	7.62
Discretionary building permit only (N=13)	7.76	24.20	24.67	47.70

[1]This count does not include five applications that developers proposed as discretionary approvals, some before SB 35's enactment, that San Francisco later approved under SB 35.

Importantly, stakeholder interviews indicate SB 35 provided both affordable developers and planning staff relief from San Francisco's local rules. Data on how San Francisco Planning processed applications for development before SB 35 indicates Planning prioritized expediting 100% affordable developments.[11] Local law still limited how quickly planners could complete review for any development, including 100% affordable development that the city helped fund. In fact, the city entitled only five 100% affordable developments in 2014 – 2017, which would yield 567 units if built. The median timeframe to approval for these five 100% affordable developments was 15 months. In contrast, SB 35's ministerial process allowed San Francisco Planning to approve 14 100% affordable developments that would yield 1,663 affordable units if built. The median timeframe for the SB 35 100% affordable developments was less than 7.5 months, inclusive of developments that began as discretionary developments and later applied for SB 35 eligibility review. The median timeframe for 100% affordable housing developments that only applied for approval under SB 35 was less than three months. Most SB 35 developments also used State Density Bonus Law, so they were, on average, larger as compared with another three discretionary 100% affordable developments San Francisco approved in 2018 – 2021, or the five entitled in 2014 - 2017.

However, SB 35's effects are limited to planning review. All stakeholders still describe the post-entitlement approval process as subjective, lacking standardization and sufficient oversight.


[10] Code compliant discretionary development means proposed housing development that conforms to all zoning and only requires a building permit. San Francisco law provides that this development is subject to discretionary review.

[11] Interviews at that time indicated internal work and analysis to expedite affordable development, but median timeframes for 100% affordable developments were still 15 months.

Stakeholders share that the post-entitlement permitting process depends entirely on the professional assigned to the project, not the project scope itself. Stakeholders report that subjectivity in the post-entitlement process can trigger additional planning review even after a project has moved to the Department of Building Inspection. Because SB 35 is limited to the planning review stage, the state law has no effect on these post-entitlement procedural issues. Developers share that because San Francisco's law offers opportunities for project opponents to challenge, or appeal, permits after entitlement, including demolition permits, SB 35 eligible projects are susceptible to process challenges after planning review as well.[12]

SB 35 also does not represent a complete fix for San Francisco's procedural challenges. SB 35 applies to qualifying projects so long as San Francisco keeps failing to meet its housing production targets. But missing housing production targets is not San Francisco's goal. **Still, San Francisco's implementation of SB 35 signals what is possible with a ministerial process while also spotlighting San Francisco's problematic existing discretionary review.**

Figure 1: Process Approval Pathway Timeframes



Graphic Developed by Dori Ganetsos using CALES data.

[12] The recent appeal of demolition permits for an SB 35 development located at 2550 Irving demonstrates this point.

Unpredictable discretionary review processes create uncertainty and risk—even for code compliant development of any size in any location citywide.


All permits in San Francisco are discretionary under local law unless preempted by state law[13] (like SB 35). Stakeholders describe the discretionary housing approval process in San Francisco as risky and unpredictable. Stakeholders report approval is uncertain even if the proposal conforms to all zoning and planning requirements. When we use different statistical methods to analyze the housing approval data, we also find that **no type of housing development is easy to entitle in San Francisco**. Even a smaller development that conforms to zoning and planning requirements faces unpredictable timeframes. When we analyze the approvals data to explore relationships between specific approval requirements and timeframes, we discover that there are factors—like affordability classification, project size, and location—outside of what zoning and planning standards require that influence timeframes. This suggests that these other factors might play a substantial role in whether and how a project gets entitled, even when a project conforms to all planning standards and zoning.

Timeframes for discretionary approvals increased.

Our 2018 - 2021 approvals data indicates that entitlement timeframes have increased as compared to the prior four years. The median timeframe for discretionary approvals of five or more units issued in 2014 - 2017 was 27 months. In 2018 - 2021, the median timeframe for the same climbed to 34 months—more than a 25% increase. Figure 2 shows that in both study periods, 100% affordable development moved comparatively faster: 100% affordable development requiring discretionary review had median approval timeframes of ~15 months in 2014 - 2017 and ~20 months in 2018 – 2021. Both periods show that the city can quicken the process, to some degree, for affordable development. Interview data from 2017 and 2022 - 2023 indicate that planning staff have been committed to expediting affordable development.

[13] The Municipal Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 26(a) provides that San Francisco's departments may "take into consideration the effects of the proposed business or calling upon surrounding property and upon its residents . . . [and to] exercise its [or their] sound discretion as to whether said permit should be granted, transferred, denied or revoked." SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., BUS. & TAX REGS. CODE § 26(a) (2019). San Francisco Planning's website states that the city interprets this part of the Municipal Code as granting the Planning Commission discretionary authority over all building permits, including permits not otherwise discretionary under zoning and planning requirements. *Discretionary Review*, S.F. PLAN., https://sfplanning.org/resource/discretionary-review (Jan. 25, 2023).

Figure 2: Comparison of Timeframes by Affordability Classification, All Years



Graphic Developed by Dori Ganetsos using CALES data.

Local policy and practices are inconsistent with the goals of the Permit Streamlining Act, Housing Accountability Act, and Housing Crisis Act.

Stakeholders report that San Francisco's local rules and politics create planning practices that are inconsistent with state housing laws which aim to quicken planning review and reduce subjectivity. Approvals data suggests these stakeholders are correct.

First, the data the city makes publicly available on project applications shows San Francisco systematically failed to meet PSA notification deadlines for discretionary approvals issued in 2018 - 2021. Planning recorded more information on application notices in its public portal for applications filed after January 1, 2018, as compared to prior years, indicating that San Francisco Planning is doing more to track and disclose project intake. Still, the city's data shows the city routinely did not meet PSA deadlines. Also, up until July 2023, local policy required the entitlement process for most dense development to begin with a mandatory Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) process that added, on average, a year to the application process.

Second, local rules drive the city's implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), which extends timelines. Local rules that allow for easy administrative appeals and require appeal of CEQA determinations to follow entitlement[14] push environmental planners to make CEQA determinations at the close of the entitlement process. This practice limits the PSA's effect on overall approval timeframes.[15] Also, the state's CEQA guidelines do not require San Francisco Planning to incorporate wind and shadow studies into compliance pathways for exempt developments, but local law does. These supplemental studies add time

[14] The Board of Supervisors provides an advisory that explains that Section 31.16 of its Administrative Code requires that the Board will hear an appeal after the final approval action. *See* S.F. BD. OF SUPERVISORS, APPEAL FILING TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA) EXEMPTION DETERMINATIONS APPEAL (Aug. 28, 2023), https://sfbos.org/sites/default/files/CEQA_Exemption_Determinations_Appeal_Info_Sheet.pdf.

[15] We interpret California Government Code § 65690(a) as imposing limits on the time to approval under the PSA only after a city makes CEQA determinations. *See* CAL. GOV'T CODE § 65690(a) (West 2023).

and cost to environmental review, and sometimes provide a basis for local administrative appeals.[16]

Third, and relatedly, administrative appeals not only delay entitlement for specific projects that face appeal, administrative appeals also influence planning practices at a systems level. Most stakeholders (across groups) perceive that San Francisco's process risks inserting the Board of Supervisors into any approval pathway through an appeal. This process nurtures risk averse planning practices at all stages which derail other local and state policy that aims to quicken review. Data also shows that appeals increase the workload for planners already juggling immense workloads, which in turn impacts the pace of review for other development proposals. For example, **an administrative appeal of just one entitlement in our dataset required 374 additional staff hours and $52,204 to prepare the appeal—even though the appeal was withdrawn**. Notably, nearly all the planners we interviewed or met with are more apprehensive of the Board of Supervisors than potential litigants.

Fourth, stakeholders report frequent continuances and multiple hearings for non-CEQA approvals, which they say also allows for changes to proposed development outside of formal hearings. San Francisco's publicly accessible data on hearing dates is incomplete for about half of our 2018 – 2021 observations. Still, we found that at least 22% of all 2018 – 2021 quasi-adjudicative entitlements had multiple continuances or hearings for a single step.[17] Some observations have remarkably high rates of continuances and hearings. One project, for example, had nine continuances for a joined Large Project Authorization and Density Bonus approval step.

Fifth, several stakeholder groups report that local policy allows frivolous and meritless challenges with ease (evidenced by withdrawn or denied appeals or withdrawn or denied requests for exceptional discretionary review)[18] and with little to no cost to project opponents, yet significant costs to planning staff and developers. Project proponents see increased costs because of the delays and uncertainty that these processes create. The processes also impact the workflow of Planning Department staff, which slows down planning review. For example, data shows that when project opponents request exceptional discretionary review, planners can expect to work several days and sometimes weeks preparing for a hearing on a project with which they already completed review. This requires shuffling work priorities. Developers report that rules that make it easy to challenge imminent planning approvals foster an opaque practice of negotiation outside of formal hearings which risks imposition of subjective conditions of approval. The approvals data show at least 14% of entitlements (across both study periods—or eight years) faced administrative appeals that were usually withdrawn or denied.[19]

---

[16] We note here that San Francisco's public portal only provides access to shadow studies, although many stakeholders including planners stated that wind studies are common.

[17] This includes entitlements that only required a planning department or zoning administrator review. If we take out those entitlements that did not require a hearing in front of the Planning Commission or Board of Supervisors under planning and zoning law, the rate is at least 30%.

[18] Exceptional discretionary review refers to a local rule that allows project opponents to request the Planning Commission exercise discretionary review for an approval that did not otherwise require the Planning Commission's involvement. This request necessitates a hearing, at which time the Planning Commission then determines if it will exercise discretionary review because of exceptional and extraordinary circumstances which could lead to modifying the conditions of approval. More detail on this local process is in the full report. We refer to this as "exceptional discretionary review" hereafter.

[19] Administrative appeal data for 2018 - 2021 depends on internal tracking and self-reported data and is not systematically available on the city's public portal. It is possible that the rate of administrative appeal could be higher.

Also, at least 20% of discretionary building permits in study years received a request for exceptional discretionary review.

Subjectivity and variability persist in the post-entitlement process.

All stakeholders experienced with development in San Francisco shared that the permitting process lacks standardization or uniformity in how the process unfolds. Outcomes, in terms of processing time, are contingent on who is assigned to the development rather than on the form of the development. This variability slows, and sometimes derails, production. Stakeholders describe building permit processes as inefficient and subjective, triggering planning review again even after entitlement. There is also notable difference in the way all stakeholders describe Planning Department and Department of Building Inspection (DBI) staff. Stakeholders blame local approval bodies for overly cautious planning practices. In contrast, stakeholders complain of too little oversight or management of DBI staff, and too few performance standards, as influencing permitting practices.

Stakeholders suggest local reforms must eliminate discretionary review on some housing or the city will not meet its RHNA or resolve long-standing inequities in land use.

Importantly, planners, developers, and many housing advocates welcomed the state's intervention into local discretion through SB 35. Though planners expressed a need for more technical support from the state when state law augments local planning review, planners agreed with developers that the state ministerial process fixed planning review for most 100% affordable development and offered that a ministerial process could do the same for other housing projects.

Stakeholder groups also shared that reforms to expedite and simplify planning review while retaining discretion will fail to fix process problems in San Francisco. Statistical analysis of approvals data suggests these stakeholders are correct. Planning review of code compliant development can take years. This is true, even though our timeline calculations do not capture the frequency of developments subject to discretionary review being punted back to Planning *after* entitlement for further additional review, because San Francisco's public data portal does not allow for systematic analysis of this problem. Regression analysis suggests that reducing process steps while maintaining discretionary review is unlikely to resolve San Francisco's production challenges.[20]

Stakeholders shared that rezoning must be coupled with procedural reform that provides a local ministerial process to address production challenges *and* equity. Planners, developers, and some housing advocates perceive current reform efforts as "tinkering" with the zoning and planning code, when what they believe is needed is procedural overhaul and equitable upzoning. Stakeholders characterize San Francisco's existing regulation as reflecting historical and current power imbalances across neighborhoods. Stakeholders caution that current density and use controls that limit housing development in more affluent neighborhoods reflect existing neighborhood power over planning and political bodies. Also, the dominance of project-level adversarial politics reflects that some communities can only access power over land use by blocking development at public hearings. When affluent neighborhoods are rezoned, stakeholders caution that neighborhood power and influence over planning and

[20] Figure 8 illustrates. For a full discussion of regression analysis using the 2014 - 2021 data, see Appendix A.

political bodies will not necessarily disappear. Without a ministerial process for at least some development, stakeholders caution that rezoning will simply catalyze more project-by-project adjudication and administrative appeals as affluent communities block more equitable distribution of dense housing development through existing process tools. If what stakeholders forecast is correct—and the data suggests that they are—then existing timelines to approval likely underestimate future approval timeframes in higher opportunity neighborhoods that the city is in the process of upzoning or proposing to upzone.

Planners, developers, and advocates share that these local rules requiring reform are values-driven. These rules reflect a widespread assumption that more process supports meaningful community engagement and sharing of power over land use which, together, help address structural inequities in the built environment. Several stakeholder groups caution that these assumptions are faulty. San Francisco's process fosters project-level political fights that result in high-risk entitlement processes without altering longstanding inequities in planning standards and zoning. Planners, in particular, share that what San Francisco needed, and still needs, is deep engagement at the policy, planning, and zoning stages to hash out what zoning and planning standards should be, as well as simplified and ministerial approval for development at the project level that serves the city's housing policy goals. Planners and developers caution that as process has gotten worse in recent years, fewer developers can navigate the risk of developing in San Francisco, and this poses major challenges to San Francisco's ability to meet its production targets. During meetings with HCD, some Commissioners and Supervisors called out this local history and the problems of process in San Francisco, seemingly aligned with the perspectives of planners, affordable developers, and housing advocates. At the same time, meetings with both Commissioners and Supervisors also revealed clear disagreement within political bodies on both the source of San Francisco's housing problems and the solution. At least some Supervisors are skeptical that increasing anything other than affordable housing production could tackle the city's housing challenges. Some Commissioners and Supervisors also expressed concern about how State Density Bonus Law and SB 35 alter the urban form, even as they want more affordability. And at least some Supervisors perceived affordability to be welcome citywide, whereas planners and affordable developers say that this is not true.

Conclusion

San Francisco's planning practice and process problems spring from local law that applies discretionary review to any permit and offers repeated opportunities to challenge project approvals after an already complex and lengthy planning review process. These rules incentivize risk averse planning practices to avoid disruptions to a busy workflow and public scrutiny from political bodies. Risk averse planning practices, in turn, limit full implementation of the Permit Streamlining Act, Housing Accountability Act, Housing Crisis Act, and in some instances, State Density Bonus Law. Local rules also limit the effects of SB 35, as affordable developers face post-entitlement appeals. Still, the direct effects of state ministerial review highlight what is possible in terms of resolving San Francisco's process issues. Planners, developers, and housing advocates suggest achievement of the city's equity goals requires a local ministerial process coupled with equitable upzoning. What is also apparent, however, is that reforming zoning and entitlement will be insufficient to attain production targets. The city has major challenges with post-entitlement processes—some of which are related, again, to local rules, and some of which are related to variability and subjectivity in permitting processes, staffing, and lack of inter-agency coordination.

Introduction

In 2016, we launched the Comprehensive Assessment of Land Use Entitlements Study (CALES) at UC Berkeley. CALES explores how communities design and apply land use law to proposals to build dense housing. We used a 2015 California Legislative Analyst's Office report that identified the metro areas with the highest housing costs in the state and where demand has outpaced supply[21] to select our first group of study cities and regions. San Francisco was at the top of the list, and we began our work by studying San Francisco and four neighboring cities.[22] We eventually grew the study to include 28 jurisdictions in seven metropolitan regions across the state.

What we found was that San Francisco zoned comparatively more land for dense housing than nearly every other city we studied across the state. Indeed, San Francisco was one of only *two* cities studied that zoned more than a third of its zoned land for all income levels.[23] Zoning land for dense multi-family housing is a necessary though insufficient condition to achieving affordability and inclusion. California's fair share housing law is premised on this concept.[24]

Despite San Francisco zoning more land for dense housing than most cities studied, we found that San Francisco's local regulatory regime was comparatively prohibitive and risked exclusion. Even though the city has explicit local policy to promote inclusion and fair housing goals through inclusionary housing programs, rent stabilization, and tenant protections, our comparative analysis categorized San Francisco as "prohibitive" due to its complex procedural maze and application of laws. Among the 28 jurisdictions studied, San Francisco was unique in that it made all development discretionary. No other city we studied made all building permits (typically issued post-entitlement) discretionary; most used aesthetic regulation or design or site plan review as the blanket discretionary hook during entitlement. A few of our study cities required use permits for all multi-family housing development. But all the other approaches we found existed in the planning code and zoning regulations. No other city studied made building permits discretionary through some other area of local law.

San Francisco was also an extreme outlier in terms of timeframes to entitlement—with median timeframes of over two years, even for housing developments that met all zoning requirements and planning standards. These lengthy timeframes eclipsed the other study cities' timeframes by many months. These timelines also exceeded planner perceptions of "average" entitlement timeframes in communities nationwide. We found that only 5% of the 140 project observations in our 2014 - 2017 dataset from San Francisco achieved entitlement in 12 months or less.

We wrote that San Francisco's land use regime exemplifies how cities can zone land for dense multi-family housing and write and implement procedural rules to create delay and uncertainty of approval. Delay creates cost. Uncertainty creates risk. Increased development costs and risk influences which developers will build within a place, and what those developers will build. In that prior research, interview data and 2014 - 2017 approvals data suggested San Francisco's local regulatory regime burdened affordable development—even if the city prioritized affordable

---

[21] CHAS ALAMO ET AL., LEGIS. ANALYST'S OFF., CALIFORNIA'S HIGH HOUSING COSTS: CAUSES AND CONSEQUENCES (2015), https://lao.ca.gov/reports/2015/finance/housing-costs/housing-costs.aspx.
[22] We refer here to our Report to the California Air Resources Board in fulfillment of Contract #3900-19STC005. MOIRA O'NEILL-HUTSON ET AL., EXAMINING ENTITLEMENT IN CALIFORNIA TO INFORM POLICY AND PROCESS: ADVANCING SOCIAL EQUITY IN HOUSING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS (2022).
[23] *Id.*
[24] *See* CAL. GOV'T CODE § 65583.2 (West 2023).

development—and likely squeezed out possibilities for middle income housing development entirely. We found that San Francisco's local law facilitated most 2014 - 2017 entitlement being sited in formerly industrial locations or neighborhoods that had multi-family zoning in place for decades. What we concluded was that San Francisco was the most sophisticated of the cities we studied in how its local law effectively blocked dense housing development through complex procedural hurdles rather than traditional density and use constraints.

California's legislature has passed nearly 100 laws relevant to housing policy since 2016[25] to spur housing production across all income levels and promote equitable housing outcomes. Many important changes target subjectivity in planning review and aim to quicken planning review, particularly for multi-family housing. There is also new law and policy to accelerate equitable housing outcomes, in terms of increased production in high opportunity locations.

More recent legislative reforms invite important questions about how well San Francisco has implemented these state housing laws intended to promote housing production, affordability, and equity. To explore these questions, we expanded and extended our Comprehensive Assessment of Land Use Entitlements Study (CALES) to better understand San Francisco's local land use regulatory regime and identify roadblocks to all multi-family housing development approvals that would yield five or more units. This report details our methods, presents findings, and discusses their implications for the California Department of Housing and Community Developments' (HCD) Policy and Practice Review.

Methods, Data, and Limitations

HCD asked:

1) At the local level, are state housing laws (including the Housing Accountability Act, Housing Crisis Act, Permit Streamlining Act, State Density Bonus Law, SB 35, and Housing Element Law) intended to promote housing production and affordability being fully implemented, and are they achieving their intended effect?
2) What are the causes of delay in San Francisco's entitlement process?
3) To what extent do discretionary review processes impact overall project timelines and the housing approvals pipeline?

Overall Research Approach

We use a spiraling mixed methods research design that joins legal research and qualitative, quantitative, and spatial analyses to understand San Francisco's local regulatory environment and answer the research questions. A spiraling research design is iterative and allows us to reexamine theoretical assumptions and methodological choices throughout the research process. This iterative research approach is sensitive to local conditions and research needs that are sometimes difficult to discover at the beginning of a research process. This approach involves producing analysis at multiple points in the study to allow for a feedback loop with both HCD and San Francisco while also informing our own theoretical assumptions about which law, policy, or planning practice factors support or obstruct housing development. This approach also means we do not rely exclusively on qualitative, quantitative, or spatial analysis to answer any

[25] *See* Ben Metcalf, Managing Dir., UC Berkeley, Terner Ctr. for Hous. Innovation, Presentation at the California Joint Oversight Hearing with Assembly Housing and Community Development Committee: Housing Production: Recent Legislative Actions and Outcomes (Feb. 28, 2023), https://shou.senate.ca.gov/node/21.

research question. We use qualitative data (interviews) to understand our quantitative and spatial analysis (using our entitlement dataset) and vice versa.

Ongoing Legal Research

We completed initial legal research into San Francisco's planning and zoning through CALES in 2016. We updated that legal research in 2018 and 2019, and then again in 2021 to understand changes to local planning review processes (for example, the elimination of the pre-application Environmental Evaluation process in 2018) and the impact of state housing laws (including changes to Density Bonus Law, Accessory Dwelling Unit Law, Senate Bill 330, SB 35, and amendments to the Housing Accountability Act), wherever changes are codified or provided for in policy documents. The legal and planning code summary informs our interview questions and guides our current data collection process. In the scope of this work, we updated our review of local law with relevant trial court and appellate court opinions.

Our Interpretation of State Law and Definition of "Full Implementation" of State Law

Answering the first research question requires us to explore whether San Francisco's policy and practices comply with state law and whether San Francisco's local policy or practices prevent specific state laws from achieving their intended effect. This requires us, first, to interpret state law and define what it means for a locality to fully implement each law for the purposes of this research. How we define "full implementation" in the research questions also informs our methods of analysis. We list our understanding of the applicability of specific state laws, their aims, and our definition of "full implementation" here.

We interpret the PSA, Housing Accountability Act, and Housing Crisis Act as applicable to *all* discretionary approvals, or entitlements, in San Francisco that do not require local legislative action. We read provisions within San Francisco's Planning Code that allow for and anticipate that the Planning Commission will issue a waiver or exception from any planning standards or zoning *without* local legislative action as adjudicative and within the purview of these state laws.

We interpret the goal of the PSA as seeking to "expedite decisions" on qualifying development projects[26] by imposing time limits on application processing and approval decisions. We also interpret the Permit Streamlining Act as imposing limits on the time to approval under the Permit Streamlining Act only after a city makes CEQA determinations.[27] If our data shows that a local policy or practice prevents the Permit Streamlining from imposing those time limits, we conclude that the local policy or practice blocks the full implementation of the PSA, even if the data does not show San Francisco violated an express provision of the PSA.

We interpret that the goal of the Housing Accountability Act is to increase housing production by limiting the ability of cities to outright deny, reduce the density of, or render infeasible a development that complies with objective development standards. We interpret the Housing Accountability Act to prohibit these actions unless a locality provides written findings that the proposed development would have an unavoidable and impossible to mitigate adverse impact on public health or safety.[28] Relatedly, we interpret the 2017 amendments to the Housing Accountability Act, found in Assembly Bill 1515, as modifying the Housing Accountability Act's "reasonable person" standard for determining compliance with land use regulations[29] in favor of

[26] CAL. GOV'T CODE § 65921 (West 2023).
[27] CAL. GOV'T CODE § 65950 (West 2023).
[28] CAL. GOV'T CODE § 65589.5 (West 2023).
[29] CAL. GOV'T CODE § 65589.5(f)(4) (West 2023).

approving qualifying development. We read the law consistent with how the First District Court of Appeal read the law.[30] We also interpret the "deemed to comply" provision of the Housing Accountability Act consistent with this same appellate court opinion.[31] We interpret this state law as requiring a city to send a project applicant timely written notice and an explanation of non-compliance if a city determines a proposed housing development is inconsistent with applicable standards.

We use descriptive statistics and interviews to explore whether San Francisco may have imposed conditions that lead to a reduced density (between application and entitlement), or subjective standards (conditions that render the development infeasible), or otherwise effectively denied a proposal to develop housing that a reasonable person would conclude is compliant with land use regulations under the Housing Accountability Act. Where our data indicates that the city may have imposed subjective standards, conditions that reduce density, or conditions that may render developments infeasible, we describe this as a failure to fully implement the Housing Accountability Act. We do *not* conclude whether San Francisco violated an express provision the Housing Accountability Act because of the limitations of our data. We gather and analyze documents that are readily available through the city's parcel information map public portal—but we cannot confirm that the city did not issue a notice of non-compliance with applicable standards *or* did not prepare findings, because the documents are not readily available on the public portal. We cannot interpret the absence of those documents on the city's public portal as meaning that those documents do not exist, ergo, San Francisco did not comply with state law.[32]

We also interpret one goal of the Housing Crisis Act of 2019, enacted in October 2019,[33] to be to curb delays associated with hearings, continuances, and meetings.[34] Where we identify entitlements with multiple hearings and more than five hearings, we describe as inconsistent with this law or that the city is not fully implementing the law. We do not determine whether the city is systematically violating the express prohibition on number of hearings, largely because of the data challenges surrounding hearings as discussed in the body of this report.

Unique Entitlement Dataset

The Comprehensive Assessment of Land Use Entitlements Study (CALES) dataset is a uniquely detailed dataset on how entitlements issued in select years navigated their approval pathway. Table 2: Entitlement Data Counts by Project and Units Across Years details observations per study year.

[30] We refer here to the opinion in Cal. Renters Legal Advoc. & Educ. Fund v. City of San Mateo, 68 Cal. App. 5th 820, 845 (2021) ("Subdivision (f)(4) is intentionally deferential to housing development.").
[31] *Id.* at 831 (a "project is deemed to comply if 'substantial evidence . . . would allow a reasonable person to conclude' that it does").
[32] We do recommend, however, that San Francisco make those documents publicly available if they exist.
[33] We refer here to the passage of Senate Bill 330, approved by the Governor on October 9, 2019. S.B. 330, 2019-2020 Leg., Reg. Sess. (Cal. 2019).
[34] CAL. GOV'T CODE § 65905.5 (West 2023).

Table 2: Entitlement Data Counts by Project and Units Across Years

	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019*	2020	2021
Projects	24	23	55	38	36	42	25	41
Units	2,470	2,069	6,371	3,359	2,824	2,807	2,839	2,869

*We included one SB 35 observation without an eligibility determination date in 2019 based on the date of the building permit.

2014 - 2017 Observations

The 2014 - 2017 dataset does not include Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) approvals but does include litigation-related data.[35] We do not rely on San Francisco's reporting on entitlement and permitting. Rather, we build our dataset from source documents including application documents, planning staff reports, motion and resolution documents, and legal pleadings where relevant, and construct our own code book. Importantly, in addition to our typical quality control measures, San Francisco uniquely provided us an opportunity to review our 2014 - 2017 dataset with the San Francisco Planning Department's Environmental Review team in 2018 following our first working paper.

Using San Francisco's online Property Information Map system (PIM), we augmented the 2014 - 2017 entitlement data in this study by:

1) Collecting additional hearing, correspondence, and approval data on the PPA and Environmental Evaluation Application processes, where available;
2) Collecting in-depth information on the nine observations where parties applied for exceptional Discretionary Review (DR) under San Francisco's Business and Tax Code, including all available data on the requests, hearings, and the Planning Commission's actions;
3) Confirming if and how market-rate developments satisfied San Francisco's inclusionary zoning (IZ) ordinance by reviewing our data and supporting documents (there are 10 market-rate developments in our dataset where we cannot confirm how the projects satisfied the IZ requirement);
4) Supplementing our search for "determined to be complete" dates issued by the Planning Department (there are none for all 140 observations) with a second search through San Francisco's Property Information Map (PIM)[36] for correspondence regarding incomplete applications; and
5) Augmenting existing CEQA-related coding with any available data on Wind, Shadow, and Transportation Demand Management studies for each observation in the 2014 - 2017 dataset.

[35] We detail how we collected and quality checked the 2014 - 2017 entitlement data we reference in the Report to the California Air Resources Board (CARB Report). MOIRA O'NEILL-HUTSON ET AL., EXAMINING ENTITLEMENT IN CALIFORNIA TO INFORM POLICY AND PROCESS: ADVANCING SOCIAL EQUITY IN HOUSING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS 36-43 (2022).

[36] PIM refers to San Francisco's public portal that provides comprehensive access to numerous records associated with parcels. *San Francisco Property Information Map*, S.F. PLAN., https://sfplanninggis.org/pim/ (last visited Sept. 18, 2023).

The Permit Streamlining Act provides planning departments should determine whether an application to develop housing is complete within 30 days of receipt or the application will be deemed complete.[37] We found no publicly available data that documents that San Francisco's planners made completeness determinations within 30 days of application for any entitlement of five or more units issued in 2014 - 2017. [38]

We explored the data to see if we could determine "deemed complete" dates as well. For discretionary building permit applications, we could almost always locate the Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) applications (where applicable) but could not always find Project Applications consistently logged. The Notice of Building Permit Application, however, references the application date (though we cannot confirm the date against a source document). For other approval applications that require only one local approval—like a Conditional Use Authorization (CUA)—we can locate the PPA documents, but we can only sometimes locate applications for those discrete approvals with date stamps of application receipt by the Planning Department.

We also cannot determine from the documents on PIM when planning review began for entitlements issued in 2014 - 2017. For projects that fall under the Permit Streamlining Act, this means that it is not possible to confirm compliance with the Permit Streamlining Act even if the Planning Department staff did not make completeness determinations. For example, we found a few instances of Planning Department correspondence that lists what an application for a discretionary approval (like a CUA) is missing, and states that review has begun and that time limits do not begin until after the project proponent submits the required materials—but the letter does not provide *when* planning review began. These letters are dated many months after the application date.[39] The date of the letter suggests non-compliance with the PSA, but the language is vague. Also, although PIM links users to a portal that provides some building permit data (permit number, description, and date), there is little to no supporting documentation available.

2018 - 2021 Observations

We first modified the data collection template to account for important changes in state law and to track source documents closely. We have variables to identify the source of data that we used to determine the timeframe, approval, and hearing values. Adding data source variables allows us to code for whether we were able to identify an approval detail or event based on the original document (primary source) or an entry in San Francisco's portal (secondary or self-reported source). We also constructed new variables to explore:

- How many public hearings (including continuances) to which a project was subjected.
- The approval body required of a developer or property owner before issuing an approval.
- Changes to project characteristics (in terms of the number of units proposed, or types of units proposed) throughout the entitlement process.
- How developments that qualified for state ministerial approvals (such as SB 35) navigated the approval process.

---

[37] CAL. GOV'T CODE § 65920 (West 2023).

[38] During our prior research in San Francisco, we did not request this information through a Public Records Act request. We did confirm in meetings with San Francisco personnel that at that time, Planning did not track the relevant information.

[39] For example, using one of our CUA observations to illustrate, we can find the application (with the submission date) and the Planning Department's notice that details what is missing, and that review is underway. The time lag between the two is about 10 months and does provide when planning review began.

Consistent with prior coding, we also always code for "other approvals" we could not anticipate from legal research and review of San Francisco's local planning and zoning ordinances. In 2018 - 2021 data, examples include approvals like those requiring sidewalk legislation to allow a development to meet other code requirements. We also continuously add variables to augment the dataset to answer the research questions above.

We built our potential observation list to collect data from multiple sources. We referenced Annual Progress Report (APR) data to identify all reported entitlements or ADU or SB 35 approvals that would yield five or more new residential units if built. The APR listed duplicates. We cleaned for duplicates as we only wanted to examine unique projects in the APR. Once we had unique reported entitlements, we ran a match within our own 2014 - 2017 dataset. We ran a fuzzy-join text matching algorithm[40] between unique entitlements in the APR with our 2014 - 2017 dataset. We found six APR unique projects that overlapped with observations in our 2014 - 2017 data (which we had already cleaned and confirmed involved entitlements in those years). We do not include those in our 2018 - 2021 dataset.[41] We incorporated the remainder of APR entitlements into our data collection strategy. We then reviewed CEQA-related approvals in San Francisco's PIM portal and Planning Commission agendas using San Francisco's public database of environmental review notices of determinations and exemptions.[42] We identified another group of observations (developments that appeared potentially approved in 2018 - 2021) to incorporate into our data collection strategy. Our 2018 - 2021 data includes 16 SB 35 observations and 17 discretionary ADUs. We provide more detail on the accuracy of APR data in Appendix C.

In all, a team of trained students collected data on 196 potential observations of entitlement/approvals issued in 2018 - 2021 after constructing a project list from the APR, cross-referencing environmental review determinations, and any other materials that listed out SB 35 project approvals. After preliminary data collection we determined 144 observations belonged in our study for analysis of entitlements and SB 35 approvals issued in 2018 - 2021. We excluded pending entitlements, entitlements outside of our study years, and Development Agreements associated with a major phased development where no phase or building had yet secured its final entitlement. We completed a full quality check of 133 of our 2018 - 2021 observations. The quality check process involved checking each coded value we recorded in the database twice against the source document or the PIM entry if no source document was available. Where there was an ambiguity or confusion about what the coded value should be, O'Neill reviewed the value and the source material to make a final coding decision.

We completed a partial quality check for 11 observations we gathered late in our data collection process, after referencing amended Annual Progress Reports, to allow for reliable summary statistics, including regression analysis, and all spatial analysis. We exclude these 11 observations from our analysis of frequency of continuances, changes in proposed density from

[40] A fuzzy join is a joining method that is used for merging two datasets that are not perfectly matched. The reason we ran a fuzzy join is that there may be differences in how an address was written in the APR and our original dataset. A fuzzy join allows us to match projects that may have similar but not identical addresses in the APR and the CALES dataset.

[41] We would have to first confirm with San Francisco Planning whether these six potential observations were new entitlements and not modifications before including them in our dataset.

[42] *Environmental Review Documents*, S.F. PLAN., https://sfplanning.org/environmental-review-documents (last visited Sept. 18, 2023).

application to approval, project intake processes, inclusionary housing program compliance pathway, and frequency of additional studies during environmental review.

Primary Source Documents

Whenever possible, we relied on primary source documents; San Francisco does not make all primary source documents readily available. For example, calculating timeframes to entitlement for discretionary observations requires tracking the earliest required application date. Prior to discontinuing the PPA requirement in July 2023, San Francisco required project proponents submit a PPA for specific types of development before submitting a project application. We have 87 observations in our 2018 - 2021 dataset that would have required a PPA application. We were able to locate the signed and dated PPA application document to determine the first application date for 48 of those observations through PIM. We sourced PPA application dates for another six observations from PPA-related correspondence (including the PPA decision document). We had to rely on PIM entries for PPA dates for 22 observations because either the application itself was not dated, or there was no PPA application in the PIM portal. San Francisco's PPA process required project proponents to submit significant information about the proposed development.

Another example relates to San Francisco Planning's policy that mandates a pre-application neighborhood notification process, and a pre-application hearing called the "Pre-Application Community Outreach Process" or "Pre-Application Meeting."[43] This pre-application process requires project proponents to send notices and copies of plans to adjacent neighbors and neighborhood organizations *before* applying to develop land for any new construction or alteration that would change an existing structure by seven vertical feet or 10 horizontal feet. San Francisco Planning compiles the list of neighborhood organizations that project proponents must notify. Though PIM makes most PPAs available, PIM rarely provides source documents that furnish detail about pre-application hearings.

Also relevant, determining compliance with the Permit Streamlining Act requires tracking whether a project proponent applied for entitlement by submitting an application package to the Planning Department. While our dataset contains initial application dates for most of our 2018 - 2021 observations, we can source these dates from primary source documents—signed and dated applications—for only 58 observations. We rely on references to application dates in Plan Check Letters sent by the Planning Department and approval documents in another 29 observations. Where we do not have a primary source document, we rely on PIM entries for application dates, which is data that a San Francisco Planning Department planner entered into the PIM system directly.

In sum, more than half (56%) of the application dates in our dataset are essentially self-reported dates from Planning—and not readily verifiable with application documents. We also highlight here that in at least four instances, the PIM entry reports an application date *after* the approval event (which is available through a primary source document). In another five instances, the PIM system reports an application date that is prior to the PPA date. We assume these are errors (an application should neither follow an entitlement nor predate a preliminary application procedure) but we report out what the data shows, nonetheless. Although these potential errors do not impact descriptive findings on time frames to approval, they do limit analysis of consistency with the PSA.

[43] *Pre-Application Meeting*, S.F. PLAN., https://sfplanning.org/resource/pre-application-meeting (July 30, 2023).

Regression Analysis

We ran several regressions to analyze existing relationships within the CALES dataset. We include all regressions, supplementary analysis, and robustness checks in a separate methods Appendix A, though the main findings are in this report. We ran regression models on 2014 - 2017 data and 2018 - 2021 data separately, and then together. We used the statsmodel Python module[44] to run all regressions in this analysis. We calculated all regression coefficients with robust standard errors (Errors of Order 3 (HC3)) in order to account for the existence of outliers and other issues within the data such as heteroskedasticity (variation in regression errors across our observations) and provide a small sample correction.[45] Note that if we did not use robust standard errors, the standard errors of our estimates would be smaller, so the standard errors and subsequent hypothesis testing are conservative.

In-Depth Interviews and Meetings and Review of Public Hearings

We have interviews from our prior research across cities from 2017. We used transcripts from six interviews conducted in 2017 with stakeholders within San Francisco (an affordable developer, market-rate developer, city employee who managed affordable development, city planner, land use attorney, and community organization advocate) in this analysis. For this research, we also completed an additional 28 in-depth interviews with 18 additional participants that did not participate in interviews in prior years or in meetings led by HCD between late-fall 2022 and May 2023. We interviewed participants from the following groups: developers (market-rate and non-profit affordable developers); private sector professionals (architects, land use lawyers, planners); government personnel (including city planning staff); and representatives from community-based organizations (including affordable housing advocates). We identified some of these interview participants as experts within San Francisco and reached out to them to participate in an interview. Other participants reached out to us to participate in interviews as well. We advised all participants that the research would be reported to HCD, but we would protect the confidentiality of each participant consistent with our research protocols. For that reason, we do not quote any individual participant and only report on themes based on what multiple participants or entire stakeholder groups shared.

We observed another 33 meetings that HCD convened for their Policy and Practice Review with approximately 146 stakeholders, including city planning personnel, Commissioners, Supervisors, market-rate developers, affordable developers, and housing organizations. Twenty of those meetings invited one participant, and five meetings invited two to three participants. These 25 HCD-led meetings with one to three participants offered in-depth conversations, much like research interviews. Most were an hour, though a few were longer or shorter. Most meetings included participants, one member of the HCD team and O'Neill. A handful of much larger meetings (with more than three participants) included more than two HCD team members

[44] Documentation for this module can be found at STATSMODELS, statsmodels.org/stable/index.html (May 5, 2023).

[45] In regression analysis, the errors are defined by the difference between the observed values of the dependent variable (in this case, project timeframes) and values predicted by the regression specification. Accurate estimation of the uncertainty of OLS-predicted values generally depends on constant errors across observations. However, in this study, we do not assume that error is constant (homoscedasticity). For instance, model error might be larger for observations with substantially longer timeframes (i.e., where projects take two to three times longer than the median timeframe). When we use robust standard errors, we no longer assume that errors are constant across all observations, which can mitigate the impacts of this regression analysis being based on observational data. Further, we are using a small sample correction to mitigate the fact that our universe of observations is relatively small and to account for the natural clustering in timeframes that occurs at each local land use approval step.

and O'Neill, along with participants. In each of these meetings, HCD informed the participants that O'Neill would be observing and listening to the conversation for research purposes and that the research would support the state's Policy and Practice Review. About half of the meetings with Commissioners and Supervisors also included a deputy city attorney in the meeting with HCD. Stakeholders discussed planning review and post-entitlement processes in-depth.

In all, we analyzed notes from interviews and meetings with representatives from six different housing advocacy groups, over 20 planning staff and more than 60 development professionals (evenly split between affordable and market-rate development). We also heard from 14 individuals split across the executive and legislative bodies within San Francisco.

Two members of the research team performed a line-by-line reading of a subset (10%) of the interview transcripts and notes from interviews and meetings[46] to identify recurrent concepts to generate a codebook in MaxQDA. We developed codes through an inductive process—a process in which we analyzed the transcript to identify codes based on themes that the speaker emphasizes. We also generated some codes for analysis using a deductive process—a process in which we analyze the notes and transcripts for content which indicates the speaker perceives that San Francisco either violated a state law *or* believes a policy or practice blocks a state law from having its intended effect. Once we had a codebook, three members of the research team coded all transcripts using the same software. We used MaxQDA software to summarize the findings by code and used the summaries to identify cross-cutting themes. This report pulled out findings where the team reached greater than 90% agreement on coded segments. We also generated stakeholder abstracts that summarized dominant themes (including internal consensus and disagreement on key topics within stakeholder groups).

Where interview participants or meeting participants directed us to specific public hearings, we also reviewed those hearings to confirm what participants shared did occur. We only inserted quotes from public hearings or relevant media reporting into this report and did not include any direct quotes from conversations between stakeholders and either HCD or O'Neill.

Document Analysis

Both interview and meeting participants, along with data collection, identified more than 41 proposed developments for a more detailed review process by our research team. We also located and analyzed documents associated with those 41 potential developments to explore in-depth what occurred during planning review.

Study and Data Limitations

Regression analysis using CALES data does not establish causal relationships. We rely on qualitative data to establish causality. Interview data is limited by the fact that all study participants volunteered. Relatedly, data from individuals and groups that agreed to participate in meetings with HCD is also limited by the fact that these participants volunteered. Voluntary participation in interviews increases selection bias and limits the generalizability of findings from interviews. We increased the number of interviews to reduce bias, but that does not allow us to generalize about San Francisco's policies or practices. Interview findings, however, can help us craft questions for quantitative analysis. Interview findings can provide important insights when

[46] Some participants asked that the interview/meeting not be recorded for transcription purposes. In those instances, O'Neill took detailed notes during the conversation, and the team joined those notes with transcripts from other interviews or meetings for qualitative analysis.

combined with regression and spatial analysis that regression and spatial analysis alone cannot yield.

The advantage of our 2014 - 2017 entitlement dataset is that it is uniquely detailed. The limitation of that dataset, however, is that our original coding structure aimed for comparative analysis across cities. This means that when we coded our 2014 - 2017 observations, we collapsed some San Francisco processes into single variables to compare processes across jurisdictions. For example, Large Project Authorizations and Downtown Project Authorizations were coded together in our master dataset as "exceptions" because that was the most analogous to similar processes in other cities. That limits our ability to explore how those two distinct processes operate when we are studying San Francisco only. To address this in coding for the 2018 - 2021 data, we created two coded datasets. The 2014 - 2017 dataset has less detail than the 2018 - 2021 dataset.

Another important limitation of our entire entitlement and SB 35 approval dataset relates to what each observation represents. Each observation reflects successful entitlements or SB 35 approvals only. That means that this universe of projects that we use for quantitative and spatial analyses represents those developments that successfully navigated the entitlement process in San Francisco. This means that the observations also represent those developments that developers likely had a high enough probability of success that they were willing to pursue entitlement in the first place. We do not have data suitable for quantitative analysis on when and how the city may have denied applications for entitlement in our dataset. That was beyond the current research scope. There is also no reliable data suitable for quantitative or spatial analyses on parcels where a property owner is unwilling to apply for entitlement.

Also, we gathered insights from stakeholders through interviews regarding what occurs during entitlement and what influences whether some buildings get built. Specifically, stakeholders suggest that smaller buildings, which those stakeholders define as 20 units or less, may get entitled but become financially difficult to build post-entitlement. The stakeholders attributed this to an entitlement process that mediates conflicts with opponents in a way that may lead to a final entitlement of a project that is not financially possible to build.[47] If entitlement processes contribute to whether a proposed development is financially feasible—and in turn whether a developer will pull building permits to build—then theoretically we might see a difference in the rate of filing for building permits for buildings that are 20 units or less as compared to larger buildings (21 units or more).

We have two challenges concerning exploring this issue with quantitative methods. The first is that augmenting the entitlement data with post-entitlement permitting data is very difficult; San Francisco's building permit data is not as accessible online or as reliable as entitlement data. Also, San Francisco's local law makes it difficult to systematically identify what counts as the permit that represents the beginning of construction activity and/or intent to build the building because San Francisco has a discretionary building permit process.

[47] Relatedly, at the time of this writing, the San Francisco Chronicle reported on a study concluding that the City's Inclusionary Housing Program is rendering some development fiscally infeasible. *See* Noah Arroyo, *Affordable-Housing Quotas Imperil New S.F. Building Projects, Study Says*, S.F. CHRON. (Jan. 22, 2023), https://www.sfchronicle.com/bayarea/article/sf-affordable-housing-projects-17727101.php.

Findings

We report findings in response to each of the questions that HCD asked, drawing on all data and methods to answer each question. Our findings sometimes rely on data from both our 2014 - 2017 and 2018 - 2021 datasets, and sometimes draw exclusively on the 2018 - 2021 dataset. We also compare four years to four years where appropriate and construct year-to-year comparisons or group years by two-year comparisons (e.g., 2014 - 2015 compared with 2018 - 2019) where appropriate.

Table 3 summarizes the total number of observations in our dataset, and the units they would yield if built, both in terms of market-rate units and affordable units. We narrowly define affordable units to refer to deed-restricted below market-rate housing units. Group housing, student housing, and single room occupancy housing are not included in any affordable housing count. Table 4 elaborates on the type of observations within our 2018 - 2021 data only.

Table 3: Summary of Total Approvals and Unit Counts Across Study Period

Study Period	Total Approvals	Total Units	Affordable Units	% Affordable Units/ All Units
2014 - 2017 Units from Entitlement of Developments of Five or More Units	140	14,269	2,168	15%
2018 - 2021 Units Approved from Approval of Developments of Five or More Units	144	11,339	3,039	27%

Table 4: 2018-2021 Approval Observations and Units by Affordability and Process

Affordability Category	Project Count	Market-rate Units	Affordable Units
100% Market-Rate Discretionary Non-ADU[1]	55	4,264	–
100% Market-Rate Discretionary ADU[2]	16	110	–
Mixed-Income Discretionary Non-ADU	52	3,473	873
Mixed-Income Discretionary ADU	1	21	3
Mixed-Income SB 35	2	4	1,659
100% Affordable Discretionary Non-ADU	4	4	210
100% Affordable SB 35	14	426	294

[1]This includes 2 Group Housing Projects and 1 Student Housing Project.

Although we elaborate on the contours of specific rules and planning practices when we discuss each finding, there are the two aspects of San Francisco's local law that dominate nearly all interviews and provide critical framing for virtually all of our findings. The first local law is one that makes all housing approvals in San Francisco discretionary. The Municipal Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 26(a) provides that San Francisco's departments may "take into consideration the effects of the proposed business or calling upon surrounding property and upon its residents . . . [and to] exercise its [or their] sound discretion as to whether said permit should be granted, transferred, denied or revoked." The city interprets this law as granting the Planning Commission discretionary authority over all building permits, including permits not otherwise discretionary under zoning and planning requirements. The Planning Commission delegates this discretionary authority to the Planning Department to review applications that meet Planning Code standards and Design Guidelines. But when disputes arise over a building permit, "concerned parties may choose to file a [request for exceptional] DR."[48] A DR effectively stops the Planning Department's approval process, sets a public hearing in front of the Planning Commission, and triggers additional planning staff analysis to prepare for the hearing.

Once a party has requested DR, unless they withdraw their request, there is always a public hearing. At the public hearing, the Planning Commission reviews materials and hears testimony and then determines whether it will "approve, disapprove or require modifications to the project."[49] The city states that the Planning Commission exercises this form of discretionary review only in exceptional circumstances when disputes between neighbors cannot be resolved through mediation.[50] The procedure, based on how it is written, indicates that the process of requesting and holding a hearing can add months to the approval timeline, even if the Planning Commission leaves the Planning Department's approval intact.

Another topic that dominated interviews is the ease with which project opponents can challenge discretionary approvals and post-entitlement permits through an administrative appeal under City Charter Section 4.106(b). The city charter provides that the Board of Appeals (an appointed political body) will hear appeals of building permits and demolition permits, unless either permit is issued after the Planning Commission authorizes a Conditional Use.[51] The Board of Supervisors hears appeals of any post-entitlement permit associated with a Conditional Use Authorization and any appeal of a CEQA decision.[52]

San Francisco's local rules prevent full implementation of the goals and aims of state housing laws.

HCD asked whether the data shows that San Francisco is fully implementing state law, including the Housing Accountability Act, Housing Crisis Act, Permit Streamlining Act, SB 35, and State Density Bonus Law. The answer, as indicated by the data, is no. Developers, planning professionals, and most housing advocacy organizations perceive local rules as

[48] *Discretionary Review*, S.F. PLAN., https://sfplanning.org/resource/discretionary-review (Jan. 25, 2023).
[49] *Discretionary Review*, S.F. PLAN., https://sfplanning.org/resource/discretionary-review (Jan. 25, 2023).
[50] The city also elaborates on its interpretation of the power this provision affords the Planning Commission in the Application Packet for Discretionary Review. *See Discretionary Review*, S.F. PLAN., https://sfplanning.org/resource/discretionary-review (Jan. 25, 2023).
[51] The city details the limitations of the Board of Appeal's jurisdiction. *About Us, Board of Appeals*, SF.GOV, https://sf.gov/departments/board-appeals/about (last visited Sept 18, 2023).
[52] Appeal of Certain CEQA Decisions, SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., ADMIN. CODE § 31.16 (2013).

blocking the full implementation of the Housing Accountability Act, Housing Crisis Act (SB 330), Permit Streamlining Act, and State Density Bonus Law. Descriptive and inferential statistical analysis of housing approvals yields findings that are consistent with these stakeholder perceptions. Stakeholders also report that SB 35 effectively expedites planning review, but does not resolve post-entitlement problems within San Francisco.

We report findings related to SB 35 and State Density Bonus Law first, and then move through findings related to steps in the entitlement and post-entitlement process.

San Francisco Planning fully implemented SB 35, but SB 35 is not a complete process fix.

SB 35 provides a state ministerial process for qualifying urban multifamily code compliant housing developments in jurisdictions that fail to meet their RHNA production targets in prior RHNA cycles. In San Francisco, SB 35 applies to qualifying housing where 50% or more of the units are affordable. A ministerial process is significant for developers and planners in San Francisco because local law renders all approvals discretionary. The state ministerial process eliminates pre-application requirements and hearings (discussed in more detail below), the opportunity for project opponents to request DR, and CEQA review. Once San Francisco Planning determines a project is eligible for SB 35, the developer proceeds directly to the Department of Building Inspection (DBI) for permitting.

SB 35 processing timeframes are fast—whereas discretionary building permits typically take years.

SB 35 cabins the eligibility review period to 90 or 180 days depending on the project size (measured by units).[53] Like many other cities, San Francisco "restarts" the review clock if there are any changes to the application.[54] The data shows San Francisco Planning diligently applied this state law. We found that planning review for developments that began as SB 35 applications take about four months but no more than eight months. Table 7 shows that, in contrast, discretionary building permits take approximately two years to entitle or complete planning review before they begin to work with the DBI. Stakeholders explain that entitlement delays increase holding costs, but approval delays may also result in being subject to higher fees, particularly when delays span over years. Timeframes for all non-ADU developments along specific approval pathways spotlight the difficulty of entitlement and the need for a local ministerial process in addition to other zoning and procedural reforms.

[53] CAL. GOV'T CODE § 65913.15(c)(1)-(2) (West 2023).
[54] Moira O'Neill & Ivy Wang, *How Can Procedural Reform Support Fair Share Housing Production? Assessing the Effects of California's Senate Bill 35,* 25 CITYSCAPE 143, 143-70 (2023).

Table 5: Entitlement Timeframe by Approval Pathway 2018-2021

Process Categorization	Min. Timeframe	**Median Timeframe**	Max. Timeframe	**Mean Timeframe**	Standard Deviation
SB 35 Only (no discretionary process prior) (N=9)	0.89	**3.42**	7.63	**4.29**	2.63
SB 35 Conversion (all began as discretionary) (N=7)[2]	15.39	**29.39**	41.39	**29.18**	10.32
Discretionary BP (N=17)	7.76	**24.20**	47.70	**24.07**	8.58
Discretionary BP with Exceptional DR request (N=4)[3]	10.32	**32.33**	55.56	**32.64**	19.76
Variance (by ZA) (N=11)	19.73	**36.00**	69.27	**41.40**	19.96
Variance (by ZA) with Exceptional DR (N=5)	10.39	**39.48**	146.69	**59.28**	52.30
Variance (by Planning Commission) and Exceptional DR (N=1)	46.68	**46.68**	46.68	**46.68**	—
DPA / LPA / SPA (N=15)	23.31	**35.67**	67.03	**38.33**	13.59
CUA Only (N=17)	18.71	**35.05**	59.34	**35.90**	12.45
CUA[4] Pplus (N=30)	17.00	**39.68**	105.40	**46.01**	21.99
PUD[5] (N=2)	7.73	**24.53**	41.33	**24.53**	23.76
Development Agreement (N=4)	32.09	**42.16**	51.52	**41.98**	7.94
Map Amendment/General Plan Amendment (N=3)	34.49	**42.08**	64.90	**47.16**	15.83


[1] We do not include two observations, discretionary building permit projects with additional administrative approvals, in this timeline calculation. One involved a discretionary building permit and an exception, and the other was a discretionary building permit with an ADU.
[2] We have one additional SB 35 project in this category that does not have an eligibility determination date. Though we know it received a building permit, we cannot include it for timeframe calculations. Each of the observations in this category proceeded through a discretionary approval process before initiating an SB 35 application. Some applications pre-date SB 35's enactment.
[3] This includes two discretionary building permits that received requests for exceptional DR and faced administrative appeals.
[4] Includes CUAs with other processes that typically go to the Zoning Administrator or Planning Commission but not the Board of Supervisors (such as CUA with a Variance, or CUA with a Certificate of Appropriateness).
[5] PUD refers to Planned Unit Development.

Developers report that SB 35 transformed planning approval pathways for affordable development.

Developers described SB 35 as eliminating risk because the law creates certainty in entitlement where none existed before. Some planners reported a steep learning curve at the outset; they shared that major changes like this to planning review are difficult to implement at first—and that early state guidance could help planning staff improve implementation. Developers, however, described San Francisco Planning's implementation of SB 35 as efficient and helpful. The data largely confirms that San Francisco Planning made most SB 35 eligibility determinations quickly and within required timeframes. The outliers represent proposals to develop affordable housing using local discretionary processes, sometimes because the project proponent filed the application before SB 35's passage and/or effective date.

Approval data also shows that state ministerial review allowed for faster processing which facilitated the approval of nearly three times the number of 100% affordable developments in 2018 - 2021 as compared to 2014 - 2017. There were only five 100% affordable developments entitled in 2014 - 2017. In 2018 - 2021 alone, San Francisco approved eighteen 100% affordable developments, and 14 of those developments used SB 35's ministerial process. Because of SB 35, most affordable units approved in 2018 - 2021 came through ministerially approved 100% affordable developments that used State Density Bonus Law. In 2014 - 2017, 74% of affordable units came from mixed income developments. In 2018 - 2021, 62% of all affordable units came from 100% affordable developments.

Figure 3: Distribution of Affordable Units by Development Type



Graphic Developed by Dori Ganetsos using CALES data.

SB 35 does not resolve post-entitlement opposition through appeals.

Affordable developers that have used SB 35 describe several post-entitlement difficulties that extend construction timelines. One difficulty affordable developers describe is that San Francisco's local rules allow project opponents to use the administrative appeals process to delay construction by challenging post-entitlement permits. (We discuss other post-entitlement difficulties below.) Construction activity impacts neighbors, who then may file complaints during the construction process.[55] But some neighborhood organizations escalate their opposition to construction by using administrative appeals to the Board of Appeals, which under local law suspends permit approvals until the appeal is resolved.[56]

2550 Irving Street exemplifies how post-entitlement challenges can delay construction of housing approved under SB 35. 2550 Irving, a 100% affordable development that would provide 90 units of supportive housing,[57] has faced at least two post-entitlement appeals of permits.[58] San Francisco Planning determined the development was SB 35 eligible on August 17, 2022. In November 2022, the Mid-Sunset Neighborhood Association appealed the demolition permit required to demolish a two-story office building because of concerns about toxins. The filing of the appeal suspended the building permit pending resolution. The Board of Appeals heard the

[55] One notable example relates to 78 Haight Street, which will house transitional-aged youth at risk of homelessness. We found three complaints from neighbors about construction logged in PIM so far. A neighborhood organization complains about inadequate notices about this development online, as well (though it characterizes the housing product incorrectly). *78 Haight*, HAYES VALLEY SAFE, https://www.hvsafe.com/78-haight/ (Mar. 17, 2022).

[56] Wherever PIM recorded an administrative appeal of a permit, we captured that in our database. San Francisco's public portal provides incomplete information about appeals and post-entitlement challenges, so we also asked interview participants to provide examples of projects that faced post-entitlement challenges. We then cross-referenced the DBI permitting system to see if we could find more information on the impact of appeals on permits.

[57] Application data indicates that at one point, this project was proposed to offer 98 units.

[58] San Francisco's public portal reports two appeals associated with the demolition permit for this development, both filed on December 5, 2022 (numbers 22-091 and 22-092). The neighborhood association also filed an appeal of the construction permit.

first appeal of the demolition permit on February 22, 2023, and denied the appeal (with a 3-2 split vote). Online records show that DBI reinstated the building permit, months after the initial approval date of October 28, 2022, on March 7, 2023. The same organization also appealed the construction site permit, originally approved on June 26, 2023. This permit was also suspended pending resolution, and on August 16, 2023, the Board of Appeals voted 2-2 on whether to grant the appeal and whether to continue the hearing. Both the appeal and the motion to continue failed as only four of five Commissioners were present. Ahead of both hearings, HCD sent Letters of Technical Assistance to the City and County of San Francisco's Board of Appeals regarding 2550 Irving, informing San Francisco that under state law, the city should not hear administrative appeals on SB 35 approvals.[59]

In related media, the neighborhood organization stated that they want more environmental remediation before construction.[60] The developer and the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development pointed to testing, review, and approval from public health and toxic substances agencies. The Chronicle reported that Supervisor Engardio publicly expressed support for 2550 Irving as "much needed [housing that] should not be delayed" though he also believed agencies could better communicate safety assurances to neighbors.[61] During confidential interviews, however, some stakeholders shared that they do not believe the neighborhood association is primarily concerned about environmental hazards; some stakeholders instead believe that the neighborhood opposes the development because of its size and the development's intended residents.

The agenda for the hearing on August 16, 2023, included a ~1,200-page record for this one appeal. During the hearing, Board of Appeals Commissioners disagreed about the effect of SB 35 on their power to review the permit and the appropriate scope of authority for Commissioners to exercise, generally, when deciding a matter that requires technical expertise. The Commissioner remarks during the hearing illustrate several of the ideological divides within local political bodies that stakeholders described during interviews. The public comments from Commissioners, some of which are quoted below, reveal conflicting perspectives on the normative value of state preemption of local power, the appropriate scope of administrative review of the work product from agency personnel with specific technical expertise, and the purpose and function of the Board of Appeals in general.

> Another point I wanted to make is in regard to SB 35 and SB 35 preemption. As one of the public commenters commented tonight . . . since SB 35 was passed several years ago, 2018-2019, **there has been a proliferation of new state level legislation also taking aim at local review processes**. And most have been drafted by San Francisco's own representatives in Sacramento, and those representatives in Sacramento need to know your opinions on these things **because they're doing their darndest to make sure there is no review process anymore, that the planning commission can't hear these items and they're trying to get it so that the Board of Appeals can't hear these items either, and if you believe in local review as I do as a member of this body, it's your duty and your responsibility to let your representatives**

[59] One of the letters is available online. *See* Letter from Shannan West, Hous. Accountability Unit Chief, Cal. Dep't Hous. & Cmty. Dev., to S.F. Bd. of Appeals, City & Cnty of S.F. (Feb. 22, 2022), https://www.hcd.ca.gov/sites/default/files/docs/planning-and-community/HAU/SanFrancisco-LOSTA-022223.pdf.
[60] The Chronicle reports on the challenges. *See, e.g.*, J.K. Dineen, *Judge Rules Contested Sunset District Affordable Housing Project Can Proceed*, S.F. CHRON. (Dec. 9, 2021), https://www.sfchronicle.com/sf/article/judge-rules-contested-sunset-district-affordable-16688685.php (unsuccessful attempt to secure an injunction).
[61] *Id*.

know what's at stake here and what this means to you [deep pause] I do think what's going on here goes far beyond the lot lines of 2550 Irving, and I don't necessarily think that even granting this appeal will fix the larger environmental hazards in the Sunset District . . . but I think there is a much bigger picture here in terms of the legal background and what is going on between several different agencies . . . .[62]

I see a distinct difference between that remediation and the permit here that we are here to pass judgment on. . . . We recognize that there is a problem . . . that problem is there is PEC contamination in the Central Sunset particularly around this site, and that needs to be remediated. . . . However, I see a distinct difference between that remediation and the permit we are here to pass judgment upon . . . . The appellant themselves admitted that the construction of this site has no bearing on the issues and levels that will be taking place in the neighborhood. So I see a very bright line between the contamination which needs to be remedied, and the permit that we are here to consider. . . . You know what, this is something that happens to us a lot in different circumstances, usually less dire, usually with a lot less scientific data that we have to parse our way through. When we end up with landlord-tenant issues, we find ourselves with a conflict . . . that needs to be worked out . . . . [I]t is probably best venued in the civil courts . . . but we look not to that issue, but we look to the permit and underlying issues within our jurisdiction . . . . **I see how SB 35 can be very confusing, it can be tedious, it can be difficult, but I have to ask myself do we have grounds under SB 35 to have grounds to appeal this, or overturn this permit, even if we identified it as being material to these issues that were here and I don't think this permit is material to the contamination thing, but even if we did, in this circumstance I don't see a way to get there because the objective standards under the Planning Code . . . are through the Maher ordinance**.[63] DPH has engaged the Maher procedures. They've gone one further for us as a neighborhood association has for them to do and brought in the DTSC because they have more expertise and more resources . . . and so that process that is supposed to take place is ongoing . . . . Let's be clear here, we get nervous sometimes as a board about playing amateur architect. **Right now we're playing scientists and we're playing amateur environmental scientists . . . . [L]et's realize it doesn't have anything to do with the permit in front of us today. I will not move to uphold the appeal**.

I so fundamentally disagree . . . . [P]eople on appeals boards make judgments on experts all the time . . . . And then we had people representing to us that there would be communication, same thing, they made it sound like there was going to be community participation, none occurred . . . . **I think there is an appropriate time to say that the experts got it wrong, or the process was wrong**. . . . I would ask that we continue this [to allow Board of Appeals President to join discussion].[64]

I am not comfortable telling the Sunset residents that they should feel safe, and that is what it really boils down to for me, it is a moral ethical issue for me, and I do and I can take that into account. . . . this body isn't the one that should be hearing this, unfortunately we don't have another body that is more appropriate to hear this . . . . [W]e're attorneys not environmental experts . . . . [T]his shouldn't be litigated in the context of permit appeals . . . . [B]ut we don't have an appropriate forum. . . . [**I]nstead what we have is the Board of Appeals, which for all intents and purposes has become a catch all in many ways and we have taken it upon ourselves in many instances to make consequential decisions and push for consequential**

---

[62] *S.F. Bd. of Appeals: Hearing on Appeal No. 23-034* (Aug. 16, 2023) (statement of Alex Lamberg, Comm'r, Bd. of Appeals), emphasis added.

[63] Commissioner Eppler is referring here to San Francisco Health Code Article 22A that gives the San Francisco Department of Public Health oversight of characterization and mitigation of hazardous substances in soil, soil vapor, and groundwater in the Maher Area identified in the city's Building Code Article 106A.3.2.4.

[64] *S.F. Bd. of Appeals: Hearing on Appeal No. 23-034* (Aug. 16, 2023) (statement of John Trasviña, Comm'r, Bd. of Appeals), emphasis added.

> **change in city policy in city operations in city administration**. And to me this is the most consequential of any the issues we've dealt with since I've been on the board . . . this one takes the cake. There are people's lives at risk here. **And I don't think we should be the body who is imbued with this power, but ultimately our state legislators have ripped away the other layers of review so it can't go to the Planning Commission. It can't go to other commissions. It's here, and we ultimately have de novo review of this, potentially with SB 35 limitations, but you know . . . ultimately legal advice is just that – it's legal advice and we as Commissioners get to make the say.** I obviously don't think we have the votes to grant the appeal here tonight . . . but you know, if there was a time to make a leap of faith, this was the time.[65]

More developments relied on State Density Bonus Law as compared with prior years, but stakeholders disagree about how easy it is to use the state law.

State Density Bonus law allows for developers building residential or mixed-use projects with five or more units to build more housing units than zoning would otherwise allow in exchange for a prescribed number of below-market-rate units. The law provides bonuses in the form of additional density and waivers of some local standards. State Density Bonus Law is a state mandate and the state law may preempt local implementation programs with a bias towards "producing the maximum number of total housing units" under § 65915(r) of the Government Code. The law prohibits cities from applying development standards to a density bonus project that would make it impossible to build at the densities or with the concessions or incentives provided in State Density Bonus Law.[66] San Francisco's Planning Code Section 206 implements State Density Bonus Law and provides two local density bonus programs, the HOME-SF program[67] and the 100% Affordable Housing Bonus Program.[68]

We found that nearly all SB 35-approved developments also relied on State Density Bonus Law. State ministerial review through SB 35 and State Density Bonus Law allowed for ministerially approved 100% affordable developments that were, on average, larger (measured in units) than 100% affordable developments requiring discretionary review. The median project size (measured by units) of all SB 35 developments is 121 units. The mean is 119 units. The median project size (measured by units) of all 100% affordable non-ADU discretionary observations is 13 units. The mean is 53 units. For comparative purposes, the median project size (measured by units) of 100% affordable developments entitled in 2014 - 2017 was 134 units, and the mean was 113 units. The median project size (measured by units) of all non-ADU discretionary observations is 24 units and the mean is 799 units. The two largest developments that exceeded 800 units if built—among the outliers—required discretionary approval.

---

[65] *S.F. Bd. of Appeals: Hearing on Appeal No. 23-034* (Aug. 16, 2023) (statement of Alex Lamberg, Comm'r, Bd. of Appeals), emphasis added.
[66] CAL. GOV'T CODE § 65915(e)(1) (West 2023).
[67] Housing Opportunities Mean Equity – San Francisco Program (HOME-SF), SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., PLAN. CODE § 206.3 (2019).
[68] The 100 Percent Affordable Housing Bonus Program, SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., PLAN. CODE § 206.4 (2018); *see also Affordable Housing Bonus Program (AHBP)*, S.F. PLAN., https://sfplanning.org/ahbp#:~:text=State%20Density%20Bonus%20Law,-In%201979%2C%20the&text=Ten%20percent%20of%20total%20housing,age%20requirements%20for%20older%20persons (last visited Sept. 18, 2023).

Table 6: Median Project Size by Product Type and Approval Pathway

Type	Median Project Size Units	Mean Project Size Units (rounded)	Standard Deviation Project Size Units (rounded)
100% Market-Rate, Discretionary Non-ADU[1] (N=55)	9	78	193
100% Market-Rate, Discretionary ADU (N=16)	6	7	3
Mixed-Income, Discretionary Non-ADU (N=52)	47	84	104
Mixed-Income, Discretionary ADU (N=1)	24	24	—
Mixed-Income, SB 35 (N=2)	**360**	**360**	**127**
100% Affordable, Discretionary Non-ADU (N=4)	13	53	83
100% Affordable, SB 35 (N=14)	**121**	**119**	**59**

[1] This grouping includes two Group Housing Projects and one Student Housing Project.

Thirty-one developments in our 2018 - 2021 dataset used State Density Bonus Law to increase the number of allowable units, and another six developments used the local HOME-SF program (all entitled in 2021). We see a notable increase in projects using density bonus programs in 2021, overall. In total, developments that secured approvals in 2018-2021 relied on density bonus programs more often than the developments entitled in 2014-2017 as well. Only four developments entitled in 2014 - 2017 used any density bonus program.

Also important is that developers used State Density Bonus Law more often than the HOME-SF program. Fifteen SB 35 ministerially approved developments in our 2018 - 2021 dataset all used State Density Bonus Law. The remaining developments that used State Density Bonus Law were discretionary mixed-income developments. At least 13 of the mixed-income developments used State Density Bonus to help meet requirements under the local Inclusionary Housing Program requirements. Five mixed income developments used Home-SF to meet requirements under the local Inclusionary Housing Program requirements as well.

There was no consensus among developers about how easily developers could use State Density Bonus Law in San Francisco.

Some developers expressed that the waivers both help create an appealing and efficient development and increase the likelihood of entitlement, overall. Some developers shared that the city's local rules and guidelines do not apply state law correctly[69] and/or that the city steered them away from using State Density Bonus Law. Developers also reported that the city applies the law so as to increase inclusionary program fee requirements once development size increases. Planners shared that design review can interfere with application of State Density Bonus Law, as political bodies may request reduced heights or removal of floors to projects that qualify for density bonuses. Affordable developers shared their frustrations concerning how planners have to do substantial work to apply different density bonus programs to help 100% affordable housing developments benefit from SB 35 while also securing required waivers. Planners also commented that State Density Bonus Law is complex, and that they (planners) would really benefit from more state guidance on its application. But planners and affordable developers emphasized that ministerial review and State Density Bonus Law were, together, critical to creating opportunities for more affordable housing within San Francisco.

Both developers and planners shared that State Density Bonus Law has been critical to helping developers manage requirements under local rules.

Developers shared that State Density Bonus Law was critical to make development financially feasible. Planners also shared that developers use State Density Bonus Law to facilitate large projects that the Planning Commission might otherwise deny. Planners explained that the city's Large Project Authorization (LPA)—theoretically meant to allow for larger projects and for modifications and waivers—does easily support larger development. Planners perceive that when developers use the modifications and waivers under the LPA, the Planning Commission interprets the project as no longer compliant and covered by the Housing Accountability Act, allowing political bodies to deny approval. Planners report that developers therefore use State Density Bonus Law to make large projects work while also staying covered by the Housing Accountability Act.

One development, outside of our study years, that stakeholders discussed during interviews as illustrative of this issue was **1010 Mission Street**. Planners reported that the developer first sought an LPA for a group housing development which the Planning Commission did not like and denied. The developer then used State Density Bonus Law to get an approval. Cross referencing documents, we found that the developer requested an LPA that was later withdrawn. The developer secured a final entitlement with an Individually Requested State Density Bonus approval and Downtown Project Authorization.

---

[69] Section 206.6 of San Francisco's Planning Code may require revision after the passage of AB 1763, which provides an 80% density bonus, four incentives or concessions, and special parking ratios for 100% affordable housing projects, and AB 2345, which increased the maximum range of the density bonus to 50% for housing projects with 15% very low-income units, 24% lower income units, or 44% moderate income units. *See* CAL. GOV'T CODE §§ 65915(f)(1), (f)(2), (f)(4). AB 2345 also lowers the required percentage of lower income units required to obtain multiple incentives and concessions under § 65915(d)(2). Table 206.6B seems inconsistent with those provisions under state law. San Francisco Planning, however, also issues Bulletins explaining how it applies state law. *See, e.g.,* S.F. PLAN., BULL. NO. 6, IMPLEMENTING THE STATE DENSITY BONUS PROGRAM (Feb. 2023), https://sfplanning.org/sites/default/files/documents/publications/DB_06_Implementing_State_Density.pdf.

Planners also stated that State Density Bonus law is critical to promoting productive dialogue about how to make proposed developments better, because once it becomes clear that the city cannot deny the project (and only after it is clear the city cannot deny the project), the public discourse shifts towards how to improve the design to be sensitive to neighborhood needs. Participants offered **321 Florida Street**, a mixed-used mixed-income development entitled in 2021 that required an LPA but also used State Density Bonus Law, as an example of a how state law helped secure entitlement rather than a project denial. After it was clear the city could not deny the development, planners also reported that the conversation with the community focused on how to improve the design in a manner that did, in fact, improve the aesthetics of the proposed development. Another example participants provided was **1560 Folsom Street**, another large mixed-use mixed-income development entitled in 2021 that required an LPA but also used State Density Bonus Law. The outcome for 1560 Folsom allowed for special sidewalk placards to celebrate the area's local history.

Planners note, however, that State Density Bonus Law, while critical to increasing certainty of entitlement for larger developments, may not produce more efficient and speedy deliberative processes during entitlement. Consistent with this perception, our data shows that the only approvals under State Density Bonus Law that planning department staff issued were those approvals associated with SB 35 projects. All other requests for density bonuses for discretionary projects required approval from San Francisco's Planning Commission. Relatedly, we found some observations with multiple continuances for hearings for joint LPA and State Density Bonus Law approvals, as well.

Our data also shows that while an LPA coupled with a State Density Bonus Law approval may secure approval from the Planning Commission, the approval is still vulnerable to being overturned by the Board of Supervisors if the community perceives the final entitlement outcome to be contrary to neighborhood needs. **2300 Harrison Street** illustrates this issue. This proposed mixed-use building would have added three stories to an existing three-story commercial building and demolished an adjacent parking lot. The development would add ~27,000 square feet of office and retail space on a site occupied by Lyft, along with 24 units of housing, of which three would be deed-restricted affordable. After the Planning Commission approved the development, community organizations appealed the Community Plan Exception under CEQA to the Board of Supervisors. The Board of Supervisors unanimously upheld the appeal. A community group publicly stated that the entitled development represented an exploitation of State Density Bonus Law.[70]

[70] Media reported that the new development would result in ~95,000 square feet of retail/commercial space. We reviewed the project proposal documents, and those documents indicate the proposed development would *add* approximately ~27,000 square feet of commercial space, and 24 units of housing, *to an existing* building that had ~68,000 square feet of office space. *See* Laura Waxmann, *S.F. Supervisors Take United Stance Against Mission Development at Former Lyft Offices*, S.F. BUS. TIMES (Aug 19, 2020), https://www.bizjournals.com/sanfrancisco/news/2020/08/19/sf-supervisors-vote-down-mission-district-office.html.

Table 7: Frequency of Use of Density Bonus (All Programs)[1]

Year (N=Total Approvals/Per Year)	N Density Bonus Used		N State Density Bonus used
2014 (N=24)	0		-
2015 (N=23)	0		-
2016 (N=55)	1		Unknown
2017 (N=38)	3		Unknown
2018 (N=33)	SB 35: 3	Other: 3	5
2019 (N=34)	SB 35: 3	Other: 2	5
2020 (N=25)	SB 35: 5	Other: 2	7
2021 (N=41)	SB 35: 4	Other: 15	16

[1]We do not calculate which density bonus programs (state or local) 2014 - 2017 entitlements used.

Stakeholders also do not agree on whether State Density Bonus Law is good for San Francisco. Market-rate developers shared that State Density Bonus Law has been critical to increasing the feasibility of housing development while also satisfying the local inclusionary program as on-site requirements increased over time.[71] Affordable developers heavily relied on State Density Bonus Law to increase the size of 100% affordable development, which did increase the number of units approved. Some Commissioners and Supervisors also described density bonuses as critical to reaching affordable housing targets.

But some Commissioners and Supervisors expressed concern about how the city's application of State Density Bonus Law might derail community outreach or historic preservation. Some planners shared that implementing State Density Bonus Law was difficult at times and required educating political bodies on where San Francisco retained discretion and where it did not under the law (which was further complicated by San Francisco's context of all permitting being discretionary). Planners also perceived that local political bodies did not like the impact of State

[71] Section 415.3 details the thresholds. Qualifying applications initiated before January 12, 2016, had a 14.5% on-site inclusionary requirement; applications initiated after that date had variable thresholds depending on the project size and a complex scheme of alternatives. Under Section 415.6(a)(1), a development larger than 10 units but smaller than 25 that elected on-site units would have to meet a 12% threshold. Section 415.6 (a)(2) and (a)(3) provided that owner occupied developments of 25 units or more would have to meet a 20% threshold, and rentals developments larger than 25 units would have to meet a 18% threshold. Section Section 415.6(a)(5) also provided for incremental increases beginning in 2018, which would raise the thresholds even higher for developments of 10 – 24 units to 15% and larger developments would increase incrementally each year, but not to exceed 26% for owner occupied developments and 24% for rental developments. SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., PLAN. CODE §§ 415.3, 415.6 (2021).

Density Bonus Law on urban form because it limited subjectivity in design review, or its impact on inclusionary outcomes in terms of the overall yield of on-site affordable units.[72] Consistent with these planner perceptions, some Commissioners and Supervisors did express concern about state law that overrides design considerations.

Local rules complicate application of the Housing Accountability Act.

When discussing the importance of SB 35 and State Density Bonus Law, another important theme emerged. Several stakeholder groups reported that local political bodies do not consistently follow the Housing Accountability Act and deny proposed development covered under state law. Importantly, stakeholders did not describe the Planning Commission as blatantly violating state law but explained that instead, complex local rules make it difficult to determine which local approvals are within the purview of the Housing Accountability Act and which are not. If there is any ambiguity about whether the Housing Accountability Act applies, and a proposed development is at all controversial, that ambiguity leads to a project denial.

Planners emphasized here again the importance of state guidance on how the law changes local processes. When state law does not create a ministerial process (like SB 35) but limits local discretion, state guidance provides clear communication to political bodies and the public how the state law changes local processes. That is critical, planners say, in a local context like San Francisco where at least some within the political bodies and communities interpret local rules as allowing the city to retain the power to deny an approval. If state law significantly limits the right to deny an approval, planners recommend that the state guidance be clear so as to enable staff and Commissioners to say publicly that state law dictates a particular outcome.[73]

Local rules require entitlement processes begin before the application—and navigate multiple hurdles along the way to approval.

Prior to July 1, 2023, the process for entitlement for many multifamily non-ADU and non-SB 35 developments began with a required Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA).[74] The Mayor's Office recently eliminated this hurdle through an Executive Directive, but we explain how this impacted the observations within our dataset.

Under the PPA process, a project proponent was required to complete the PPA before they could submit their project application. San Francisco's PPA process required project proponents to submit significant information about the proposed development. We have 87 observations in our dataset that would have required a PPA application under that local policy. We can verify PPA application dates against source documents for more than half of those, but otherwise rely

[72] Commissioner Diamond on June 1, 2023, expressed concern about the impact of State Density Bonus Law on urban form when questioning whether Supervisor Melgar's proposed legislation to increase density in a west side neighborhood would, in conjunction with State Density Bonus Law, lead to nine-story buildings.

[73] It is important to note, however, that during this research, HCD sent two advisory letters to the city on the impact of SB 35 on post-entitlement administrative appeals, and the limitations that SB 35 placed on San Francisco's ability to hear post-entitlement appeals in the context of an SB 35 approval. San Francisco's Board of Appeals heard both post-entitlement administrative appeals, even though at least one of these letters explicitly stated that SB 35 did not allow for post-entitlement appeals.

[74] San Francisco Planning now provides that it no longer accepts PPAs consistent with the Mayor's Executive Directive issued on February 7, 2023, subsection II.9. OFF. OF THE MAYOR, CITY & CNTY. OF S.F., DIRECTIVE 23-01, HOUSING FOR ALL (Feb. 7, 2023), https://sf.gov/sites/default/files/2023-02/Executive%20Directive%2023-01_Housing%20for%20All.pdf.

on self-reported dates from San Francisco's system. The average time from PPA application to project application was about a year.

Table 8: PPA to Application Timeframes

(months)	Median	Mean	Standard Deviation
PPA to Earliest Application Date	4.96	11.71	21.00

San Francisco Planning, responding to direction from the Mayor's Office, eliminated the PPA process. Still, San Francisco Planning policy mandates a neighborhood notification process before a project proponent files an application, and a pre-application hearing called the "Pre-Application Community Outreach Process" or "Pre-Application Meeting."[75] This pre-application process requires project proponents to send notices and copies of plans to adjacent neighbors and neighborhood organizations *before* applying to develop land for any new construction or alteration that would change an existing structure by 7 vertical feet or 10 horizontal feet. San Francisco Planning compiles the list of neighborhood organizations that project proponents must notify. However, San Francisco Planning does not consistently track pre-application meetings in its public portal.

Stakeholders have differing perspectives on the value of this pre-application meeting process. Some Commissioners and Supervisors referred to the pre-application process as important community outreach. Other stakeholders perceive it as a requirement that assumes conflict exists before a developer has even proposed a development.

Application intake processes were inconsistent with the PSA but improved marginally over time.

The Permit Streamlining Act (PSA) requires cities to provide information to applicants about city requirements for applications to develop housing and sets limits on how long a city can take to determine an application is complete and begin planning review. This state law applies to all discretionary development projects that are quasi-adjudicatory actions (like a variance or conditional use requirement). The PSA also limits the amount of time a city can take to process an application, but the clock begins to run after Planning prepares environmental review documents.

We collected information on application dates, and any notices regarding the status of applications and the dates of those notices, when available on PIM, for 135 discretionary, non-ADU entitlements that we believe did not require a legislative act or development agreement for approval. This list includes more observations than we analyze—or it includes observations we collected some data on that we did not include in our timeline analysis because they were not yet entitled, or they were entitled in 2022 or 2023 .

Of these 135 observations, we found notifications sent to project proponents about their entitlement's application status (inclusive of notices about the incompleteness of their applications) for 75 observations(~56%). Of those 75 observations, we were able to determine

[75] *Pre-Application Meeting*, S.F. PLAN., https://sfplanning.org/resource/pre-application-meeting (July 30, 2023).

an application date and notice of status date for 72 observations. Of those 72 observations, 56 notifications (~78%) were outside of the required 30-day period. Of the 56 (out of 72 observations) that are in our dataset for analysis (observations entitled from 2018 - 2021), 41 notifications (~73%) were outside of the required 30-day period.

This does not mean that San Francisco Planning complied with the PSA in the other 60 instances, only that there is insufficient data to determine compliance or non-compliance with the PSA in half the observations.

We also looked at whether San Francisco Planning improved its project intake and notification processes over time. We have a confirmed application date for 130 out of 135 observations. In all five observations where we could not confirm an application date, we could also not confirm a notice of status date. Of these 130 observations, 65 observations have a confirmed application date after 1/1/2018, and 65 observations have a confirmed application date before 1/1/2018.

Of the 65 observations that have a confirmed application date after 1/1/2018, we found San Francisco Planning sent notifications to project proponents about their entitlement's application status (inclusive of notices about the incompleteness of their applications) for 53 observations (~82%). Of these 53 observations, 37 notifications are dated after the required 30-day period (70%). Of the 65 observations that have a confirmed application date before 1/1/2018, we found notifications sent to project proponents about their entitlement's application status (inclusive of notices about the incompleteness of their applications) for 19 observations (~29%). Of these 19 observations, 19 notifications are dated after the required 30-day period (100%). This suggests that San Francisco improved its application intake and notification process, but only marginally. What is also clear is San Francisco Planning is doing a better job to track the data, which can facilitate internal monitoring of this issue and continued improvement.

Table 9: Analysis of Application Status Notifications

	Application Date Before 1/1/2018 (N=65)	Application Date After 1/1/2018 (N= 65)
Percentage of observations where notice of application status is available	29% (N=19)	82% (N=53)
Percentage of observations where notice, if available, is outside of the required 30-day period	100% (N=19)	70% (N=37)

Planning policy relies on exemptions to comply with CEQA, but local rules require additional studies.

State law provides that if a development approval is discretionary, CEQA applies. With a few exceptions, local law determines whether CEQA applies to classes of housing development by making those housing approvals discretionary. State law, however, allows cities to quicken environmental review for some development. There are statutory exemptions in the California Public Resources Code, and the state's CEQA Guidelines provide for another thirty-three categorical exemptions. For example, a planning department can use the Class 32 infill exemption for an urban infill project to bypass CEQA review if the project satisfies certain conditions. The department must still prepare documentation. But the process is comparatively

faster than more intensive environmental review processes, like an Environmental Impact Report (EIR), within most jurisdictions in the state.

When a project is not categorically exempt, the planning agency conducts an initial study to assess whether there is substantial evidence that the project will have a significant effect on the environment. If it is not clear that the impacts can be mitigated below a significance threshold, a planning agency must prepare an EIR. If there is not substantial evidence of a potentially significant effect on the environment, the agency issues a Negative Declaration (ND). If there is substantial evidence that a project will significantly impact the environment, but the developer can properly mitigate the effects, then the agency issues a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND).

California law also allows the planning agency to reuse existing EIRs to facilitate "streamlining" some classes of development through the environmental review process. This is called "tiering." Tiering allows the proposed development to satisfy CEQA's requirements by relying on existing EIRs, typically programmatic EIRs associated with a plan, and narrowing the environmental review documents to only those issues that have not been evaluated in a prior EIR that covers the proposed project. Tiering requires a prior environmental review document (generally an EIR) typically connected to a prior large-scale planning approval (usually a General Plan or Specific Plan); however, the source of the document varies. A Community Plan Exemption (CPE), for example, is a tiering-based exemption available to projects consistent with a community plan, General Plan, or zoning. When proposed development satisfies environmental review through tiering, it should theoretically reduce project-level costs for the developer because cities generally pay the costs of the relevant plan- or program-level EIR.[76]

EIRs are uncommon in San Francisco. Most developments benefit from streamlining. San Francisco is like its neighbors in this way, though San Francisco's timeframes are quite different from other neighboring jurisdictions we have studied. One notable change between 2014 - 2017 and 2018 - 2021 is that there are more categorical exemptions in the latter four years. That highlights that San Francisco Planning made a change in planning practice that simplifies and lightens the burden of environmental review for qualifying development—and yet overall, entitlements timelines increased in 2018 - 2021.

[76] Robert Olshansky, *The California Environmental Quality Act and Local Planning*, 62 J. AM. PLAN. ASS'N 313, 319–20 (1996).

Table 10: CEQA Compliance Pathways

Year Entitled and N	Categorical Exemption	Tiering (CPE)	Addendum	MND/ND	EIR	Multiple Pathway	CEQA Unknown*
2014 (N=24)	4%	79%	4%	0%	12%	0%	0%
2015 (N=23)	4%	56%	4%	15%	15%	7%	0%
2016 (N=55)	16%	67%	0%	11%	5%	0%	0%
2017 (N=38)	3%	82%	0%	3%	11%	0%	3%
2018 (N=31)	29%	45%	3%	13%	3%	3%	3%
2019 (N=29)	48%	38%	0%	10%	0%	0%	3%
2020 (N=18)	44%	17%	6%	17%	17%	0%	0%
2021 (N=33)	52%	33%	0%	9%	6%	0%	0%

Although San Francisco uses exemptions and tiering to comply with CEQA, local rules, not state CEQA guidelines, also require developers complete additional studies. Developers and planners in interviews and meetings indicated that local law demands that planning require wind and shadow studies. We collected information on whether San Francisco Planning required additional studies for 100 discretionary, non-ADU observations. We found no information about wind studies in San Francisco's public portal, which is noteworthy because wind studies came up frequently in interviews. Also, we note here that Class 32 infill exemptions require Transportation Demand Management studies.

Out of the 44 observations that satisfied CEQA through a Categorical Exemption, 22 (50%) required additional studies.

- ~18% (N=8) of all observations that benefited from a Categorical Exemption (N=44) also required a Shadow study.
- ~43% (N=19) of all observations that benefited from a Categorical Exemption (N=44) required a Transportation Demand Management study.
- ~11% (N=5) of all observations that used a Categorical Exemption (N=44) required both Shadow and Transportation Demand Management studies.

Out of the 33 observations that satisfy CEQA through a Community Plan Exemption, 24 (72%) required additional studies.

- ~32% (N=11) of all observations that used CPE (N=33) also required a Shadow study.
- ~70% (N=23) of observations that used a CPE (N=33) also required a Transportation Demand Management study.

- ~30% (N=10) of all observations that used a CPE (N=33) required both Shadow and Transportation Demand Management studies.

One observation (out of two) that complied with CEQA through a CEQA Addendum required a Transportation Demand Management study. Neither project required a Shadow Study.

Out of the 12 observations that required a Negative Declaration or Mitigated Negative Declaration, 10 (83%) required additional studies.

- ~33% (N=4) of all observations that required a ND or MND (N=12) required a Shadow Study.
- ~67% (N=8) of all observations that required a ND or MND (N=12) required a Transportation Demand Management study.
- ~17% (N=2) of all observations that used an ND/MND (N=12) to satisfy CEQA required both Shadow and Transportation Demand Management studies.

Out of the six observations that required an Environmental Impact Report, 3 (50%) also required a Shadow Study.

Risk of costly local appeals drives cautious environmental planning practices that limit the impact of the PSA.

In theory, using streamlined environmental review should quicken the planning review process. The PSA sets sixty-day time limits on approving development proposals that qualify for CEQA exemptions and streamlining, once the city makes a determination that the development is exempt from environmental review.[77] But in San Francisco, that is not necessarily true. One possible explanation might be that if environmental determinations always follow other entitlement approvals, using a streamlined environmental review process may have little impact on overall timelines if the other approval steps require more time (though a streamlined process should still reduce costs associated with more intensive environmental planning review).

After reviewing pre-application requirements and notification practices, we explored the data to understand when San Francisco Planning began environmental review and made CEQA determinations. We were able to isolate the environmental review determination or approval date in 95 of our discretionary non-ADU observations. Figures 4 and 5 illustrate what we found: that environmental review determinations almost always happen close to or at the same time as final entitlement decisions under local land use regulation. In 20 of those observations, the environmental determination and approval date is also the latest approval. For the remaining observations in this group, environmental determinations or approvals are often close to the final entitlement date. For 21 (out of 95) observations, the environmental approval date is at most seven days before the final approval date. For 36 (out of 95) observations, the environmental approval date is at most 30 days before the final approval date. For 48 (out of 95) observations, the environmental approval date is at most 60 days before the final approval date. This is important because of the limitations on entitlement review timeframes that the PSA imposes but, as noted, the clock begins to run after Planning prepares environmental review documents, not before. Because environmental determinations occur so close to the end of the entitlement period, the PSA seems to have little effect on overall entitlement timeframes.

[77] CAL. GOV'T CODE § 65950 (West 2023).




Figure 4: CEQA Milestone Timelines Categorical Exemptions Only (2018 - 2021)




Figure 5: CEQA Milestone Timelines Multiple Pathways (2018 - 2021)

Commissioners, planners, and developers all agreed that CEQA slows approvals, and all—including planners and Commissioners—expressed concerns about CEQA abuse. During interviews and meetings with these stakeholders, we asked why environmental review takes as long as it does, as most development in San Francisco is categorically exempt from environmental review or benefits from a streamlined CEQA process. Developers believe San Francisco Planning is too slow to assign environmental planners to projects. Commissioners believe planners are overly cautious because they fear judicial scrutiny. In contrast, planners from multiple departments shared that there are two features of local rules that extend environmental review: (1) local rules requiring further studies add more work, and (2) administrative appeals, or the risk of administrative appeals, to the Board of Supervisors[78] steers planning practice and influences how long review takes overall.

On the second point, planners elaborated that because it is easy to appeal planning approvals, the risk of appeal influences planning practices. For environmental review, both Commissioners and planners perceive that there is a high risk that project opponents will challenge projects by

[78] State law governs much of the requirements for administrative appeals of CEQA determinations (*see* CAL. PUB. RES. CODE § 21151(c) (West 2023); CAL. CODE REGS. tit. 14, § 15025(b) (West 2023)) but local rules require that the filing deadline for an administrative appeal of a CEQA determination begins to run only after final entitlement decisions under local land use regulation.

challenging environmental determinations. What is most striking about the difference between Commissioner and planner perspectives is that Commissioners believe planners are worried about judges, but planners expressed confidence that their work would survive judicial scrutiny. Instead, planners expressed concerns regarding the Board of Supervisors.

Planners shared that even if most administrative appeals are withdrawn or denied, the beginning of an appeal creates more work for planning staff members managing environmental review. That additional work changes the pace of all environmental planning reviews for all projects because the projects that face an administrative appeal change review priorities. Also important, the experience of the administrative appeal for planners during the administrative appeal hearing influences their approach to work, overall. The risk of an appeal makes planners more conservative and risk-adverse in their work. One notable trend in interviews and meetings with planners was that planners appeared much more apprehensive of the Board of Supervisors than potential litigants. One planner also stated that, when elected, political bodies are highly critical of planning staff work within a public hearing. This can be demoralizing and impacts the department's working culture.

We reviewed our data across 2014 - 2021 to determine the rate of administrative appeal (inclusive of CEQA-related appeals and other appeals). At least 14% of the approvals in our data (2014 - 2021) faced administrative appeals. We say *at least* 14% because we are not certain that we have located all records on local administrative appeals, as the city does not make past records on administrative appeals readily available online. It is also true that most of the appeals we could locate are denied or withdrawn, and most administrative appeals involve challenges to CEQA determinations as well.

San Francisco Planning's environmental planning division also tracks administrative appeals worked on by their team. This log captures appeals of residential and non-residential entitlements. We reviewed their log of staff hours spent on administrative appeals involving CEQA. Twenty out of 48 administrative appeals filed in 2015 - 2021 that San Francisco Planning tracked overlap with our 2014 - 2021 dataset. Of these 20, the internal department data offers information on cost and time for 19 of our observations. Although the other appeals are not for multi-family housing development, planners shared that these appeals also influence how planners work on housing entitlements. Out of the 20 administrative appeals associated with entitlements in the CALES dataset, San Francisco Planning data indicates that 11 (55%) were denied, five (25%) were withdrawn, only one was upheld, and three were closed with no other details.[79]

San Francisco Planning reports that it logged a total of 5,680.75 hours because of all 48 administrative appeals related to CEQA that they tracked from 2015 - 2021. San Francisco Planning logged a total of 3,031.25 additional staff hours to prepare for CEQA-related administrative appeals associated with entitlements in the CALES database. Translating these hours into days, we find that on average, planners add about 20 days of work per year to their workload to deal with CEQA-related administrative appeals for housing entitlements.

[79] This is consistent with what San Francisco Planning reports for all of the administrative appeals.

Table 11: Total Time Spent on All CEQA Appeals 2015-2021 N=48

(days)	Minimum	**Median**	Max.	**Mean**	**Standard Deviation**
Total Time Related to Admin. Appealed	0.56	8.69	71.06	15.11	14.92

Table 12: Total Time Spent on CEQA Appeals 2015-2021 for CALES Observations

(days)	Minimum	**Median**	Max.	**Mean**	**Standard Deviation**
Total Time Related to Admin. Appealed	1.88	12.78	71.06	19.94	18.05

Administrative appeals add costs to the developer in lost time and higher holding costs, but there are also direct costs to the city associated with the work to prepare for an appeal, even if the appeal is withdrawn. San Francisco Planning reported that all administrative appeals related to CEQA cost the city a total of $793,993 in the years where San Francisco tracked the data (2015-2021). Administrative appeals related to CEQA and associated with entitlements in the CALES dataset (2015-2021) cost the city a total of $421,314. One entitlement in our dataset, 1500-1540 Market Street,[80] required 374 additional staff hours and $52,204 in costs to San Francisco Planning to prepare for the appeal—even though the appeal was withdrawn.

Table 13: Total Cost CEQA Appeals 2015-2021 (N=48)

(USD)	Minimum	**Median**	Max.	**Mean**	**Standard Deviation**
Total Cost Related to Admin. Appeals	$535	$10,245	$81,558	$16,893	$16,860

Table 14: Total Cost CEQA Appeals CALES Housing Only (N=19)

(USD)	Minimum	**Median**	Max.	**Mean**	**Standard Deviation**
Total Cost Related to Admin. Appeal	$2,167	$13,741	$81,558	$22,174	$20,501

[80] This is a 100% market-rate mixed-use development that satisfied the inclusionary program with an in-lieu fee.

During interviews and meetings, we also learned that San Francisco Planning has undertaken substantial internal work to address at least some part of this problem by consolidating what is presently six steps in the planning review and permitting into three steps. The aim is to bring the process from application through permitting into one department and facilitate one appeal period for project proponents. It is unclear, however, how these proposed operational changes would address post-entitlement appeals, if at all.

Continuances—possibly meant to avoid later challenges through administrative appeal—are frequent.

According to stakeholders, changes to the proposed development might appear voluntary but result from negotiations outside of hearings facilitated by Planning staff (who are mediating between project proponents and opponents) before a scheduled Planning Commission hearing. The negotiation is meant to facilitate Planning Commission approval, but developers report that what developers end up agreeing to can render a project infeasible. This is another perception that is difficult to verify through government documents, as there would be no written record of negotiations occurring informally before a scheduled hearing. Stakeholders suggested we look for continuances, or a frequency of continuances and multiple hearings, as evidence of this outcome.

We have 93 discretionary, non-ADU observations that required quasi-adjudicative hearings (but not legislative action). All 93 observations have *some* information about hearings, but only about half have complete information about hearings. Still, approximately 22% (N=20) of these observations, inclusive of observations that do not require public hearings under local zoning and planning law, have multiple hearings or continuances associated with a single approval step. One of the entitlements with multiple hearings had multiple hearings related to CEQA approvals. Another two observations were related to density bonus approvals only—one related to the local program and the other to State Density Bonus Law. Nine observations had more than three continuances or hearings for a single approval step. One of these observations (out of nine) is a discretionary building permit project (with no request for exceptional DR), which utilized San Francisco's local density bonus program, HOME-SF, for approval. The two continuances and one hearing for this observation were associated with the approval of the local density bonus program. This building permit project's application date was 3/3/2020, and San Francisco Planning approved it on 5/13/2021. Three observations required five or more hearings for approval. One of these projects had nine continuances for the same approval step. It is also possible that the rate of multiple hearings for a single approval step *might be higher* than what the data currently reveals—as interviews suggest. Our ability to verify these statements against hearing-related data is contingent on San Francisco Planning making the data publicly available.

When we analyze our data overall, we find that the density proposed is greater than density in final approval for 23 observations. Four (out of 23) observations are associated with a continuance. Another two (out of the 23) are associated with an administrative appeal.

Publicly Initiated Exceptional DR occurs frequently and may foster negotiations outside of public hearings.

San Francisco uniquely allows an interested party to request the Planning Commission exercise exceptional DR, which involves the Planning Commission "effectively taking a second look at the proposed project." This occurs even when the zoning and planning code do not require a

hearing in front of the Planning Commission, but where an interested member of the public states there are exceptional or extraordinary circumstances that warrant a public hearing.

There was not a consensus across stakeholder groups on the impact of this policy. Most of the city personnel and Planning Commissioners we spoke to through HCD-led meetings expressed perceptions that the ability to request exceptional DR is primarily, if not almost entirely, associated with disputes between neighbors relating to modifications or smaller developments (like single-family dwellings). These groups did not perceive exceptional DR as a dominant obstacle to multifamily development but as helpful to mediating smaller disputes between neighbors, even if it might take too much of the Planning Commission's time. San Francisco Planning shared their log of staff hours to support exceptional DR hearings between 2014 - 2021. Exceptional DR adds fees to all permits to support this process; the department collects between $750,000 - $1 million per year in permitting fees to support staff time for the exceptional DR process.

When we examine data on the staff hours logged to support exceptional DR, we find that between 2014 – 2021, San Francisco Planning had to allocate ~1,872 full days (8 hours per day) or ~7 business years (262 days at 8 hours per day) to additional work to respond to exceptional DR requests. But only about 4% of those hours were spent on exceptional DR requests associated with the multifamily housing entitlements in our dataset. From the perspective of staff who manage that work, the number of work hours dedicated to addressing exceptional DR hearings, generally, may make the same work for multi-family housing seem minimal compared with the work hours spent addressing all other exceptional DR requests. This may influence staff and Commissioner perceptions of whether DR burdens developers proposing multifamily housing.

But we also found that across almost all participants in confidential research interviews (where HCD was not present), regardless of the stakeholder group, exceptional DR was a dominant issue. The only interview participants that did not to bring up DR were those participants that self-described as only having worked with large-scale phased developments. Interview participants raised the topic of DR as a key obstacle to housing production and described the Planning Code Section 311 neighborhood notification process associated with a discretionary building permit, and potential for a request for DR and related hearing, as an opportunity to oppose entitlement on the eve of approval. Stakeholders described this provision as offering an early "appeal" of a planning approval for smaller or mid-size code compliant buildings. These participants also shared that even the request for DR could result in a change to the project that results in something that is no longer financially feasible to build.

Some stakeholders also shared that opposition comes from different types of neighbors; some are interested in the impacts on their own properties, but others use this process to address neighborhood-level concerns. In the latter context, stakeholders share that frequent project-level adjudications are the consequence of inequitable zoning and planning. The DR provision also came up in interviews when parties discussed the suggested reforms laid out in the recent housing element. Some city personnel that expressed support for proposed rezoning, specifically upzoning in more affluent areas, also predicted that upzoning without eliminating DR in certain neighborhoods would result in project opponents effectively using DR to delay housing development. In terms of its use, there are publicly initiated requests for DR for 19% of the discretionary building permits in our 2018 - 2021 data and 21% in the 2014 - 2017 data—for a combined rate of 20% across eight years for building permits only. We also know that the developments that require exceptional DR take comparatively longer to entitle, as well. The frequency with which exceptional DR comes up for code compliant multi-family housing (relative

to other code compliant multifamily housing) might explain why different stakeholder groups have such different perspectives on the same procedural rule, in terms of its influence on entitlement timelines generally.

In our 2018 - 2021 data, 35% of all variances also had hearings for exceptional DR. There were also another two requests for exceptional DR associated with discretionary ADU observations. One of the requests for exceptional DR was withdrawn. The Planning Commission heard the second request and granted DR. There are an additional two requests associated with approvals that already went before the Planning Commission—but the Planning Commission heard both requests for exceptional DR (and denied them).[81]

During interviews, stakeholders reported that once a party requests DR, Planning Staff (to mediate between the project proponent and the party requesting DR) might verbally ask the developer to change the proposed development to incentivize the party requesting DR to withdraw their request. We cannot verify this through the available entitlement data, however.

We explored the data to find instances of requests for DR being associated with developments that change in size (measured by units) over time. We did come across two proposals to develop five or more units through the local ADU ordinance that resulted in tenant requests for DR, though both would later be withdrawn. The first development that would lead to a tenant request for DR involved a request for five ADUs that required a variance. The Zoning Administrator approved a variance for three units, and a later revised approval document states the proposal changed from five to three units. The request for DR occurred after the variance approval, but before the later revision—though there is nothing that indicates there is a relationship between the request for DR and the later revision to the proposed number of units. In the request for DR, the tenants complain that the approved ADUs would interfere with parking both temporarily and permanently. The tenants also detail an ongoing dispute with the project proponent, their failed attempts to initiate mediation, and their failed efforts to delay final permitting.

Another DR request involved a proposal to build nine ADUs, but a building permit was ultimately issued for just six units. This project involved no special discretionary approval step, so it is even more difficult to determine why the proposal changed over time. The DR documents indicate that the organization that requested exceptional DR initiated the request because of concerns about the impact of the ADUs on parking, and the specific impact on a family with a child with a disability. The request for DR was ultimately withdrawn. Again, there is no data that directly links the reduction from nine to six units to the DR request; the DR request only indicates an ongoing dispute with tenants over parking impacts related to an accessibility and disability issue.

Developers report that design guidelines are vague and invite subjective conditions of approval.

Planners and developers describe design guidelines as highly subjective, allowing for random outcomes, problematic, and wielded as a “weapon.” Many stakeholders report that the design guidelines are not about design; they are about anticipating complaints from neighbors around light, air, “inches or feet” in setbacks, and related features within development that trigger complaints from neighbors, and satisfying neighbors.

[81] One of these observations required a CUA and the other required a zoning map amendment.

Planners shared that although the guidelines are not part of the Planning Code, they are codified in a roundabout way through a cross reference to the Planning Code. For example, Section 311(c)(1) of the Planning Code provides that Residential Design Guidelines shall be used to review plans for all new construction and alterations of existing residential buildings in R Districts. According to the Planning Department, "The Residential Design Guidelines (Guidelines) articulate expectations regarding the character of the built environment and are intended to promote design that will protect neighborhood character, enhancing the attractiveness and quality of life in the City."[82]

Importantly, developments that comply with the Planning Code but do not conform to the Guidelines end up back in deliberative processes, and sometimes back in front of planning staff, even when they have completed planning review and secured entitlement. Planners, developers, and architects note, however, that the subjectivity in the Guidelines makes this an inevitable outcome. Also, in the context of discretionary building permits, the design guidelines raise issues that often lead to requests for exceptional DR as well.

The Guidelines are filled with requirements that on their face allow for subjective interpretation through words like "compatible," "respect," and "character." Examples include, "In areas with a defined visual character, design buildings to be *compatible* with the patterns and architectural features of surrounding buildings." Explanatory text mandates that designers in areas of "mixed visual character" "draw on the *best* features of surrounding buildings" and "design buildings to help define, unify and contribute positively to the existing visual context." *Site Design* guidelines are also often subjective, requiring, for example, that designs "*[r]espect* the topography of the site." Guidelines addressing *Building Scale and Form* intend to ensure design is "*compatible* with that of surrounding buildings." Scale of buildings must be "*compatible*" in terms of height and depth of surrounding buildings, as well as with the "scale at the street" and mid-block open spaces. Building forms, facades, proportions, and rooflines must be "*compatible*" with those of existing buildings.

Cumulative and unique procedural hurdles create comparatively long entitlement timelines.

We explored our 2014 - 2017 data to run a comparative analysis with neighboring cities where we had similar data. Importantly, our 2014 - 2017 dataset indicates that entitlement timelines were generally *shorter* than in 2018 - 2021. Still, 2014 - 2017 timelines were longer than other jurisdictions. We searched our data to match observations from our 2014 - 2017 data with similar entitlements in Oakland, Berkeley, and Redwood City, looking for the best matches across the following characteristics:

- Same neighborhood characteristics (defined by 2019 Tax Credit Allocation Committee maps; we do not match high resource neighborhoods with low resource neighborhoods);
- Either for sale or for rent (in other words, we do not compare for sale developments to for rent developments);
- Around the same size (plus or minus five units). They need to have the same income characteristics (either all market-rate, all mixed-income, or all 100% affordable developments); and

[82] *Residential Design Guidelines*, S.F. PLAN., https://sfplanning.org/resource/residential-design-guidelines (Mar. 4, 2020).

- Similar local process characteristics (we do not compare a code compliant development that also benefited from a CPE with a non-code compliant development that required a conditional use permit or variance but also benefited from a CPE).

We use these criteria based on several assumptions about neighborhood-level politics across all cities. For example, we assume the political context varies across neighborhood types (in terms of income level). We also assume that neighborhood opposition might vary based on project type (for sale condos versus for rent apartments, and affordable versus market-rate). The last criterion (process steps) is the most difficult for us to match because no two study cities have identical regulatory environments. We therefore looked for equivalencies within local processes based on whether a development required special approvals or not.

We were unable to find matches in Berkeley and Redwood City. We found that the average difference between all San Francisco-Oakland pairs is 1,086 days (~3 years). The difference in timelines appeared related to San Francisco's pre-application requirements and exceptional DR process.

Table 15: Comparison of Entitlements Requiring CPEs Oakland-San Francisco 2014 - 2017 data

Address Jurisdiction	Project Size (units) and Type	2019 TCAC Classification	Neighborhood (Name)	Affordability	Compliance with IZ (SF)	Required Local Approvals	Timeframe to Entitlement (days)	Difference in Timeframes [83]
1924 Mission San Francisco	11 units for rent	Low Resource	Mission	Market-Rate (possibly 1 1-bedroom affordable unit)[84]	On-site	Discretionary Code Compliant (Building Permit only)	1,203 days	–
3253 Ettie St. Oakland[85]	9 units for rent	Low Resource	Clawson	Market-Rate	N/A	Discretionary Code Compliant (Design Review only)	348 days	855 days
7540 Macarthur Oakland	11 units for rent	Low Resource	Eastmont Hills	Market-Rate	N/A	Discretionary Code Compliant (Design Review only)	51 days	1,152 days
198 Valencia St. San Francisco	28 units for rent	Low Resource	SoMa	Market-Rate	Unknown	Variance, Public Initiated Discretionary Review	1,302 days	–
3129 Elmwood	30 units for rent	Low Resource	Jingletown	Market-Rate	N/A	Variance, Design Review	150 days	1,152 days

[83] Only populated for Oakland projects. This column shows the many more days it took for the Oakland project to entitle, relative to its matched San Francisco project.
[84] There is an August 2018 One Unit Compliance with Inclusionary Housing Program Affidavit that provides that one of the one-bedroom units would be affordable—but we could not locate a deed restriction in PIM.
[85] It looks like the developer successfully secured excavation, electrical, mechanical, and plumbing building permits post-entitlement in 2018, but those expired in 2019 and 2020.

Address Jurisdiction	Project Size (units) and Type	2019 TCAC Classification	Neighborhood (Name)	Affordability	Compliance with IZ (SF)	Required Local Approvals	Timeframe to Entitlement (days)	Difference in Timeframes [83]
Oakland								
956 63rd St. Oakland	28 units for rent	Low Resource	Paradise Park	Market-Rate	N/A	Variance, Design Review	105 days	1,197 days
645-647 Valencia St, San Francisco	7 units for rent	Moderate Resource	Mission	Market-Rate	N/A	Variance, Public Initiated Discretionary Review	1,435 days	–
4429 Piedmont, Oakland	9 units for rent	Moderate Resource	Piedmont Avenue	Market-Rate	N/A	Variance, Design Review	137 days	1,289 days
2201 Market San Francisco	17 units for rent	Low Resource	Mission	Market-Rate	Fee	Variance, Public Initiated Discretionary Review	1,160 days	–
5325 San Pablo Oakland	17 units for rent	Low Resource	Gaskill	Market-Rate	N/A	Variance, Design Review	287 days	873 days

Stakeholders report that San Francisco's policy emphasizes project-level adjudication to achieve equitable development outcomes, when what the city needs to achieve equitable development outcomes is zoning and planning reform.

The comparatively longer timeframes in San Francisco are associated with processes that illustrate a larger, complex, and recurring theme that dominated several interviews with developers, planners, and affordable housing advocates. From the table above, we pull out the entitlement at 1924 Mission to explain what stakeholders report—San Francisco's current policy attempts to resolve neighborhood-level concerns about inequitable land use development through project-level adjudication rather than more equitable planning and zoning.

1924 Mission Street involved a proposal to construct an 11-unit building with ground-floor retail on a site with an auto body shop. The project proponent submitted a required PPA in March 2014.[86] This pre-application process required submitting an application for assessment with the site plan, floor plan, building elevations, and photographs. This PPA process also required

[86] This is a required process applicable (at the time) to all proposed developments of seven or more units. San Francisco has since modified applicability; it is required for developments of 10 or more units, creation or expansion of group housing using 10,000 square feet or more, and unspecified "other complex projects." *Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA)*, S.F. PLAN., https://sfplanning.org/resource/ppa-application (July 11, 2023).

notice to the neighborhood[87] and a pre-application neighborhood meeting. The pre-application neighborhood meeting is supposed to identify neighborhood grievances and prevent requests for exceptional Discretionary Review.[88] Importantly, developers state that these pre-application processes do *not* achieve that end, and this example is consistent with those perceptions.

The Planning Department issued a Certificate of Determination on April 2, 2015, that the project qualified for a CPE (tiering). According to the Notice of Building Permit Application, the project proponent then applied for discretionary building permits on May 23, 2016.[89] The Planning Department issued the Notice of Building Permit Application on March 20, 2017.

A local neighborhood organization applied for the Planning Commission to take exceptional Discretionary Review on April 19, 2017. The application for exceptional Discretionary Review provided that the neighborhood organization requesting review believed the proposed development was inconsistent with the General Plan's policy priority that "[t]hat existing housing and neighborhood character be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhoods."[90] The application for Discretionary Review stated that proposed rents would be high, and expressed concern that "gentrification-inducing design, intended to target higher-end tenants, will create local upward price pressure on surrounding tenants."[91]

Importantly, the neighborhood organization expressed concerns that this proposed development was one of several that created harm in the neighborhood. The applicant noted that the harm was related to "the cumulative impact of this and the other seven projects proposed for the immediate vicinity of Mission St."[92] The request for Discretionary Review asked that the Planning Commission consider the cumulative impacts associated with the proposed development and other developments and "demand this project alter its appearance in order that it comes into line with neighboring buildings on the Mission corridor in a way that better helps 'preserve the cultural and economic diversity' of the corridor and the Mission District."[93]

The Planning Commission heard this request on July 6, 2017. The Planning Commission agreed that there were "extraordinary and exceptional circumstances" that warranted Discretionary Review and that "project refinements were necessary to address concerns over the project's compatibility with the surrounding neighborhood." The Planning Commission conditioned the building permit approval on the following grounds: the ground floor retail space needed to be designated for trade shop use, the project proponent needed to explore providing a mural on one wall, and the project proponent needed to "work with Planning Department staff on refin[ing] the exterior design to provide a stronger relationship to the surrounding context." The Building Department issued a demolition permit to demolish the auto body shop in August

[87] The notice requirements for the Pre-Application Meeting demanded notification to all property owners within a 300 feet radius, all relevant neighborhood organizations, and anyone who requested notice. Meetings may only be held during certain hours, and project proponents must keep a record of all attendees.
[88] The first page of the Pre-Application Meeting Packet logged in PIM provides: "The meeting's intention is to initiate neighbor communication and identify issues and concerns early on; provide the project sponsor the opportunity to address neighbor concerns about the potential impacts of the project prior to submitting an application; and, reduce the number of Discretionary Reviews (DRs) that are filed."
[89] There is no Project Application logged in PIM.
[90] This language comes from the Application for Discretionary Review, page 4, logged in PIM.
[91] Id.
[92] Id.
[93] Id.

2019 and a temporary shoring permit for an empty lot in 2021. DBI's Permit Tracking system seems to indicate review of plans through spring of 2021, but no activity is logged after that.[94] It is also unclear how the final project-specific conditions of approval resolve the larger, neighborhood level concerns about gentrification and displacement raised during this request for exceptional Discretionary Review—which are at least in part related to the city's zoning and planning that dictates where developers may build multi-family housing citywide.

Planners and developers believe San Francisco needs procedural reform that addresses discretionary review, but not all Commissioners and Supervisors agree.

Stakeholders explained that three features of San Francisco's local law invite project-by-project adversarial politics that will prevent San Francisco from meeting housing production targets and equitable housing outcomes: (1) density and use controls that limit development to specific neighborhoods, (2) procedural law and policy that renders all approvals discretionary, and (3) charter provisions that allow project opponents to appeal multiple post-entitlement construction permits.

When discussing SB 35, affordable developers and planners explained the state ministerial process resolved the second issue without touching the first or third. SB 35 may fix planning review for eligible projects, but it cannot fix San Francisco's housing production pipeline because two major impediments to production remain. (SB 35 also only applies because San Francisco has failed to meet its RHNA targets—which is not the city's aim.)

According to planners, developers, and many housing advocates, achieving production targets, affordability, and equity demand long-range planning, rezoning for density in higher opportunity areas in conjunction with a *local* ministerial approval process, and charter reform to limit post-entitlement appeals. Some planners shared that a local ministerial process would have more legitimacy with community members than a state ministerial process; legitimacy that planners perceive as important within San Francisco because of the city's poor track record in prior decades of engaging with certain neighborhoods and low-income communities. But many stakeholders, including planners, shared their belief that current and proposed local procedural reforms, including the Mayor's Housing for All Executive Directive, are insufficient to remove policy constraints on production. According to these stakeholders, current reforms merely "tinker" with the planning code while leaving blanket discretionary review and the administrative appeal process intact. Stakeholders who shared this perspective stated plainly that they think the Mayor's Office can only do so much to fix these issues—the real fix depends on the Board of Supervisors and possibly the electorate. There were a handful of stakeholders who emphasized that the Mayor's Office must lead in addressing problems with permitting and felt entitlement processes were not the problem.

Every stakeholder that shared that San Francisco needs a local ministerial process and charter reform also felt accomplishing either one is politically impossible. Several planners expressed a belief in the need for state intervention—but not necessarily a preference for state intervention. Interview participants across several stakeholder groups emphasized that local processes that require the most reform are intertwined with values and assumptions about what these

[94] It is difficult to ascertain much more than the status of a permit from building permit data.

procedural rules offer in terms of stakeholder engagement, historic and cultural preservation, and ultimately, spatial equity.

Several planners also explained that San Francisco has inadequately engaged community around planning and zoning for decades. There was a consensus among planners that recent efforts by Supervisors to connect with low-income communities around land use still lack sufficient and intentional community engagement. Planners also described a need for the city to mend relationships with community through acknowledgment of and documentation of past harms. Some affordable developers echoed these concepts when they described how some neighborhoods continue to have the city's legacy of racism codified in neighborhood association covenants, conditions, and restrictions (CC&R).

Planning staff and some housing advocates explained that it is not in the city's best interests to keep existing processes as they are if the city's goal is to redress these past harms and increase housing production in an equitable way. But because process requirements are framed as key to stakeholder engagement and participation, planners believe no local political body wants to dismantle them. Process in San Francisco is sacrosanct. Consistent with this perspective from planners, some Commissioners emphasized the importance of engagement, but Commissioners focused on engagement during the project entitlement phase. The difference in how stakeholder groups described the need for community engagement in relationship to planning, zoning, and project development is significant. Planners discussed a need for engagement at larger scales and at the legislative level, to facilitate equitable planning and zoning, not just at the project-level. Commissioners focused on engagement at the project-level.

Interview participants also elaborated and described existing density and use controls and project-level adjudication as reflecting how power over land use is inequitably distributed citywide. Certain neighborhoods wield enough power over political bodies to block changing density and use controls, so no multifamily housing is proposed in the first instance. These constituents who benefit most from the spatial distribution of density and use controls do not need to attend public hearings to block housing development. Developers propose dense multifamily housing (and affordable housing) where housing may be built under zoning and planning standards.[95] That leaves communities in the neighborhoods where zoning allows housing to be built with one primary pathway to access power over land use; they must go through project-level adjudication, or public hearings. Some neighborhoods have built up power over time and can now effectively block all development through project-level adjudication. Other neighborhoods have more recently begun advocating for community needs through project adjudication. Planners also described alliances between wealthy residents and community activists with less money and influence that are working to protect their communities from harm from what they perceive to be the "greedy developer."

Stakeholders explained that project-level adversarial politics may seem responsive to inequitable land use patterns because it allows communities to advocate for what they need, but

[95] These perspectives were consistent with what we discovered in earlier research on San Francisco's zoning, reviewing zoning neighborhood planning between 1921 (beginning with the 1921 San Francisco Building Zone Ordinance, and reviewing 1948, 1979 and 1990 zoning) through the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan adopted in 2009. We found that the entitlements for 5 or more units issued in 2014 - 2017 were concentrated almost entirely in neighborhoods that had zoning for multi-family housing in place since at least 1921 (the Mission) or in neighborhoods that may have been zoned industrial neighborhoods but later rezoned for mixed-use (such as SoMa and Potrero Hill).

this approach fails to change power imbalances or solve for structural inequities. Neighborhoods that have prevented density (through zoning and planning standards) remain unavailable for development. Other neighborhoods feel perpetually burdened. When project opponents from vulnerable neighborhoods cannot stop an approval, they also interpret the entitlement as signaling that political bodies do not care about their neighborhood's needs[96] even though planners state that the opposite is true. Planners believe that the Planning Commission cares very deeply about neighborhood needs. From the perspective of planners, it is because the Commissioners care deeply about neighborhood needs that they slow or block housing approvals.

Planners shared local rules do too little to facilitate meaningful public input into design because the local rules without state intervention lead to just one conversation about how the city may deny the proposed development. Planners perceive that soliciting meaningful community input into design does not happen until political bodies and neighbors accept a project approval is imminent. Only then, according to planners, does the entitlement process facilitate community input to make the design better and prevent unintended harm the neighborhood. But planners report that at present productive dialogue to allow for community input depends entirely on state law that intervenes in local discretion in some way, and that the current local regulatory framework provides an inefficient and slow means to achieve housing production sensitive to neighborhood needs.

Participants in confidential research interviews cautioned that proposals to rezone need to be coupled with local ministerial processes or the rezoning will leave the existing inequities in place. Planners predict that any rezoned neighborhoods that have not welcomed dense housing in the past will use San Francisco's procedural law to block development if rezoning is not coupled with a ministerial approval process. Affordable developers share this perspective. Also, planners believe a local ministerial process would require all parties to pay more attention to the requirements of the code, which would better achieve more predictable and desired housing outcomes. Many planners and housing advocates said that disrupting this structural imbalance of power requires the kind of procedural overhaul that challenges entrenched beliefs about what current discretionary processes offer, which these stakeholders believe makes local procedural reform politically impossible. Planners believe the ideological divide within political bodies limits legislative proposals; planners believe Supervisors are limited to developing legislation that Supervisors believe will get passed,[97] which may or may not result in effective reform. Nonetheless, there was an unequivocal consensus among planners and affordable developers that San Francisco needs major procedural reform because not all neighborhoods welcome affordable housing development.

Although within stakeholder groups there was agreement on these topics, there was no consensus across stakeholder groups on any of these points. Planners and developers (including affordable developers) agree that San Francisco needs substantial local process reform that removes some discretion, but not all Commissioners and Supervisors share this perspective. During meetings with HCD, some Commissioners and Supervisors' perceptions clearly aligned with planners and developers on the relationship between zoning, procedural rules, and substantive standards on development and inequities across neighborhoods. These

[96] During interviews, one development noted as illustrative was 792 Capp Street, which required a Conditional Use Authorization to demolish a single-family dwelling to build four units; the CUA hearing was continued seven times before entitlement.

[97] Supervisor Melgar's public statements during the hearing on June 1, 2023, where she states her recommendations are to help ensure that the Housing Element gets passed, reflect a similar perspective.

participants acknowledged the challenges with existing discretionary review and administrative appeals of post-entitlement permits, and articulated these rules as potential constraints on supply and affordability. These Commissioners and Supervisors explained the difficult tradeoffs political bodies grapple with when developing or amending procedural rules, but they did acknowledge a need for legal reform.

Other Commissioners and Supervisors, however, expressed entirely different perceptions. Some Commissioners and Supervisors emphasized the importance of maintaining discretionary review while proposing that reforms should promote faster, more predictable processes. Some Supervisors characterized San Francisco's political bodies as consistently inclined to approve most proposals for housing and stated that all neighborhoods welcome affordable housing (though they did not distinguish between neighborhood groups responding to proposals to build affordable housing and their own voting records on affordable housing). The perspectives of some Supervisors on the topic of affordable housing sharply contrasted with what both affordable developers and planners shared. Affordable developers stated that many San Francisco neighborhoods do not welcome affordable development and residents are concerned about more units or taller buildings, generally. Affordable developers also perceived the west side of the city as particularly unwelcoming of affordable development.

Some Supervisors also shared their skepticism about the need for market-rate housing supply to address the city's housing issues, and their belief that inadequate funding for subsidized housing was the primary obstacle to addressing the city's housing needs.[98] While affordable developers and planners agreed that more state funding is critical for San Francisco to develop needed affordable housing, affordable developers and planners also called out local policy obstacles to production (including post-entitlement problems). In sum, affordable developers see funding and regulatory reform as both essential to increasing affordable development, whereas some Supervisors critique the latter as an approach to solving the city's housing challenges.

Some Commissioners and Supervisors also expressed deep concerns about state law that they interpreted as punitive, or harmful to local implementation of important aesthetic controls and historic preservation. What also really stood out was the difference between affordable developer and planner perspectives and those of some members of political bodies on the role of state law in accelerating affordable development.

All stakeholder groups report persistent post-entitlement challenges.

During interviews and meetings, *all* stakeholders, ranging from developers, architects, lawyers, and planners, complained of persistent challenges post-entitlement. Some of the dominant concerns related to the lack of uniformity in post-entitlement permitting. These stakeholders perceive that permitting depends on who is assigned to the process rather than on the form or

[98] In the November 15, 2022 hearing on the draft Housing Element, Supervisor Preston, for example, repeatedly stated that the aim of state law is to avoid providing more funding and to instead deregulate market-rate housing as the pathway to increase affordable development. *See S.F. Bd. of Supervisors: Hearing on the Draft Housing Element 2022* (Nov. 15, 2022) (statement of Dean Preston, Supervisor). Supervisor Preston shared these same perspectives in an open letter online, as well. Letter from Dean Preston, Supervisor, S.F. Bd. of Supervisors, to Gustavo Velasquez, Director, Cal. Dep't Hous. & Cmty. Dev. (Aug. 11, 2022), https://56a418ca-94d2-476c-9a45-f491ca4a0387.usrfiles.com/ugd/56a418_6abc98cb39f3429b85a1e3f2fb69fa17.pdf.

requirements of the development. Developers also commented that the system of review, itself, incentivizes extending review timelines. There is also no mechanism to escalate projects to someone with a higher position or a deeper understanding of what the projects require. The fact that there is priority review for affordable development is also negated by the fact that other developers can pay for priority review, so there is no true prioritization in the review process. Developers also shared that the subjectivity in the post-entitlement process can trigger a second stage of planning review even after the development has proceeded to the Department of Building Inspections.

Affordable developers were emphatic that state law, like SB 35, does nothing for post-entitlement challenges. All developers grapple with inadequate interagency coordination during the post-entitlement phase of development that creates duplicative review processes, delays, and inefficiencies. Interviews and meetings also suggest that affordable development may be most impacted. Developers attribute these problems to city departments lacking a production focus, and that no single person or department is sufficiently empowered to monitor the process. One stakeholder described post-entitlement as a “kickball game” with developers going back and forth between departments and personnel. Planners also described problems with permitting processes as at least in part due to a poorly structured operation that lacks adequate policy and transparency, so staff are unaccountable in the way that planning staff are held accountable. Developers shared similar perceptions. Stakeholders describe the lack of an intermediate administrator between DBI and the Building Inspection Commission (an administrator within the city’s executive branch) as a deficiency that contributes to inadequate coordination within and between departments.

Affordable developers shared significant difficulties with utilities processes for affordable development that led to extended periods of no power during and after construction. One developer characterized the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) power requirements as “crippling” for affordable housing development. All developers expressed frustration with Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E), generally, with some developers describing PG&E as monopolistic and engaged in “political retribution” with SFPUC by imposing infrastructure improvements or deprioritizing projects that go through the SFPUC. Affordable developers also report challenges with poor inter-agency coordination around meeting accessibility requirements, trouble with satisfying public art requirements, and difficulty meeting local hiring requirements because of labor shortages.

Nearly all participants offered their concerns about current efforts to address challenges with DBI and permitting. One frequent comment was that any directive to improve permitting processes (for example, by shortening permitting timelines) depends on having a baseline to make improvements from, but there is no baseline because there is poor data on permitting and no one has managed to track that information.

Conclusion

We entered this research understanding that San Francisco’s entitlement timeframes were much longer than other jurisdictions. (The state’s Annual Progress Report Data Dashboard would later show that San Francisco self-reported the longest entitlement timeframes across the state.) What remained unclear was *why* retaining discretion over all development creates comparatively longer timeframes in San Francisco. Neighboring jurisdictions in the Bay Area also used discretionary review to approve all multifamily housing as well, but they did not take as long. Oakland, for example, retained discretion over all development of five or more units and

the median timeframe to approval was six months. Redwood City applied discretionary review to similar housing development and required *more* approval steps and the timelines were still shorter. Even entitlement in the City of Berkeley, which requires a use permit for any development, did not take as long as San Francisco. These are findings we could not explain because we did not dive into the details of how different discretionary pathways influenced approval outcomes or timeframes for specific types of multi-family housing.

Our earlier data also made it clear that San Francisco Planning prioritized 100% affordable developments—yet it was also true that affordable development did not move quickly, and the local regulatory environment was not hospitable to affordable housing despite staff efforts to quicken approvals for affordable development. In fact, our interviews from prior years signaled that even as San Francisco Planning prioritized 100% affordable development, local regulation, and local application of environmental review created risk that some affordable developers simply could not manage. Consistent with what interview and meeting participants shared, the 2014 - 2017 housing approvals data revealed there were only five 100% affordable developments entitled in those four years. Nearly three out of every four affordable housing units entitled in 2014 - 2017 depended on mixed-income development, or application of the city's inclusionary program to market-rate housing. It is important to note that before SB 35, increasing affordable housing production depended almost entirely on market-rate developers.

The data we have now, however, offers more insight into what parts of San Francisco's system generate comparatively longer timeframes and why. San Francisco, like so many other cities we have studied, continues to grapple with the consequences of inequitable land use policy from earlier decades. One of the primary tools San Francisco uses to redress past wrongs is process. Thus, like many other cities, San Francisco local law creates a procedural maze for housing entitlement through both zoning and aesthetic regulation. But what the data above tells us is that in San Francisco, the procedural maze is one with walls that move. Provisions within the Business and Tax Code and the city's Charter allow project opponents to repeatedly challenge approvals during and after planning review, and in some instances, impose new conditions of approval. No proposed housing development is immune under local law. This fosters a system of lengthy and repeated negotiations throughout and beyond entitlement.

The state asked whether San Francisco was fully implementing state housing law, and the data indicates that for the most part, the answer is no. This is true despite the diligent work of city personnel to facilitate housing approvals. What came through as a dominant theme in most interviews and meetings with developers was high regard for planning personnel combined with a heightened level of frustration with planning department processes. It was also clear that several Commissioners and Supervisors want to see more housing production, as well.

What exactly about local law blocks full implementation of state law that aims to simplify and quicken process? Stakeholders explained that the same rules which allow for repeated challenge to approvals, including post-entitlement approvals, are what invite subjective conditions of approval and constant negotiation outside of public hearings during the entitlement process. They also report that the risk of administrative appeal to local political bodies drives all planning practice, not just environmental planning practices—although environmental planning is particularly burdened. Though we found that most administrative appeals are withdrawn or denied, we heard that the beginning of an appeal creates more work for planning staff, which in turn changes the pace of all environmental planning review for all projects. All environmental determinations under CEQA occur near the end of the entitlement process (right before or at final entitlement). This practice seems to eviscerate the effects of PSA on timely approvals. If left as is, existing blanket discretionary review and planning practices will likely diminish the

effects of SB 330 as well, which targets excessive continuances and hearings, going forward. That suggests that addressing this problem requires scrutinizing both existing planning practice and the local administrative appeal process. According to most stakeholders we consulted, although many parts of San Francisco's local law need reform, the efficacy of any reform hinges on whether the city can revise its Business and Tax Code and Charter.

San Francisco's application of SB 35 yields the most insight into what legal reforms will likely expedite planning review. SB 35 changed San Francisco's application and intake process for qualifying development. Although the 2018 - 2021 data indicates that San Francisco's application intake process under local law was inconsistent with the PSA, the city regularly complied with SB 35's time constraints on planning review. When discussing what is needed to improve the housing approval pipeline in general, participants in confidential interviews shared that San Francisco needs a local ministerial process that parallels SB 35, to eliminate blanket discretionary review of all permits, thoughtful reform of local administrative appeal processes, and equitable rezoning in low density affluent areas. But no interview participant was optimistic that San Francisco could deliver on these reforms without state intervention in local power.

Also important—there was consensus among several stakeholder groups that communities within San Francisco have been harmed by the city's planning and zoning in the past, but no consensus on how the city should proceed going into the future. There was also no consensus between stakeholder groups, particularly between city staff and city officials, on what housing production would best serve the city's housing needs, on the role of local regulation in enabling or blocking housing production, the role of state law on facilitating housing production, and what the city should do to meet housing need *and* achieve spatial equity.

For example, planners and city personnel discussed the city's RHNA obligations when defining the city's housing problems. Planners described San Francisco land use policy with a wide lens, pulling in developer perspectives, neighborhood needs, and politics when discussing the effects of current policy and planning practice on production outcomes. Also notable, most city staff described how reforms could advance participation goals or spatial justice, but they also described individual policies and planning practices as pieces within a larger system that accounted for law, policy, and cyclical market conditions. Planners and city personnel offered detailed analysis of what is not working that was easy to verify using other data. City staff were clear that local legal reform would be the best solution, but also were not hostile to state laws that addressed some of San Francisco's procedural challenges.

Discussions with members of the political bodies responsible for developing and enacting the local legal reform were very different. All Commissioners and Supervisors agreed that the housing approval process was slow and needed improvement. One Supervisor even went so far as to describe San Francisco's entitlement process as difficult by design. Some Commissioners and Supervisors were also as pragmatic as staff offered robust explanations of how local regulation operates across the city, distinguishing between law and practice and explaining how politics influence planning practice and production outcomes. A few foregrounded specific and precise local legal reforms to support housing production citywide with sensitivity to equity and spatial justice within the city's existing policy framework and current market conditions. Some were deferential to planning staff as experts on what is needed in terms of procedural reform. Some were explicit in their support of program statements in the housing element that call for ministerial processes for at least some development.

But some political participants responded to questions about how policy and planning work within San Francisco with answers focused almost entirely on contributing factors to production

that were outside of the city's purview—like state funding for affordable housing. Some Commissioners focused most on how to improve implementation of the existing rules while retaining discretion in all planning review. There was also a split in how the Commissioners and Supervisors perceived state law, and the housing element process, as well. Some were explicit that they felt the state was penalizing San Francisco through the RHNA process, and that regulatory and practice reform would not resolve the challenges San Francisco is facing.

Thus, what the data also shows is that the primary gatekeepers to local policy reform do not agree with each other or city staff on the scope of San Francisco's housing need or on what the city must to do to meet that need. There is also no agreement on the relative importance of local regulation in creating, perpetuating, or ameliorating the city's housing problems.

Appendix A: Regression Supplement With Methods

In earlier writing, we found that longer timeframes within a city were not necessarily associated with more approval steps on average. But our analysis compared median timeframes and average local steps to entitlement in one city to another city. We did not explore the potential relationship between timeframes and local steps to entitlement in any single case study city. This analysis, within San Francisco only, is important because at least some procedural reform proposals assume that reducing steps to approval while maintaining discretionary review will shorten timeframes. At the same time, stakeholders describe San Francisco's regulations as creating variability and uncertainty in the approval process, even when a proposed development has few steps to approval.

Generally, within a single city, even if entitlement takes a long time overall, we expect that more approval steps extend timeframes. Theoretically, if a development conforms to existing planning and zoning and requires no local-level approvals, it should take less time than a development that requires one or more special approvals to secure entitlement. San Francisco's local law does provide for dense residential buildings in some neighborhoods, without any special approvals. San Francisco's law also allows dense residential housing in other neighborhoods but with required special approvals. For example, development over a specific height threshold in some areas requires a Conditional Use Authorization or Large Project Authorization. If the local law is operating as we think it should, planning review might take longer when a development requires a Conditional Use Authorization before a building permit than if the development requires only a building permit. Finally, when a property owner proposes development that requires a rezoning or General Plan Amendment, it might take even longer than a project requiring a Conditional Use Authorization because what the developer is proposing is not provided for in existing planning and zoning.

But what we have heard within interviews so far is that this is not how local planning and zoning operates in practice. Most stakeholders described a process where neighbors may oppose any proposed development in any context, and planners are placed in a position of mediating disputes. Because of this, the time to entitlement (and certainty of approval) is unpredictable for all development subject to discretionary review, whether a project conforms to the local planning and zoning or not.

Stakeholders describe informal and formal pre-application processes for initial outreach and meetings to help planners, and the property owners anticipate neighborhood reaction and adjust a proposed development before proceeding through the entitlement application process. They also described a process where planners worked to mediate and resolve potential conflicts before proposals went in front of approval bodies (like the Planning Commission).

But stakeholders also note that although a property owner may begin negotiations with neighbors before the application (and in cases where the Planning Department requires a Preliminary Project Assessment, sometimes before that process), and continue negotiations throughout planning review, project opposition may not manifest until late in the process. They emphasized that smaller buildings are most vulnerable. Therefore, no matter what work the planners and property owners put into anticipating and mediating disputes over proposed projects, the process allows the risk of opposition for new, sometimes unpredictable, reasons to remain. Because opposition can emerge at any time, stakeholders say this makes the timeframes and approval outcomes uncertain.

These statements suggest that we should explore the entitlement data to see if entitlement for code compliant development is associated with shorter timeframes as compared with entitlement that requires special approvals or deviates from planning and zoning. Theoretically, code-consistent development should always move faster. One way we do this is to explore relationships between local steps to entitlement and timeframe to entitlement. If longer timeframes are associated with more approval steps, then policy proposals that focus on eliminating or consolidating approval process steps to expedite housing approvals should help shorten timeframes. But if more approval steps are not associated with longer timeframes, this means that something else is occurring to lengthen timeframes. If that is true, reducing the number of discretionary approval steps, alone, may not resolve the uncertainty and unpredictability stakeholders describe. **Although analyzing our entitlement dataset using regression cannot "prove" or "disprove" what stakeholders have shared, this additional analysis allows us to use more than one method and multiple data points for insights, which is more reliable than relying on only one method or data point.**

We chose to run linear regression models, rather than probability models, because we are interested in understanding what drives project timeframes in San Francisco—not necessarily what drives extreme delays within the context of San Francisco's regulatory environment. If we used a probability model, we would need to generate a binary variable as the dependent variable in our analysis. This variable would distinguish observations that are delayed (in terms of the project timeframe). San Francisco's extraordinarily long entitlement timeframes make this very difficult. For example, generating a binary cutoff for delayed timeframes at the median would lead to a cutoff of 39 months. That means we would be defining observations with incredibly long timeframes as "not delayed" because they were below this median, and then using the probability model to see whether certain factors generate delays beyond 39 months. Since most discretionary projects in San Francisco are delayed, even if they are delayed for less than 39 months, a probability model with a binary dependent variable is not best suited for our analysis. Also, that model would ignore project factors that are associated with two- or three-year timeframes because it would classify these projects as "not delayed."

Regression Analysis Using 2018 – 2021 Data (OLS Models)

We first analyze the existing associations between local land use approvals[99] required for entitlement in 2018 - 2021 and project timeframes using a multivariable, Ordinary Least Squares Regression (OLS). First, we ran a simple, OLS regression using local land use approval steps as the single independent variable, and timeframes as the dependent variable.

We used the statsmodel Python module to run all regressions in this analysis. We calculated all regression coefficients with robust standard errors (Errors of Order 3 (HC3)) to account for the existence of outliers and other issues within the data such as heteroskedasticity (variation in regression errors across our observations) and provide a small sample correction. Note that if we did not use robust standard errors with a small sample and clustered observation correction, the standard errors of our estimates would be smaller, so the standard errors and subsequent hypothesis testing are conservative.[100]

We observe a positive association between approval steps and timeframes. Interpreting the results of this simple regression, an additional approval step is associated with approximately a four-month increase in timeframes. While this positive association exists, our data suggests that observations with little to no local land use steps can take a long time. From this simple regression, we expect a development requiring a discretionary building permit only to take 32 months. Further, out of the 64 observations with less than a single local land use approval step, 23 observations (~36%) are above the mean (~38.6 months) and 26 observations (~41%) are above the median (~34.9 months) timeframe in San Francisco. While this positive association exists, timeframes are variable, regardless of the number of approval steps.

Even if such a relationship between local land use approval steps and timeframes exists, the magnitude of the relationship is, arguably, small. Meaning, the impact of approval steps on timeframes is small. From this simple regression, an additional approval step is associated with an additional ~3.7 months for approval. Given that the mean timeframe for all 111 observations is ~38.56 months, the impact of an additional approval step on timeframes is minimal.

[99] We define local land use approval steps as any discrete approval step required for entitlement under local law, not including the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) compliance pathway step.
[100] In regression analysis, the errors are defined by the difference between the observed values of the dependent variable (in this case, project timeframes) and values predicted by the regression specification. Accurate estimation of the uncertainty of OLS-predicted values generally depends on constant errors across observations. However, in this study, we do not assume that error is constant (homoscedasticity). For instance, model error might be larger for observations with substantially longer timeframes (i.e., where projects take two to three times longer than the median timeframe). When we use robust standard errors, we no longer assume that errors are constant across all observations, which can mitigate the impacts of this regression analysis being based on observational data. Further, we are using a small sample correction to mitigate the fact that our universe of observations is relatively narrow and to account for the natural clustering in timeframes that occurs at each local land use approval step.

Figure 6: Regression 2018 - 2021 Observations (No Controls)




Figure 6 depicts the simple regression of time frames on local land use approval steps. In this graph, the translucent bounds represent the confidence interval for the regression line. Several observations, however, fall outside the bounds of the confidence interval for the regression line. The confidence interval indicates the uncertainty in our regression estimates. This uncertainty could suggest model misspecification.[101] More specifically, the number of approval steps does not adequately capture the variation in project timeframes. **This model misspecification could suggest that there are unaccounted variables that influence the existing relationship between the number of approval steps and timeframes.**

[101] A large confidence interval is also often a function of sample size. In other words, because of a limited amount of data, our regression estimates are uncertain. However, we capture a complete dataset of all discretionary, non-ADU entitlements greater than five or more units in 2018 - 2021. Because of this, we are not making statistical inferences based on a sample, but rather generating quantitative analysis on an entire population (and interpreting our results within the context of this population only). Therefore, theoretically, there is no statistical uncertainty through sampling uncertainty.

We controlled for project characteristics that based on interviews and meetings we assumed might influence the relationship between timeframes and the number of local land use approvals. One such example is affordability thresholds. We heard from planners, Commissioners, and Supervisors that the city wants to prioritize 100% affordable development. To control for affordability, we placed the 111 observations into three categories: market-rate, mixed-income, and 100% affordable. To avoid perfect multicollinearity, we did not include the indicator variable which controls for observations that are market-rate. However, due to the model specification, we are still controlling for all affordability classifications in our regression. Below is the distribution of all 111 discretionary observations, by affordability classification:

1) Market-Rate **(N=55)**
2) Mixed-Income **(N=52)**
3) 100% Affordable **(N=4)**

We also controlled for local process characteristics related to the intensity of the approval process—which is distinct from whether an approval process requires more steps. What we are referring to here is how a project proponent may seek only a Variance, or only a Conditional Use Authorization (CUA), or only a Large Project Authorization—and each may require one approval step, but these approval processes are quite different in terms of what we describe as process intensity. A Variance in San Francisco usually requires approval from the Zoning Administrator without a public hearing (though the public may request a public hearing in front of the Planning Commission through the exceptional Discretionary Review process). A Conditional Use Authorization and Large Project Authorization always requires a hearing in front of the Planning Commission. Interviews reveal, however, that the Planning Commissioners interpret the Housing Accountability Act as not applicable to Large Project Authorizations—and that they have the discretion to deny the Large Project Authorization.

Therefore, we wanted to explore whether the *type* of approval process—not necessarily the number of local land use approval steps—is what influences increases in timeframes. We identified five distinct process categories: Discretionary Building Permit, Variance, CUA & PUD, Large Project Authorizations and Downtown Project Authorizations, and Legislative Actions. We want to explore whether observations with a more intense process are associated with longer timeframes and, theoretically, more approval steps. Below is the distribution of all 111 discretionary observations, by process category:

1) Discretionary Building Permit (**N=23)**: The building permit category represents a group of observations that are only discretionary by virtue of the Business & Tax Code provision that renders all government approvals discretionary.

2) Variance Only (**N=17**): These are observations that required a variance for approval. The observations do not require any Conditional Use Authorizations, Large Project Exceptions, or Legislative Actions.

3) CUA & PUD (**N=49**): These are observations that required a Conditional Use Authorization or Planned Unit Development (PUD) Approval. The observations do not require any Large Project Exceptions or Legislative Actions.

4) Large Project Authorizations and Downtown Project Authorizations **(N=15)**: These are observations that required either a Downtown Project Authorization or Large Project Authorization. Interviews and meetings indicate that Large Projects face significant hurdles—because they are disfavored. The issue here though is that these large projects may only require one step, and they theoretically seem to be no different than a CUA if we only consider the process in terms of both the number of approval steps and the approval body. However, the procedural step allows for waivers or exceptions to allow for a large project under the planning code. Though these do not appear to require legislative action, interviews suggest that the Planning Commission eschews these approvals, believes that they are not covered by the Housing Accountability Act, and will deny these approvals. That the Planning Commission interprets the Housing Accountability Act as not applying to the LPAs is something planners dispute, as they think this is a faulty interpretation of state law.

5) Legislative Actions (**N=7**): These are observations that required a local legislative act (Planning Code Amendment, Zoning Map Amendment, General Plan Amendment, or Development Agreement) for approval.

To assess the impact of process intensity on approval steps, we translated process intensity and incremental numeric ranking in the following order: Discretionary Building Permit (least intense), Variance Only, CUA & PUD, Large Project Authorizations and Downtown Project Authorizations (referred to collectively as Exceptions), Legislative Actions (most intense). After running a simple regression of the number of approval steps on this numeric ranking, we find increasing process intensity is associated with an increase of one approval step (rounded).[102] A project that requires a local legislative act or a development agreement for approval is expected to have three to four more approval steps than a discretionary building permit project. This makes sense, as Development Agreements are often associated with proposals that require multiple approvals. This association is statistically significant at the 1% level. While process intensity and the number of local land use approval steps are related, they are not multicollinear. The correlation coefficient between the numeric translation between process intensity and local land use approval steps is 0.63. In an additional section of this report, we run a correlation heatmap between all independent variables to identify any possible sources of multicollinearity.

We also calculate the variation in the number of approval steps for all process categories. Below is a table that breaks out the quantile distribution of approval steps, by process intensity.

[102] The slope coefficient in the simple regression 0.856.

Table 16: Variation in Number of Approval Steps, by Process Categories, Non-ADU Discretionary Observations 2018 - 2021 (N=111)

Process Categorization	Min. Steps	25th Percentile Steps	**Median Steps**	75th Percentile Steps	Max. Steps	**Mean Steps**	Standard Steps
Discretionary Building Permit (N=23)[103]	0	0	**0**	0	2	0.13	0.46
Variance (N=17)[104]	1	1	**1**	1	3	1.29	0.59
CUA & PUD (N=49)[105]	1	1	**2**	2	4	1.96	0.96
Exceptions (N=15)[106]	1	1	**1**	2	5	1.60	1.12
Legislative Acts (N=7)[107]	1	3	**5**	7	9	5	2.94

We highlight this variation to show that process categorizations are not just a categorical grouping of the number of local land use approval steps. For instance, all process categorizations have observations that require a single approval step. However, an observation that requires only a variance is significantly different from an observation that requires only a Large Project Exception. It is because these single approval step processes are so different that we control for process in our analysis.

Finally, we also control for project size and whether the observation was in a vulnerable area. Interviews suggest that larger projects are disfavored. We control for project size (instead of just an LPA or DPA) because some proposed developments benefit from State Density Bonus Law, increasing their size, but they do not necessarily require an LPA or DPA (which is determined in part by location as well). Lastly, we control for location within a priority equity geography because interviews suggest political bodies are sensitive to proposals to build in these areas. These project and neighborhood characteristics can also impact the relationship between local land use approval steps and timeframes.

We completed several regression models to explore whether there is a relationship between number of approval steps and timeframes. Or in other words, does increasing the number of required approval steps create longer entitlement timeframes? **The regression models show that when we control for affordability characteristics, project size, location within a vulnerable geographic area, and intensity of the approval process, there is no**

[103] Out of the 23 discretionary building permit observations, one observation had an additional administrative approval. Another observation required an additional administrative approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval.
[104] There are 13 observations that require only one step or only a variance for approval.
[105] There are 18 observations that require only one step, or only a CUA or PUD for approval.
[106] There are 10 observations that require only one step, or an exception (Downtown Project Authorization or Large Project Authorization) for approval.
[107] There is one observation that required only a legislative act for approval.

statistically significant association between the number of approval steps and timeframes.

This outcome supports what stakeholders say to be true in San Francisco—factors outside of law influence timeframes, and there is a lot of uncertainty of how entitlement will unfold in San Francisco no matter what a developer proposes to build. This outcome does not prove that there is no causal relationship between timeframes and approval steps; we cannot account for all confounding variables that influence this relationship. OLS identifies associations within our data only. And we are using observational data, as well. Thus, the data and methods do not allow us to prove or disprove that there is no relationship between number of approval steps and timeframes. **But importantly, the regression findings are consistent with what descriptive statistics and interviews both show—there is no easy entitlement pathway in San Francisco, and factors outside of law appear to influence entitlement outcomes. This tells us that reforms that focus on simplifying discretionary review by reducing the number of steps to approval may be insufficient to address uncertainty and lengthy timeframes to approval.**

Discretionary Non-ADU Observations 2018 - 2021 with Controls

Table 17 below shows the association between local land use approval steps and timeframes was numerically smaller and no longer statistically significant after we controlled for affordability, process intensity, and project size. These results indicate that there are factors outside of what the planning and zoning law requires of developers that strongly affect the relationship between approval steps and timeframes.

What Table 17 illustrates is that project size may impact the relationship between approval steps and timeframes in our dataset. When controlling for number of approval steps to understand the relationship between project size and timeframes, an additional unit increase in project size is associated with a 0.021 month increase in timeframes. This relationship is statistically significant at the 5% level.

Another factor that may impact the relationship between approval steps and timeframes is the intensity of the process. An observation requiring a variance or CUA/PUD is associated with an increase in timeframes, relative to a discretionary building permit observation. This relationship is diminished (in terms of significance) but is still present when we add controls. Further, an approval requiring a Large Project Authorization is associated with an increase in timeframes, relative to a discretionary building permit observation—but this association is no longer statistically significant when we add all controls (including project size).

Table 17: All Discretionary Non-ADU Observations 2018 - 2021


Variables	No Controls	Affordability Controls	Neighborhood Controls	Size Controls	Process Controls	All Controls
Dependent Variable: Timeframe (denoted in months)						
Num. Approvals	3.693***	3.681***	3.743***	2.794**	2.761*	2.360
	(1.244)	(1.353)	(1.260)	(1.117)	(1.637)	(1.755)
Market-rate		12.706				4.160
		(9.493)				(8.372)
Mixed Income		12.934				6.833
		(9.242)				(8.970)
Vulnerable Area			1.584			1.307
			(3.860)			(4.331)
Project Size				0.021**		0.028**
				(0.011)		(0.013)
Variance					19.468**	20.488**
					(8.799)	(9.149)
CUA & PUD					12.286***	11.115**
					(4.092)	(4.547)
Exceptions					9.987*	6.653
					(5.317)	(6.152)
Legis. Acts					6.467	0.558
					(9.207)	(11.431)
Constant	32.580***	20.246**	31.714***	32.369***	23.930***	17.656**
	(2.653)	(8.889)	(2.854)	(2.587)	(2.567)	(7.260)
Observations	111	111	111	111	111	111
R-squared	0.075	0.088	0.076	0.094	0.157	0.197
Adj. R-Squared	0.066	0.063	0.059	0.077	0.117	0.126

Notes: *** indicates coefficient is significant at the 1% level. ** indicates coefficient is significant at the 5% level. * indicates coefficient is significant at the 10% percent level. Table presents robust standard errors in parentheses.

Regression Analysis Using 2014 - 2017 Data

After running a simple regression on approval steps and timeframes using the 2014 - 2017 dataset, we find a positive association between approval steps and timeframes. This association is not statistically significant. In terms of magnitude, the association between local land use approval steps within the 2014 - 2017 dataset is weaker than in the 2018 - 2021 dataset.

Figure 7: Ordinary Least Squares Regression 2014 - 2017 Observations (N=140)



We also run our regressions on observations that received a Community Plan Exemption (N=100).
We did this to further explore whether local approval steps impact timeframes for projects that satisfy CEQA in the same way.

Table 18: Regression Using 100 CPE Observations 2014 - 2017


Variables	No Controls	Affordability Controls	Neighborhood Controls	Size Controls	Process Controls	All Controls
Dependent Variable: Timeframe (denoted in months)						
Num. Approvals	3.295	3.521	3.009	4.097	4.062	2.515
	(2.740)	(3.802)	(2.731)	(2.615)	(7.615)	(6.105)
Market-rate		15.159***				22.226
		(5.177)				(19.833)
Mixed Income		12.443*				23.791
		(6.614)				(19.983)
Vulnerable Area			-2.478			-1.423
			(3.184)			(3.265)
Project Size				-0.019		0.002
				(0.022)		(0.028)
Variance					4.305	3.071
					(9.589)	(9.902)
CUA & PUD					-5.188	-6.306
					(10.667)	(10.416)
Exceptions					-4.053	-3.885
					(19.060)	(17.804)
Legis. Acts					10.918	20.784
					(34.670)	(35.476)
Constant	24.966***	11.406**	26.813***	25.232***	25.700***	6.351
	(3.513)	(5.124)	(4.363)	(3.667)	(2.779)	(19.031)
Observations	100	100	100	100	100	100
R-squared	0.055	0.086	0.061	0.061	0.119	0.196
Adj. R-Squared	0.046	0.057	0.042	0.042	0.072	0.092

Notes: *** indicates coefficient is significant at the 1% level. ** indicates coefficient is significant at the 5% level. * indicates coefficient is significant at the 10% percent level. Table presents robust standard errors in parentheses.

Regressions Using 2014 - 2021 Data

We ran our regression models on the entire 2014 - 2021 dataset. We find no differences in our main findings above. Figure 3 depicts the simple regression of time frames on local land use approval steps. We found a positive association between number of approval steps and timeframes that is statistically significant. In this graph, the translucent bounds represent the confidence interval for the regression line. As was true in the regression of 2018 - 2021 data only, several observations fall outside the bounds of the confidence interval for the regression line. The confidence interval indicates the uncertainty in our regression estimates. This uncertainty suggests that there are other unaccounted variables that influence the existing relationship between the number of approval steps and timeframes.

Figure 8: Regression All Non-ADU Discretionary Observations 2014 - 2021 (No Controls)



Our results using the 2014 - 2021 dataset also show that when we control for affordability characteristics, project size, location within a vulnerable geographic area, and intensity of the approval process, there is no statistically significant association between the number of approval steps and timeframes.

We also add an additional model where we only exclude process controls. We find that there exists a positive, statistically significant association between approval steps and timeframes when we only control for affordability, project size, and area characteristics, but this relationship is numerically smaller and decreases in statistical significance when we add these controls.

Table 19: Regression All Discretionary Non-ADU Observations 2014 - 2021 With Controls

Variables	No Controls	Affordability Controls	Neighborhood Controls	Size Controls	Process Controls	All Controls Except Process Controls	All Controls
	Dependent Variable: Timeframe (denoted in months)						
Num. Approvals	3.328***	3.363***	3.149***	2.882***	2.998**	2.643**	2.263
	(1.019)	(1.034)	(0.990)	(1.043)	(1.470)	(1.046)	(1.453)
Market-rate		14.441***				13.854***	11.718**
		(4.756)				(5.168)	(5.446)
Mixed Income		12.003***				11.610**	10.510*
		(4.539)				(4.933)	(5.497)
Vulnerable Area			-3.878			-3.577	-3.798
			(2.494)			(2.574)	(2.588)
Project Size				0.009		0.012	0.016
				(0.010)		(0.010)	(0.011)
Variance					10.836*		10.407*
					(5.620)		(5.763)
CUA & PUD					4.266		3.413
					(3.793)		(4.122)
Exceptions					0.859		-0.183
					(4.628)		(5.428)
Legis. Acts					5.815		4.783
					(8.056)		(9.030)
Constant	29.094***	16.346***	31.460***	28.968***	26.008***	18.847***	17.794***
	(2.013)	(4.357)	(2.548)	(2.026)	(2.466)	(4.943)	(5.063)
Observations	251	251	251	251	251	251	251
R-squared	0.052	0.070	0.061	0.055	0.080	0.082	0.109
Adj. R-Squared	0.048	0.059	0.053	0.047	0.062	0.063	0.076

Notes: *** indicates coefficient is significant at the 1% level. ** indicates coefficient is significant at the 5% level. * indicates coefficient is significant at the 10% percent level. Table presents robust standard errors in parentheses.

It is not typical for a development to have eight to nine steps to entitlement in San Francisco. Because it is possible that the relationship between approval steps and timeframes is driven by atypical projects in San Francisco (or observations that require eight or nine steps for approval), we also analyze the impact of outliers (in terms of the number of approval steps) on the relationship between approval steps and timeframes. Any observation in our discretionary, non-ADU dataset from 2018 - 2021 with more than four approval steps is considered an outlier.[108] We dropped these from our dataset and reran our regression models in the table below.

Table 20: Regression Results, Dropping Approval Step Outliers (2014 - 2021 Data)

Variables	No Controls	Some Controls	All Controls
Dependent Variable: Timeframe (denoted by months)			
Num. Approvals	1.987*	1.685	-0.756
	(1.133)	(1.309)	(1.928)
Market-rate		17.294***	14.218***
		(3.723)	(3.982)
Mixed Income		15.522***	12.450***
		(3.397)	(4.428)
Vulnerable Area		-1.829	-2.090
		(2.666)	(2.683)
Project Size		0.006	0.010
		(0.012)	(0.013)
Variance			13.440**
			(6.072)
CUA & PUD			6.949
			(4.802)
Exceptions			7.935
			(5.780)
Legs. Acts			9.840
			(7.396)
Constant	30.585***	15.720***	15.110***
	(2.205)	(3.880)	(4.142)
Observations	229	229	229
R-squared	0.010	0.041	0.075
Adj. R-Squared	0.005	0.020	0.037

Notes: *** indicates coefficient is significant at the 1% level. ** indicates coefficient is significant at the 5% level. * indicates coefficient is significant at the 10% percent level. Table presents robust standard errors in parentheses

[108] We calculated the bounds for large outliers (based on the number of approval steps) with the following formula: 1.5 * [75% Percentile – 25% Percentile] + 75% Percentile. For all 251 observations, the 25% percentile is one approval step and the 75th percentile is two approval steps. Using this formula, 1.5 * (2 – 1) + 2 = 3.5. Meaning, any observations with more than four approval steps are outliers.

We observe a positive association between approval steps and timeframes when we discard outlier observations, although this association is numerically smaller and decreases in statistical significance. When we exclude process controls in our regression—and only control for affordability, project size, and neighborhood characteristics—we find no statistically significant association between approval steps and timeframes. This suggests that the observations which required significantly more steps for approval play a role in the association between approval steps and timeframes. In other words, when we discard these observations to generate a dataset of more typical developments in San Francisco, we find no statistically significant association between approval steps and timeframe, controlling for factors outside of planning and zoning law. This also suggests that a more typical observation (an observation with two or three steps) would likely see no substantial difference in timeframe if it have been approved with fewer steps.

Robustness Checks for Analysis

We generated correlation heat maps to understand existing associations between the independent variables in our models. If high correlations exist between our independent variables, it could lead to imperfect multicollinearity.

In the following correlation heat maps, the only variables that are highly associated with each other are indicator variables that are mutually exclusive and exhaustive. As a result of these heatmaps, we feel comfortable using these variables as independent variables in our regression.




Figure 9: Correlation Heat Map for 2018 - 2021 Regression Data (N=111) with Affordability, Neighborhood, and Process Characteristics

Residual Plots for Regressions

We also run residual plots for some of our models for assessment. First, we use the residual plots to assess our model's functional form (e.g., is the association between the number of approval steps and timeframes linear?). We also use residual plots to assess the effectiveness of our control variables. We are interested in understanding if the introduction of these control variables help capture the underlying associations within our data.

Figure 10: Residual Plot and LOESS Line for Simple Regression ("No Controls" in Table 1) Using All 111 Non-Discretionary Non-ADU Observations 2018 - 2021





Figure 11: Residual Plot and LOESS Line for Simple Regression ("All Controls" in Table 1) Using All 111 Discretionary Non-ADU Observations 2018 - 2021



In Figure 10: Residual Plot and LOESS Line for Simple Regression ("No Controls" in Table 1) Using All 111 Non-Discretionary Non-ADU Observations 2018 - 2021, there is clustering in this plot. This indicates that the simple regression model is missing information to properly explain the relationship between the number of approval steps and timeframes. It strongly indicates that there are factors outside the number of approval steps that impacts the linear relationship between timeframes.

Figure 11: Residual Plot and LOESS Line for Simple Regression ("All Controls" in Table 1) Using All 111 Discretionary Non-ADU Observations 2018 - 2021 shows the residual plot of the regression specification when we control for process intensity, project size, neighborhood vulnerability, whether the project received an administrative appeal, and affordability. The clustering in this residual plot is less pronounced, which indicates that the controls are effective

in capturing sources of variation that influence the relationship between the number of approval steps and timeframes. Also, observe that there is no clear, consistent pattern in the residual plot. This indicates that a linear regression is most likely the best functional form for our model.

However, observe that the LOESS line is not a linear line at zero, but is rather slightly sloping downward. This indicates that there may be other omitted variables that impact the relationship between timeframes and approval steps, which may bias the magnitude of our regression estimates. Future regression work can test the use of interactive effects between independent variables or assess the impact of new control variables.

Appendix B: Spatial Distribution of Developments

Affordability and TCAC Category Cross Sectional Table (N=144), 2018 - 2021[1]

Highest Resource	Projects	Units	Affordable Units	Median Time	Mean Time
Market-rate	10	352	-	29.38	30.91
Market-rate(ADU)	1	5	-	6.41	6.41
Mixed Inc.(Discretionary)	3	150	38	28.21	31.34
100% Aff.(Discretionary)	0	-	-	-	-
100% Aff.(SB 35–Began as Disc.)	1[2]	135	135	15.39	15.39
High Resource	**Projects**	**Units**	**Affordable Units**	**Median Time**	**Mean Time**
Market-rate	9	328	-	39.81	38.15
Market-rate(ADU)	6	47	-	9.63	17.20
Mixed Inc.(Discretionary)	6	242	43	53.51	53.48
100% Aff.(Discretionary)	2	19	19	9.53	9.53
100% Aff.(Always SB 35)	2	228	228	4.47	4.47
Moderate Resource (Rapidly Changing to higher resources)	**Projects**	**Units**	**Affordable Units**	**Median Time**	**Mean Time**
Market-rate	4	47	-	32.74	37.44
Market-rate(ADU)	1	7	-	21.99	21.99
Mixed Inc.(Discretionary)	3	237	81	32.08	28.48
Mixed Inc.(ADU)	1	24	3	41.19	41.19
100% Aff.(Discretionary)	0	-	-	-	-
100% Aff.(SB 35–Began as Disc.)	2[3]	268	267	26.20	26.20
Moderate Resource	**Projects**	**Units**	**Affordable Units**	**Median Time**	**Mean Time**
Market-rate	18	1,555	-	40.41	40.30
Market-rate(ADU)	6	38	-	26.50	24.38
Mixed Inc.(Discretionary)	21	2,564	520	41.03	40.67
100% Aff.(Discretionary)	1	178	176	28.04	28.04
100% Aff.(Always SB 35)	2	175	173	4.65	4.65
100% Aff.(SB 35–Began as Disc.)	1[4]	63	63	41.39	41.39
Low Resource	**Projects**	**Units**	**Affordable Units**	**Median Time**	**Mean Time**
Market-rate	14	1,982	-	38.45	47.15

Mixed Inc.(Discretionary)	19	1,153	191	27.58	33.47
Mixed Inc.(Always SB 35)	2	720	294	6.84	6.84
100% Aff.(Discretionary)	1	15	15	55.96	55.96
100% Aff.(Always SB 35)	3	400	400	2.40	2.40
100% Aff.(SB 35–Began as Disc.)	3[5]	394	393	32.58	30.70

High Segregation & Poverty	Projects	Units	Affordable Units	Median Time	Mean Time
Market-rate	0	-	-	-	-
Market-rate(ADU)	2	13	-	19.04	19.04
Mixed Inc.(Discretionary)	0	-	-	-	-
100% Aff.(Discretionary)	0	-	-	-	-

[1] Observations that are student or group housing developments have been categorized as market-rate. We confirmed that group housing beds are not deed-restricted affordable.
[2] This is 1360 43rd Ave, originally proposed under 1351 42nd Ave. This project began as a discretionary entitlement. We use the earliest file date to calculate timeframes.
[3] The two SB 35 projects in this category of Moderate Resource (Rapidly Changing) began before SB 35 was signed into law, which influences timeframe calculations in this neighborhood classification. We logged one project, 2340 San Jose Ave, as having an earliest file date of 9/21/2017. We logged a second project, 4840 Mission St, as having an earliest file date of 9/21/2016. Further, 2340 San Jose Ave does not have an eligibility determination date, though we know it received a building permit. But we excluded it from timeframe analysis.
[4] This is 2205 Mission St, which began as a discretionary project.
[5] Three SB 35 projects in this category (Low Resource) began before SB 35 was signed into law.

Affordability and 2021 TCAC Category Cross Sectional Table, 2014 - 2017

Highest Resource	Projects	Units	Affordable Units	Median Time	Mean Time
Market-rate	3	69	-	89.98	79.68
Mixed Income	1	41	6	38.70	38.70
100% Affordable	0	0	0	0.00	0.00

High Resource	Projects	Units	Affordable Units	Median Time	Mean Time
Market-rate	6	120	-	23.79	24.77
Mixed Income	5	287	27	18.94	20.92

100% Affordable	0	0	0	-	-
Moderate Resource (Rapidly Changing)	Projects	Units	Affordable Units	Median Time	Mean Time
Market-rate	4	100	-	19.50	21.48
Mixed Income	3	527	171	34.26	32.10
100% Affordable	0	0	0	-	-
Moderate Resource	Projects	Units	Affordable Units	Median Time	Mean Time
Market-rate	29	2415	-	26.37	34.31
Mixed Income	25	3071	415	31.59	35.11
100% Affordable	0	0	0	-	-
Low Resource	Projects	Units	Affordable Units	Median Time	Mean Time
Market-rate	20	1600	-	23.98	27.17
Mixed Income	39	5472	982	31.23	30.30
100% Affordable	4	400	400	13.73	14.16
High Segregation & Poverty	Projects	Units	Affordable Units	Median Time	Mean Time
Market-rate	0	0	-	-	-
Mixed Income	0	0	0	-	-
100% Affordable	1	167	167	34.49	34.49

Affordability and Priority Equity Geographies (PEG) Sectional Table, 2018 - 2021 (N=144)

Vulnerable Area, Denoted by PEG	Projects	Units	Affordable Units	Median Time	Mean Time
Market-rate(Discretionary)	26	2,377	-	36.85	43.54
Market-rate(ADU)	6	37	-	21.70	22.56
Mixed Inc.(Discretionary)	35	2,424	468	32.09	34.97
Mixed Inc.(Always SB 35)	1	270	109	6.05	6.05
Market-rate(ADU)	1	24	3	41.19	41.19
100% Aff.(Discretionary)	1	15	15	55.96	55.96
100% Aff.(Always SB 35)	4[2]	512	510	2.91	3.31
100% Aff.(SB 35–Began As Disc.)	6	725	723	32.58	31.94
Not In a Vulnerable Area, Denoted by PEG	**Projects**	**Units**	**Affordable Units**	**Median Time**	**Mean Time**
Market-rate	29	1,88773	-	36.00	36.40
Market-rate(ADU)	10		-	9.71	18.07
Mixed Inc.(Discretionary)	17	1,922	405	42.44	45.09
100% Aff.(Always SB 35)	1	450	185	7.63	7.63
100% Aff.(Discretionary)	3	197	195	11.31	15.70
100% Aff.(Always SB 35)	3	291	291	2.76	3.90
100% Aff.(SB 35–Began As Disc.)	1	135	135	15.39	15.30

Distribution of Affordable Units (Inclusive of 11 Observations From Updated APR)

2014 - 2015 Affordable Units, by 2021 TCAC Distribution (N=351 new affordable units)

Neighborhood TCAC Category	Total Affordable Units in Category	Percentage (of Total Affordable Units)
Highest Resource	0	0.00%
High Resource	3	3.70%
Moderate Resource (Rapidly Changing)	0	0.00%
Moderate Resource	194	55 .27%

Low Resource	144	41.03%
High Segregation and Poverty	0	0.00%

2016 - 2017 Affordable Units Distribution, by 2021 TCAC (N=1,817 new affordable units)

Neighborhood TCAC Category	Total Affordable Units in Category	Percentage (of Total Affordable Units)
Highest Resource	6	0.33%
High Resource	14	0.77%
Moderate Resource (Rapidly Changing)	171	9.41%
Moderate Resource	221	12.16%
Low Resource	1,238	68.13%
High Segregation and Poverty	167	9.19%

2018 - 2019 Affordable Units Distribution by 2021 TCAC, Expanded by SB 35 Affordable Units (N=1,390 new affordable units, SB 35 affordable units=896)

Neighborhood TCAC Category	Total Affordable Units in Category	Percentage (of Total Affordable Units)
Highest Resource	Total: 22 • SB 35: 0 • Non SB 35: 22	Total: 1.58%

High Resource	Total: 17 • SB 35: 0 • Non SB 35: 17	Total: 1.22%
Moderate Resource (Rapidly Changing)	Total: 336 • SB 35: 267 • Non SB 35: 69	Total: 24.17%
Moderate Resource	Total: 321 • SB 35: 0 • Non SB 35: 321	Total: 23.09%
Low Resource	Total: 694 • SB 35: 629 • Non SB 35: 65	Total: 49.93%
High Segregation and Poverty	Total: 0 • SB 35: 0 • Non SB 35: 0	Total: 0.00%

2020 - 2021 Affordable Units Distribution by 2021 TCAC, Expanded by SB 35 Affordable Units (N=1,649 new affordable units, SB 35 affordable units=1,057)

Neighborhood TCAC Category	Total Affordable Units in Category	Percentage (of Total Affordable Units)
Highest Resource	Total: 151 • SB 35: 135 • Non SB 35: 16	Total: 9.16%
High Resource	Total: 273 • SB 35: 228 • Non SB 35: 45	Total: 16.56%
Moderate Resource (Rapidly Changing)	Total: 15 • SB 35: 0 • Non SB 35: 15	Total: 0.91%
Moderate Resource	Total: 611 • SB 35: 236 • Non SB 35: 375	Total: 37.05%
Low Resource	Total: 599 • SB 35: 458 • Non SB 35: 141	Total: 36.33%

High Segregation and Poverty	Total: 0 • SB 35: 0 • Non SB 35: 0	Total: 0.00%

Distribution of Affordable Units, by Priority Equity Geographies

2014 - 2015 Affordable Units by Priority Equity Geographies (N=351 new affordable units)

	Total Affordable Units in Category	Percentage (of Total Affordable Units)
Vulnerable Area, Denoted by Priority Equity Geographies	154	43.87%
NOT in a vulnerable Area, Denoted by Priority Equity Geographies	197	56.13%

2016 - 2017 Affordable Units by Priority Equity Geographies (N=1,817 new affordable units)

	Total Affordable Units in Category	Percentage (of Total Affordable Units)
Vulnerable Area, Denoted by Priority Equity Geographies	282	15.52%
NOT in a vulnerable Area, Denoted by Priority Equity Geographies	1,535	84.48%

2018 - 2019 Affordable Units by Priority Equity Geographies (N=1,390 new affordable units, SB 35 affordable units=896)

	Total Affordable Units in Category	Percentage (of Total Affordable Units)
Vulnerable Area, Denoted by Priority Equity Geographies	Total: 294 • SB 35: 0 • Non-SB 35: 294	Total: 21.15%

NOT in a vulnerable Area, Denoted by Priority Equity Geographies	Total: 1,096 • SB 35: 896 • Non-SB 35: 200	Total: 78.85%

2020 - 2021 Affordable Units by Priority Equity Geographies (N=1,649 new affordable units, SB 35 affordable units=1,057)

	Total Affordable Units in Category	Percentage (of Total Affordable Units)
Vulnerable Area, Denoted by Priority Equity Geographies	Total: 732 • SB 35: 446 • Non-SB 35: 286	Total: 44.39%
NOT in a vulnerable Area, Denoted by Priority Equity Geographies	Total: 917 • SB 35: 611 • Non-SB 35: 306	Total: 55.61%

Number and Percentage of 100% Affordable Developments in Areas with a Higher Density of Vulnerable Populations, by Year.

Year	Number of 100% Affordable Entitlements	Percentage of 100% Affordable Entitlements in Sensitive Geographies
2014 – 2017 (N=5)	Total: 5	Total: 100%
2018 – 2019 (N=8)	Total: 6 • SB 35: 6 • Discretionary Non-ADU: 0	Total: 75%
2020 – 2021 (N=10)	Total: 5 • SB 35: 4 • Discretionary Non-ADU: 1	Total: 50%

Appendix C: Analysis of Accuracy of Annual Progress Report Data on Entitlements and SB 35 Approvals

We relied on Annual Progress Report data that we pulled over three periods. For the 2018 - 2019 analysis, we first built a list of observations from 2018 - 2019 APR data that we gained access to on May 18, 2020. We began collecting data on these observations for related research during the 2021 - 2022 academic year, prior to working with HCD on this study. We did not collect as much information as we did for this research during that period, however. We then downloaded San Francisco's Original 2020 - 2021 APR data on or around October 2, 2022, to construct our original observation list for data collection. We then downloaded 2021 APR data on February 18, 2023. Then we downloaded all four years—2018 - 2021—APR data on July 14, 2023, from the state data dashboard to do a final check to confirm if we had any additional observations that may have come in through corrected reporting for any one of these four years. We also separately reviewed environmental review determinations to identify any possible observations not included in any APR data.

San Francisco reported 72 entitlements or SB 35 approvals in 2018 and 2019 on the report we accessed dated May 18, 2020.

- Of the 72 entitlements or SB 35 approvals from 2018 - 2019, we determined that 45 of these observations (~63%) were entitled in 2018 - 2019 and reported in the correct year.
- Therefore, 27 entitlements or SB 35 approvals (~38%) in the 2018 - 2019 APR (N=72) were incorrect reports.
- We found an additional seven entitlements or SB 35 approvals issued in 2018 - 2019 that San Francisco reported in another year (or the wrong year).
- The 2018 - 2019 APR Report also missed 33 entitlements issued in those years, which we found from reviewing San Francisco's Environmental Review Documents and Planning Commission Agendas.

San Francisco reported 82 observations entitled in 2020. San Francisco reported 30 entitlements or SB 35 approvals in 2021. Combined, San Francisco reported 112 entitlements or SB 35 approvals across 2020 - 2021.

- Of the 112 observations from 2020 - 2021, we determined that 45 of these observations (~40%) were entitled in 2020 - 2021 and San Francisco reported the correct year.
- We found an additional 18 entitlements or SB 35 approvals issued in 2020 - 2021 that San Francisco reported, but reported as entitled in the wrong year.
- 67 observations (~60%) in the 2020 - 2021 APR (N=112) are incorrect reports.
- Most, or 62 (out of 67), incorrect reports in the 2020 - 2021 APR are from Reporting Year 2020.
- The 2020 - 2021 APR data also missed an additional 21 entitlements, which we found through reviewing environmental review determinations.

In the inaccurate reporting across 2018 - 2021, we determined six entitlements that San Francisco incorrectly reported in 2018 - 2021 were entitled sometime in 2014 - 2017.

We also used the July 14, 2023, download of San Francisco's Annual Progress Reports to HCD a final time to run a second audit of the 2018 - 2021 APR before completing all analysis. In total, San Francisco underreported on 69 entitlements or SB 35 approvals across those four years.

From:	Lagunte, Richard (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); BOS-Operations; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject:	5 letters regarding zoning
Date:	Tuesday, November 25, 2025 10:00:11 AM
Attachments:	File Nos 250700, 250701, 250966.pdf

Dear Supervisors,

Please see attached for 5 letters regarding Zoning.

File No. 250966: General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 250700: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan (Mayor, Sauter, Mahmood, Dorsey)

File No. 250701: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan (Mayor)

File No. 251072: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan (Mayor)

Regards,

Richard Lagunte
Office of the Clerk of the Board – Operations Division
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Voice (415) 554-7709 | Fax (415) 554-5163
richard.lagunte@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

Pronouns: he, him, his

Disclosures: *Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors' website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From:	agandi@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of ader gandi
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Friday, November 21, 2025 11:40:05 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I live on a narrow russian hill alley called lynch. This unchecked building boom is crazy. completely ruins the flavor os sf and legacy neighborhood. dont let this irreversible decision happen.

The Land Use Committee, on a vote of 2-1, has blocked Supervisor Chan's amendments and its Chair declined to invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Committee must advance these compliant amendments for the protection of sound housing, historic resources, and our coastline to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparent and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
ader gandi
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: rbinsf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Rita Pisciotta
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Sunday, November 23, 2025 9:52:15 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan,born and raised here in North Beach, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

My Italian Grandparents immigrated here to North Beach in 1898

Sincerely,
Rita Pisciotta
San Francisco, CA 94133

From:	justintruong56@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Justin Truong
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 24, 2025 12:00:45 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Justin Truong

From: selizabethvaughan@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Susan Vaughan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 24, 2025 7:40:26 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisor Chan,

San Francisco is already build out. Increasing density will be hard to to without evicting and displacing current tenants and small businesses and demolishing the buildings they already occupy -- including the one that I occupy. Therefore, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes this demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

I am also an environmentalist, and I do not agree that evictions, displacement, and demolition are effective ways to protect the environment.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Susan Vaughan
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: lrb louisbiro.com
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Support for Tenant Protection Amendments in North Beach Family Zoning Plan
Date: Monday, November 24, 2025 8:34:47 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I hope this message finds you well. I am writing to express our strong support for all amendments aimed at protecting tenants within the proposed family zoning plan.

As you consider the upzoning changes, it is crucial to prioritize the needs and rights of the current tenants in our community. North Beach is not just a neighborhood; it is a vibrant community rich in history and diversity. We believe that the amendments designed to safeguard tenant rights will enhance our neighborhood's resilience, ensuring that long-standing residents can continue to call North Beach home.

The proposed family zoning plan offers a promising opportunity for growth and development in our area, but this growth should not come at the expense of our community's residents. It is vital that we create an inclusive environment that respects the contributions of all who live here, particularly those who have built their lives in North Beach over the years.

We appreciate your attention to this matter and urge you to consider our support for these important amendments. Protecting tenants is essential for maintaining the character and culture of our beloved North Beach community.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Louis Biro & Adrienne Biro Petrikovics

546 Filbert Street

San Francisco, CA 94133

From: D M LaPointe
Subject: Re: Family Zoning - continue item
Date: Monday, November 24, 2025 12:00:01 PM
Attachments: Melgar - 11-24-25 response.docx

Dear Supervisor Melgar,

Thank you for responding. Please find attached a response outlining legitimate concerns from your constituents in your reply and requesting additional clarification and information.

Denise

On 2025-11-21 20:24, Melgar, Myrna (BOS) wrote:

> Dear Denise and Members of the West of Twin Peaks Central Council,
>
> Thank you for your letter. Please find my response attached.
>
> The next Committee hearing on the rezoning items will be on Monday, December 1, 2025 at 1:30pm.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> Myrna
>
> ---
>
> **From:** D M LaPointe <president@westoftwinpeaks.org>
> **Sent:** Monday, November 17, 2025 8:32 AM
> **To:** Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>
> **Cc:** Wtpcc Delegates <wtpcc-delegates@googlegroups.com>; Wtpcc Officers <wtpcc-officers@googlegroups.com>; Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>; Segal, Ned (MYR) <ned.segal@sfgov.org>; Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC) <sarah.dennis-phillips@sfgov.org>; Tanner, Rachael (CPC) <rachael.tanner@sfgov.org>; Farrah, Michael (BOS) <michael.farrah@sfgov.org>
> **Subject:** Family Zoning - continue item
>
> This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.
>
> Please find attached a letter of concern from WTPCC on the Family Zoning Plan.
>
> --
> Denise M. LaPointe
> President
> WTPCC

Office of Supervisor Myrna Melgar, District 7
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 260
San Francisco, CA 94102
www.sfbos.org/melgar
Sign up to receive Supervisor Melgar's Newsletter

--
Denise M. LaPointe
President
WTPCC

West of Twin Peaks Central Council

A Resource for Neighborhood Organizations West of Twin Peaks in San Francisco since 1936

PO Box 27112
San Francisco, CA 94127

http://www.westoftwinpeaks.org/

November 24, 2025

Supervisor Myrna Melgar
Chair, Land Use and Transportation Committee

Supervisor Melgar,

Thank you for your response and for outlining your perspective as Chair of Land Use and Transportation on the Family Zoning Plan which was received after the close of business on November 21,2025. I appreciate the time you took to address several of the issues we raised. That said, there remain important points that deserve clarification if we are to maintain a constructive and transparent dialogue on a matter of such significant consequence to District 7 residents.

I do, however, want to better understand one particular line in your letter:

"These goals are not mutually exclusive, but neither should be held hostage by the other."

To be candid, this characterization is troubling. West of Twin Peaks Central Council (WTPCC) has raised substantive, good-faith concerns about the Family Zoning Plan's timing, implications, and state-law compliance to you, the Planning Department and the Mayor's office. Engaged neighborhood advocacy is not "hostage-taking," nor is it an attempt to obstruct the City's legal obligations. It is the core of civic participation - something I know you value. I would appreciate your clarification on why that framing was used and what, specifically, you believe our membership is "holding hostage."

Beyond that, several areas require further explanation if our member organizations are to fully understand the implications of the proposal:

First**,** while we understand the Charter deadlines that govern the General Plan Amendment, the community is seeking assurance that the accelerated timeline does not come at the expense of meaningful public review. The 90-day clock may be fixed, but thoughtful policymaking still requires engagement beyond procedural minimums - particularly on a zoning overhaul that will reshape long-established neighborhoods and our quality of life.

Second**,** you note that the City has been informed that density decontrol cannot be removed under current state compliance expectations. For many residents, this remains the most consequential component of the proposal. If this position is indeed immovable, we ask that your office clearly articulate what alternative adjustments are available to ensure predictability, impact mitigation, and neighborhood-appropriate outcomes across District 7.

Third, your letter references improvements the Board has made to the mayor's original legislation - including tenant protections, small business incentives, and safeguards for landmarks and historic buildings. We ask for a full summary of these amendments prior to December 1, 2025, so our member organizations can accurately understand their scope and effect.

While we recognize the legal framework imposed by state law, constituents expect their supervisor – our representative - to advocate for solutions that both comply with state requirements and reflect local conditions and impacts. West of Twin Peaks homeowners and residents want a zoning plan that achieves housing goals responsibly, without unforeseen consequences for infrastructure, public safety, schools, and neighborhood character. We believe these objectives are not only compatible but essential and achievable.

Our role is to represent the residents who will live with the consequences of these decisions. Your role is to ensure those concerns are fully considered, heard without dismissive language, and integrated into the City's policymaking rather than caricatured.

We remain willing partners in improving San Francisco's housing future. What we ask, respectfully, is that our concerns be met with the same seriousness and responsibility with which we bring them forward. We look forward to your clarification and to a continued dialogue rooted in mutual respect and accountability to the people of District 7.

Sincerely,
Denise LaPointe
President, West of Twin Peaks Central Council

Cc: Mayor Daniel Lurie
Board President, Supervisor Rafael Mandelman
WTPCC Delegates and interested neighbors

From:	Melgar, Myrna (BOS)
To:	D M LaPointe; Carroll, John (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS)
Cc:	Wtpcc Delegates; Wtpcc Officers; Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Segal, Ned (MYR); Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC); Tanner, Rachael (CPC); Farrah, Michael (BOS)
Subject:	Re: Family Zoning - continue item
Date:	Friday, November 21, 2025 5:24:44 PM
Attachments:	Melgar Response to WTPCC - 11.20.2025.pdf

Dear Denise and Members of the West of Twin Peaks Central Council,

Thank you for your letter. Please find my response attached.

The next Committee hearing on the rezoning items will be on Monday, December 1, 2025 at 1:30pm.

Sincerely,

Myrna

From: D M LaPointe <president@westoftwinpeaks.org>
Sent: Monday, November 17, 2025 8:32 AM
To: Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>
Cc: Wtpcc Delegates <wtpcc-delegates@googlegroups.com>; Wtpcc Officers <wtpcc-officers@googlegroups.com>; Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>; Segal, Ned (MYR) <ned.segal@sfgov.org>; Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC) <sarah.dennis-phillips@sfgov.org>; Tanner, Rachael (CPC) <rachael.tanner@sfgov.org>; Farrah, Michael (BOS) <michael.farrah@sfgov.org>
Subject: Family Zoning - continue item

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

Please find attached a letter of concern from WTPCC on the Family Zoning Plan.

--
Denise M. LaPointe
President
WTPCC

Office of Supervisor Myrna Melgar, District 7
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 260
San Francisco, CA 94102
www.sfbos.org/melgar
Sign up to receive Supervisor Melgar's Newsletter

Member, Board of Supervisors
District 7

City and County of San Francisco

MYRNA MELGAR

November 20, 2025

Ms. Denise LaPointe
President
West of Twin Peaks Central Council

RE: Letter Responding to Family Zoning Plan Deadline and State Law

Dear Ms. LaPointe,

I appreciate the time and effort you invested in outlining the concerns of the West of Twin Peaks Central Council. Your commitment to your neighborhoods is evident, and your voice is an important part of this conversation. That said, I need to be equally clear in my response.

The passage of the Family Zoning Plan cannot be delayed. The deadline is dictated by our own City and County Charter. If the Board of Supervisors fails to act within 90 days of receipt of the General Plan Amendment, which is part of the Zoning package, the General Plan Amendment will be deemed approved. It would be irresponsible for the Board to lapse on this timeframe. The vacancy of a member of the Board of Supervisors for District 4 created by the recall of the former District 4 representative can only be addressed by the Mayor, not the Board, but it cannot delay or stop the Board's work. We have a quorum, and the authority and responsibility to carry on our work. Additionally, I can assure you that former Supervisor Engardio did work on this plan extensively until he was recalled.

In addition, as you note in reference to recent communications from the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), extensions are not being considered at this time. The City has been informed that removal of density decontrol is likewise not on the table under current state compliance expectations. We cannot operate under the assumption that delay or rollback is a viable strategy when the state has been explicit about its requirements.

I also recognize and share concerns about SB 79, which is why my office advocated for amendments to ensure that it did not impede our ability to pass a local plan. This exemption is critical and sets the framework moving forward. The Family Zoning Plan, inclusive of density decontrol, would provide the City the ability to submit a compliant alternative plan that exempts the City now and into the future. SB 79 requires that the alternative plan be resubmitted for approval by 2032.

San Francisco must move forward within the legal and regulatory framework we are given. The Board of Supervisors has greatly improved on the Mayor's original legislation: we have added protections for tenants, incorporated incentives for small businesses, larger family-sized units, transparency in the process, protection for landmarks and historic buildings, and made the plan more workable for each district.

I respect the long history and civic stewardship of the West of Twin Peaks neighborhoods. I also believe that San Francisco must grapple honestly with its housing and land use responsibilities. These goals are not mutually exclusive, but neither should be held hostage by the other.

Thank you again for your letter and for your continued engagement.

Sincerely,

Myrna Melgar
Supervisor, District 7
San Francisco Board of Supervisors

City Hall • 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place • Room 244 • San Francisco, California 94102-4689 • (415) 554-6516 Fax
(415) 554-6546 • TDD/TTY (415) 554-5227 • E-mail: Myrna.Melgar@sfgov.org

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); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations; BOS Legislation, (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject:	4 Letters regarding Zoning
Date:	Friday, November 21, 2025 11:39:18 AM
Attachments:	4 Letters regarding Zoning.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached for 4 letters regarding Zoning.

File No. 250966: General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 250700: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan (Mayor, Sauter, Mahmood, Dorsey)

File No. 250701: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan (Mayor)

File No. 251072: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan (Mayor)

Sincerely,

Joe Adkins
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From:	Deanb182@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Dean Badessa
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Thursday, November 20, 2025 3:55:56 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Dean Badessa
San Francisco, CA 94109

From:	carobikam@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Robert Heisler
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Wednesday, November 19, 2025 8:24:20 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

The Land Use Committee, on a vote of 2-1, has blocked Supervisor Chan's amendments and its Chair declined to invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Committee must advance these compliant amendments for the protection of sound housing, historic resources, and our coastline to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparent and accountable planning, not obvious trained obedience to the developer syndicate.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Robert Heisler

From:	debhowj@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Debra Leifer
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Wednesday, November 19, 2025 2:06:47 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I voted for Mayor Lurie and I am in favor of housing development. However, as both a long time resident of San Francisco, and someone who had a career of over 40 years in the architecture and design industry, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's current upzoning plan. To begin with - the proposed 8 story, 526 unit development over Safeway in my Outer Richmond neighborhood is totally out of scale with the neighborhood where the adjacent condo complexes are all just 3 stories high. Why not start building this 8 story, 526 unit at the abandoned Car wash site on Divisadero Street, which was slated for housing? Or, how about building these units at the Coronet Theatre and / or the Alexandria Theatre on Geary Blvd, both closed over 20 years ago and awaiting redevelopment? How about Park Merced where 4 towers were supposed to be built for additional housing?

It appears that Mayor Lurie's current upzoning plan incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displaces renters and small businesses, and transforms our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors. Therefore, we call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Debra Leifer
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: Bob Fitch
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: demolition of rent controlled housing
Date: Wednesday, November 19, 2025 9:27:24 AM

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

Any Supervisor who votes for an "up zoning plan" that includes demolition of existing housing will face a recall. period.

Bob Fitch
North Beach

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); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations; BOS Legislation, (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject:	43 Letters regarding Zoning
Date:	Wednesday, November 19, 2025 12:10:50 PM
Attachments:	43 Letters regarding Zoning.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached for 43 letters regarding Zoning.

File No. 250966: General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 250700: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan (Mayor, Sauter, Mahmood, Dorsey)

File No. 251071: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan (Mayor, Sauter, Mahmood, Dorsey)

File No. 250701: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan (Mayor)

File No. 251073: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations, Administrative Codes - Family Zoning Plan (Mayor)

File No. 251072: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan (Mayor)

Sincerely,

Joe Adkins
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From:	mel.e.simp@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Melinda Simpson
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 1:31:06 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We’re hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won’t invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Sincerely,
Melinda Simpson
San Francisco, CA 94127

From:	mary.lipian@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mary Lipian
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 1:30:27 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am a long time resident in District 3 having lived there since 1997. This is the most highly concentrated area in the entire city and I'm concerned that the best interests of the residents are not being taken into account? How can that be?

North Beach and Telegraph Hill are magical and full of character. This is the Barbary Coast. Why would we want to change what is working so well? The 40 foot height limit needs to be protected to ensure this character.

I heard that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

I feel strongly that the Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Mary Lipian
San Francisco, CA 94133

From:	mpegdietz@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Margaret Dietz
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 1:25:01 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan and renter in District 3, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing AFFORDABLE rent-controlled buildings, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable (and therefore vacant) luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps - JUST DO THE MINIMUM TO MEET STATE MANDATES FOR NOW!
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Limit new construction to 6 stories.
Save the Coastal Zone from this.
City land must be used only if the housing is 100% AFFORDABLE.
Do not densify so-called "transit corridors" until Muni can handle it. The 38 GEARY is already too crowded and unpleasant to ride, forcing people back into their cars.
The Mayor's Plan is TOO EXTREME and not focused on Affordability.

Sincerely,
Margaret Dietz
San Francisco, CA 94109

From:	shopdicke@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Leslie Dicke
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 1:05:03 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

I'm a fourth generation San Franciscan who cares deeply about our city growing in a thoughtful and intelligent way that preserves character, enhances affordability and supports small business.

Sincerely,
Leslie Dicke
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: cutelynx@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Qi Wolf
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 1:01:47 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Qi Wolf
San Francisco, CA 94123

From:	cutelynx@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Qi Wolf
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 1:01:18 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Qi Wolf
San Francisco, CA 94123

From:	paulagiants@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Paula Katz
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 12:36:21 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

My name is Paula Katz and I am a decades-long District 4 homeowner and resident without a supervisor to represent me and the rest of District 4. We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

It's critical that the Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands. These amendments are important, and SF residents should know how each of their representatives stand on these critical amendments. Hopefully by that time we'll have a new D4 supervisor, and we'll want to know how she/he stands on both of these amendments, which I and many other D4 residents support.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance. This is useful information for all supervisors, as they will not have studied the Mayor's proposals as closely as the Land Use Committee has. And the HD's information will be critical for helping to educate our new supervisor and bringing them up to speed on this issue.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Sincerely,
Paula Katz
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: ms.pedroni@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lilianna Pedroni
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 12:28:25 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Lilianna Pedroni
San Francisco, CA 94133

From:	ms.pedroni@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lilianna Pedroni
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 12:27:56 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Sincerely,
Lilianna Pedroni
San Francisco, CA 94133

From:	sf.lorna@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lorna Walker
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 12:22:33 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We’re hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won’t invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Sincerely,
Lorna Walker
San Francisco, CA 94115

From:	joanneshanahan135@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of joanne shanahan
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 12:17:43 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

I am a 4th generation San Franciscan and was appalled when I heard that! You need to hear from all of us especially those that live in the affected areas. I realize the need for housing but what works for one neighborhood does not work for another. Please listen to us!

Sincerely,
joanne shanahan
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: rkinsf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Richard Kay
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 12:16:20 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

I honestly don't think that there's enough information available to the average San Franciscan. I can't tell by looking at maps, what my neighborhood will become. Please do more outreach! I haven't heard anything from my supervisor. thank you.

Sincerely,
Richard Kay
San Francisco, CA 94117

From:	awawd@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Ansel Wettersten
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 12:15:48 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We’re hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won’t invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Ansel Wettersten
San Francisco, CA 94109

From:	naplisa123@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Ann Napoli
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 12:12:37 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Sincerely,
Ann Napoli
San Francisco, CA 94127

From:	johngarrity@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Garrity
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 12:12:26 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
John Garrity
San Francisco, CA 94127

From:	familyadler@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of B Adler
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 12:10:10 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

My neighbors in the Sunset District are shocked to hear this lack of response and transparency!

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

We expect much better from our government.

Sincerely,
B Adler

From: shop@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of beth weissman
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 12:05:51 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
beth weissman
San Francisco, CA 94115

From: ademas1@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Anita Demas
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 12:05:44 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

This upzoning is causing clear and deserved outrage. The fact that there are attempts to circumvent and silence the voices of constituents is unacceptable. This is clearly an ill-thought out and devastatingly impactful plan. As a 35+ year resident, I am disgusted and disappointed that the beauty of SF is at stake and that lawmakers are pandering to developers and others. I vote and your choices will be noted.

Dr. Anita Demas

Sincerely,
Anita Demas
San Francisco, CA 94118

From:	jamiespiral55@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of J Sheldon
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 12:01:59 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisor Connie Chan,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments: I was born in San Francisco over 70 years ago, and have lived in District 1 for nearly 27 years. I urge you to not let Supervisor Melgar to block your and Chen's amendments ASAP.

Sincerely,
J Sheldon

From:	marycmcf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mary McFadden
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 11:43:38 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Prohibiting public opinion is the opposite of representing one's constituents. To forbid oversight & prevent citizens from determining the shape of the city we built, we live in, & we maintain is anti-democratic and the opposite of what supervisors are elected to do. Melgar needs to be reminded that her job is to represent constituents, not special interests, developers, or her own ambitions.

Sincerely,
Mary McFadden
San Francisco, CA 94115

From:	amy7w2m@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Amy Meyer
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 11:33:46 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I live in Lincoln Manor on Clement Street.

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

I am very concerned that full information come before the public at this meeting, in order to understand the full effects of the legislation.

Sincerely,
Amy Meyer
San Francisco, CA 94121

From:	wrthoma@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Walter Thoma
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 11:33:37 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We’re hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won’t invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

I have noticed an large increase in new multi-story housing complexes in my Excelsior neighborhood yet the infrastructure remains unchanged resulting in further congestion, poor law enforcement (we don't even have a police station) and lack of parking for residents and businesses. It's also unclear how many units are for lower income, elderly and working class San Franciscans. I personally believe that without analyzing the impact of increased housing on traffic, safety, public transit and quality of life issues, San Francisco will become an unlivable city for most outside of the wealthy class.

Sincerely,
Walter Thoma
San Francisco, CA 94112

From:	Paul Conroy
To:	Melgar, Myrna (BOS)
Cc:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); Lurie, Daniel (MYR)
Subject:	"Family Zoning Plan"
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 1:37:18 PM
Attachments:	To Supervisor Melgar re Family Zoning Plan.pdf

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

Dear Supervisor Melgar,
Ingleside Terraces Homes Association, representing your constituents and neighbors in Ingleside Terraces, again asks that you take steps to protect our neighborhood from the damage that will be inflicted by adoption of the "Family Zoning Plan" in its present form. This appeal follows on our August 29, 2025 letter to the mayor which we copied to you, setting forth a multitude of reasons why this unnecessary and destructive plan should be rejected. Our members have also provided public comment before your committee, expressing our strong concerns about this plan.

We reiterate those reasons, and further request that, if this plan is to be adopted, at a minimum: the amendments proposed to prevent demolition of sound housing and historic resources be adopted; density decontrol be removed; setbacks, height transitions and massing rules be preserved; forty-foot height limits be preserved for commercial corridors adjoining low scale residences; and historic resources, including category "A" structures, be preserved.

We also request that your committee postpone final consideration of this plan until our neighbors, the residents of District 4, have a new supervisor in place to represent their interests. We believe that every district should be represented by its own supervisor to advance the interests of that district's constituency. Certainly, the purpose of district elections is for communities within each district to be truly represented by a supervisor who has the best interests of their constituents at heart.

Very truly yours,
Paul Conroy, President
Ingleside Terraces Homes Association

Cc: Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Mayor Lurie
Ingleside Terraces Homes Association (ITHA) Board of Directors
All Ingleside Terraces residents via Email and ITHA Website
West of Twin Peaks Central Council

Neighborhoods United SF

Paul Conroy, President
Ingleside Terraces Homes Association
www.ithasf.org

Ingleside Terraces Homes Association

P.O. Box 27304 ● San Francisco, California 94127

November 17, 2025

The Honorable Myrna Melgar, Chair
Land Use and Transportation Committee
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Via email

Re: "Family Zoning Plan"

Dear Supervisor Melgar,

Ingleside Terraces Homes Association, representing your constituents and neighbors in Ingleside Terraces, again asks that you take steps to protect our neighborhood from the damage that will be inflicted by adoption of the "Family Zoning Plan" in its present form. This appeal follows on our August 29, 2025 letter to the mayor which we copied to you, setting forth a multitude of reasons why this unnecessary and destructive plan should be rejected. Our members have also provided public comment before your committee, expressing our strong concerns about this plan.

We reiterate those reasons, and further request that, if this plan is to be adopted, at a minimum: the amendments proposed to prevent demolition of sound housing and historic resources be adopted; density decontrol be removed; setbacks, height transitions and massing rules be preserved; forty-foot height limits be preserved for commercial corridors adjoining low scale residences; and historic resources, including category "A" structures, be preserved.

We also request that your committee postpone final consideration of this plan until our neighbors, the residents of District 4, have a new supervisor in place to represent their interests. We believe that every district should be represented by its own supervisor to advance the interests of that district's constituency. Certainly, the purpose of district elections is for communities within each district to be truly represented by a supervisor who has the best interests of their constituents at heart.

Very truly yours,

Paul Conroy, President
Ingleside Terraces Homes Association

Cc: Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Ingleside Terraces Homes Association (ITHA) Board of Directors
All Ingleside Terraces residents via Email and ITHA Website
West of Twin Peaks Central Council
Neighborhoods United SF

From:	robert.stern47@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Robert Stern
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 2:45:13 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:
I also wanted to note that I'm a Sunset District resident, and these issues directly affect my neighborhood and my ability to remain in my home.

Sincerely,
Robert Stern
San Francisco, CA 94122

From:	ajsmith@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Artemis Smith
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 2:44:53 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:
I also wanted to note that I'm a Sunset District resident, and these issues directly affect my neighborhood and my ability to remain in my home.

Sincerely,
Artemis Smith
San Francisco, CA 94122

From:	soaring_leap@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lauren Meredith
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 2:38:30 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments: Upzoning should be about affordable housing and little else. And squeezing out public input on such a massively important issue is wildly unfair. Let Chan and Chen's amendments advance!

Sincerely,
Lauren Meredith
San Francisco, CA 94121

From:	antispila@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Candace Low
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 2:35:53 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Candace Low
San Francisco, CA 94122

From:	sf_district6@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Michael Nulty
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 2:24:31 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees. Zoning can be done in phases and not all at once, for some reason the politicians are giving away the keys to the city!

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Michael Nulty
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: carolkellyclark@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Carol Clark
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 2:23:20 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am a resident in the West Portal area.
I reject any idea of buildings more 4 stories.
It is unnecessary to have huge high rise buildings in residential areas.
High rises belong downtown.

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's up zoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required.
This is not planning.

Sincerely,
Carol Clark
San Francisco, CA 94127

From:	kielygomes@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Karen Schwartz
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 2:19:32 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Karen Schwartz
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: clarable@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Claire Mills
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 1:43:04 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Our city is our city and we all should be a part of this public process!

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountability.

Sincerely,
Claire Mills
San Francisco, CA 94123

From:	Devon Bolla
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	Ryan Patterson; Ephraim Margolin; Sonja Trauss
Subject:	Proposed Family Zoning Plan and Housing Element Implementation: File Nos. 250700, 250701, 251071, 251073, 250985, and 250966
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 2:44:12 PM
Attachments:	2025.11.17 Ltr re SF Family Zoning Plan - RJP.pdf

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

Good afternoon,

Attached for your review is a memo regarding a proposed family zoning plan and housing element implementation.

Thank you,

Devon J. Bolla
(she/her)
Paralegal
Patterson & O'Neill, PC
Office: (415) 907-9110
Direct: (415) 907-7703
Fax: (415) 907-7704
235 Montgomery Street, Suite 950
San Francisco, CA 94104
devon@pattersononeill.com
www.pattersononeill.com

This email may contain privileged or confidential material for the sole use of the intended recipient. Review or distribution by others is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the original sender and delete all copies. Nothing in this email or any attachments should be regarded as tax advice unless expressly stated.

From:	Ryan Patterson
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	Ephraim Margolin; Sonja Trauss; Devon Bolla
Subject:	RE: Proposed Family Zoning Plan and Housing Element Implementation: File Nos. 250700, 250701, 251071, 251073, 250985, and 250966
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 2:58:40 PM
Attachments:	2025.11.17 Ltr re SF Family Zoning Plan - RJP.pdf

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

Further to the below email, can you please kindly add the attachment to the above-captioned files?

Thank you very much,

Ryan J. Patterson
Patterson & O'Neill, PC
Main: (415) 907-9110
Direct: (415) 907-7701
Mobile: (530) 913-7609
Fax: (415) 907-7704
235 Montgomery Street, Suite 950
San Francisco, CA 94104
ryan@pattersononeill.com
www.pattersononeill.com

This email may contain privileged or confidential material for the sole use of the intended recipient. Review or distribution by others is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the original sender and delete all copies. Nothing in this email or any attachments should be regarded as tax advice unless expressly stated.

From: Devon Bolla <devon@pattersononeill.com>
Sent: Monday, November 17, 2025 2:43 PM
To: john.carroll@sfgov.org; Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
Cc: Ryan Patterson <ryan@pattersononeill.com>; Ephraim Margolin <emargolin@pattersononeill.com>; Sonja Trauss <sonja@yimbylaw.org>
Subject: Proposed Family Zoning Plan and Housing Element Implementation: File Nos. 250700, 250701, 251071, 251073, 250985, and 250966

Good afternoon,

Attached for your review is a memo regarding a proposed family zoning plan and housing

element implementation.

Thank you,

Devon J. Bolla
(she/her)
Paralegal
Patterson & O'Neill, PC
Office: (415) 907-9110
Direct: (415) 907-7703
Fax: (415) 907-7704
235 Montgomery Street, Suite 950
San Francisco, CA 94104
devon@pattersononeill.com
www.pattersononeill.com

This email may contain privileged or confidential material for the sole use of the intended recipient. Review or distribution by others is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the original sender and delete all copies. Nothing in this email or any attachments should be regarded as tax advice unless expressly stated.

PATTERSON & O'NEILL, PC

235 Montgomery Street, Suite 950
San Francisco, CA 94104
Telephone: (415) 907-9110
Facsimile: (415) 907-7704

November 17, 2025

VIA EMAIL

Chair Myrna Melgar
Land Use and Transportation Committee
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
49 South Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94103
john.carroll@sfgov.org
Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Proposed Family Zoning Plan and Housing Element Implementation
File Nos. 250700, 250701, 251071, 251073, 250985, and 250966

Dear Chair Melgar and Honorable Supervisors:

Our office represents Yes In My Back Yard ("YIMBY Law"), a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization whose mission is to enforce state housing laws. We write to share our concerns regarding San Francisco's proposed Family Zoning Plan ("FZP"). Our comments incorporate the comments of YIMBY Action and its members, including the attached letters dated September 11, 2025 and October 29, 2025.

I. The City Will Violate the Housing Element Law if it Adopts the FZP Knowing that it Will Not Produce the Required Housing Units

The City's 6th cycle housing element noted that the City was unable to identify enough sites to accommodate the number of units for lower- and moderate-income households, including a 15% buffer, that it was assigned to plan for during its 6th cycle ("RHNA Shortfall"). The Department of Housing and Community Development, therefore, directed the City to include a program in its housing element identifying sites for rezoning to accommodate these units as mandated by the Housing Element Law. (Gov. Code § 65584.09(a)-(b); Gov. Code § 65583(c)(1); *Martinez v. City of Clovis* (2023) 90 Cal. App. 5th 193, 225.) However, the City's proposed rezoning program—Program 7.1.1— and the FZP, which implements Program 7.1.1, are inadequate because (1) the City's own analysis found that the FZP will not create enough units for the City to meet its RHNA Shortfall; (2) the FZP will not create sufficient capacity because it relies on density decontrol in residential neighborhoods without corresponding changes in development standards; and (3) the FZP's local alternative to the state Density Bonus Law will not increase

density because it is duplicative of existing capacity under the state Density Bonus Law.

A. The Chief Economist's Report Confirms that the FZP Will Not Create Enough Units for the City to Meet its RHNA Shortfall

On October 29, 2025, the City's Chief Economist published a report, which found that the FZP will produce **less than half** the number of housing units that the City is required to plan for to meet its RHNA Shortfall – in more than double the time allowed. The report concluded that in a best-case scenario, the FZP would only produce around 14,600 additional units over the next 20 years, representing just 40% of the 36,282 units the City is required to plan for over the next eight years. Under a low-growth scenario, the FZP would only produce 8,504 units over 20 years. Either scenario is inadequate and would be a spectacular failure of the City to comply with the Housing Element Law, which requires local governments to plan to meet their RHNA shortfall through rezoning programs. (Gov. Code § 65583(c)(1) and Gov. Code § 65583.2(h).)

B. The FZP Will Not Create Sufficient Capacity Because it Relies on Density Decontrol in Single-Family Neighborhoods But Does Not Create Room for Additional Density

The FZP uses form-based zoning without corresponding changes in development standards in single-family neighborhoods, which means developers cannot build in these areas. Therefore, the FZP does not actually increase capacity in these neighborhoods.

The FZP uses form-based zoning (also called density decontrol), which regulates the allowed density on a site by setting limits on height, bulk, setbacks, and other features (rather than setting numerical density limits). And while the City claims that the change from the existing numerical density limits to form-based zoning will produce additional units, its refusal to ease the existing limitations on height, bulk, and other standards that limit the buildable envelope for construction in these neighborhoods means there is no actual capacity to build additional units. For example, a lot with an existing single-family home that occupies most or all of the buildable area is unlikely to be redeveloped into multifamily housing because without easing height limits, setbacks, parking minimums, and the like, there will be no place to build the additional units.

The FZP promises to increase density, but its use of form-based density without easing height limits, setbacks, parking minimums, and other development standards will prevent building in the City's highest-resourced neighborhoods.

C. The FZP's Alternative to the State Density Bonus Law Does Not Add Sufficient Density

The City contends that its local alternative to the state Density Bonus Law will create additional capacity for housing production, and it relies on that claim to meet its RHNA shortfall. However, almost all of the capacity that the City is relying on is already available for housing production through the state Density Bonus Law, so the City's local alternative is duplicative of existing capacity under the state Density Bonus Law.

The state Density Bonus Law requires local agencies to grant density bonuses under the state law to qualifying projects. (Gov. Code § 65915(a)(1)-(b).)

The FZP would give applicants a local alternative to the state Density Bonus Law called Housing Choice-San Francisco ("HCSF"). Crucially, HCSF does not offer any increase in density beyond what is offered by the state Density Bonus Law in most locations. Moreover, when both the state Density Bonus Law and HCSF are available, applicants can only avail themselves of one.

The state Density Bonus Law is intended as a bonus on *top* of local rules. (Gov. Code § 65915(u)(1).) But the HCSF offers no increase in density beyond what developers are already entitled to under the state Density Bonus Law when a project is eligible for both. Therefore, the HCSF does not create the additional capacity required by the Housing Element Law.

II. The City Fails to Use the Required "Analytical Model" to Determine the Likelihood of Site Development

The FZP fails to use the "analytical model" required by the City's housing element. When a city includes a program in its housing element, the Housing Element Law makes it mandatory to implement the features of those programs. (Gov. Code § 65581(b); Gov. Code § 65583(c)(1); *Hoffmaster v. City of San Diego* (1997) 55 Cal.App.4th 1098.)

Program 7.1.1 of the City's housing element commits the City to implementing a rezoning program that "reasonably account[s] for sites' likelihood of development during the planning period using an analytical model." In addition to the Housing Element Law, which makes it mandatory for the City to use an "analytical model," the City's housing element uses mandatory language, stating that the City "shall" build its rezoning program around such a "probability-of-development" analysis. The FZP, however, fails to use an "analytical model," in violation of the housing element. Instead, the FZP uses three alternative methods to estimate how many housing units the FZP will produce, none of which meets the requirements of Program 7.1.1.

First, the City proposes using a "soft sites" method, which assumes that a site that is already developed with a residential use has a two percent probability of being redeveloped with the FZP's planned residential capacity, and a site that is already developed with a non-residential use has a seventy percent probability of redevelopment with a residential use. This assumption is just that, and not an analytical model. Such rigid calculations based on uniform, citywide assumptions about the odds of development on thousands of very different sites are not an "analytical model" and do not "reasonably account for sites' likelihood of development" as required by Program 7.1.1.

Second, the City assesses the likelihood of a given site being developed under the rezoning proposal using a model that evaluates whether new housing is financially feasible at a given site. The model assumes that two percent of sites currently occupied by residential uses and thirty-five percent of other sites will be redeveloped with economically feasible new housing developments. Again, this is not an "analytical model" that "reasonably account[s] for sites' likelihood of development" as required by Program 7.1.1 because its assumptions are not grounded in historical development standards in San Francisco, and its focus on financial feasibility is a distinct concept from focusing on "the probability of development." It may be financially feasible for a property to be redeveloped, but that same property can have a low likelihood of being redeveloped for a variety of reasons, especially for single-family homes that play a big role in the FZP, and which already contain high-value structures or the property owner faces financial constraints, lack of development experience, or the need to use the property for their own housing. Moreover, even if this method were accurate, it projects only 19,000 new units of housing over the planning period – far below the requirement of 36,282 new units.

The third model that the City relies on involves examining the rate at which units across the City were approved using historical data from 2005-2023 and multiplying that by the theoretical capacity of the sites. This model does not qualify as an "analytical model" because it ignores the fact that much of the development in the City in recent years has taken place on vacant sites or extremely underutilized land. In fact, around 25% of sites that were redeveloped from 2005-2023 had residential uses before redevelopment, while around 84% of sites under the FZP have residential uses. Non-vacant sites already containing residential uses are 70% less likely to be redeveloped according to the City's own analysis, and the FZP errs in assuming that non-vacant and vacant sites will be redeveloped at the same rate. (*See* Housing Element, Appendix B.2, Figure 2.) Since the FZP mostly contains parcels with residential uses, unlike past development, this approach of extrapolating from past development does not correspond to future development predictions.

The areas where housing would be built under the FZP already contain high-value structures, such as single-family homes, where the owners are unlikely or unable to redevelop the site as multi-family housing due to financial constraints, lack of development experience, and the need to use their properties for their own housing.

These areas will have much lower rates of redevelopment, which this model does not take into account. Moreover, this model has unrealistically low estimates of the City's residential zoning capacity in prior years (thus inflating the share of residential zoned capacity that has been built out) and the inclusion of residential projects built under development agreements, which do not correspond to rezonings, and which were separately counted towards the City's pre-existing residential zoned capacity in the housing element. These two reasons disqualify this model from being an "analytical model."

Additionally, the FZP does not create sufficient capacity because it assumes certain large pipeline projects will actually be constructed within the planning period, when in reality such development is exceedingly unlikely – if not impossible. For the Hunters Point/Candlestick project, approximately 3,500 units are located on Navy-owned parcels. The City will not even obtain control of these parcels until the Navy finishes remediation, which is estimated to take at least 11 more years. ("The Navy has recently informed OCII that completion of remediation and conveyance of all portions of the Shipyard Site, excluding Parcel F, to Developer will occur between 2036-2038 . . . ." (Resolution No. 26-2024, available at https://sfocii.org/sites/default/files/2024-08/5.%20RESO%2026-2024_HPS%20Approval%20of%20Amendments%20to%20Redevelopment%20Plan.pdf; *see also* https://www.sfchronicle.com/sf/article/hunters-point-shipyard-radioactive-materials-21129542.php.) Similarly, Treasure Island's phasing includes a maximum of 4,600 units completed before 2031, but the City is counting all 8,000 units toward the pipeline. (*See* https://media.api.sf.gov/documents/Ex._JJ_-_SOP.pdf; Treasure Island Sub-Phase Application 3, Schedule of Performance, Exh. JJ, Appendix B, https://media.api.sf.gov/documents/TI_Sub-Phase_Application_3_Book-Revision_1_-_reduced.pdf.)

Since none of the three models that the City considers qualifies as a reasonable "analytical model," the City is violating its legally binding commitment under Program 7.1.1.

III. The FZP Adds New Constraints On Housing Production and Fails to Analyze the Impact of These Constraints

The FZP adds new constraints on housing development, which were not analyzed in its housing element, in violation of the Housing Element Law and Senate Bill ("SB") 330.

A. The FZP's New Constraints Violate the Housing Element Law

The FZP adds new constraints on housing production, which it fails to analyze as required by the Housing Element Law. When considering rezoning plans, the Housing Element Law requires local governments to analyze new governmental constraints on housing production. (Gov. Code § 65583(a)(5); *see also Californians*

for Homeownership, Inc. v. City of Beverly Hills (2023) Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCP00143, at p. 6, [finding planned rezonings for housing element site inventory must analyze new constraints].)

The FZP adds new constraints on development that were not analyzed by the City's housing element, including caps on dwelling unit size, limits on curb cuts, lower parking maximums, and limits imposed by the City's local alternative to the state Density Bonus Law. As explained above, the FZP imposes new constraints because it deprives applicants of the ability to use the state Density Bonus Law in conjunction with the City's local alternative to the state Density Bonus Law, which reduces the number of units the FZP will produce. Other constraints reduce physical development capacity, e.g., caps on dwelling unit size that cannot accommodate larger families, and reduce the economic feasibility of developing housing. The FZP does *not* analyze the impact of these policies on housing production. The FZP, therefore, violates the Housing Element Law's requirement that local governments analyze new governmental constraints on housing production if they were not analyzed in a housing element. (Gov. Code § 65583(a)(5).)

B. The FZP's New Constraints Violate SB 330's Prohibition Against Rezonings Which Decrease Housing Intensity

The FZP's new constraints on housing violate SB 330's prohibition against rezonings which "lessen the intensity of housing." (Gov. Code § 66300(b)(1)(A).)

SB 330—also known as the Housing Crisis Act—prohibits local governments from enacting a development policy, standard, or condition that would "Chang[e] the general plan land use designation, specific plan land use designation, or zoning of a parcel or parcels of property to a less intensive use or reduc[e] the intensity of land use within an existing general plan land use designation, specific plan land use designation, or zoning district below what was allowed under the land use designation and zoning ordinances of the affected county or affected city, as applicable, as in effect on January 1, 2018[.]" (*Id.*) SB 330 defines "less intensive use" as including situations where a local government imposes reductions to the height, density, or floor area ratio, new or increased open space or lot size requirements, new or increased setback requirements, minimum frontage requirements, maximum lot coverage limitations, or "*any other action that would individually or cumulatively reduce [a] site's residential development capacity*." (*Id.*; emph. added.)

As mentioned above, the FZP contains new constraints on housing, including caps on dwelling unit size, limits on curb cuts, and lower parking maximums, reduces the number of units the FZP will produce. These new constraints run afoul of SB 330 because they reduce the size of units that applicants are able to construct, which physically reduces the intensity of residential use and reduces the financial viability of residential construction. The City has also conducted no analysis to show

that there will be a concurrent increase in intensity of land use to offset the decrease in intensity of land use caused by the FZP. (Gov. Code § 66300(h).)

IV. The FZP Violates the Housing Element Law By Relying on an Overlay for Nonvacant Sites Where Development of Nonresidential Uses Is Permitted

The FZP violates the recent decision in *New Commune v. City of Redondo Beach et al.* (2025) 337 Cal.Rptr.3d 782 that overlays cannot be used to meet minimum density requirements required by rezoning programs if they permit developers to redevelop sites for non-residential uses.

As explained above, when a local government cannot accommodate its RHNA Shortfall for lower-income households with a site inventory, it has to include a rezoning program in its housing element. The Housing Element Law also requires jurisdictions that must develop rezoning programs to ensure that at least 50% of the lower income housing the agency must plan for is "accommodated on sites designated for residential use and for which nonresidential uses or mixed uses are not permitted." (Gov. Code § 65583.2(h)(2).) As the City acknowledges in Program 7.1.1, it is subject to this statutory minimum density requirement.

In *New Commune*, the court ruled that residential "overlays are unlawful when they allow development below the statutory minimum density [required by Gov. Cod § 65583.2(h)(2)]." (*Id*. at 797.) The court in *New Commune* also noted that residential overlays are unlawful whether they are overlaid over a base zoning that permits residential or industrial and commercial uses. (*Id*.)

The FZP runs afoul of the *New Commune* decision and the Housing Element Law's minimum density requirement because it still permits nonresidential redevelopment of sites. The FZP is an overlay because it does not change the base zoning of properties, but is instead overlaid over existing zones, including non-residential zones. For instance, for properties subject to the FZP developers can still use the underlying C-2 and C-3 zoning to construct commercial structures, which would be below the statutory minimum density because no residential units would be constructed. By permitting developers to build nonresidential projects within the overlay, the FZP violates the Housing Element Law as explained by the court in *New Commune*.

V. The FZP Violates the Prohibition against Jurisdictions Forcing Applicants to Waive Their Right to Use the State Density Bonus Law

The FZP primarily relies on a local alternative to the state Density Bonus Law, which developers can only use if they waive their right to use the state Density Bonus Law. This is a violation of the state Density Bonus Law.

Local agencies are prohibited from adopting ordinances that conflict with the state Density Bonus Law or using their local alternative to impose development requirements that are more restrictive than the state Density Bonus Law. (*Schreiber v. City of Los Angeles* (2021) 69 Cal.App.5th 549.) The court in *Schreiber* made it clear that applicants have the right to use the state Density Bonus Law regardless of any local provisions, and that cities cannot deny, limit, or condition the use of the state Density Bonus Law by requiring an applicant to instead use a local alternative.

The FZP creates a local alternative to the state Density Bonus law called Housing Choice-San Francisco ("HCSF"). HCSF—proposed Planning Code Section 206.10(b)(5)—has only one criterion: that applicants agree to "not receive any density or development bonuses or relief from applicable Planning Code standards in any other State or local law or program[.]" HCSF violates the state Density Bonus Law's prohibition that local agencies cannot bar an applicant from using the state Density Bonus Law, regardless of any local provisions. The FZP illegally forces applicants to choose between the state Density Bonus Law and HCSF, which violates the rule that "an otherwise valid local ordinance that conflicts with the state Density Bonus Law is preempted." (*Latinos Unidos Del Valle De Napa Y Solano v. County of Napa* (2013) 217 Cal.App.4th 1160, 1169.) The City must amend the FZP so that the state Density Bonus Law can be used on *top* of the HCSF, which has the potential to create meaningful housing production.

VI. Conclusion

We urge the City to comply with the law and remedy the deficiencies in its rezoning plan. If the City fails to significantly increase its proposed residential capacity, there will be no realistic chance of meeting its RHNA obligations. YIMBY Law is prepared to take legal action to hold the City accountable for these clear violations of state housing law.

PATTERSON & O'NEILL, PC



Ryan J. Patterson
General Counsel for Yes In My Back Yard

CC CA Department of Housing and Community Development
Mayor Daniel Lurie

Encl. September 11, 2025 Letter from Yes In My Back Yard
October 29, 2025 Letter from Yes In My Back Yard
October 29, 2025 Report from the Chief Economist of San Francisco

EXHIBIT A

YIMBY Law

2261 Market Street STE 10416
San Francisco, CA 94114
hello@yimbylaw.org

YIMBY LAW

9/11/2025

San Francisco Planning Commission
400, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

(via email) commissions.secretary@sfgov.org

Re: San Francisco's Draft Housing Rezoning Program and Compliance with State Law

Dear Commissioners,

YIMBY Law is a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization dedicated to ensuring compliance with California's housing laws. We write today to express significant concerns regarding the City's proposed Housing Element Rezoning Program and the accompanying "Housing Choice–San Francisco" local bonus ordinance.

Summary

While the rezoning plan, including the local program, is a good step forward for housing in San Francisco, we are concerned that the plan does not actually fulfill what it promises to do. The city has produced no publicly available reports that show how the plan will be more capable of delivering the housing San Franciscans desperately need than what state laws already allow. While we support density decontrol, we do not believe the city has shown that the handful of incentives that are coupled with it will be enough to produce any more housing than state laws such as the Density Bonus Law already do.

Capacity Projections

San Francisco's Housing Element made a binding commitment to meet its Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) through a rezoning program rooted in a probabilistic analytical model Program 7.1.1. San Francisco did not base its rezoning on a site's inventory, but on the projected housing based on that model. The targets and assumptions it sets are enforced by Program 8.1.5. If San Francisco does not produce sufficient units, Program 8.1.5. applies additional upzoning requirements.

Despite the City's commitments to specific unit production, applying the city's own model used to determine the shortfall on the rezone sites, we can determine that the map would produce around 17k homes by 2031, or 47% of the 36k units promised by Program 7.1.1. That regression analysis was built on different logic than the Housing Element's existing capacity analysis. While the proposal does not clearly make up for the RHNA shortfall, its usefulness is difficult to gauge when it functions by different logic than the original rezoning analysis. In order to be comprehensible, realistic, and enforceable, San Francisco must produce a "realistic capacity" table for the rezoned sites that incorporates the Housing Element' regression analysis.

We understand that the City has conducted its own analysis that disputes these figures, but the methodology and details of this analysis have not been made publicly available; therefore we remain concerned and skeptical about the efficacy of the rezoning program in meeting the city's needed housing requirements under housing element law.

Compliance with State Law

San Francisco's rezoning program would institute a local density bonus program that, theoretically, according to the city's assertions (which are not supported by any publicly available information), would accommodate the City's RHNA shortfall. The practical and legal realities according to our analysis suggest that it would fail to produce housing at the suggested rates, and fail to meet statutory requirements.

The latest staff report associated with the September 11 Planning Commission hearing notes that 77% of parcels in the rezoning plan fall into the form based zoning code and will not have their heights increased, while for "the vast majority of residential sites, these changes are only available for projects opting into the local program."

Some proposed areas not eligible for the state bonus would benefit from San Francisco's local program. However, this local program would be exclusive to California's state density bonus law in all areas where both options are available. Whether or not the local program is superior to state incentives, the one cannot replace the other. State density bonus law is intended as a bonus on top of local rules, and should not be supplanted when it generally offers superior development potential.

San Francisco's density decontrol is generally less feasible than the state program. While we applaud the city for applying a local density bonus program to projects between 2-4 units, which are not otherwise eligible for the state density bonus, as well as allowing alternatives to providing on-site affordable units, such as off-site developments, for the vast majority of the city's proposed "rezoning" program, state density bonus law offers a superior alternative: unlimited waivers from local zoning and development standards,

providing limited discretion for local review. Comparatively, the local program is far more stringent. It contains strict rules about building size, setbacks, open space, dwelling unit exposure, and parking allowances. It contains only a 15% reduction of other development standards. The proposal would allow for greater than 15% reductions if approved by a discretionary process. Even if that expensive, time consuming process doesn't result in universal denials, it renders the project not code compliant, forcing the developer to lose protections under the Housing Accountability Act.

While we support the majority of the proposed staff changes made to the local program, we believe that they do not go far enough to ensure that the local program is a superior alternative to state density bonus law. For example, the proposal to require projects with 5+ units to reserve a minimum of 25% of the units for 2+BR units is a constraint that is not required under state density bonus law that will negatively impact density potential for the local program. Additionally, the proposed local program not only requires applicants to choose to give up their option to pursue waivers and incentives under state density bonus law, but *any other* state program that provides its own bonuses or waivers from local zoning, such as AB 2011, which offers waivers of local side and rear setback requirements when those requirements limit feasibility, limits front setback requirements, and allows 55 foot heights, which are greater than the 40 foot height limits proposed for the majority of the local program's rezoned sites.

This proposal not only replaces state density bonus allowances with a worse option, it places new constraints on any such developments via inclusionary requirements and requiring new wind studies on construction. These constraints were not reviewed in the Housing Element, meaning that they may not be imposed or that San Francisco must amend its Element to account for those constraints. New constraints must be accounted for in the Element, to demonstrate how San Francisco can realistically meet its RHNA requirements.

San Francisco must also analyze how this program would interact with existing land use regulations. Transfer taxes, inclusionary requirements, and impact fees are key drivers of unit loss, but have not been incorporated into any City analyses yet. We encourage the City Economist to incorporate them into any future analysis of this program.

Even if all of these deficiencies are corrected, they cannot make up for the requirement to change the base zoning of parcels, as required by Housing Element law and HCD interpretation. Under the new scheme, San Francisco would not change its zoned capacity, and therefore would not comply with state law. Density bonuses must add capacity on top of that allowed for in the zoning code.

Conclusion

Given the substantial deficiencies in San Francisco's rezoning program and the speculative nature of its local density bonus ordinance, the City's Housing Element certification is at risk. The burden is on San Francisco to demonstrate compliance. The use of analytical models that inflate development probability, the reliance on unproven local bonus mechanisms, and the introduction of new constraints all undermine that burden. In short, the program is not legally defensible as currently drafted, with the limited information supporting the city's conclusions that it exceeds the city's RHNA obligation

YIMBY Law has taken legal action against the City of Los Angeles for a similar failure to deliver a legally compliant rezoning program. We sincerely hope litigation will not be necessary in San Francisco. However, San Francisco will be vulnerable to lawsuits from parties working to ensure that the City complies with state law and delivers a realistic path toward housing affordability and accessibility.

We urge the Board to direct Planning to:

- Re-run the BlueSky regression analysis used for the Housing Element's "existing capacity" estimate on the rezoning proposal to produce a transparent, realistic capacity table that is made publicly available.

- Incorporate the waiver and incentive framework of SDBL into the local bonus program, or ensure that projects can access SDBL concurrently.

- Remove new constraints on development introduced by the ordinance.

- Ensure that the rezoning program meets or exceeds the 36,282-unit requirement via base zoning and that its methodology aligns with Program 7.1.1.

The stakes for San Francisco are high. We urge the City to correct course by allowing the use of density bonus and other state programs in combination with the local program.

Sincerely,

Jack Farrell, Esq.
Research Attorney
YIMBY Law

EXHIBIT B

From:	Jane Natoli
To:	paul.mcdougall@hcd.ca.gov
Cc:	gustavo.velasquez@hcd.ca.gov; melinda.coy@hcd.ca.gov; Zisser, David@HCD; megan.kirkeby@hcd.ca.gov; shannan.west@hcd.ca.gov; Frank, Lisa@HCD; Herrera, Fidel@HCD; matthew.struhar@doj.ca.gov; david.pai@doj.ca.gov; alex.fisch@doj.ca.gov; Annie Fryman; Tanner, Rachael (CPC); Chen, Lisa (CPC); Sonja Trauss; matt@caforhomes.org; senator.wiener@senate.ca.gov; Severiano.Christian@sen.ca.gov; Mohtashemi, Raayan; David Broockman; Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Supervisors; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Bonde, Aly (MYR); Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC)
Subject:	SF YIMBY"s letter on the City Economist"s report
Date:	Wednesday, October 29, 2025 4:13:34 PM
Attachments:	SF YIMBY FZP Letter October 29 2025.pdf

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

Hello,

We are writing to urgently draw your attention to the just released report from the City Economist that shows San Francisco's rezoning will not meet our state housing requirements. Please see our attached letter, and let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you,

--
Jane Natoli (she/her)
San Francisco Organizing Director
415-335-9950



Check out everything we achieved in 2024!

Paul McDougall, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Mayor Daniel Lurie
San Francisco Board of Supervisors (re: file #250700)
October 29, 2025

We write to urgently draw your attention to **an analysis the City of San Francisco ("SF") released that finds that its own rezoning plan would violate state law.** The Family Zoning Plan ("FZP") is a significant step forward, but the city's analysis found that it will not meet the city's Housing Element's 36,282-unit requirement. **According to the city's own numbers, state law requires the city to conduct additional rezoning beyond the FZP.**

As a reminder, in 2022, the California Department of Housing and Community Development ("HCD") suggested that, instead of a traditional sites inventory, SF instead pledge to assess the capacity of its rezoning using the method from its underutilized sites analysis (a model called BlueSky, which estimates the likelihood of development). Housing Element Program 7.1.1 thus committed that SF's rezoning "shall reasonably account for sites' likelihood of development during the planning period using an analytical model."

SF's August submission to HCD revealed that SF still had not done so (see Appendix). HCD thus instructed SF that "As part of Program 7.1.1 and using analytical models to account for a site's likelihood of development in the planning period, the city should continue to explore additional and multiple methods and make adjustments as appropriate."

Today, SF did so: its City Economist reported that he used an updated version of the BlueSky analytical model—the same method HCD originally suggested SF use—to estimate the number of units the FZP will likely develop. **He reported that, in the best case scenario, the City's analytical model finds that the FZP is only likely to develop 14,646 units by 2045, far less than the 36,282 required by 2031** under 7.1.1. In other words, **using the exact method HCD suggested SF use, the City itself has found that its rezoning plan does not meet Program 7.1.1's requirements, and is around 10 times too small.**

Gov. Code § 65588(e)(4)(C)(iii) states, "If a jurisdiction…fails to complete the required rezoning within the time period required, the jurisdiction's adopted housing element shall be subject to" the housing element decertification process. Thus, **if SF fails to expand its plan, HCD will be legally obliged to begin the decertification process**.

We encourage HCD to offer SF guidance about how to bring its proposed rezoning into compliance, building on HCD's recent guidance to the city to "make adjustments as appropriate" when more analysis was made available. For example, using recent changes in state law (e.g., SB 131, SB 79), additional rezoning or policy changes that supplement the FZP (e.g., reduced fees and exactions) could be passed within months. Given the timeline required for decertification, HCD could reasonably offer SF up to six months before the builders' remedy would apply to fully complete its "required rezoning" through such a supplement.

Confirming that SF must rely on the City Economist's updated BlueSky analytical model to assess the rezoning's capacity, as well as the actions taken to satisfy Program 8.1.5 (the "circuit breaker"), would also be consistent with HCD's recent direction to the city to "us[e] conservative assumptions…that facilitate the highest housing outcomes."

SF's actions risk paving a path for other cities to evade state law. In particular, rather than "demonstrat[ing] that the existing use [on each non-vacant site] does not constitute an impediment to additional residential development" (Gov. Code, § 65583.2(g)), cities will be tempted to follow SF: promise in a Housing Element to provide this evidence later in the form of statistical analysis—but then ignore what this evidence shows when rezoning.

Best regards,

Salim Damerdji
Volunteer Lead, San Francisco YIMBY

Jane Natoli
San Francisco Organizing Director,
YIMBY Action

CC: Gustavo Velasquez, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Megan Kirkeby, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Melinda Coy, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Shannan West, California Department of Housing and Community Development
David Zisser, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Lisa Frank, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Fidel Herrera, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Alex Fisch, California Department of Justice
Matthew Struhar, California Department of Justice
David Pai, California Department of Justice
Annie Fryman, SPUR
Aly Bonde, Office of Mayor Daniel Lurie
Sarah Dennis-Phillips, Rachael Tanner, and Lisa Chen, San Francisco Planning
Sonja Trauss, YIMBY Law
Matt Gelfand, Californians for Homeownership
Senator Scott Wiener

Appendix: Why the Planning Department's methods do not satisfy the Housing Element's requirement to "reasonably account for sites' likelihood of development during the planning period using an analytical model"

The San Francisco Planning Department's August 1 submission to HCD contained three analyses of the capacity provided by its rezoning. None of these analyses satisfy Program 7.1.1's commitment to "reasonably account for sites' likelihood of development during the planning period using an analytical model." The below details why each of the Planning Department's methods do not satisfy this requirement. Indeed, a closer look at the Planning Department's analyses suggests conclusions that are in line with the City Economist's finding that the rezoning is insufficient.

"Soft Sites Method"

Under this method, the vast majority of the rezoning's capacity is from sites without existing residential uses (but that largely have other uses). The Planning Department assumes that 70% of these sites will be developed to their maximum capacity during the planning period. This 70% assumption is not "reasonabl[e]" (and certainly not "conservative" like the city claims):

1. In San Francisco, fewer than 70% of entitled projects are ultimately developed — making it implausible that 70% of all sites without residential use will be developed, even those where no interest has been expressed in development or discontinuing existing uses. As another comparison, the Terner Center found that only 8.6% of LA's very best sites are developed over 5 years (versus SF's 70% assumption across a huge number of sites).
2. These sites largely do have other non-residential uses which make their development especially improbable. For example, the first page of SF's parcel list includes 1201-05 Columbus Avenue, a 3-story Travelodge in Fisherman's Wharf. The city assumes there is a 70% chance that properties like this will be redeveloped during the planning period.
3. The city's related assertion that 2% of sites with existing residential uses will be redeveloped during the planning period is similarly made without evidence.

This approach also allows the city to evade complying with GC 65583.2(g)'s requirement that the city provide substantial evidence that existing uses on "lower income" sites are likely to be discontinued during the planning period. The city has not provided site-specific evidence supporting their assertion that most sites with existing non-residential uses will be developed during the planning period. The lack of site-specific evidence would not be a problem if the city had provided statistical evidence (i.e., had statistically estimated what percent of these sites will have their existing use discontinued during the planning period based on historical data, as action 7.1.1 promises). But the Planning Department simply provides no evidence whatsoever that 70% of sites with existing non-residential uses will be developed, either site-specific or

statistical. This 70% figure is simply fabricated — not from "an analytical model," and it is not at all "reasonable."

"Citywide Capacity Method"

This method calculates what share of the city's remaining zoned capacity was developed annually over the last 18 years (2005-2023). It then assumes the new capacity created by the rezoning will be developed at a similar annual rate.

While reasonable in theory, there are several errors and problems with how the Planning Department is implementing this approach that make it not "reasonabl[e]" in practice:

1. The city has two versions of this approach, each with errors:
    a. The primary version (with "exclusions") divides citywide development by the amount of capacity on only a subset of parcels. This overstates the rate at which capacity historically translates into development because less capacity is considered despite all development being considered. This is like computing the average grades of all students in a class by adding up all students' grades but then dividing this total by half the number of students there are in the class.
    b. The city describes another version of the method that measures capacity on all parcels but uses Planning entitlements to measure development; during this period there were 90K entitlements but only 53K building permits. Using entitlements to measure development overstates the historical development rate, as in San Francisco many entitlements are never developed (in part due to constraints the city places on development).
2. The city's statistic that 53K units were constructed citywide 2005-2023 includes development from development agreements (DAs). By counting historical DA development when computing the rate at which historical zoned capacity is developed, the city therefore assumes that the rezoning will produce new DA development during this planning period. This is unreasonable, as DAs do not result from (re)zoning. Furthermore, the city's housing element already counted expected development from DAs during the planning period in its claims of existing capacity.
3. Parcels where projects have been proposed but have not received permits are excluded from the city's calculation of its historical capacity; this leads the city to underestimate how much historical capacity it had, and therefore overstate the development rate of its capacity.
4. The new rezoned capacity is also less developable than the existing remaining capacity. Specifically, according to the city's Bluesky model (the model it used for its underutilized sites analysis), the new capacity is about 20% less likely to be developed. This is because, for example, rezoned capacity is 3x more likely to be on sites with an existing residential use than existing capacity. It's therefore not entirely reasonable to assume that the city's historical rate of development will manifest for the new capacity.

5. The Planning Department is relying on its UrbanSim tool to measure its remaining zoned capacity (313K). But the city's housing element (Sites Inventory Appendix B2 p. 4) gives a much larger number for this (572K), as do our own calculations. Insofar as the city is now understating how much capacity it has, it is therefore overstating the rate at which that capacity has been developed. We have asked for data that would help us understand this discrepancy, but the city has indicated that its UrbanSim tool is unable to provide the underlying data that supports this 313K calculation.

When addressing the first four errors and issues above, and when using the city's housing element's estimate that the city has 572K units of capacity remaining (see point 5), the historical development rate is 0.4% and the adjusted capacity of the rezoning is therefore 10K units.

"Financial Feasibility Method"

The Planning Department has contracted with UrbanSim to estimate whether development will be economically feasible on rezoned parcels. While this analysis is welcome, there are several problems with this approach:

1. Totaling the amount of economically feasible development does not "account for sites' likelihood of development." Historically, only a fraction of economically feasible units are actually developed, and some research practitioners have advised us that there is nearly an order of magnitude difference between the two.
2. The Planning Department's economic assumptions are not "reasonabl[e]": the Department assumes that construction costs, interest rates, and developer return expectations will drop without providing evidence. It also assumes rents will jump. The Department justifies these optimistic assumptions by asserting that it is only responsible for making housing feasible to develop under better economic conditions than are likely during this planning period — but action 7.1.1 commits to providing enough capacity to make 36K units likely developed during this planning period. Furthermore, the city's poor economic environment for development reflects the city's constraints on development that Housing Element Law is supposed to remediate. I.e., the fact that the city so heavily constrains development makes more rezoning (and changes to its other policies) necessary, and cannot be ignored when considering the appropriate scope of actions to accommodate development.
3. The Department's submission describes a flawed approach for using UrbanSim's output to account for the likelihood of development: asserting that 2% of economically feasible projects will occur on sites with existing residential uses and 35% of economically feasible projects will occur on sites with other non-residential uses. These assumptions are not based on any evidence and, for the same reasons we described in the context of the "soft sites" method, are not reasonable.
4. After applying this flawed approach for accounting for the likelihood of development, the Planning Department nevertheless finds that only 19K units will be developed during the planning period. This is short of the 36K required by action 7.1.1. The Planning

Department argues that this is acceptable because the method must only demonstrate sufficient capacity for meeting the city's 16K RHNA shortfall in the Moderate and Above-Moderate income categories. But action 7.1.1 makes no reference to separate by-category targets, it simply states that the rezoning must "accommodate… approximately 36,282 new units." Furthermore, the Department's argument is also belied by the Housing Element Law and the No Net Loss Law, both of which contemplate development of market-rate and mixed-income projects on "lower income" sites (GC 65583.2(c) & (h); GC 65863(c)(2)).

EXHIBIT C

Family Zoning Plan: Economic Impact Report

Office of the Controller
Office of Economic Analysis

Items 250700 & 250701
October 29, 2025

Introduction

- Two proposed ordinances would change zoning controls to permit more housing on a large segment of San Francisco, particularly on the western half of the city. They implement changes to the Housing Element of the City's General Plan, a planning document whose revisions were adopted in 2023.
- The Ordinance in file #250700, the Zoning Map Amendment, would generally raise allowable building heights along commercial corridors and transit lines, to permit mid-rise and some high-rise development.
- The Ordinance in file #250701 implements the Housing Choice-San Francisco program, which offers an alternative to the State Density Bonus program.
- The Office of Economic Analysis (OEA) has prepared this report because the proposed legislation may have a material impact on the city's economy. This report uses a model that estimates potential new development, in order to assess economic impact. That model is not a replacement for the City's estimates of realistic capacity under Government Code § 65583.2.


Zoning Map Amendment: Key Provisions

- The Zoning Map Amendment would make changes to allowable building heights and bulk, and/or zoning districts, in over 92,000 parcels in the city.
- The vast majority are residential parcels, whose allowable heights would either remain at 40 feet, or rise to 50 or 65 feet.
- On these and many other rezoned parcels, the Housing Choice San Francisco program (described on the next page) relaxes existing controls on the number of housing units allowed on a parcel.
- Allowable heights are generally increased to 65 to 85 feet along many commercial corridors, with development along wider streets near transit stations or major lines increased to 85 feet.
- Heights above 140 feet are allowed on certain streets that currently allow high-rise development or have larger parcels, at key intersections, and near certain major transit routes and stations. The map on page 5 provides additional details.

Housing Choice San Francisco – Key Provisions

- The Housing Choice San Francisco program, or "Local Program", gives developers an alternative to the State Density Bonus.
- Many of the rezoned residential parcels are too small to be eligible for the State Density Bonus, but may achieve greater density through the use of the Local Program.
- Local Program users also gain benefits associated with housing unit mix, methods of complying with inclusionary housing requirements, rear-yard and setback requirements, broad code flexibility, and certain process changes.
- The ordinance has several other provisions, including limiting the maximum size of new residential units, reducing allowable parking, and restricting new curb cuts. These policy changes are not considered in this report.
- Additionally, the proposed ordinance gives displaced businesses the right to relocate anywhere in the city where their activity is permitted by zoning, without a conditional use permit, and waives development impact fees associated with the relocation.

Details of the Rezoning



The map to the left, from the City Planning department, indicates which parcels in the city will be rezoned, and to which heights. It reflects the plan as of July.

Gray parcels will be zoned for low-rise, 40-50 feet housing developments. This includes single-family residential zones, within which greater density will be permitted via the Local Program.

Yellow and orange parcels will be upzoned to mid-rise development of 65-105 feet.

Pink and purple parcels will have height limits ranging from 120-180 feet, and the blue and green parcels will be upzoned for high-rise development, of 240 feet or greater.

The Rezoning and the Regional Housing Needs Assessment

- Each jurisdiction in California is required to have its Housing Element be certified by the State's Housing and Community Development Department.
- Certification involves, among other things, ensuring that the City has the zoning capacity to meet the city's obligations under the State's Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA).
- RHNA is a Statewide planning process, in which future needs are forecasted for metropolitan areas, and then allocated to the individual cities and counties that administer land use planning.
- In San Francisco's case, the RHNA obligation requires the City to have realistic capacity for approximately 82,000 new housing units, at different economic levels, within an 8-year planning period ending in 2031.
- Of this 82,000 unit requirement, the City must create capacity for approximately 36,000 units.

Substitutions and Proposed Amendments

- On September 30, a new version of #250700 was substituted by Mayor Lurie, which made relatively minor zoning changes on a number of parcels. This analysis reflects those changes.
- On October 21, Supervisor Melgar proposed an amendment that would prohibit the use of the Local Program on any parcel containing more then two existing housing units, which would involve the demolition of a unit subject to rent control.
- Also on October 21, Supervisor Sauter introduced an amendment that creates incentives for developers to replace lost commercial space.
- As the language of these two amendments was made public less than one week ago, this report does not attempt to model their economic impact.

Economic Impact Factors

- When the City relaxes zoning controls, by reducing density restrictions or increasing allowable heights, more development projects will become financially feasible, and the supply of housing in the city will rise.
- This increased supply will put downward pressure on housing prices in the city. Cheaper housing benefits city residents who move within the city, and also makes San Francisco more affordable for new arrivals.
- The development of new housing also stimulates investment and employment in construction and related industries.
- The population growth associated with new housing also stimulates the local economy, by expanding the numbers of workers and consumers.
- On the other hand, the limited amount of vacant lots in the city means that new housing generally involves the loss of existing buildings, including both residential and commercial properties. This can impose relocation and other costs on residential and commercial tenants.

Estimating the Likelihood of New Housing Development

- The amount of new housing that the rezoning will produce is an important contributor to its economic impact. To estimate this, OEA refined a statistical model that it has used since 2016 to estimate the impact of policy changes on housing production in the city[1].
- The model was the result of statistical analysis of housing production in San Francisco over the 2004-2024 period. Technical details on the model are provided in the Appendix.
- The first part of the model estimates the likelihood that multifamily housing will be developed on a given parcel, in a given year. The statistical analysis found that a parcel is more likely to develop when:
  - it has smaller existing buildings (or is vacant), and is located closer to downtown.
  - its zoning allows for a greater height, makes it eligible for the State Density Bonus, and does not restrict the number of units that may be constructed.
  - housing prices are relatively high, and construction costs are relatively low, compared to other years.

Estimating the Number of Units Produced

- The second part of the model estimates the number of units that will be produced when a parcel does develop housing. Based on past experience, the statistical analysis found that a parcel developing housing will produce more units when:
  - its land area and allowable maximum height are greater;
  - it is eligible for the State Density Bonus;
  - its zoning does not restrict the number of units that may be built.
- The OEA used the first part of the model to estimate the probability that housing will be built on a parcel over the next twenty years[2]. That probability was multiplied by the estimate of housing units from the second part, to create an expected number of housing units generated for each parcel over twenty years. When this is summed across all parcels, a citywide housing total is generated.
- This method was used to create estimates of housing production under the existing zoning, and the proposed rezoning. The difference is the estimate of housing that could be produced as a result of the proposed zoning changes.


Limitations of the Housing Development Model

- The housing development model can forecast future housing development based on the city's past experience, but important caveats must be made.
- Because of data availability, not every factor that affects housing production could be included. Missing data may include features of the parcel itself, or policies that may have changed over the 2004-24 period, or vary within the aggregated zoning designations used by the model.
- Limited data also prevents the analysis of fine-grained policy changes in the proposed rezoning, such as restrictions on unit size and mix.
- Several new City and State policies that were intended to encourage housing production have been enacted in recent years, such as, for example, the City's 2023 Housing Production Ordinance (0248-23). The model may be unable to properly assess the impact of these policies in the future.
- Despite these limitations, the OEA believes this approach is well-suited to estimating housing production, for the purposes of economic impact reporting.

Future Housing Market Scenarios

- As noted earlier, the amount of housing that will be produced as a result of the rezoning, and its economic impact, will depend on future housing market conditions. This creates an additional level of uncertainty in the forecasts.
- Gauging future market conditions is further complicated by changes in the city's housing market since the COVID-19 pandemic, as described on the next page.
- To understand the scope of what could potentially happen, the OEA created two future scenarios for housing prices and costs in San Francisco.
- In a high-growth scenario, San Francisco's housing prices, relative to the U.S., return to pre-COVID levels by 2030, and grow at the city's pre-COVID rate after that. Construction costs are assumed to grow at the same rate as inflation.
- In a low-growth scenario, San Francisco's post-COVID relative housing prices are assumed to represent a "new normal," and housing prices are assumed to grow only at a national average level over the next twenty years. Construction costs are also assumed to grow at the same rate as inflation.

San Francisco and U.S. Housing Price Trends Since 2000




While San Francisco's housing has always been expensive, during the 2010s, average San Francisco condo prices rose much faster than the rest of the U.S., to as much as 5 times the typical U.S. price.

Since 2020, however, San Francisco condo prices have declined, despite rising inflation and rising U.S. condo prices. Adjusted for inflation, typical San Francisco condo prices in 2025 are 25% lower than they were in 2019.

Among other factors, the increase in remote office work during COVID has reduced the value of a residence near large office employment centers like downtown San Francisco.

Source: Zillow. Data retrieved October 1, 2025.

Housing Price Trends Within the City




Source: Zillow. Data retrieved October 1, 2025.

The reduced value of a downtown location has also shifted multifamily price patterns within the city.

Condos in neighborhoods like Downtown and South of Market have experienced inflation-adjusted price drops of more than 40% since 2016, while the Richmond and Sunset have fallen by far less.

Because most multifamily housing in the city is near downtown, but most of the proposed rezoning is not, the use of a citywide average condo price index is inappropriate. This analysis uses an average price across the 10 Zillow neighborhoods most affected by the zoning, which is somewhat higher than the citywide average.

High and Low Growth Scenario Price Forecasts




Our high-growth scenario assumes that San Francisco's housing prices, relative to the U.S., return to pre-pandemic levels by 2030, and then grow at the city's long-term average rate until 2045. This implies a rapid growth in housing prices over the next five years, of over 10% per year.

In the low-growth scenario, the post-COVID housing market represents a new normal, and San Francisco housing prices are assumed to grow only at the U.S. long-term rate at 1.8% per year, in inflation-adjusted dollars. Under this assumption, San Franciso housing prices would not recover to their pre-COVID peak, in inflation-adjusted dollars, until 2041.

Source: Zillow. 10 Neighborhoods are Buena Vista, Polk Gulch, Inner Sunset, Marina, Mission, North Waterfront, Outer Sunset, Outer Richmond, Inner Richmond, and Western Addition.

Construction Cost Trends and Scenarios



Source: Bureau of Economic Analysis; U.S. Census Bureau, "Quarterly Workforce Indicators

The housing development model uses two measures of construction costs: materials cost and local construction industry wages. They are blended into a single index for modeling purposes. Details are in the Appendix.

The cost of construction materials and local wages have grown faster than overall inflation, particularly in the last few years. In 2024, real construction materials costs were 18% higher, and real local wages were 10% higher, than they were in 2016.

In both the high-growth and low-growth scenarios, the blended index is assumed to grow at 0% (after inflation) over the 2026-2045 period. This reflects an assumption that both labor and material costs inflation will revert to the broader rate of inflation in the long term.

Housing Production Forecasts Under Current Zoning

Planning District	Historic, 2000-24	Low-Growth Scenario Forecast, 2026-45	High-Growth Scenario Forecast, 2026-45
Buena Vista	975	43	90
Central	72	192	390
Downtown	289	112	230
Ingleside	0	58	120
Inner Sunset	123	28	59
Marina	131	126	263
Mission	187	197	406
Northeast	449	136	283
Outer Sunset	15	16	33
Richmond	0	23	47
South Central	0	6	11
Western Addition	997	658	1,265
Total	3,238	1,594	3,199

Source: For historic housing production, San Francisco Planning Department

Generally, the housing development model forecasts that the current zoning will produce fewer units in the next 20 years than the numbers of units that were produced in the last 20 years.

The table to the left only covers the portion of each planning district that is in the proposed rezoning area. In total, under the current zoning, the model forecasts 1,594 or 3,199 units under the low- and high-growth forecasts, respectively, while 3,238 units were built in the same areas over the 2000-2024 period.

On the next two pages, the model's forecasts of the additional housing created by the proposed zoning is discussed.

Forecast Net Effect of the Zoning

- As shown in the table below, under the low-growth and high-growth scenarios described earlier, the rezoning would lead to 8,504 and 14,646 additional housing units, beyond what would be produced under current zoning, over the next 20 years.

Low Growth Scenario	**Units**
20-Year Housing Production, Existing Zoning	1,594
20-Year Housing Production, Proposed Rezoning	10,098
Effect of Proposed Rezoning	8,504

High Growth Scenario	**Units**
20-Year Housing Production, Existing Zoning	3,199
20-Year Housing Production, Proposed Rezoning	17,845
Effect of Proposed Rezoning	14,646

Summary by Current Zoning District

		Low-Growth			High-Growth		
Current Zoning[3]	Number of Parcels	Average Housing Likelihood, Current	Average Housing Likelihood, Proposed	Change in Housing Units	Average Housing Likelihood, Current	Average Housing Likelihood, Proposed	Change in Housing Units
RH1	43,009	0.001%	0.205%	798	0.003%	0.446%	1,731
RH2	26,486	0.002%	0.259%	576	0.005%	0.565%	1,250
RH3_RM1	13,741	0.009%	0.347%	547	0.018%	0.756%	1,186
Office/Commercial	114	0.570%	0.780%	48	1.185%	1.639%	104
Public	239	0.060%	1.450%	3,483	0.122%	2.560%	4,814
Density-Restricted Multifamily	7,079	0.336%	0.490%	3,007	0.674%	1.026%	5,467
Form-Based Multifamily	2,053	0.725%	0.725%	46	1.502%	1.502%	94
Total	92,721			8,504			14,646

The table to the left breaks out the results by current zoning. It illustrates how many rezoned parcels are in the RH-1, RH-2, and RH-3 or RM-1 residential zones, primarily in the western side of the city. These areas will see a substantial increase in the likelihood of developing housing over the next 20 years, but the chances are still small, so those 83,000+ parcels are only forecast to produce about additional 4,200 housing units by 2045, in the high growth scenario.

Fewer Public parcels (generally owned by the City or SFUSD) are larger, and more likely to develop housing through the rezoning, though this depends on the owner's decisions.

Estimating the Loss of Existing Residential Units

- To evaluate the economic impact, OEA calculated the net increase in housing units.
- In the low-growth scenario, 463 more units would be lost under the proposed zoning than under current zoning, over the 20-year forecast period. In the high-growth scenario, 1,031 more housing units would be lost. These losses represent a 6-8% of the housing units gained as a result of the rezoning. Amendments proposed on October 20th may reduce these losses, along with overall housing production.
- The loss of existing housing slightly dampens the housing price reductions associated with the rezoning, and may impose financial harms on existing tenants. City and State law heavily restricts, but does not prohibit, the eviction of tenants for the purpose of demolition, or the demolition of rent-controlled housing. These events have been quite rare in recent decades. If this occurs, tenants are entitled to relocation payments.
- Without any way to meaningfully estimate the number of evictions or demolitions of rent-controlled units, or the financial impact on tenants, this report does not attempt to quantify these potential costs.

Impacts on Housing Prices

- The responsiveness of housing prices to increases in housing supply is a function of price elasticities of supply and demand, which the OEA has estimated in past research[4].
- The elasticities imply that the proposed rezoning would lead to a -2.5% to -4.2% change in housing prices in the city, depending on the scenario. For context, those percentages are also expressed in terms of current housing prices and apartment rents.

	Low Growth Scenario	**High Growth Scenario**
Net Change in Housing Supply (units produced less demolitions)	8,041	13,615
Percentage Change in Housing Supply[5]	2.0%	3.4%
Price Elasticity of Demand	-0.7	-0.7
Price Elasticity of Supply	0.1	0.1
Percent change in housing prices	-2.5%	-4.2%
Corresponding change in condo prices[6]	-$24,500	-$41,600
Corresponding change in annual apartment market rents[7]	-$903	-$1,529

Estimating Relocation and Disruption Costs

- To account for the impact on commercial businesses, OEA estimated potential displacement costs. Details are provided in the Appendix.
- Displaced businesses are estimated to occupy commercial space ranging from approximately 1.5 to 2.6 million square feet, depending on the scenario. This displacement would occur over twenty years, and it is highly likely that the rezoning would lead to an increase in the amount of commercial space in the city.
- Annual business disruption and relocation costs range from $16 to $28 million, in today's dollars.

	Low Growth	High Growth
Loss of occupied commercial space (million sf)	1.5	2.6
Disruption-relocation cost/sf	$190	$190
Annual disruption/relocation cost (2025 $ million)	$16	$28

REMI Economic Impact Simulation

- Based on the economic impact factors described earlier, the OEA used the REMI model to measure the net economic impact of the changes associated with the high and low growth scenarios to the city's economy over the 2026-2045 period:
  - An increase in the city's residential capital stock of $8.0 billion (low growth) to $13.5 billion (high growth) in today's dollars, representing the investment associated with the new units forecast under the two scenarios. These figures are calculated by multiplying the net increase in units by average prices.
  - A reduction in citywide housing prices, reaching 2.5% (low growth) and 4.2% (high growth) by 2045.
  - Annual business disruption and relocation costs for retail businesses of $16 million (low growth) and $28 million (high growth) in today's dollars, until 2045.

Economic Impact Assessment

- In the low-growth scenario, the city's GDP would be $560 million larger, in today's dollars, on average over the 2026-45 period. Total employment in the city would be approximately 3,000 more than under the current zoning, on average over the period.
- In the high-growth scenario, the city's GDP growth would be $940 million larger than under current zoning, in 2025 dollars. Employment would be about 5,000 higher.
- Employment gains are expected in every sector, but would be most heavily concentrated in the construction, health care, real estate, and accommodations and food services sectors.
- Despite the displacement of businesses, retail trade is forecast to grow as a result of the population and economic growth created by the proposed rezoning, adding about 210 jobs in the low-growth scenario and about 350 jobs in the high-growth scenario.
- Like most major policies, the proposed rezoning involves benefits and costs. Our analysis suggests the proposed rezoning's positive impact on the city's economy, from lower housing prices and construction, outweighs the negative impact from displaced businesses, by a factor of approximately 22:1.

Conclusions

- The context for housing development in San Francisco has changed profoundly in the past several years. Since 2019, after adjusting for inflation, condo prices in San Francisco have dropped by 25%, while our blended construction cost index has risen by 8%.
- Given this starting point, an expansive rezoning effort, like the proposed Family Zoning plan, will be challenged to match the 2010s levels of new housing development in the city, even under an optimistic high-growth scenario.
- Nevertheless, under both scenarios considered in this report, the proposed rezoning would lead to a significant increase in the city's housing supply, and have broadly positive effects on housing prices and the city's broader economy. The benefits of new residential investments and lower housing prices are projected to outweigh the costs of business interruption and displacement by a factor of roughly 22:1.
- If market conditions were such that the 36,000 unit target was achieved, as a result of the rezoning, the economic impact on the city would likely be significantly more positive than the estimates in this report.

Footnotes

1. See, for example, Inclusionary Housing Working Group: Preliminary Report September 2016.
2. Three large parcels were excluded from the analysis: Laguna Honda Hospital, and the USF Main and Lone Mountain campuses. While all three parcels receive height increases in the proposed rezoning, their size and unique uses makes them unsuitable for the model. If the model could accurately estimate the amount of housing likely to occur on those parcels, the total housing estimate reported in this report would be larger.
3. These are the aggregate zoning classifications used by the model. See the Appendix for details.
4. See Potential Effects of Limiting Market-Rate Housing in the Mission.
5. Assuming 406,000 housing units in the city.
6. Based on Zillow's 2025 average condo prices for San Francisco.
7. Based on 2025 average apartment asking rents, from ApartmentList.

Appendix

- Housing Development Model
  - Methodology
  - Data sources
  - Model coefficients and performance
  - Scenario Inputs
  - Zoning District Classification
  - Logic of Applying the Model to the Proposed Rezoning
- Estimates of Business Interruption and Relocation Costs

Appendix: Housing Development Model: Methodology

- The housing development model is a two-stage step model. The first stage is a logistic regression, covering every parcel in the city, except those subject to a development agreement, over the 2004-2024 period.
- The dependent variable of the logistic regression is 1 if the parcel produced housing in a given year, and 0 otherwise. Parcels that produce housing in a given year were removed from the dataset for subsequent years. Independent variables, reflecting existing land use, market conditions, and zoning, are listed on the next page.
- The second stage is a regression model including all parcels that produced multifamily housing with more than 10 units, over the 2004-24 period. The dependent variable is the number of units produced on the parcel, and the independent variables are the parcel's "building envelope" (its area multiplied by its allowable height), and two interaction variables: the building envelope times a dummy indicating if the parcel was eligible for the State Density Bonus in that year, and the building envelope times a dummy indicating if the parcel was subject to density-restricted zoning in that year. The intercept of the model was fixed at zero.

Appendix: Housing Development Model: Methodology

- The models' coefficients were used in a forecast that calculated the log-likelihood of development for each rezoned parcel, in each of the forecast years 2026-2045, using the site and zoning information, and the price and cost assumptions for each year (shown on the next page). The log-likelihoods were converted into annual probabilities, from which a 20-year probability of development was calculated.
- The model coefficients were also used to calculate a units estimate; the 20-year probability times the units estimate is the expected number of units produced on that parcel in the 20-year forecast period.
- The forecast model was run for both the current and the proposed zoning. See the section "Logic of Applying the Model to the Proposed Rezoning" for more details.
- Three parcels were excluded from the forecast: Laguna Honda Hospital, the University of San Francisco Main Campus, and the University of San Francisco Lone Mountain Campus. While some housing may be built on those parcels in the forecast period, the model is not well-suited for large parcels with unique uses like these.

Appendix: Housing Development Model: Data Sources

Variable Description	Variable	Data Source
Height limit for site in ft	Height_Ft	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Area for lot in 1000 sq ft	Area_1000	Planning Department, Land Use Database 4/16/25
Extisting building square footage in 1000 sq ft	Bldg_SqFt_1000	Planning Department, Land Use Database 4/16/25
Residential Existing Use using ResUnits (Dummy)	Res_Dummy	Planning Department, Land Use Database 4/16/25
Historic Status for Parcel (Dummy)	Historic	Planning Department, Land Use Database 4/16/25
Real Construction Cost Variable, 2 years prior	Construc_Cost_Real	a 60/40 average of Real Construction Materials PPI and Real San Francisco MSA Construction Wages, 2016=100
10-Neighborhood Housing Price Index (Zillow), Real, 2 years prior	Zillow_Price_Real	SF real condo prices per Zillow, 2016=100
Dummy indicating eligibility for State Density Bonus, 2016 forward	SDB_2016_5Plus	Calculated from Zoning Districts
Zoning dummy: Office/Commercial	zp_OfficeComm	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Zoning dummy: Density Restricted Multifamily, RTO = Form Based	zp_DRMulti_RTO	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Zoning dummy: Form Based Multifamily, RTO = form based	zp_FBDMulti_RTO	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Zoning dummy: Industrial / Production, Distribution & Repair	zp_PDRInd	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Zoning dummy: Public/Open Space	zp_Public	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Zoning dummy: Redevelopment Area	zp_Redev	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Zoning dummy: Residential 2-Family (2 Units per Lot)	zp_RH2	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Zoning = Residential 3-Family or Res Mixed (1/800 sqft)	zp_RH3_RM1	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Planning District dummy variables	DIST_<District Name>	Planning District from Assessor's Secured Roll DB

Appendix: Logistic Regression Coefficients

Variable Description	Variable	Coeff	StdErr	WaldChiSq	Prob>Chi Sq
Intercept	Intercept	(1.6226)	1.2829	1.5998	0.2059
Height limit for site in ft	Height_Ft	0.0017	0.0007	4.9693	0.0258
Area for lot in 1000 sq ft	Area_1000	0.0049	0.0009	30.6563	0.0000
Envelope Area in 1000 sq ft (area/1000*ht/10)	Env_1000_Area_Height	0.0002	0.0001	5.0369	0.0248
Extisting building square footage in 1000 sq ft	Bldg_SqFt_1000	(0.0023)	0.0007	10.7241	0.0011
Residential Existing Use using ResUnits (Dummy)	Res_Dummy	(0.8231)	0.1222	45.3669	0.0000
Historic Status for Parcel (Dummy)	Historic	(1.0378)	0.1271	66.6847	0.0000
Real Construction Cost Variable	Construc_Cost_Real	(0.0992)	0.0129	58.8929	0.0000
SF Housing Price Index (Zillow), Real	Zillow_Price_Real	0.0143	0.0053	7.1326	0.0076
Dummy for State Density Bonus, 5+ Unit Sites, 2016 forward	SDB_2016_5Plus	0.6303	0.1608	15.3724	0.0000
Zoning = Office/Commercial	zp_OfficeComm	4.2634	0.4873	76.5337	0.0000
Zoning = Density Restricted Multifamily, RTO = Form Based	zp_DRMulti_RTO	4.2450	0.4523	88.0989	0.0000
Zoning = Form Based Multifamily, RTO = form based	zp_FBDMulti_RTO	5.0508	0.4640	118.4768	0.0000
Zoning = Industrial / Production, Distribution & Repair	zp_PDRInd	3.4115	0.4790	50.7257	0.0000
Zoning = Public/Open Space	zp_Public	1.2491	0.8385	2.2190	0.1363
Zoning = Redevelopment Area	zp_Redev	4.5361	0.4999	82.3213	0.0000
Zoning = Residential 2-Family (2 Units per Lot)	zp_RH2	0.2674	0.6672	0.1607	0.6885
Zoning = Residential 3-Family or Res Mixed (1/800 sqft)	zp_RH3_RM1	1.3187	0.6064	4.7289	0.0297

Appendix: Logistic Regression Coefficients (Continued)

Variable Description	Variable	Coeff	StdErr	WaldChiSq	Prob>Chi Sq
District = South Bayshore	DIST_SBayshore	(1.4824)	0.3179	21.7380	0.0000
District = Bernal Heights	DIST_BernalHts	(1.7011)	0.6087	7.8100	0.0052
District = South Central	DIST_Scentral	(1.7307)	0.3867	20.0267	0.0000
District = Central	DIST_Central	(1.1523)	0.3353	11.8102	0.0006
District = Buena Vista	DIST_BuenaVista	(2.5369)	1.0188	6.2010	0.0128
District = Northeast	DIST_Northeast	(1.4171)	0.2539	31.1439	0.0000
District = Western Addition	DIST_WestAddition	(0.6831)	0.2362	8.3630	0.0038
District = South of Market	DIST_SOMA	(0.0756)	0.1903	0.1579	0.6911
District = Inner Sunset	DIST_InnerSunset	(1.6187)	0.4882	10.9939	0.0009
District = Richmond	DIST_Richmond	(2.8019)	0.5355	27.3716	0.0000
District = Ingleside	DIST_Ingleside	(1.8670)	0.4925	14.3711	0.0002
District = Outer Sunset	DIST_OuterSunset	(2.6147)	0.6098	18.3867	0.0000
District = Marina	DIST_Marina	(1.2492)	0.3253	14.7457	0.0001
District = Mission	DIST_Mission	(1.0938)	0.2380	21.1176	0.0000

Omitted Variables for Groups of Dummy Variables:

Omitted zoning = RH1

Omitted district = Downtown

Appendix: Units Regression Coefficients

Variable Description	Variable	Coeff	St Error	T-Stat
Simple building envelope (area/1000 * ht/10)	Env_1000_Area_Height	0.4252	0.0159	26.72
State Density Bonus * Simple Bldg Envelope (5+ Unit Sites, 2016 forward)	SDB_2016_5Plus_EnvFull	0.4385	0.0389	11.28
Simple Bldg Envelope only if density-restricted	Zoning_DR_EnvFull	(0.1601)	0.0174	(9.22)

Note: Model removes largest 5% (Positive and Negative) residual outliers

Appendix: Model Performance

Logistic Regression	
Number of Observations	3,369,573
Number with Dependent Variable = 1	422
Pseudo R-Square	0.000611
Max Rescaled R-Square	0.244596

Units Regression	
Number of Observations	383
R-Sq	0.867779
Adj R-Sq	0.866735
Dependent Mean Value	81.87206
Standard Error of Regression	48.40184

Appendix: Zoning Classifications

- The table below shows the correspondence between the City's zoning districts, and the aggregate zoning variables in the model.

Zoning Variable	Zoning Districts
zp_RH1	C-2/RH-1(D); RH-1(D)/C-2; C-M/RH-1; M-1/RH-1; NC-1/RH-1; NC-1/RH-1/RH-2; NC-2/RH-1; NC-2/RH-1(D); NC-3/RH-1; NCD/RH-1; NCD/RH-1(D); NC-S/RH-1; NCT-OCEAN/RH-1(D); NCT/RH-1(D); P/P-W/RH-1; P/RH-1; P/RH-1(D); P/RH-1/RH-1(D); P/RH-1/RH-2; RH-1; RH-1(D); RH-1(D)/NC-2; RH-1(D)/RH-1; RH-2/RH-1; RH-2/RH-1(D); RH-1(D)/RH-2; RH-1(D)/RM-1; RH-1(S); RH-1/C-M; RH-1/M-1; RH-1/NC-1; RH-1/NC-2; RH-1/NC-3; RH-1/NC-S; RH-1/RH-1(D); RH-1/RH-2; RH-1/RH-2/RM-1; RH-1/RM-1; RM-1/RH-1; RH-3/RH-1
zp_RH2	NC-1/RH-1/RH-2; P/RH-1/RH-2; RH-2/RH-1; RH-2/RH-1(D); RH-1(D)/RH-2; RH-1/RH-2; RH-1/RH-2/RM-1; M-1/RH-2/RM-1; MUR/RH-2; NC-1/RH-2; NC-2/RH-2; NC-3/RH-2; NCD/RH-2; NC-S/RH-2; NCT-GLEN PARK/RH-2; NCT-OCEAN/RH-2; NCT/RH-2; P/RH-2; P/RM-1/RH-2; RH-2; RH-2/NC-1; RH-2/NC-2; RH-2/NC-3; RH-2/RH-3; RH-2/RM-1; RM-1/RH-2; RH-2/RM-2; RM-2/RH-2; RH-2/RM-3; RM-3/RH-2; RH-3/RH-2
zp_RH3_RM1	RH-1/RH-2/RM-1; M-1/RH-2/RM-1; P/RM-1/RH-2; RH-2/RH-3; RH-2/RM-1; RM-1/RH-2; RH-3/RH-2; RH-1(D)/RM-1; RH-1/RM-1; RM-1/RH-1; RH-3/RH-1; C-2/RH-3; C-2/RM-1; C-2/RM-1/RM-4; C-M/RM-1; HP-RA/RM-1; M-1/RM-1; M-2/RH-3; NC-1/RM-1; RM-1/NC-1; NC-2/RH-3; NC-2/RM-1; NC-3/RH-3; NC-3/RM-1; NCD/RH-3; NCD/RH-3/UPR MARKET; NCD/RH-3/UPR MARK; NCD/RH-3/VALENCIA; NCD/RM-1; NCD/RM-1/SACRAMENTO; NCD/SACRAMENTO ST; NCD/SACRAMENTO/RM-1; NCD/RM-1/SACRAMEN; NCT-DIVISADERO/RH-3; NCT-DIVISADERO/RM-1; NCT/RH-3; NCT/RM-1; P/PM-R/RM-1; P/RH-3; P/RM-1; PM-MU2/PM-OS/PM-R/RM-1; PM-R/RM-1; RH-3; RH-3/C-2; RH-3/HAYES; RH-3/M-2; RH-3/NC-2; RH-3/RM-1; RM-1/RH-3; RH-3/RM-2; RM-2/RH-3; RH-3/RM-3; RM-3/RH-3; RH-3/RSD; RH-3/VALENCIA; RM-1; RM-1/C-M; RM-1/C-M/M-1; RM-1/NC-3; RM-1/RM-2; RM-1/RM-3; RM-1/RM-4; RM-1/SACRAMENTO
zp_OfficeComm	C-2/RH-3; C-2/RM-1; C-2/RM-1/RM-4; C-M/RM-1; RH-3/C-2; RM-1/C-M; RM-1/C-M/M-1; C-2/RH-1(D); RH-1(D)/C-2; C-M/RH-1; RH-1/C-M; C-2; C-2/M-1; C-2/M-1/P; C-2/P; C-3-G; C-3-G/C-3-R; C-3-G/C-M; C-3-G/RC-4; C-3-O; C-3-O(SD); C-3-O(SD)/P; C-3-O(SD)/TB DTR; C-3-O/C-3-O(SD); C-3-O/C-3-R; C-3-O/C-3-S; C-3-O/C-3-S/P; C-3-O/TB DTR; C-3-R; C-3-S; C-3-S/P; C-M; C-M/M-1; CMUO; CMUO/MUR; CMUO/P; MUO; NCD/C-2; P/C-3-R; RM-3/C-2; RM-4/C-2; WMUO

Appendix: Zoning Classifications (Continued)

Zoning Variable	Zoning Districts
zp_DRMulti_RTO	NC-2/P; NC-3/P/RM-3; NCD/P; NC-S/P; P/NC-S; P/NC-2; P/RC-4; P/RM-2; P/RM-3; C-2/RM-1/RM-4; C-3-G/RC-4; NCD/C-2; RM-3/C-2; RM-4/C-2; NC-1/RM-1; RM-1/NC-1; NC-2/RH-3; NC-2/RM-1; NC-3/RH-3; NC-3/RM-1; NCD/RH-3; NCD/RH-3/UPR MARKET; NCD/RH-3/UPR MARK; NCD/RH-3/VALENCIA; NCD/RM-1; NCD/RM-1/SACRAMENTO; NCD/SACRAMENTO ST; NCD/SACRAMENTO/RM-1; NCD/RM-1/SACRAMEN; RH-3/HAYES; RH-3/NC-2; RH-3/RM-2; RM-2/RH-3; RH-3/RM-3; RM-3/RH-3; RH-3/RSD; RH-3/VALENCIA; RM-1/NC-3; RM-1/RM-2; RM-1/RM-3; RM-1/RM-4; RM-1/SACRAMENTO; NC-1/RH-1/RH-2; NC-1/RH-2; NC-2/RH-2; NC-3/RH-2; NCD/RH-2; NC-S/RH-2; RH-2/NC-1; RH-2/NC-2; RH-2/NC-3; RH-2/RM-2; RM-2/RH-2; RH-2/RM-3; RM-3/RH-2; NC-1/RH-1; NC-2/RH-1; NC-2/RH-1(D); NC-3/RH-1; NCD/RH-1; NCD/RH-1(D); NC-S/RH-1; RH-1(D)/NC-2; RH-1/NC-1; RH-1/NC-2; RH-1/NC-3; RH-1/NC-S; 24TH-MISSION; 24TH STREET- NOE VALL; 24TH-NOE; BROADWAY; BROADWAY NEIGHBORHOOD; C-2/RM-4; CASTRO STREET NEIGHBO; CASTRO; CCB; CRNC; CR-NC; CRNC/CVR; CR-NC/CVR; CRNC/RM-4; CVR; DTR/RC-4; FILLMORE; HAIGHT; HAIGHT STREET NEIGHBO; HAYES; HAIGHT STREET NEIGHBO; INNER CLEMENT; INNER CLEMENT STREET; INNER SUNSET; INNER SUNSET NEIGHBOR; M-1/NC-2; M-1/RM-2; M-1/RSD; NC-1; NC-1/RM-2; NC-1/RM-3; NC-2; NC-2/M-1; NC-2/NC-3; NC-3/NC-2; NC-2/RM-3; NC-2/RM-4; NC-3; NC-3/RC-4; NC-3/RM-3; NC-3/RM-4; NCD; NCD/; NCD/24TH STREET- NOE VALL; NCD/24TH STREET-; NCD/24TH-MISSION; NCD/24TH-NOE; NCD/24TH-NOE-VALLE; NCD/24TH-NOE-VALLEY; NCD/BROADWAY; NCD/BROADWAY NEIG; NCD/BROADWAY NEIGHBORHOOD; NCD/CASTRO; NCD/CASTRO STREET; NCD/CASTRO STREET NEIGHBO; NCD/EXCELSIOR OUTER MISSI; NCD/EXCELSIOR OUT; EXCELSIOR OUTER MISSI; NCD/FILLMORE; NCD/HAIGHT; NCD/HAIGHT STREET; NCD/HAIGHT STREET NEIGHBO; NCD/HAYES; NCD/HAYES NCT; NCD/HAYES NCT/RTO; NCD/INNER CLEMENT; NCD/INNER CLEMENT STREET; NCD/INNER SUNSET; NCD/INNER SUNSET NEIGHBOR; NCD/IRVING STREET NEIGHBO; NCD/IRVING STREET; NCD/IRVING; IRVING STREET NEIGHBO; NCD/JAPANTOWN NEIGHBORHOO; NCD/JAPANTOWN NEI; JAPANTOWN NEIGHBORHOO; NCD/JUDAH STREET NEIGHBOR; NCD/JUDAH; NCD/JUDAH STREET; JUDAH STREET NEIGHBOR; NCD/NC-1; NCD/NC-2; NCD/NC-3; NCD/NCT; NCD/NO BEACH; NCD/NORIEGA STREET NEIGHB; NCD/NORIEGA STREE; NCD/NORIEGA; NCD/NORTH BEACH NEIGHBORH; NCD/NORTH BEACH N; NCD/NORTH BEACH; NCD/NORTHBEACH; NCD/NORTH BEACH/RM-1; NCD/NORTHBEACH/RM-1; NCD/OUTER CLEMENT; NCD/OUTER CLEMENT STREET; NCD/OUTER CLEMENT STREET; NCD/PACIFIC; NCD/PACIFIC AVENU; NCD/PACIFIC/RM-3; NCD/PACIFIC;RM-3; NCD/PACIFIC AVENUE NEIGHB; NCD/POLK; NCD/POLK STREET N; NCD/POLK STREET NEIGHBORH; NCD/POLK/RC-3; NCD/POLK/RC-4; NCD/RC-3; NCD/RESIDENTIAL- HOUSE, O; NCD/RESIDENTIAL-; NCD/RM-2; NCD/RM-3; NCD/RM-3/PACIFIC; NCD/RTO; NCD/SACRAMENTO; NCD/SACRAMENTO STREET NEI; NCD/TARAVAL STREET NEIGHB; NCD/TARAVAL STREE; NCD/TARAVAL; NCD/UNION; NCD/UNION STREET; NCD/UNION STREET NEIGHBOR; NCD/UPPER FILLMORE NEIGHB; NCD/UPPER FILLMOR; NCD/UPPER FILLMORE; NCD/UPPERFILLMORE; NCD/UPPER MARKET STREET N; NCD/UPPER MARKET; NCD/UPR MARKET NC; NCD/UPR MARKET; NCD/UPR MARKET NCT; NCD/UPR MARKET NCT/; NCD/VALENCIA; NCD/WEST PORTAL; NCD/WEST PORTAL A; NCD/WEST PORTAL AVENUE NE; NCD/BAYVIEW; NCD/COLE VALLEY; NCD/CORTLAND AVENUE; NCD/GEARY BOULEVARD; NCD/GEARY BOULEVA; NCD/GEARY BOULEVARD/RH-2; NCD/GEARY BOULEVARD/RM-1; NCD/INNER BALBOA STREET; NCD/INNER BALBOA S; NCD/OUTER BALBOA STREET; NCD/ OUTER BALBOA STREET; NCD/OUTER BALBOA S; NCD/LOWER HAIGHT STREET; NCD/LOWER HAIGHT S; NCD/LOWER HAIGHT STREET/RH-3; NCD/LOWER POLK STREET; NCD/MISSION BERNAL; NCD/INNER TARAVAL STREET; NCD/INNER TARAVAL; NCD/SAN BRUNO AVENUE; NCD/LAKESIDE VILLAGE; NCD/LAKESIDE VILLAG; NC-S; NC-S/PM-R; NC-S/RM-3; NCT-DIVISADERO/RM-3; NCT/RM-3; NCT/RM-4; NO BEACH; OUTER CLEMENT; POLK; RC-3; RC-3/POLK; RC-3/RM-3; RC-4; RC-4/NC-3; RC-4/RH DTR; RC-4/RM-4; RED/SLR; RM-2; RM-2/M-1; RM-2/NC-1; RM-2/NC-2; RM-2/NO BEACH; RM-2/RM-3; RM-2/RM-4; RM-3; RM-3/NC-1; RM-3/NC-2; RM-3/NC-3; RM-3/NC-S; RM-3/RC-3; RM-3/RM-4; RM-4; RM-4/CR-NC; RM-4/NC-2; RM-4/NC-3; RM-4/RC-4; RSD; RSD/SLR; SACRAMENTO; SLR; SSO; UNION; UPR MARKET; VALENCIA; WEST PORTAL

Appendix: Zoning Classifications (Continued)

Zoning Variable	Zoning Districts
zp_Public	C-2/M-1/P; C-2/P; C-3-O(SD)/P; C-3-O/C-3-S/P; C-3-S/P; CMUO/P; P/C-3-R; P/RM-1/RH-2; P/PM-R/RM-1; P/RH-3; P/RM-1; PM-MU2/PM-OS/PM-R/RM-1; P/RH-1/RH-2; P/RH-2; P/P-W/RH-1; P/RH-1; P/RH-1(D); P/RH-1/RH-1(D); Remove; HP-RA/M-1/M-2/P; HP-RA/M-2/P; M-1/M-2/P; M-1/P; M-2/MB-OS; M-2/MB-RA/P; M-2/P; MB-O; MB-O/MB-RA; MB-OS; MB-RA/P; MUG/P; NC-2/P; NC-3/P/RM-3; NCD/P; NC-S/P; NCT/P; NCT-3/P; NCT-3/RTO; P; P/C-3-O(SD); P/M-1; P/M-2; P/MISS BAY S PL; P/MISS BAY S PLN; P/MUR; P/NC-S; P/NC-2; P/PDR-2; P/PM-OS; P/PM-OS/PM-R; P/P-W; P/RC-4; P/RM-2; P/RM-3; P/TB DTR; P/RTO-C; P, RTO-C; PM-CF; PM-CF/PM-OS; PM-CF/PM-OS/PM-R; PM-MU1/PM-OS; PM-MU2/PM-OS/PM-R; PM-OS; PM-OS/PM-R; PM-OS/PM-R/PM-S; PM-OS/PM-S; Public
zp_FBDMulti_RTO	DTR/RC-4; NCD/HAYES NCT; NCD/HAYES NCT/RTO; NCD/NCT; NCD/RTO; NCD/UPR MARKET NCT; NCD/UPR MARKET NCT/; NC-S/PM-R; NCT-DIVISADERO/RM-3; NCT/RM-3; NCT/RM-4; RC-4/RH DTR; RED/SLR; P/PM-R/RM-1; PM-MU2/PM-OS/PM-R/RM-1; MUG/P; NCT/P; NCT-3/P; NCT-3/RTO; P/MUR; P/PM-OS/PM-R; P/TB DTR; P/RTO-C; P, RTO-C; PM-CF/PM-OS/PM-R; PM-MU1/PM-OS; PM-MU2/PM-OS/PM-R; PM-OS/PM-R; PM-OS/PM-R/PM-S; C-3-O(SD)/TB DTR; C-3-O/TB DTR; CMUO/MUR; NCT-DIVISADERO/RH-3; NCT-DIVISADERO/RM-1; NCT/RH-3; NCT/RM-1; PM-R/RM-1; MUR/RH-2; NCT-GLEN PARK/RH-2; NCT-OCEAN/RH-2; NCT/RH-2; NCT-OCEAN/RH-1(D); NCT/RH-1(D); DTR; DTR/M-1; M-1/RH DTR; M-2/MR-MU; M-2/P70-MU; MB-RA/MR-MU; MR-MU; MUG; MUG/RED; MUR; NCT; NCT-DIVISADERO; NCT-FOLSOM; NCT-GLEN PARK; NCT-HAYES; NCT-HAYES/RTO; NCT-HAYES/RTO-1; NCT-MISSION; NCT-UPPER MARKET; NCT-UPPER MARKET;; NCT-UPPER MARKET/RH-2; NCT-UPPER MARKET/RH-3; NCT-OCEAN; NCT-SOMA; NCT/NCT-3; NCT/RCD; NCT/RED-MX; NCT/RTO; NCT/RTO-M; NCT/UMU; NCT-1; NCT-2; NCT-3; NCT-3/NCT-HAYES; RTO-1/NCT-3; RTO/NCT-3; P70-MU; PDR-1-D/UMU; PDR-1-G/UMU; PM-MU1; PM-MU1/PM-R; PM-MU2/PM-R; PM-MU2; PM-R; RCD; RED; RED-MX; RED-MX/WMUG; RH DTR; RH DTR/SB-DTR; RH DTR/TB DTR; RTO; RTO-1; RTO/NCT; RTO-1/RTO-C; RTO-C; RTO-M; SB-DTR; SPD; TB DTR; UMU; WMUG
zp_PDRInd	DTR/M-1; M-1/RH DTR; M-2/MR-MU; M-2/P70-MU; PDR-1-D/UMU; PDR-1-G/UMU; M-1/NC-2; M-1/RM-2; M-1/RSD; NC-2/M-1; RM-2/M-1; C-2/M-1/P; HP-RA/M-1/M-2/P; HP-RA/M-2/P; M-1/M-2/P; M-1/P; M-2/MB-OS; M-2/MB-RA/P; M-2/P; P/M-1; P/M-2; P/PDR-2; C-2/M-1; C-M/M-1; RH-1/RH-2/RM-1; M-1/RH-2/RM-1; M-1/RM-1; M-2/RH-3; RH-3/M-2; M-1/RH-1; RH-1/M-1; HP-RA/M-1; HP-RA/M-2; M-1; M-1/M-1; M-1/M-2; M-1/PDR-1-B; M-1/PDR-2; M-2; M-2 (MB); M-2/MB-RA; M-2/PDR-2; M-2/SLI; MISS BAY S PLN/M-2; MISS BAY S PL; MISS BAY S PLN; MISS BAY S PLN/M-; PDR-1; PDR-1/PDR-2; PDR-1-B; PDR-1-B/PDR-2; PDR-1-D; PDR-1-G; PDR-2; SALI; SLI; SLI/M-2
zp_Redev	HP-RA/M-1/M-2/P; HP-RA/M-2/P; M-2/MB-RA/P; HP-RA/M-1; HP-RA/M-2; M-2/MB-RA; MISS BAY S PLN/M-2; MISS BAY S PL; MISS BAY S PLN; MISS BAY S PLN/M-; MB-RA/MR-MU; MB-O/MB-RA; MB-RA/P; P/MISS BAY S PL; P/MISS BAY S PLN; HP-RA/RM-1; HP-RA; MB-RA; MISS BAY N RED; MISS BAY N RED PLN; MISS BAY N RED PL; MISS BAY S RED; MISS BAY S RED PLN; MISS BAY S RED PL

Appendix: Logic of Applying the Model

- This section of the appendix describes in more detail how the model was used to produce estimates of future housing production.
- For the existing zoning (“baseline”), the application of the model is straightforward. Current zoning was encoded using the zoning classification on the previous page, and current allowable height was used as the height variable in the logistic regression, and to calculate building envelope in the units regression.
- For the proposed rezoning (“policy”), the logic used was as follows: based on the units regression, each 1000 square feet of building envelope results in 0.42 units. The State Density Bonus adds an additional 0.44 units. Parcels that elect to use the Local Program therefore need to accommodate at least 0.44 additional units per 1000 square feet of envelope if developers are to choose this option. For parcels where the Local Program was more desirable, and on parcels that are ineligible for the SDB, because their zoning and size prevents them from building more than 5 units, the Local Program was applied. For all other parcels the SDB was used.

Appendix: Logic of Applying the Model (Continued)

- Probabilities and units for any parcel using the State Density Bonus were calculated by:
  - In the logistic regression, using the first new height in the rezoning table for Height_Ft and in the Env_1000_Area_Height calculation.
  - In the units regression, using the first new height in the rezoning table to calculate Env_1000_Area_Height;
  - Incorporating the SDB_2016_5Plus_EnvFull effect;
  - Incorporating the Zoning_DR_EnvFull if applicable (i.e. the parcel is density-restricted.

Appendix: Logic of Applying the Model (Continued)

- Probabilities and units for any parcel using the Local Program were calculated by:
  - In the logistic regression, setting zp_FBDMulti_RTO = 1, to account for the relaxation of density controls in the Local Program;
  - In the logistic regression, using the second new height in the rezoning table for Height_Ft and in the Env_1000_Area_Height calculation.
  - In the units regression, using the second new height in the rezoning table to calculate Env_1000_Area_Height;
  - In the units regression, removing the SDB_2016_5Plus_EnvFull effect;
  - In the units regression, removing the Zoning_DR_EnvFull effect.

Appendix: Business Disruption / Relocation Costs

- The analysis makes the following assumptions about business disruption and relocation costs:
  - Lost space will be 10% vacant, so 90% of the loss represents the loss of occupied space.
  - Lost business net income (for 6 months of disruption): $5/occupied square foot.
  - Fixed labor costs (for 6 months): $10/occupied square foot.
  - Moving costs and build-out of space at new premises: $175/occupied square foot

Staff Contact

Ted Egan, Ph.D., Chief Economist ted.egan@sfgov.org

From:	Bobak Esfandiari
Cc:	Mike Chen
Subject:	SF Democratic Party"s Resolution in support of the Family Zoning Plan
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 3:00:25 PM
Attachments:	Resolution In Support of the Family Zoning Plan to Make Housing More Affordable And Preserve Local Control Combined.pdf

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

To all interested parties,

On October 22, 2025 the San Francisco Democratic Party passed a resolution supporting the Family Zoning Plan to Make Housing More Affordable And Preserve Local Control.

The resolution was passed with a vote of 21 AYEs, by the members present and was introduced by Michael Chen and Nancy Tung.

A certificate detailing the vote count is included on the attached PDF which includes the resolution.

If you have further questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to reach out to myself or the author, who is copied on this email.

Best,
Bobak Esfandiari

--
Bobak Esfandiari
Executive Director, San Francisco Democratic Party
bobak@sfdems.org | +1.925.899.2409 he/him



SF DEMS
SAN FRANCISCO DEMOCRATIC PARTY

Date Passed: October 22, 2025

Resolution Number: 2025-10-Family Zoning

SAN FRANCISCO DEMOCRATIC COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE

OFFICERS
Nancy Tung, Chair
Dan Calamuci, First Vice Chair
Marjan Philhour, Second Vice Chair
Cedric Akbar, Third Vice Chair
Emma Hare, Fourth Vice Chair
Michael Lai, Finance Director
Mike Chen, Internal Operations Director
Lanier Coles, External Operations Director

MEMBERS
Michela Alioto-Pier
Joshua Arce
John Avalos
Connie Chan
Trevor Chandler
Matt Dorsey
Peter Gallotta
Parag Gupta
Lily Ho
Jane Kim
Eric Kingsbury
Bilal Mahmood
Gordon Mar
Michael Nguyen
Joe Sangirardi
Jade Tu

EX OFFICIO MEMBERS
U.S. Speaker Emerita Nancy Pelosi
U.S. Congressmember Kevin Mullin
Lieutenant Governor Eleni Kounalakis
State Treasurer Fiona Ma
State Controller Malia Cohen
State Senator Scott Wiener
State Assemblymember Matt Haney
State Assemblymember Catherine Stefani

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
Bobak Esfandiari

San Francisco Democratic Party
1390 Market Street, Suite 200
San Francisco, CA 94102

(415) 226-9771
info@sfdems.org
www.sfdems.org

Aye: 21 – Akbar, Arce, Calamuci, Chandler, Chen, Coles, Dorsey, Gupta, Hare, Ho, Kingsbury, Lai, Mahmood, Philhour, Sangirardi, Tung, Ma, Cohen, Wiener, Haney, Stefani

Nay: 5 – Avalos, Chan, Gallotta, Mar, Mullin

Abstain: 3 – Tu, Pelosi, Kounalakis

Absent: 3 – Alioto-Pier, Kim, Nguyen

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was ADOPTED on October 22, 2025 by the San Francisco Democratic Party.

Bobak Esfandiari

Bobak Esfandiari
Executive Director

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE FAMILY ZONING PLAN TO MAKE HOUSING MORE AFFORDABLE AND PRESERVE LOCAL CONTROL

Principal Authors: Mike Chen, Nancy Tung
Co-Sponsors: Cedric Akbar, Joshua Arce, Dan Calamuci, Trevor Chandler, Lanier Coles, Matt Dorsey, Parag Gupta, Eric Kingsbury, Michael Lai, Bilal Mahmood, Marjan Philhour, Joe Sangirardi

WHEREAS, San Francisco's decades-long housing shortage has caused housing prices to explode; high housing costs are a burden on San Franciscans and contribute to the homelessness, displacement, and cost of living crises; and San Francisco must proactively address rising housing costs in order to retain and attract workers, artists, innovators, and young people to live here; and

WHEREAS, California law requires cities and counties to plan for more housing to meet population growth; to comply with state law, in 2023, after outreach and neighborhood input, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors adopted a plan to allow 82,069 new homes at varying income affordability levels by 2031;[1] the plan commits San Francisco to a rezoning program to allow more homes to be created; and

WHEREAS, If the city fails to follow through on the plan and rezone, the city will go back on its commitments to the state, leading to court penalties, the loss of over $100 million every year in state funds for transportation and low-income housing, and loss of local land use authority through a state takeover that nullifies all local planning standards around height, setbacks, design, density, parking, and shadows through the Builder's Remedy; without a rezoning plan, San Francisco will continue to become more expensive, less racially diverse, and less welcoming to working families, young people, seniors, and immigrants, while losing the ability to plan responsibly; and

[1] Board File #230001, Housing Element https://sfgov.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=5982213&GUID=A8FDFF26-50BF-4031-9A36-D58ECD208048

PROPOUNDED BY: Chen, Tung
ADOPTED: 10-22-2025
RESOLUTION NO. 2025-10-Family Zoning

WHEREAS, the proposed Family Zoning Plan for San Francisco (a) focuses more housing capacity along transit and commercial corridors where more housing makes the most sense; (b) would facilitate low-income housing in priority equity neighborhoods such as the Mission, Chinatown or South of Market; (c) would generate funding and expand opportunities for low- and middle-income housing built by community-based non-profit organizations, including (but not limited to) drug-free housing for people recovering from substance use disorder; (d) incentivizes construction of family-sized homes with at least two bedrooms; (e) includes strategies to prevent small business displacement; (f) complements state housing laws and labor standards that promote union construction jobs and lift up working conditions and standards for all residential construction workers; (g) ensures that low-income affordable housing is preserved or replaced, and that tenants can return there after construction; (h) allows the creation of new rent-controlled housing; and

WHEREAS, the Family Zoning Plan will also build on existing and developing policies to stabilize families and communities, including the inclusionary housing program for generating affordable housing for low-income workers and immigrant families, the neighborhood preference program to keep vulnerable low-income families in their own neighborhoods and the city, demolition controls to preserve tenant-occupied and guard against the destruction and loss of rent-controlled housing, rent control, tenant eviction protections, and fully-funded small business assistance and relocation programs; and therefore

RESOLVED, that the San Francisco Democratic Party supports the Family Zoning Plan with the aforementioned goals and principles, which preserves local control, complies with the state-mandated Housing Element, makes housing more affordable, supports union construction jobs with high labor standards, advances recovery from addiction, and protects tenants and small businesses from displacement; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, that copies of this Resolution be sent to Mayor Daniel Lurie and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors; and that the San Francisco Democratic Party directs the Executive Director to support the Family Zoning Plan.

PROPOUNDED BY: Chen, Tung
ADOPTED: 10-22-2025
RESOLUTION NO. 2025-10-Family Zoning

From:	Lee Heidhues
To:	Lurie, Daniel (MYR)
Cc:	Luke Bornheimer; Lucas Lux; DPH-jodie; Robin at KidSafe SF; Andy Thornley; Chan, Connie (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Joe Eskenazi; Joe Fitzgerald; rswan@sfchronicle.com; Garcia-Ruiz, Emilio; Ms. Lizzie Ann Heidhues
Subject:	Fwd: Upzoning plan amendments: What got stalled?
Date:	Tuesday, November 18, 2025 5:50:25 PM

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

Mayor Lurie

https://newspack-missionlocal.s3.amazonaws.com/mission/wp-content/uploads/2025/11/D4-Questionnaire-Final.pdf

The questionnaire has an implicit bias in that it asks how the respondent voted on Proposition Kpp and refers to "Great Highway" even though the proper name is Sunset Dunes Park
Given that you, Mayor Lurie, are opposed to the Park the phrasing of the question lays bare your bias.
A proponent of Proposition K will never be appointed

In Solidarity,
Lee Heidhues

---------- Forwarded message ---------
From: **Lee Heidhues** <leerossh@gmail.com>
Date: Tue, Nov 18, 2025, 5:33 PM
Subject: Fwd: Upzoning plan amendments: What got stalled?
To: Barish Jean <jeanbbarish@hotmail.com>


Jean

Thought you might like to see this

In Solidarity,
Lee

---------- Forwarded message ---------
From: **Mission Local** <info@missionlocal.com>
Date: Tue, Nov 18, 2025, 5:31 PM
Subject: Upzoning plan amendments: What got stalled?
To: <leerossh@gmail.com>

mission-local-logo



Good afternoon!

Want to be D4 supervisor? Mission Local obtained the 5-page questionnaire the **Mayor's office** is sending out to applicants. In an only-in-San Francisco touch, applicants were asked whether they'd ever hired a **permit expediter** on their properties.

The Land Use committee of the S.F. Board of Supervisors approved a few state-supported **amendments to the city's controversial upzoning plan**, and tabled more sweeping attempts to **exempt** certain areas from development. **Io Yeh Gilman** explains what's happening—and what's next.


The legacy business **Bissap Baobab** is closing its Mission Street venue after **28 years.** The owner, **Marco Senghor**, is actively looking for a new location, and promises a **farewell party** for the neighborhood December 20.

For the **back story**, read about Senghor's previous move from '**Little Baobab**' to 'Big Baobab.'

More soon,


Sara

Latest News




Sweeping amendments to S.F. upzoning plan tabled

"We cannot simply agree to demolish San Francisco for the sake of meeting a state mandate."



Want to be D4 supervisor? Here's the mayor’s questionnaire.


"Have you ever said anything that could be perceived as offensive on social media platforms such as X?"



Bissap Baobab to close Mission St. location

"Let us be clear: Baobab is NOT done. The Baobab bends, but it never breaks."


Back Story



‘Big Baobab’ to plant fresh roots on Mission Street

"I feel like Baobab is not mine anymore; it belongs to the community."

SNAP



Viva KitKat

By Elina Davenport

Events

All Events


Today: Wendy DeWitt, Queen of Boogie Woogie at the Woodchopper's Ball, Verdi Club, November 18, 9-11:30PM

Tomorrow: Public Board Meeting at the Mission Cultural Center for Latino Arts, November 19, 6-8PM

We have $76,500 in matching funds!

One gift, twice the impact. Donate today to keep Mission Local **forever free — for everyone.**

I'm in! Match my gift.





This email was sent to leerossh@gmail.com
why did I get this? unsubscribe from this list update subscription preferences
Mission Local · 2489 Mission St Ste 22 · San Francisco, CA 94110-2473 · USA

From: hobb2@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sherri Samu
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Tuesday, November 18, 2025 1:44:18 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Sherri Samu
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: young.erika@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Erika Young
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 10:47:24 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

What on earth is happening to City Hall? Do Scott Wiener and his YIMBY overlords decide everything now? The Land Use Committee just voted to kill Supervisor Chan and Chen's amendments to Mayor Lurie's “Rich Family Housing Plan”. This means that Daniel Lurie deliberately created a housing plan that would drive his own residents and small businesses out of the city.

I can only assume that greed and money are driving Senator Wiener and Supervisor Melgar, because I can't find a way to explain their actions with logic. I also find it shameful that Wiener would come to the city of San Francisco and make it his home -- a city that ensures his personal freedom as a gay man -- and then turn around and do everything he can to destroy it.

Regarding Supervisor Melgar, I've seen news coverage that the residents of D7 are starting to consider a recall. I've also seen quotes from constituents who really used to like her, and now can't understand why she literally ignores them.

A lot of city residents have been asking how something like Redevelopment could have happened. Now we know.

Sincerely,
Erika Young
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: jennifer_mahoney@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of jennifer mahoney
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 4:55:16 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):Lincoln Manor neighborhoods parking is a big problem because there are not any parking permits here-all the apartment residents on Geary and Clement use our street (shore view) as a parking lot!! Because there isn't any enforcement, it's a real nuisance for ppl who live here It cannot get any worse.

Sincerely,
jennifer mahoney
San Francisco, CA 94121

From:	dadaray2002@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Linda Ray
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 4:32:28 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning. The proposed zoning changes are the most far reaching in decades and should not be rushed through behind closed doors.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Linda Ray
San Francisco, CA 94133

From:	kielykids@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of LaVive Kiely
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 4:05:40 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

What are you tying to hide from us?

Sincerely,
LaVive Kiely
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: betho9@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Beth O Kellenberger
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 3:21:30 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

THIS PLAN jumps the gun. Poorly considered. We don't even really know how much vacant housing there is because that's "hard to determine" in S.F. Meanwhile, owners don't want to rent because they can't get bad tenants out. LET'S FIX THAT FIRST. Also , we don't have public transit built for NORTH/SoUTH travel by car OR by public transit…. Especially now that great highway is closed….. SO LET'S FIX THAT first.

Sincerely,
Beth O Kellenberger
San Francisco, CA 94121

From:	timepuzzle@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Robert Smith
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 3:07:51 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We’re hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won’t invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
John Robert Smith
San Francisco, CA 94127

From:	noguera@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Hatun Noguera
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 3:06:25 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments: Do what the people who elected you want, not what you want.

Sincerely,
Hatun Noguera
San Francisco, CA 94127

SF DEMS
SAN FRANCISCO DEMOCRATIC PARTY

Date Passed: October 22, 2025

Resolution Number: 2025-10-Family Zoning

Aye: 21 – Akbar, Arce, Calamuci, Chandler, Chen, Coles, Dorsey, Gupta, Hare, Ho, Kingsbury, Lai, Mahmood, Philhour, Sangirardi, Tung, Ma, Cohen, Wiener, Haney, Stefani

Nay: 5 – Avalos, Chan, Gallotta, Mar, Mullin

Abstain: 3 – Tu, Pelosi, Kounalakis

Absent: 3 – Alioto-Pier, Kim, Nguyen

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was ADOPTED on October 22, 2025 by the San Francisco Democratic Party.

Bobak Esfandiari

Bobak Esfandiari
Executive Director

SAN FRANCISCO DEMOCRATIC COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE

OFFICERS
Nancy Tung, Chair
Dan Calamuci, First Vice Chair
Marjan Philhour, Second Vice Chair
Cedric Akbar, Third Vice Chair
Emma Hare, Fourth Vice Chair
Michael Lai, Finance Director
Mike Chen, Internal Operations Director
Lanier Coles, External Operations Director

MEMBERS
Michela Alioto-Pier
Joshua Arce
John Avalos
Connie Chan
Trevor Chandler
Matt Dorsey
Peter Gallotta
Parag Gupta
Lily Ho
Jane Kim
Eric Kingsbury
Bilal Mahmood
Gordon Mar
Michael Nguyen
Joe Sangirardi
Jade Tu

EX OFFICIO MEMBERS
U.S. Speaker Emerita Nancy Pelosi
U.S. Congressmember Kevin Mullin
Lieutenant Governor Eleni Kounalakis
State Treasurer Fiona Ma
State Controller Malia Cohen
State Senator Scott Wiener
State Assemblymember Matt Haney
State Assemblymember Catherine Stefani

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
Bobak Esfandiari

San Francisco Democratic Party
1390 Market Street, Suite 200
San Francisco, CA 94102

(415) 226-9771
info@sfdems.org
www.sfdems.org

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE FAMILY ZONING PLAN TO MAKE HOUSING MORE AFFORDABLE AND PRESERVE LOCAL CONTROL

Principal Authors: Mike Chen, Nancy Tung
Co-Sponsors: Cedric Akbar, Joshua Arce, Dan Calamuci, Trevor Chandler, Lanier Coles, Matt Dorsey, Parag Gupta, Eric Kingsbury, Michael Lai, Bilal Mahmood, Marjan Philhour, Joe Sangirardi

WHEREAS, San Francisco's decades-long housing shortage has caused housing prices to explode; high housing costs are a burden on San Franciscans and contribute to the homelessness, displacement, and cost of living crises; and San Francisco must proactively address rising housing costs in order to retain and attract workers, artists, innovators, and young people to live here; and

WHEREAS, California law requires cities and counties to plan for more housing to meet population growth; to comply with state law, in 2023, after outreach and neighborhood input, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors adopted a plan to allow 82,069 new homes at varying income affordability levels by 2031;[1] the plan commits San Francisco to a rezoning program to allow more homes to be created; and

WHEREAS, If the city fails to follow through on the plan and rezone, the city will go back on its commitments to the state, leading to court penalties, the loss of over $100 million every year in state funds for transportation and low-income housing, and loss of local land use authority through a state takeover that nullifies all local planning standards around height, setbacks, design, density, parking, and shadows through the Builder's Remedy; without a rezoning plan, San Francisco will continue to become more expensive, less racially diverse, and less welcoming to working families, young people, seniors, and immigrants, while losing the ability to plan responsibly; and

---

[1] Board File #230001, Housing Element
https://sfgov.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=5982213&GUID=A8FDFF26-50BF-4031-9A36-D58ECD208048

PROPOUNDED BY: Chen, Tung
ADOPTED: 10-22-2025
RESOLUTION NO. 2025-10-Family Zoning

WHEREAS, the proposed Family Zoning Plan for San Francisco (a) focuses more housing capacity along transit and commercial corridors where more housing makes the most sense; (b) would facilitate low-income housing in priority equity neighborhoods such as the Mission, Chinatown or South of Market; (c) would generate funding and expand opportunities for low- and middle-income housing built by community-based non-profit organizations, including (but not limited to) drug-free housing for people recovering from substance use disorder; (d) incentivizes construction of family-sized homes with at least two bedrooms; (e) includes strategies to prevent small business displacement; (f) complements state housing laws and labor standards that promote union construction jobs and lift up working conditions and standards for all residential construction workers; (g) ensures that low-income affordable housing is preserved or replaced, and that tenants can return there after construction; (h) allows the creation of new rent-controlled housing; and

WHEREAS, the Family Zoning Plan will also build on existing and developing policies to stabilize families and communities, including the inclusionary housing program for generating affordable housing for low-income workers and immigrant families, the neighborhood preference program to keep vulnerable low-income families in their own neighborhoods and the city, demolition controls to preserve tenant-occupied and guard against the destruction and loss of rent-controlled housing, rent control, tenant eviction protections, and fully-funded small business assistance and relocation programs; and therefore

RESOLVED, that the San Francisco Democratic Party supports the Family Zoning Plan with the aforementioned goals and principles, which preserves local control, complies with the state-mandated Housing Element, makes housing more affordable, supports union construction jobs with high labor standards, advances recovery from addiction, and protects tenants and small businesses from displacement; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, that copies of this Resolution be sent to Mayor Daniel Lurie and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors; and that the San Francisco Democratic Party directs the Executive Director to support the Family Zoning Plan.

PROPOUNDED BY: Chen, Tung
ADOPTED: 10-22-2025
RESOLUTION NO. 2025-10-Family Zoning

Public Comment to the Land Use Committee 11/17/2025
Jessica Vistnes

My name is Jessica Vistnes and I am a resident of District 2. I've given public comment several times before and was thinking about not coming again today but I feel so strongly about this issue that here I am. I have a lot of concerns about the upzoning in District 2, but in my 2 minutes I want to concentrate on the upzoning to 14 stories on Lombard Street from Laguna going east to Van Ness.

My understanding of how this came about was that it was in response to a proposal from the Cow Hollow Association. I am attaching a copy of that proposal with my comments today and I am hoping you will read it. The proposal had asked to taper the increase of heights on Lombard so that there would be no increase from four stories around the Palace of Fine Arts up through Webster Street so people could see the Palace of Fine Arts. Then the proposal called for increasing heights to five stories from Webster to Gough and then six stories between Gough and Van Ness. This proposal seemed very reasonable to me and fits with the scale of the neighborhood.

My understanding was that in response to this proposal heights WERE lowered close to the Palace of Fine Arts – in line with neighborhood concerns. But heights were not lowered to five stories on the next part of Lombard and instead of heights of six stories closer to Van Ness they were increased from what had been in the plan before to now be 14 stories. And my further understanding is this was done to maintain the count along Lombard Street – which is, in my opinion, not a thoughtful way to do planning.

This part of San Francisco has many of the views of the Bay that are iconic. These blocks on Lombard would affect views of Fort Mason and Alcatraz from many viewpoints. So, I am here again to ask you to put in an amendment to lower the heights from 14 stories on the blocks from Laguna to Van Ness. If the heights were so easily increased from maps that had been in the works for years, they should be able to be decreased although time is getting very short.

COW HOLLOW ASSOCIATION
P.O. BOX 471136 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94147



April 30, 2025

Supervisor Stephen Sherrill
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Proposed Revisions to the Upzoning Map to Reflect District 2's Community Planning, Safety, and Growth Objectives

Dear Supervisor Sherrill,

Thank you for your engagement with our neighborhood as we collectively work toward a vision of housing growth that respects San Francisco's history, diverse communities, scale, and distinctive public spaces.

As SF Planning continues to revise the proposed Upzoning Map, we request a series of specific, actionable changes critical to maintaining the identity, livability, and uniqueness of this part of San Francisco. We look forward to working with you to:

- Maintain Lombard Street as a Scenic Gateway to San Francisco
- Protect Existing Housing and Prioritize Safety
- Safeguard Neighborhood-Serving Retail Corridors
- Remove Density Decontrol Provisions

This part of District 2 features some of San Francisco's most iconic landmarks—from the Bay and the Palace of Fine Arts to the Golden Gate Bridge. As drivers enter the city via the Presidio Parkway, they experience a rare blend of hillside housing and urban density, evoking the charm of Europe's great coastal cities. The combination of natural setting, architectural rhythm, and cultural legacy makes this area both a world-class tourist destination and a cherished residential neighborhood.

For over a century, development west of Van Ness has followed the city's natural topography, integrating the urban grid with the land's slope, sunlight, and airflow. This is no accident—it is the result of organic, community-guided planning. Taller buildings crown the hilltops, gradually stepping down to 40 feet as the land slopes toward the Bay. Where this balance has been ignored, the consequences have been damaging.

COW HOLLOW ASSOCIATION
P.O. BOX 471136 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94147



As the city updates its zoning map to meet housing goals, it has both the opportunity and the obligation to respect this historic, context-sensitive development pattern. A one-size-fits-all approach invites speculative land grabs, drives up land costs, and risks replacing community-serving homes and businesses with unaffordable, investor-driven development.

Requested Map Changes & Policy Adjustments

1. Maintain Lombard Street as a Scenic Gateway to San Francisco

Lombard Street forms a gateway into San Francisco from the Golden Gate Bridge, framing iconic landmarks like the Palace of Fine Arts. Longstanding planning principles recognize that such landmarks must retain their visual prominence within the surrounding cityscape.

The proposed Upzoning Map undermines those principles by allowing buildings 6 to 8 stories tall—or more—immediately adjacent to or within the vicinity of lower-scale blocks and historic landmarks. These oversized structures, up to 100% larger than their surroundings, would crowd and compete with iconic features like the Palace of Fine Arts—a City Landmark that has long defined San Francisco's northern waterfront. Its visual stature depends on a built environment that respects both scale and setting. A blunt, uniform upzoning to 85 feet disregards topography and erodes the historic character that makes this area both livable and globally recognized.

We recommend a tapered height approach: 40 feet near the Palace, rising gradually to 50 and then 65 feet approaching Van Ness. This reflects the area's historical development pattern and ensures a balanced transition from the waterfront to the city's interior.

Recommended Height Limits:

- Limit building height to 40' on Richardson Avenue and on Lombard Street (starting at the Lombard Gate) to Webster Street
- Allow gradual increases beyond Webster to Van Ness:
    - 50' between Webster and Gough
    - 65' between Gough and Van Ness

This part of San Francisco — including Cow Hollow, the Marina, and Pacific Heights — has been assigned thousands of new units of housing capacity through broad density decontrol and increased height allowances, all contributing to the state's RHNA targets. It is more than our fair share in one of the city's most densely populated neighborhoods. These policies, when done properly, could enable new growth by allowing duplexes, triplexes, and small multi-unit buildings across the neighborhood.



In addition, Lombard is home to many small, independent motels dating back to the era of the Golden Gate Bridge — a rare remnant of San Francisco's history of welcoming visitors within neighborhood settings. Lombard is one of the last Motorways in the country that captures that hope-filled era of travel in mid-century America, rebuilding after World War II. These motels provide reasonably priced rooms and proximity to a major tourist destination, and support for our local businesses. Several of these motels have already been converted to student housing for the Academy of Art University. Losing others will result in losing tourism to our community and neighborhoods.

These recommendations align with the Planning Department's stated goals under the General Plan to preserve neighborhood character, maintain economic diversity, and enhance citywide view corridors.

2. Protect Existing Housing and Prioritize Safety

Lombard Street already has many residents living in rent-controlled apartments. These homes are essential to neighborhood stability and affordability, and support a vibrant mix of retail, services, and housing. Let's ensure long-time tenants in older rent-controlled buildings will not be quietly displaced through buyouts and demolitions.

As the upzoning plans allowed for more residents, we need to ensure the safety of those residents. The Planning Department must consider the serious risk of liquefaction in these areas. Much of the low-lying Marina and Cow Hollow was built on infill and remains vulnerable to seismic activity.

Aside from Lombard being a liquefaction zone, fire response time is a consideration. Cow Hollow boasts a newly rebuilt fire station on Greenwich Street. However, the fire truck ladders at this station can only service buildings as tall as 6-7 stories. If the building heights nearby are raised to 85' or taller, trucks must come from other neighborhoods, increasing the response time and endangering residents and visitors. This public safety issue has not been addressed anywhere in the city where buildings are proposed for drastic height increases.

These issues point to the need for thoughtful major corridor plans along not only Lombard, but Geary, 19th, and Taraval, among others, to ensure that urban planning practices can be implemented with the public input and care that went into the Market-Octavia or Central SOMA Plans of recent years.

3. Safeguard Neighborhood-Serving Retail Corridors

Chestnut, Union, and Fillmore streets are economic and cultural anchors. Their small-scale, sunlit retail corridors support thousands of jobs and contribute significantly to neighborhood livability and a large contingent of the city's 20+ million visitors that further contribute to supporting local employment and small businesses.



Upzoning these corridors would trigger redevelopment that almost always begins with demolition—many of these buildings are historic one-story Art Deco structures that currently house thriving small businesses. These businesses will not survive the transition, and adjacent shops are often dragged down by years of construction-related disruption. Noise, fencing, blocked sidewalks, lost parking, and reduced foot traffic can destabilize entire commercial blocks. The result is not affordable housing—it is the slow erosion of the vitality and street life that make these neighborhoods work.

The Marina Safeway site is another concern. While redevelopment may be considered, its location and current use are vital for residents—especially seniors and families without access to private transportation. A high-rise would be inappropriate and disruptive in this context.

Recommended Height Limits:

- Limit height to 40 feet on:
    - Union Street
    - Chestnut Street
    - Lower Fillmore Street (within the Marina and Cow Hollow)
    - Upper Fillmore Street (from Jackson to Bush)
    - Safeway site (corner of Laguna and Marina Blvd)

4. Remove Density Decontrol Provisions

To promote transparency and encourage meaningful neighborhood engagement, urge SF Planning to update the current interactive Upzoning Map to clearly reflect the two key provisions. Most San Franciscans are unfamiliar with these kinds of online tools and may not realize they need to click the "Info" button in the left-hand legend to uncover the proposed changes.

Currently, if someone clicks on a corner lot within the density decontrol area, the map still shows a proposed height of 40 feet—rather than the actual 65 feet being contemplated. This creates confusion and obscures the true scope of the changes. Failure to make these provisions plainly visible may not meet the standards of procedural transparency or informed public review expected under CEQA and other land use statutes. Complete clarity is essential.

But clarity alone is not enough. These provisions are deeply flawed and should be removed:

Recommended Changes:



- **Remove the provision that allows 65' heights on corners lots.** This will result in taller, randomly-placed towers among otherwise consistent 1-4 story residential blocks — with no relationship to neighborhood form or any broader planning vision.

- **Remove the provision that allows lots 8,000 sq. ft. or greater to automatically rise to 65'.** This provision encourages lot mergers that will invade the unique and vital greenbelts, backyards, and trees that provide vital open space in dense urban living.

Conclusion

We support new housing through thoughtful, context-sensitive growth. Like the city, we believe in expanding housing opportunities through planning that respects topography, preserves neighborhood identity, and safeguards essential services.

This area has already added housing capacity through the 4- and 6-plex legislation led by Supervisor Mandelman and adopted in 2023. We welcome further improvements that recognize Lombard Street's role as a scenic gateway.

But the current map goes too far. It invites speculation, drives up land costs, and encourages the demolition of sound housing—quietly displacing tenants and small businesses in favor of unaffordable luxury towers. These are the very people and places that give our neighborhoods their life and character.

Incorporating the revisions we've outlined will build public trust, reflect sound planning, and reduce the risk of unnecessary conflict or delay.

We urge you to support a smarter, long-term strategy—one that protects what makes San Francisco unique: its layered history, diverse communities, small businesses, and walkable, human-scale neighborhoods that reflect generations of thoughtful planning—while ensuring that truly affordable housing is the outcome, not just the promise, of these efforts.

Sincerely,

Lori Brooke
President, Cow Hollow Association

cc:
CHA Association Board and Membership
Mayor Daniel Lurie
Ned Segal, Chief of Housing and Economic Development
Rich Hillis, Director, Planning Department
Rachael Tanner, Director of Citywide Planning, Planning Department
Joshua Switzky, Deputy Director of Citywide Policy, Planning Department
Lisa Chen, Principal Planner, Planning Department

SUBMITTED FOR FAMILY ZONING CUT 11/17/2023

SB 9 does not produce below-market-rate (BMR) units, without a substantial increase in supply, it will not realistically assist moderate, low, or extremely low income households (below 120% AMI) obtain housing.

Many areas of the city with lower land values, high percentages of households of color, and/or with lower outcomes in health, wealth, and life expectancy also have high rates of owner-occupied single family housing, for example, the Bayview (73%), Visitation Valley (70%), and Outer Mission (75%). SB 9 may offer these homeowners the opportunity to add units for extended families or to generate rental income, or gain wealth through lot splits. However, there are significant hurdles to realize these gains. Acquiring financing for project development, navigating a complex permitting process, and having the resiliency to manage the significant disruption and take financial risks of construction are major barriers facing existing homeowners in communities of color and low-income communities. Without City investment in programs that support owner-occupied development, such as construction loans or funding prioritized for owners of color or low-income owners, the more straightforward option would be for existing owners to sell their property, or "cash out," and leave San Francisco for areas with lower home costs. While the bill includes a provision that the applicant of an SB 9 lot split is required to occupy one of the housing units as their principal residence for a minimum of three years from the date of the lot split approval, it does not apply to SB 9 project without the lot split. And while selling may financially benefit an individual household, this practice has been incrementally devastating to communities of color, Cultural Districts, and areas of the city where residents have a common sense of cultural identity, and a historic and major loss to San Francisco as a whole.

Agenda Item 4 Attachment

Additional Considerations THIS IS A PRELUDE TO THE REZONING BEING APPROVED

Beyond the issues addressed above, there are unintended consequences for any legislation and these conditions can be difficult to study and anticipate. Some property owners or developers may use SB 9 to streamline the redevelopment of smaller, existing homes into larger, more expensive single family homes with a small additional unit that may never be rented, undermining the intent of creating more housing stock. Renters are protected by SB 9, but may be vulnerable to unscrupulous landlords due to a variety of circumstances, like being undocumented, in a dire financial state, or otherwise exploited. While the city must implement projects that meet the requirements of SB 9, and other state requirements such as SB 330, the Housing Accountability Act, and others, it may also consider allowable measures to tailor SB 9 through local implementation such as creating owner-occupied development programs that prioritize households of color and low income households, unit parity requirements that balance housing unit size, or others new programs. NEED MITIGATION. FOR EXAMPLE: WHAT HAPPENED TO SMALL SITES PROGRAM?

SB 10 Summary

Senate Bill 10 (Wiener)[7] authorizes a local government to adopt an ordinance to zone any parcel for up to 10 units of residential density per parcel, at a height specified in the ordinance if the parcel is located in a transit-rich area or an urban infill site. Specifically, this bill:

TO: LUT FROM: Jerry Schubert

[7] The legislative history and full text of the bill is available at https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=202120220SB10

From:	Ryan Patterson
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	Ephraim Margolin; Sonja Trauss; Devon Bolla
Subject:	RE: Proposed Family Zoning Plan and Housing Element Implementation: File Nos. 250700, 250701, 251071, 251073, 250985, and 250966
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 2:58:40 PM
Attachments:	2025.11.17 Ltr re SF Family Zoning Plan - RJP.pdf

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

Further to the below email, can you please kindly add the attachment to the above-captioned files?

Thank you very much,

Ryan J. Patterson
Patterson & O'Neill, PC
Main: (415) 907-9110
Direct: (415) 907-7701
Mobile: (530) 913-7609
Fax: (415) 907-7704
235 Montgomery Street, Suite 950
San Francisco, CA 94104
ryan@pattersononeill.com
www.pattersononeill.com

This email may contain privileged or confidential material for the sole use of the intended recipient. Review or distribution by others is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the original sender and delete all copies. Nothing in this email or any attachments should be regarded as tax advice unless expressly stated.

From: Devon Bolla <devon@pattersononeill.com>
Sent: Monday, November 17, 2025 2:43 PM
To: john.carroll@sfgov.org; Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
Cc: Ryan Patterson <ryan@pattersononeill.com>; Ephraim Margolin <emargolin@pattersononeill.com>; Sonja Trauss <sonja@yimbylaw.org>
Subject: Proposed Family Zoning Plan and Housing Element Implementation: File Nos. 250700, 250701, 251071, 251073, 250985, and 250966

Good afternoon,

Attached for your review is a memo regarding a proposed family zoning plan and housing element implementation.

Thank you,

Devon J. Bolla
(she/her)
Paralegal
Patterson & O'Neill, PC
Office: (415) 907-9110
Direct: (415) 907-7703
Fax: (415) 907-7704
235 Montgomery Street, Suite 950
San Francisco, CA 94104
devon@pattersononeill.com
www.pattersononeill.com

This email may contain privileged or confidential material for the sole use of the intended recipient. Review or distribution by others is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the original sender and delete all copies. Nothing in this email or any attachments should be regarded as tax advice unless expressly stated.

PATTERSON & O'NEILL, PC

235 Montgomery Street, Suite 950
San Francisco, CA 94104
Telephone: (415) 907-9110
Facsimile: (415) 907-7704

November 17, 2025

VIA EMAIL

Chair Myrna Melgar
Land Use and Transportation Committee
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
49 South Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94103
john.carroll@sfgov.org
Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Proposed Family Zoning Plan and Housing Element Implementation
File Nos. 250700, 250701, 251071, 251073, 250985, and 250966

Dear Chair Melgar and Honorable Supervisors:

Our office represents Yes In My Back Yard ("YIMBY Law"), a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization whose mission is to enforce state housing laws. We write to share our concerns regarding San Francisco's proposed Family Zoning Plan ("FZP"). Our comments incorporate the comments of YIMBY Action and its members, including the attached letters dated September 11, 2025 and October 29, 2025.

I. The City Will Violate the Housing Element Law if it Adopts the FZP Knowing that it Will Not Produce the Required Housing Units

The City's 6th cycle housing element noted that the City was unable to identify enough sites to accommodate the number of units for lower- and moderate-income households, including a 15% buffer, that it was assigned to plan for during its 6th cycle ("RHNA Shortfall"). The Department of Housing and Community Development, therefore, directed the City to include a program in its housing element identifying sites for rezoning to accommodate these units as mandated by the Housing Element Law. (Gov. Code § 65584.09(a)-(b); Gov. Code § 65583(c)(1); *Martinez v. City of Clovis* (2023) 90 Cal. App. 5th 193, 225.) However, the City's proposed rezoning program—Program 7.1.1— and the FZP, which implements Program 7.1.1, are inadequate because (1) the City's own analysis found that the FZP will not create enough units for the City to meet its RHNA Shortfall; (2) the FZP will not create sufficient capacity because it relies on density decontrol in residential neighborhoods without corresponding changes in development standards; and (3) the FZP's local alternative to the state Density Bonus Law will not increase

density because it is duplicative of existing capacity under the state Density Bonus Law.

A. The Chief Economist's Report Confirms that the FZP Will Not Create Enough Units for the City to Meet its RHNA Shortfall

On October 29, 2025, the City's Chief Economist published a report, which found that the FZP will produce **less than half** the number of housing units that the City is required to plan for to meet its RHNA Shortfall – in more than double the time allowed. The report concluded that in a best-case scenario, the FZP would only produce around 14,600 additional units over the next 20 years, representing just 40% of the 36,282 units the City is required to plan for over the next eight years. Under a low-growth scenario, the FZP would only produce 8,504 units over 20 years. Either scenario is inadequate and would be a spectacular failure of the City to comply with the Housing Element Law, which requires local governments to plan to meet their RHNA shortfall through rezoning programs. (Gov. Code § 65583(c)(1) and Gov. Code § 65583.2(h).)

B. The FZP Will Not Create Sufficient Capacity Because it Relies on Density Decontrol in Single-Family Neighborhoods But Does Not Create Room for Additional Density

The FZP uses form-based zoning without corresponding changes in development standards in single-family neighborhoods, which means developers cannot build in these areas. Therefore, the FZP does not actually increase capacity in these neighborhoods.

The FZP uses form-based zoning (also called density decontrol), which regulates the allowed density on a site by setting limits on height, bulk, setbacks, and other features (rather than setting numerical density limits). And while the City claims that the change from the existing numerical density limits to form-based zoning will produce additional units, its refusal to ease the existing limitations on height, bulk, and other standards that limit the buildable envelope for construction in these neighborhoods means there is no actual capacity to build additional units. For example, a lot with an existing single-family home that occupies most or all of the buildable area is unlikely to be redeveloped into multifamily housing because without easing height limits, setbacks, parking minimums, and the like, there will be no place to build the additional units.

The FZP promises to increase density, but its use of form-based density without easing height limits, setbacks, parking minimums, and other development standards will prevent building in the City's highest-resourced neighborhoods.

C. The FZP's Alternative to the State Density Bonus Law Does Not Add Sufficient Density

The City contends that its local alternative to the state Density Bonus Law will create additional capacity for housing production, and it relies on that claim to meet its RHNA shortfall. However, almost all of the capacity that the City is relying on is already available for housing production through the state Density Bonus Law, so the City's local alternative is duplicative of existing capacity under the state Density Bonus Law.

The state Density Bonus Law requires local agencies to grant density bonuses under the state law to qualifying projects. (Gov. Code § 65915(a)(1)-(b).)

The FZP would give applicants a local alternative to the state Density Bonus Law called Housing Choice-San Francisco ("HCSF"). Crucially, HCSF does not offer any increase in density beyond what is offered by the state Density Bonus Law in most locations. Moreover, when both the state Density Bonus Law and HCSF are available, applicants can only avail themselves of one.

The state Density Bonus Law is intended as a bonus on *top* of local rules. (Gov. Code § 65915(u)(1).) But the HCSF offers no increase in density beyond what developers are already entitled to under the state Density Bonus Law when a project is eligible for both. Therefore, the HCSF does not create the additional capacity required by the Housing Element Law.

II. The City Fails to Use the Required "Analytical Model" to Determine the Likelihood of Site Development

The FZP fails to use the "analytical model" required by the City's housing element. When a city includes a program in its housing element, the Housing Element Law makes it mandatory to implement the features of those programs. (Gov. Code § 65581(b); Gov. Code § 65583(c)(1); *Hoffmaster v. City of San Diego* (1997) 55 Cal.App.4th 1098.)

Program 7.1.1 of the City's housing element commits the City to implementing a rezoning program that "reasonably account[s] for sites' likelihood of development during the planning period using an analytical model." In addition to the Housing Element Law, which makes it mandatory for the City to use an "analytical model," the City's housing element uses mandatory language, stating that the City "shall" build its rezoning program around such a "probability-of-development" analysis. The FZP, however, fails to use an "analytical model," in violation of the housing element. Instead, the FZP uses three alternative methods to estimate how many housing units the FZP will produce, none of which meets the requirements of Program 7.1.1.

First, the City proposes using a "soft sites" method, which assumes that a site that is already developed with a residential use has a two percent probability of being redeveloped with the FZP's planned residential capacity, and a site that is already developed with a non-residential use has a seventy percent probability of redevelopment with a residential use. This assumption is just that, and not an analytical model. Such rigid calculations based on uniform, citywide assumptions about the odds of development on thousands of very different sites are not an "analytical model" and do not "reasonably account for sites' likelihood of development" as required by Program 7.1.1.

Second, the City assesses the likelihood of a given site being developed under the rezoning proposal using a model that evaluates whether new housing is financially feasible at a given site. The model assumes that two percent of sites currently occupied by residential uses and thirty-five percent of other sites will be redeveloped with economically feasible new housing developments. Again, this is not an "analytical model" that "reasonably account[s] for sites' likelihood of development" as required by Program 7.1.1 because its assumptions are not grounded in historical development standards in San Francisco, and its focus on financial feasibility is a distinct concept from focusing on "the probability of development." It may be financially feasible for a property to be redeveloped, but that same property can have a low likelihood of being redeveloped for a variety of reasons, especially for single-family homes that play a big role in the FZP, and which already contain high-value structures or the property owner faces financial constraints, lack of development experience, or the need to use the property for their own housing. Moreover, even if this method were accurate, it projects only 19,000 new units of housing over the planning period – far below the requirement of 36,282 new units.

The third model that the City relies on involves examining the rate at which units across the City were approved using historical data from 2005-2023 and multiplying that by the theoretical capacity of the sites. This model does not qualify as an "analytical model" because it ignores the fact that much of the development in the City in recent years has taken place on vacant sites or extremely underutilized land. In fact, around 25% of sites that were redeveloped from 2005-2023 had residential uses before redevelopment, while around 84% of sites under the FZP have residential uses. Non-vacant sites already containing residential uses are 70% less likely to be redeveloped according to the City's own analysis, and the FZP errs in assuming that non-vacant and vacant sites will be redeveloped at the same rate. (*See* Housing Element, Appendix B.2, Figure 2.) Since the FZP mostly contains parcels with residential uses, unlike past development, this approach of extrapolating from past development does not correspond to future development predictions.

The areas where housing would be built under the FZP already contain high-value structures, such as single-family homes, where the owners are unlikely or unable to redevelop the site as multi-family housing due to financial constraints, lack of development experience, and the need to use their properties for their own housing.

These areas will have much lower rates of redevelopment, which this model does not take into account. Moreover, this model has unrealistically low estimates of the City's residential zoning capacity in prior years (thus inflating the share of residential zoned capacity that has been built out) and the inclusion of residential projects built under development agreements, which do not correspond to rezonings, and which were separately counted towards the City's pre-existing residential zoned capacity in the housing element. These two reasons disqualify this model from being an "analytical model."

Additionally, the FZP does not create sufficient capacity because it assumes certain large pipeline projects will actually be constructed within the planning period, when in reality such development is exceedingly unlikely – if not impossible. For the Hunters Point/Candlestick project, approximately 3,500 units are located on Navy-owned parcels. The City will not even obtain control of these parcels until the Navy finishes remediation, which is estimated to take at least 11 more years. ("The Navy has recently informed OCII that completion of remediation and conveyance of all portions of the Shipyard Site, excluding Parcel F, to Developer will occur between 2036-2038 . . . ." (Resolution No. 26-2024, available at https://sfocii.org/sites/default/files/2024-08/5.%20RESO%2026-2024_HPS%20Approval%20of%20Amendments%20to%20Redevelopment%20Plan.pdf; *see also* https://www.sfchronicle.com/sf/article/hunters-point-shipyard-radioactive-materials-21129542.php.) Similarly, Treasure Island's phasing includes a maximum of 4,600 units completed before 2031, but the City is counting all 8,000 units toward the pipeline. (*See* https://media.api.sf.gov/documents/Ex._JJ_-_SOP.pdf; Treasure Island Sub-Phase Application 3, Schedule of Performance, Exh. JJ, Appendix B, https://media.api.sf.gov/documents/TI_Sub-Phase_Application_3_Book-Revision_1_-_reduced.pdf.)

Since none of the three models that the City considers qualifies as a reasonable "analytical model," the City is violating its legally binding commitment under Program 7.1.1.

III. The FZP Adds New Constraints On Housing Production and Fails to Analyze the Impact of These Constraints

The FZP adds new constraints on housing development, which were not analyzed in its housing element, in violation of the Housing Element Law and Senate Bill ("SB") 330.

A. The FZP's New Constraints Violate the Housing Element Law

The FZP adds new constraints on housing production, which it fails to analyze as required by the Housing Element Law. When considering rezoning plans, the Housing Element Law requires local governments to analyze new governmental constraints on housing production. (Gov. Code § 65583(a)(5); *see also Californians*

for Homeownership, Inc. v. City of Beverly Hills (2023) Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCP00143, at p. 6, [finding planned rezonings for housing element site inventory must analyze new constraints].)

The FZP adds new constraints on development that were not analyzed by the City's housing element, including caps on dwelling unit size, limits on curb cuts, lower parking maximums, and limits imposed by the City's local alternative to the state Density Bonus Law. As explained above, the FZP imposes new constraints because it deprives applicants of the ability to use the state Density Bonus Law in conjunction with the City's local alternative to the state Density Bonus Law, which reduces the number of units the FZP will produce. Other constraints reduce physical development capacity, e.g., caps on dwelling unit size that cannot accommodate larger families, and reduce the economic feasibility of developing housing. The FZP does *not* analyze the impact of these policies on housing production. The FZP, therefore, violates the Housing Element Law's requirement that local governments analyze new governmental constraints on housing production if they were not analyzed in a housing element. (Gov. Code § 65583(a)(5).)

B. The FZP's New Constraints Violate SB 330's Prohibition Against Rezonings Which Decrease Housing Intensity

The FZP's new constraints on housing violate SB 330's prohibition against rezonings which "lessen the intensity of housing." (Gov. Code § 66300(b)(1)(A).)

SB 330—also known as the Housing Crisis Act—prohibits local governments from enacting a development policy, standard, or condition that would "Chang[e] the general plan land use designation, specific plan land use designation, or zoning of a parcel or parcels of property to a less intensive use or reduc[e] the intensity of land use within an existing general plan land use designation, specific plan land use designation, or zoning district below what was allowed under the land use designation and zoning ordinances of the affected county or affected city, as applicable, as in effect on January 1, 2018[.]" (*Id.*) SB 330 defines "less intensive use" as including situations where a local government imposes reductions to the height, density, or floor area ratio, new or increased open space or lot size requirements, new or increased setback requirements, minimum frontage requirements, maximum lot coverage limitations, or "*any other action that would individually or cumulatively reduce [a] site's residential development capacity*." (*Id.*; emph. added.)

As mentioned above, the FZP contains new constraints on housing, including caps on dwelling unit size, limits on curb cuts, and lower parking maximums, reduces the number of units the FZP will produce. These new constraints run afoul of SB 330 because they reduce the size of units that applicants are able to construct, which physically reduces the intensity of residential use and reduces the financial viability of residential construction. The City has also conducted no analysis to show

that there will be a concurrent increase in intensity of land use to offset the decrease in intensity of land use caused by the FZP. (Gov. Code § 66300(h).)

IV. The FZP Violates the Housing Element Law By Relying on an Overlay for Nonvacant Sites Where Development of Nonresidential Uses Is Permitted

The FZP violates the recent decision in *New Commune v. City of Redondo Beach et al.* (2025) 337 Cal.Rptr.3d 782 that overlays cannot be used to meet minimum density requirements required by rezoning programs if they permit developers to redevelop sites for non-residential uses.

As explained above, when a local government cannot accommodate its RHNA Shortfall for lower-income households with a site inventory, it has to include a rezoning program in its housing element. The Housing Element Law also requires jurisdictions that must develop rezoning programs to ensure that at least 50% of the lower income housing the agency must plan for is "accommodated on sites designated for residential use and for which nonresidential uses or mixed uses are not permitted." (Gov. Code § 65583.2(h)(2).) As the City acknowledges in Program 7.1.1, it is subject to this statutory minimum density requirement.

In *New Commune*, the court ruled that residential "overlays are unlawful when they allow development below the statutory minimum density [required by Gov. Cod § 65583.2(h)(2)]." (*Id*. at 797.) The court in *New Commune* also noted that residential overlays are unlawful whether they are overlaid over a base zoning that permits residential or industrial and commercial uses. (*Id*.)

The FZP runs afoul of the *New Commune* decision and the Housing Element Law's minimum density requirement because it still permits nonresidential redevelopment of sites. The FZP is an overlay because it does not change the base zoning of properties, but is instead overlaid over existing zones, including non-residential zones. For instance, for properties subject to the FZP developers can still use the underlying C-2 and C-3 zoning to construct commercial structures, which would be below the statutory minimum density because no residential units would be constructed. By permitting developers to build nonresidential projects within the overlay, the FZP violates the Housing Element Law as explained by the court in *New Commune*.

V. The FZP Violates the Prohibition against Jurisdictions Forcing Applicants to Waive Their Right to Use the State Density Bonus Law

The FZP primarily relies on a local alternative to the state Density Bonus Law, which developers can only use if they waive their right to use the state Density Bonus Law. This is a violation of the state Density Bonus Law.

Local agencies are prohibited from adopting ordinances that conflict with the state Density Bonus Law or using their local alternative to impose development requirements that are more restrictive than the state Density Bonus Law. (*Schreiber v. City of Los Angeles* (2021) 69 Cal.App.5th 549.) The court in *Schreiber* made it clear that applicants have the right to use the state Density Bonus Law regardless of any local provisions, and that cities cannot deny, limit, or condition the use of the state Density Bonus Law by requiring an applicant to instead use a local alternative.

The FZP creates a local alternative to the state Density Bonus law called Housing Choice-San Francisco ("HCSF"). HCSF—proposed Planning Code Section 206.10(b)(5)—has only one criterion: that applicants agree to "not receive any density or development bonuses or relief from applicable Planning Code standards in any other State or local law or program[.]" HCSF violates the state Density Bonus Law's prohibition that local agencies cannot bar an applicant from using the state Density Bonus Law, regardless of any local provisions. The FZP illegally forces applicants to choose between the state Density Bonus Law and HCSF, which violates the rule that "an otherwise valid local ordinance that conflicts with the state Density Bonus Law is preempted." (*Latinos Unidos Del Valle De Napa Y Solano v. County of Napa* (2013) 217 Cal.App.4th 1160, 1169.) The City must amend the FZP so that the state Density Bonus Law can be used on *top* of the HCSF, which has the potential to create meaningful housing production.

VI. Conclusion

We urge the City to comply with the law and remedy the deficiencies in its rezoning plan. If the City fails to significantly increase its proposed residential capacity, there will be no realistic chance of meeting its RHNA obligations. YIMBY Law is prepared to take legal action to hold the City accountable for these clear violations of state housing law.

PATTERSON & O'NEILL, PC



Ryan J. Patterson
General Counsel for Yes In My Back Yard

CC CA Department of Housing and Community Development
Mayor Daniel Lurie

Encl. September 11, 2025 Letter from Yes In My Back Yard
October 29, 2025 Letter from Yes In My Back Yard
October 29, 2025 Report from the Chief Economist of San Francisco

EXHIBIT A

YIMBY Law

2261 Market Street STE 10416
San Francisco, CA 94114
hello@yimbylaw.org

YIMBY LAW

9/11/2025

San Francisco Planning Commission
400, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

(via email) commissions.secretary@sfgov.org

Re: San Francisco's Draft Housing Rezoning Program and Compliance with State Law

Dear Commissioners,

YIMBY Law is a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization dedicated to ensuring compliance with California's housing laws. We write today to express significant concerns regarding the City's proposed Housing Element Rezoning Program and the accompanying "Housing Choice–San Francisco" local bonus ordinance.

Summary

While the rezoning plan, including the local program, is a good step forward for housing in San Francisco, we are concerned that the plan does not actually fulfill what it promises to do. The city has produced no publicly available reports that show how the plan will be more capable of delivering the housing San Franciscans desperately need than what state laws already allow. While we support density decontrol, we do not believe the city has shown that the handful of incentives that are coupled with it will be enough to produce any more housing than state laws such as the Density Bonus Law already do.

Capacity Projections

San Francisco's Housing Element made a binding commitment to meet its Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) through a rezoning program rooted in a probabilistic analytical model Program 7.1.1. San Francisco did not base its rezoning on a site's inventory, but on the projected housing based on that model. The targets and assumptions it sets are enforced by Program 8.1.5. If San Francisco does not produce sufficient units, Program 8.1.5. applies additional upzoning requirements.

Despite the City's commitments to specific unit production, applying the city's own model used to determine the shortfall on the rezone sites, we can determine that the map would produce around 17k homes by 2031, or 47% of the 36k units promised by Program 7.1.1. That regression analysis was built on different logic than the Housing Element's existing capacity analysis. While the proposal does not clearly make up for the RHNA shortfall, its usefulness is difficult to gauge when it functions by different logic than the original rezoning analysis. In order to be comprehensible, realistic, and enforceable, San Francisco must produce a "realistic capacity" table for the rezoned sites that incorporates the Housing Element' regression analysis.

We understand that the City has conducted its own analysis that disputes these figures, but the methodology and details of this analysis have not been made publicly available; therefore we remain concerned and skeptical about the efficacy of the rezoning program in meeting the city's needed housing requirements under housing element law.

Compliance with State Law

San Francisco's rezoning program would institute a local density bonus program that, theoretically, according to the city's assertions (which are not supported by any publicly available information), would accommodate the City's RHNA shortfall. The practical and legal realities according to our analysis suggest that it would fail to produce housing at the suggested rates, and fail to meet statutory requirements.

The latest staff report associated with the September 11 Planning Commission hearing notes that 77% of parcels in the rezoning plan fall into the form based zoning code and will not have their heights increased, while for "the vast majority of residential sites, these changes are only available for projects opting into the local program."

Some proposed areas not eligible for the state bonus would benefit from San Francisco's local program. However, this local program would be exclusive to California's state density bonus law in all areas where both options are available. Whether or not the local program is superior to state incentives, the one cannot replace the other. State density bonus law is intended as a bonus on top of local rules, and should not be supplanted when it generally offers superior development potential.

San Francisco's density decontrol is generally less feasible than the state program. While we applaud the city for applying a local density bonus program to projects between 2-4 units, which are not otherwise eligible for the state density bonus, as well as allowing alternatives to providing on-site affordable units, such as off-site developments, for the vast majority of the city's proposed "rezoning" program, state density bonus law offers a superior alternative: unlimited waivers from local zoning and development standards,

providing limited discretion for local review. Comparatively, the local program is far more stringent. It contains strict rules about building size, setbacks, open space, dwelling unit exposure, and parking allowances. It contains only a 15% reduction of other development standards. The proposal would allow for greater than 15% reductions if approved by a discretionary process. Even if that expensive, time consuming process doesn't result in universal denials, it renders the project not code compliant, forcing the developer to lose protections under the Housing Accountability Act.

While we support the majority of the proposed staff changes made to the local program, we believe that they do not go far enough to ensure that the local program is a superior alternative to state density bonus law. For example, the proposal to require projects with 5+ units to reserve a minimum of 25% of the units for 2+BR units is a constraint that is not required under state density bonus law that will negatively impact density potential for the local program. Additionally, the proposed local program not only requires applicants to choose to give up their option to pursue waivers and incentives under state density bonus law, but *any other* state program that provides its own bonuses or waivers from local zoning, such as AB 2011, which offers waivers of local side and rear setback requirements when those requirements limit feasibility, limits front setback requirements, and allows 55 foot heights, which are greater than the 40 foot height limits proposed for the majority of the local program's rezoned sites.

This proposal not only replaces state density bonus allowances with a worse option, it places new constraints on any such developments via inclusionary requirements and requiring new wind studies on construction. These constraints were not reviewed in the Housing Element, meaning that they may not be imposed or that San Francisco must amend its Element to account for those constraints. New constraints must be accounted for in the Element, to demonstrate how San Francisco can realistically meet its RHNA requirements.

San Francisco must also analyze how this program would interact with existing land use regulations. Transfer taxes, inclusionary requirements, and impact fees are key drivers of unit loss, but have not been incorporated into any City analyses yet. We encourage the City Economist to incorporate them into any future analysis of this program.

Even if all of these deficiencies are corrected, they cannot make up for the requirement to change the base zoning of parcels, as required by Housing Element law and HCD interpretation. Under the new scheme, San Francisco would not change its zoned capacity, and therefore would not comply with state law. Density bonuses must add capacity on top of that allowed for in the zoning code.

Conclusion

Given the substantial deficiencies in San Francisco's rezoning program and the speculative nature of its local density bonus ordinance, the City's Housing Element certification is at risk. The burden is on San Francisco to demonstrate compliance. The use of analytical models that inflate development probability, the reliance on unproven local bonus mechanisms, and the introduction of new constraints all undermine that burden. In short, the program is not legally defensible as currently drafted, with the limited information supporting the city's conclusions that it exceeds the city's RHNA obligation

YIMBY Law has taken legal action against the City of Los Angeles for a similar failure to deliver a legally compliant rezoning program. We sincerely hope litigation will not be necessary in San Francisco. However, San Francisco will be vulnerable to lawsuits from parties working to ensure that the City complies with state law and delivers a realistic path toward housing affordability and accessibility.

We urge the Board to direct Planning to:

- Re-run the BlueSky regression analysis used for the Housing Element's "existing capacity" estimate on the rezoning proposal to produce a transparent, realistic capacity table that is made publicly available.

- Incorporate the waiver and incentive framework of SDBL into the local bonus program, or ensure that projects can access SDBL concurrently.

- Remove new constraints on development introduced by the ordinance.

- Ensure that the rezoning program meets or exceeds the 36,282-unit requirement via base zoning and that its methodology aligns with Program 7.1.1.

The stakes for San Francisco are high. We urge the City to correct course by allowing the use of density bonus and other state programs in combination with the local program.

Sincerely,

Jack Farrell, Esq.
Research Attorney
YIMBY Law

EXHIBIT B

From:	Jane Natoli
To:	paul.mcdougall@hcd.ca.gov
Cc:	gustavo.velasquez@hcd.ca.gov; melinda.coy@hcd.ca.gov; Zisser, David@HCD; megan.kirkeby@hcd.ca.gov; shannan.west@hcd.ca.gov; Frank, Lisa@HCD; Herrera, Fidel@HCD; matthew.struhar@doj.ca.gov; david.pai@doj.ca.gov; alex.fisch@doj.ca.gov; Annie Fryman; Tanner, Rachael (CPC); Chen, Lisa (CPC); Sonja Trauss; matt@caforhomes.org; senator.wiener@senate.ca.gov; Severiano.Christian@sen.ca.gov; Mohtashemi, Raayan; David Broockman; Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Supervisors; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Bonde, Aly (MYR); Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC)
Subject:	SF YIMBY"s letter on the City Economist"s report
Date:	Wednesday, October 29, 2025 4:13:34 PM
Attachments:	SF YIMBY FZP Letter October 29 2025.pdf

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

Hello,

We are writing to urgently draw your attention to the just released report from the City Economist that shows San Francisco's rezoning will not meet our state housing requirements. Please see our attached letter, and let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you,

--
Jane Natoli (she/her)
San Francisco Organizing Director
415-335-9950



Check out everything we achieved in 2024!

Paul McDougall, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Mayor Daniel Lurie
San Francisco Board of Supervisors (re: file #250700)
October 29, 2025

We write to urgently draw your attention to **an analysis the City of San Francisco ("SF") released that finds that its own rezoning plan would violate state law.** The Family Zoning Plan ("FZP") is a significant step forward, but the city's analysis found that it will not meet the city's Housing Element's 36,282-unit requirement. **According to the city's own numbers, state law requires the city to conduct additional rezoning beyond the FZP.**

As a reminder, in 2022, the California Department of Housing and Community Development ("HCD") suggested that, instead of a traditional sites inventory, SF instead pledge to assess the capacity of its rezoning using the method from its underutilized sites analysis (a model called BlueSky, which estimates the likelihood of development). Housing Element Program 7.1.1 thus committed that SF's rezoning "shall reasonably account for sites' likelihood of development during the planning period using an analytical model."

SF's August submission to HCD revealed that SF still had not done so (see Appendix). HCD thus instructed SF that "As part of Program 7.1.1 and using analytical models to account for a site's likelihood of development in the planning period, the city should continue to explore additional and multiple methods and make adjustments as appropriate."

Today, SF did so: its City Economist reported that he used an updated version of the BlueSky analytical model—the same method HCD originally suggested SF use—to estimate the number of units the FZP will likely develop. **He reported that, in the best case scenario, the City's analytical model finds that the FZP is only likely to develop 14,646 units by 2045, far less than the 36,282 required by 2031** under 7.1.1. In other words, **using the exact method HCD suggested SF use, the City itself has found that its rezoning plan does not meet Program 7.1.1's requirements, and is around 10 times too small.**

Gov. Code § 65588(e)(4)(C)(iii) states, "If a jurisdiction…fails to complete the required rezoning within the time period required, the jurisdiction's adopted housing element shall be subject to" the housing element decertification process. Thus, **if SF fails to expand its plan, HCD will be legally obliged to begin the decertification process**.

We encourage HCD to offer SF guidance about how to bring its proposed rezoning into compliance, building on HCD's recent guidance to the city to "make adjustments as appropriate" when more analysis was made available. For example, using recent changes in state law (e.g., SB 131, SB 79), additional rezoning or policy changes that supplement the FZP (e.g., reduced fees and exactions) could be passed within months. Given the timeline required for decertification, HCD could reasonably offer SF up to six months before the builders' remedy would apply to fully complete its "required rezoning" through such a supplement.

Confirming that SF must rely on the City Economist's updated BlueSky analytical model to assess the rezoning's capacity, as well as the actions taken to satisfy Program 8.1.5 (the "circuit breaker"), would also be consistent with HCD's recent direction to the city to "us[e] conservative assumptions…that facilitate the highest housing outcomes."

SF's actions risk paving a path for other cities to evade state law. In particular, rather than "demonstrat[ing] that the existing use [on each non-vacant site] does not constitute an impediment to additional residential development" (Gov. Code, § 65583.2(g)), cities will be tempted to follow SF: promise in a Housing Element to provide this evidence later in the form of statistical analysis—but then ignore what this evidence shows when rezoning.

Best regards,

Salim Damerdji
Volunteer Lead, San Francisco YIMBY

Jane Natoli
San Francisco Organizing Director,
YIMBY Action

CC: Gustavo Velasquez, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Megan Kirkeby, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Melinda Coy, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Shannan West, California Department of Housing and Community Development
David Zisser, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Lisa Frank, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Fidel Herrera, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Alex Fisch, California Department of Justice
Matthew Struhar, California Department of Justice
David Pai, California Department of Justice
Annie Fryman, SPUR
Aly Bonde, Office of Mayor Daniel Lurie
Sarah Dennis-Phillips, Rachael Tanner, and Lisa Chen, San Francisco Planning
Sonja Trauss, YIMBY Law
Matt Gelfand, Californians for Homeownership
Senator Scott Wiener

Appendix: Why the Planning Department's methods do not satisfy the Housing Element's requirement to "reasonably account for sites' likelihood of development during the planning period using an analytical model"

The San Francisco Planning Department's August 1 submission to HCD contained three analyses of the capacity provided by its rezoning. None of these analyses satisfy Program 7.1.1's commitment to "reasonably account for sites' likelihood of development during the planning period using an analytical model." The below details why each of the Planning Department's methods do not satisfy this requirement. Indeed, a closer look at the Planning Department's analyses suggests conclusions that are in line with the City Economist's finding that the rezoning is insufficient.

"Soft Sites Method"

Under this method, the vast majority of the rezoning's capacity is from sites without existing residential uses (but that largely have other uses). The Planning Department assumes that 70% of these sites will be developed to their maximum capacity during the planning period. This 70% assumption is not "reasonabl[e]" (and certainly not "conservative" like the city claims):

1. In San Francisco, fewer than 70% of entitled projects are ultimately developed — making it implausible that 70% of all sites without residential use will be developed, even those where no interest has been expressed in development or discontinuing existing uses. As another comparison, the Terner Center found that only 8.6% of LA's very best sites are developed over 5 years (versus SF's 70% assumption across a huge number of sites).
2. These sites largely do have other non-residential uses which make their development especially improbable. For example, the first page of SF's parcel list includes 1201-05 Columbus Avenue, a 3-story Travelodge in Fisherman's Wharf. The city assumes there is a 70% chance that properties like this will be redeveloped during the planning period.
3. The city's related assertion that 2% of sites with existing residential uses will be redeveloped during the planning period is similarly made without evidence.

This approach also allows the city to evade complying with GC 65583.2(g)'s requirement that the city provide substantial evidence that existing uses on "lower income" sites are likely to be discontinued during the planning period. The city has not provided site-specific evidence supporting their assertion that most sites with existing non-residential uses will be developed during the planning period. The lack of site-specific evidence would not be a problem if the city had provided statistical evidence (i.e., had statistically estimated what percent of these sites will have their existing use discontinued during the planning period based on historical data, as action 7.1.1 promises). But the Planning Department simply provides no evidence whatsoever that 70% of sites with existing non-residential uses will be developed, either site-specific or

statistical. This 70% figure is simply fabricated — not from "an analytical model," and it is not at all "reasonable."

"Citywide Capacity Method"

This method calculates what share of the city's remaining zoned capacity was developed annually over the last 18 years (2005-2023). It then assumes the new capacity created by the rezoning will be developed at a similar annual rate.

While reasonable in theory, there are several errors and problems with how the Planning Department is implementing this approach that make it not "reasonabl[e]" in practice:

1. The city has two versions of this approach, each with errors:
    a. The primary version (with "exclusions") divides citywide development by the amount of capacity on only a subset of parcels. This overstates the rate at which capacity historically translates into development because less capacity is considered despite all development being considered. This is like computing the average grades of all students in a class by adding up all students' grades but then dividing this total by half the number of students there are in the class.
    b. The city describes another version of the method that measures capacity on all parcels but uses Planning entitlements to measure development; during this period there were 90K entitlements but only 53K building permits. Using entitlements to measure development overstates the historical development rate, as in San Francisco many entitlements are never developed (in part due to constraints the city places on development).
2. The city's statistic that 53K units were constructed citywide 2005-2023 includes development from development agreements (DAs). By counting historical DA development when computing the rate at which historical zoned capacity is developed, the city therefore assumes that the rezoning will produce new DA development during this planning period. This is unreasonable, as DAs do not result from (re)zoning. Furthermore, the city's housing element already counted expected development from DAs during the planning period in its claims of existing capacity.
3. Parcels where projects have been proposed but have not received permits are excluded from the city's calculation of its historical capacity; this leads the city to underestimate how much historical capacity it had, and therefore overstate the development rate of its capacity.
4. The new rezoned capacity is also less developable than the existing remaining capacity. Specifically, according to the city's Bluesky model (the model it used for its underutilized sites analysis), the new capacity is about 20% less likely to be developed. This is because, for example, rezoned capacity is 3x more likely to be on sites with an existing residential use than existing capacity. It's therefore not entirely reasonable to assume that the city's historical rate of development will manifest for the new capacity.

5. The Planning Department is relying on its UrbanSim tool to measure its remaining zoned capacity (313K). But the city's housing element (Sites Inventory Appendix B2 p. 4) gives a much larger number for this (572K), as do our own calculations. Insofar as the city is now understating how much capacity it has, it is therefore overstating the rate at which that capacity has been developed. We have asked for data that would help us understand this discrepancy, but the city has indicated that its UrbanSim tool is unable to provide the underlying data that supports this 313K calculation.

When addressing the first four errors and issues above, and when using the city's housing element's estimate that the city has 572K units of capacity remaining (see point 5), the historical development rate is 0.4% and the adjusted capacity of the rezoning is therefore 10K units.

"Financial Feasibility Method"

The Planning Department has contracted with UrbanSim to estimate whether development will be economically feasible on rezoned parcels. While this analysis is welcome, there are several problems with this approach:

1. Totaling the amount of economically feasible development does not "account for sites' likelihood of development." Historically, only a fraction of economically feasible units are actually developed, and some research practitioners have advised us that there is nearly an order of magnitude difference between the two.
2. The Planning Department's economic assumptions are not "reasonabl[e]": the Department assumes that construction costs, interest rates, and developer return expectations will drop without providing evidence. It also assumes rents will jump. The Department justifies these optimistic assumptions by asserting that it is only responsible for making housing feasible to develop under better economic conditions than are likely during this planning period — but action 7.1.1 commits to providing enough capacity to make 36K units likely developed during this planning period. Furthermore, the city's poor economic environment for development reflects the city's constraints on development that Housing Element Law is supposed to remediate. I.e., the fact that the city so heavily constrains development makes more rezoning (and changes to its other policies) necessary, and cannot be ignored when considering the appropriate scope of actions to accommodate development.
3. The Department's submission describes a flawed approach for using UrbanSim's output to account for the likelihood of development: asserting that 2% of economically feasible projects will occur on sites with existing residential uses and 35% of economically feasible projects will occur on sites with other non-residential uses. These assumptions are not based on any evidence and, for the same reasons we described in the context of the "soft sites" method, are not reasonable.
4. After applying this flawed approach for accounting for the likelihood of development, the Planning Department nevertheless finds that only 19K units will be developed during the planning period. This is short of the 36K required by action 7.1.1. The Planning

Department argues that this is acceptable because the method must only demonstrate sufficient capacity for meeting the city's 16K RHNA shortfall in the Moderate and Above-Moderate income categories. But action 7.1.1 makes no reference to separate by-category targets, it simply states that the rezoning must "accommodate… approximately 36,282 new units." Furthermore, the Department's argument is also belied by the Housing Element Law and the No Net Loss Law, both of which contemplate development of market-rate and mixed-income projects on "lower income" sites (GC 65583.2(c) & (h); GC 65863(c)(2)).

EXHIBIT C

Family Zoning Plan: Economic Impact Report

Office of the Controller
Office of Economic Analysis

Items 250700 & 250701
October 29, 2025

Introduction

- Two proposed ordinances would change zoning controls to permit more housing on a large segment of San Francisco, particularly on the western half of the city. They implement changes to the Housing Element of the City's General Plan, a planning document whose revisions were adopted in 2023.
- The Ordinance in file #250700, the Zoning Map Amendment, would generally raise allowable building heights along commercial corridors and transit lines, to permit mid-rise and some high-rise development.
- The Ordinance in file #250701 implements the Housing Choice-San Francisco program, which offers an alternative to the State Density Bonus program.
- The Office of Economic Analysis (OEA) has prepared this report because the proposed legislation may have a material impact on the city's economy. This report uses a model that estimates potential new development, in order to assess economic impact. That model is not a replacement for the City's estimates of realistic capacity under Government Code § 65583.2.


Zoning Map Amendment: Key Provisions

- The Zoning Map Amendment would make changes to allowable building heights and bulk, and/or zoning districts, in over 92,000 parcels in the city.
- The vast majority are residential parcels, whose allowable heights would either remain at 40 feet, or rise to 50 or 65 feet.
- On these and many other rezoned parcels, the Housing Choice San Francisco program (described on the next page) relaxes existing controls on the number of housing units allowed on a parcel.
- Allowable heights are generally increased to 65 to 85 feet along many commercial corridors, with development along wider streets near transit stations or major lines increased to 85 feet.
- Heights above 140 feet are allowed on certain streets that currently allow high-rise development or have larger parcels, at key intersections, and near certain major transit routes and stations. The map on page 5 provides additional details.

Housing Choice San Francisco – Key Provisions

- The Housing Choice San Francisco program, or "Local Program", gives developers an alternative to the State Density Bonus.
- Many of the rezoned residential parcels are too small to be eligible for the State Density Bonus, but may achieve greater density through the use of the Local Program.
- Local Program users also gain benefits associated with housing unit mix, methods of complying with inclusionary housing requirements, rear-yard and setback requirements, broad code flexibility, and certain process changes.
- The ordinance has several other provisions, including limiting the maximum size of new residential units, reducing allowable parking, and restricting new curb cuts. These policy changes are not considered in this report.
- Additionally, the proposed ordinance gives displaced businesses the right to relocate anywhere in the city where their activity is permitted by zoning, without a conditional use permit, and waives development impact fees associated with the relocation.

Details of the Rezoning



The map to the left, from the City Planning department, indicates which parcels in the city will be rezoned, and to which heights. It reflects the plan as of July.

Gray parcels will be zoned for low-rise, 40-50 feet housing developments. This includes single-family residential zones, within which greater density will be permitted via the Local Program.

Yellow and orange parcels will be upzoned to mid-rise development of 65-105 feet.

Pink and purple parcels will have height limits ranging from 120-180 feet, and the blue and green parcels will be upzoned for high-rise development, of 240 feet or greater.

The Rezoning and the Regional Housing Needs Assessment

- Each jurisdiction in California is required to have its Housing Element be certified by the State's Housing and Community Development Department.
- Certification involves, among other things, ensuring that the City has the zoning capacity to meet the city's obligations under the State's Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA).
- RHNA is a Statewide planning process, in which future needs are forecasted for metropolitan areas, and then allocated to the individual cities and counties that administer land use planning.
- In San Francisco's case, the RHNA obligation requires the City to have realistic capacity for approximately 82,000 new housing units, at different economic levels, within an 8-year planning period ending in 2031.
- Of this 82,000 unit requirement, the City must create capacity for approximately 36,000 units.

Substitutions and Proposed Amendments

- On September 30, a new version of #250700 was substituted by Mayor Lurie, which made relatively minor zoning changes on a number of parcels. This analysis reflects those changes.
- On October 21, Supervisor Melgar proposed an amendment that would prohibit the use of the Local Program on any parcel containing more then two existing housing units, which would involve the demolition of a unit subject to rent control.
- Also on October 21, Supervisor Sauter introduced an amendment that creates incentives for developers to replace lost commercial space.
- As the language of these two amendments was made public less than one week ago, this report does not attempt to model their economic impact.

Economic Impact Factors

- When the City relaxes zoning controls, by reducing density restrictions or increasing allowable heights, more development projects will become financially feasible, and the supply of housing in the city will rise.
- This increased supply will put downward pressure on housing prices in the city. Cheaper housing benefits city residents who move within the city, and also makes San Francisco more affordable for new arrivals.
- The development of new housing also stimulates investment and employment in construction and related industries.
- The population growth associated with new housing also stimulates the local economy, by expanding the numbers of workers and consumers.
- On the other hand, the limited amount of vacant lots in the city means that new housing generally involves the loss of existing buildings, including both residential and commercial properties. This can impose relocation and other costs on residential and commercial tenants.

Estimating the Likelihood of New Housing Development

- The amount of new housing that the rezoning will produce is an important contributor to its economic impact. To estimate this, OEA refined a statistical model that it has used since 2016 to estimate the impact of policy changes on housing production in the city[1].
- The model was the result of statistical analysis of housing production in San Francisco over the 2004-2024 period. Technical details on the model are provided in the Appendix.
- The first part of the model estimates the likelihood that multifamily housing will be developed on a given parcel, in a given year. The statistical analysis found that a parcel is more likely to develop when:
  - it has smaller existing buildings (or is vacant), and is located closer to downtown.
  - its zoning allows for a greater height, makes it eligible for the State Density Bonus, and does not restrict the number of units that may be constructed.
  - housing prices are relatively high, and construction costs are relatively low, compared to other years.

Estimating the Number of Units Produced

- The second part of the model estimates the number of units that will be produced when a parcel does develop housing. Based on past experience, the statistical analysis found that a parcel developing housing will produce more units when:
  - its land area and allowable maximum height are greater;
  - it is eligible for the State Density Bonus;
  - its zoning does not restrict the number of units that may be built.
- The OEA used the first part of the model to estimate the probability that housing will be built on a parcel over the next twenty years[2]. That probability was multiplied by the estimate of housing units from the second part, to create an expected number of housing units generated for each parcel over twenty years. When this is summed across all parcels, a citywide housing total is generated.
- This method was used to create estimates of housing production under the existing zoning, and the proposed rezoning. The difference is the estimate of housing that could be produced as a result of the proposed zoning changes.


Limitations of the Housing Development Model

- The housing development model can forecast future housing development based on the city's past experience, but important caveats must be made.
- Because of data availability, not every factor that affects housing production could be included. Missing data may include features of the parcel itself, or policies that may have changed over the 2004-24 period, or vary within the aggregated zoning designations used by the model.
- Limited data also prevents the analysis of fine-grained policy changes in the proposed rezoning, such as restrictions on unit size and mix.
- Several new City and State policies that were intended to encourage housing production have been enacted in recent years, such as, for example, the City's 2023 Housing Production Ordinance (0248-23). The model may be unable to properly assess the impact of these policies in the future.
- Despite these limitations, the OEA believes this approach is well-suited to estimating housing production, for the purposes of economic impact reporting.

Future Housing Market Scenarios

- As noted earlier, the amount of housing that will be produced as a result of the rezoning, and its economic impact, will depend on future housing market conditions. This creates an additional level of uncertainty in the forecasts.
- Gauging future market conditions is further complicated by changes in the city's housing market since the COVID-19 pandemic, as described on the next page.
- To understand the scope of what could potentially happen, the OEA created two future scenarios for housing prices and costs in San Francisco.
- In a high-growth scenario, San Francisco's housing prices, relative to the U.S., return to pre-COVID levels by 2030, and grow at the city's pre-COVID rate after that. Construction costs are assumed to grow at the same rate as inflation.
- In a low-growth scenario, San Francisco's post-COVID relative housing prices are assumed to represent a "new normal," and housing prices are assumed to grow only at a national average level over the next twenty years. Construction costs are also assumed to grow at the same rate as inflation.

San Francisco and U.S. Housing Price Trends Since 2000




While San Francisco's housing has always been expensive, during the 2010s, average San Francisco condo prices rose much faster than the rest of the U.S., to as much as 5 times the typical U.S. price.

Since 2020, however, San Francisco condo prices have declined, despite rising inflation and rising U.S. condo prices. Adjusted for inflation, typical San Francisco condo prices in 2025 are 25% lower than they were in 2019.

Among other factors, the increase in remote office work during COVID has reduced the value of a residence near large office employment centers like downtown San Francisco.

Source: Zillow. Data retrieved October 1, 2025.

Housing Price Trends Within the City




Source: Zillow. Data retrieved October 1, 2025.

The reduced value of a downtown location has also shifted multifamily price patterns within the city.

Condos in neighborhoods like Downtown and South of Market have experienced inflation-adjusted price drops of more than 40% since 2016, while the Richmond and Sunset have fallen by far less.

Because most multifamily housing in the city is near downtown, but most of the proposed rezoning is not, the use of a citywide average condo price index is inappropriate. This analysis uses an average price across the 10 Zillow neighborhoods most affected by the zoning, which is somewhat higher than the citywide average.

High and Low Growth Scenario Price Forecasts




Our high-growth scenario assumes that San Francisco's housing prices, relative to the U.S., return to pre-pandemic levels by 2030, and then grow at the city's long-term average rate until 2045. This implies a rapid growth in housing prices over the next five years, of over 10% per year.

In the low-growth scenario, the post-COVID housing market represents a new normal, and San Francisco housing prices are assumed to grow only at the U.S. long-term rate at 1.8% per year, in inflation-adjusted dollars. Under this assumption, San Franciso housing prices would not recover to their pre-COVID peak, in inflation-adjusted dollars, until 2041.

Source: Zillow. 10 Neighborhoods are Buena Vista, Polk Gulch, Inner Sunset, Marina, Mission, North Waterfront, Outer Sunset, Outer Richmond, Inner Richmond, and Western Addition.

Construction Cost Trends and Scenarios



Source: Bureau of Economic Analysis; U.S. Census Bureau, "Quarterly Workforce Indicators

The housing development model uses two measures of construction costs: materials cost and local construction industry wages. They are blended into a single index for modeling purposes. Details are in the Appendix.

The cost of construction materials and local wages have grown faster than overall inflation, particularly in the last few years. In 2024, real construction materials costs were 18% higher, and real local wages were 10% higher, than they were in 2016.

In both the high-growth and low-growth scenarios, the blended index is assumed to grow at 0% (after inflation) over the 2026-2045 period. This reflects an assumption that both labor and material costs inflation will revert to the broader rate of inflation in the long term.

Housing Production Forecasts Under Current Zoning

Planning District	Historic, 2000-24	Low-Growth Scenario Forecast, 2026-45	High-Growth Scenario Forecast, 2026-45
Buena Vista	975	43	90
Central	72	192	390
Downtown	289	112	230
Ingleside	0	58	120
Inner Sunset	123	28	59
Marina	131	126	263
Mission	187	197	406
Northeast	449	136	283
Outer Sunset	15	16	33
Richmond	0	23	47
South Central	0	6	11
Western Addition	997	658	1,265
Total	3,238	1,594	3,199

Source: For historic housing production, San Francisco Planning Department

Generally, the housing development model forecasts that the current zoning will produce fewer units in the next 20 years than the numbers of units that were produced in the last 20 years.

The table to the left only covers the portion of each planning district that is in the proposed rezoning area. In total, under the current zoning, the model forecasts 1,594 or 3,199 units under the low- and high-growth forecasts, respectively, while 3,238 units were built in the same areas over the 2000-2024 period.

On the next two pages, the model's forecasts of the additional housing created by the proposed zoning is discussed.

Forecast Net Effect of the Zoning

- As shown in the table below, under the low-growth and high-growth scenarios described earlier, the rezoning would lead to 8,504 and 14,646 additional housing units, beyond what would be produced under current zoning, over the next 20 years.

Low Growth Scenario	**Units**
20-Year Housing Production, Existing Zoning	1,594
20-Year Housing Production, Proposed Rezoning	10,098
Effect of Proposed Rezoning	8,504

High Growth Scenario	**Units**
20-Year Housing Production, Existing Zoning	3,199
20-Year Housing Production, Proposed Rezoning	17,845
Effect of Proposed Rezoning	14,646

Summary by Current Zoning District

		Low-Growth			High-Growth		
Current Zoning[3]	Number of Parcels	Average Housing Likelihood, Current	Average Housing Likelihood, Proposed	Change in Housing Units	Average Housing Likelihood, Current	Average Housing Likelihood, Proposed	Change in Housing Units
RH1	43,009	0.001%	0.205%	798	0.003%	0.446%	1,731
RH2	26,486	0.002%	0.259%	576	0.005%	0.565%	1,250
RH3_RM1	13,741	0.009%	0.347%	547	0.018%	0.756%	1,186
Office/Commercial	114	0.570%	0.780%	48	1.185%	1.639%	104
Public	239	0.060%	1.450%	3,483	0.122%	2.560%	4,814
Density-Restricted Multifamily	7,079	0.336%	0.490%	3,007	0.674%	1.026%	5,467
Form-Based Multifamily	2,053	0.725%	0.725%	46	1.502%	1.502%	94
Total	92,721			8,504			14,646

The table to the left breaks out the results by current zoning. It illustrates how many rezoned parcels are in the RH-1, RH-2, and RH-3 or RM-1 residential zones, primarily in the western side of the city. These areas will see a substantial increase in the likelihood of developing housing over the next 20 years, but the chances are still small, so those 83,000+ parcels are only forecast to produce about additional 4,200 housing units by 2045, in the high growth scenario.

Fewer Public parcels (generally owned by the City or SFUSD) are larger, and more likely to develop housing through the rezoning, though this depends on the owner's decisions.

Estimating the Loss of Existing Residential Units

- To evaluate the economic impact, OEA calculated the net increase in housing units.
- In the low-growth scenario, 463 more units would be lost under the proposed zoning than under current zoning, over the 20-year forecast period. In the high-growth scenario, 1,031 more housing units would be lost. These losses represent a 6-8% of the housing units gained as a result of the rezoning. Amendments proposed on October 20th may reduce these losses, along with overall housing production.
- The loss of existing housing slightly dampens the housing price reductions associated with the rezoning, and may impose financial harms on existing tenants. City and State law heavily restricts, but does not prohibit, the eviction of tenants for the purpose of demolition, or the demolition of rent-controlled housing. These events have been quite rare in recent decades. If this occurs, tenants are entitled to relocation payments.
- Without any way to meaningfully estimate the number of evictions or demolitions of rent-controlled units, or the financial impact on tenants, this report does not attempt to quantify these potential costs.

Impacts on Housing Prices

- The responsiveness of housing prices to increases in housing supply is a function of price elasticities of supply and demand, which the OEA has estimated in past research[4].
- The elasticities imply that the proposed rezoning would lead to a -2.5% to -4.2% change in housing prices in the city, depending on the scenario. For context, those percentages are also expressed in terms of current housing prices and apartment rents.

	Low Growth Scenario	**High Growth Scenario**
Net Change in Housing Supply (units produced less demolitions)	8,041	13,615
Percentage Change in Housing Supply[5]	2.0%	3.4%
Price Elasticity of Demand	-0.7	-0.7
Price Elasticity of Supply	0.1	0.1
Percent change in housing prices	-2.5%	-4.2%
Corresponding change in condo prices[6]	-$24,500	-$41,600
Corresponding change in annual apartment market rents[7]	-$903	-$1,529

Estimating Relocation and Disruption Costs

- To account for the impact on commercial businesses, OEA estimated potential displacement costs. Details are provided in the Appendix.
- Displaced businesses are estimated to occupy commercial space ranging from approximately 1.5 to 2.6 million square feet, depending on the scenario. This displacement would occur over twenty years, and it is highly likely that the rezoning would lead to an increase in the amount of commercial space in the city.
- Annual business disruption and relocation costs range from $16 to $28 million, in today's dollars.

	Low Growth	High Growth
Loss of occupied commercial space (million sf)	1.5	2.6
Disruption-relocation cost/sf	$190	$190
Annual disruption/relocation cost (2025 $ million)	$16	$28

REMI Economic Impact Simulation

- Based on the economic impact factors described earlier, the OEA used the REMI model to measure the net economic impact of the changes associated with the high and low growth scenarios to the city's economy over the 2026-2045 period:
  - An increase in the city's residential capital stock of $8.0 billion (low growth) to $13.5 billion (high growth) in today's dollars, representing the investment associated with the new units forecast under the two scenarios. These figures are calculated by multiplying the net increase in units by average prices.
  - A reduction in citywide housing prices, reaching 2.5% (low growth) and 4.2% (high growth) by 2045.
  - Annual business disruption and relocation costs for retail businesses of $16 million (low growth) and $28 million (high growth) in today's dollars, until 2045.

Economic Impact Assessment

- In the low-growth scenario, the city's GDP would be $560 million larger, in today's dollars, on average over the 2026-45 period. Total employment in the city would be approximately 3,000 more than under the current zoning, on average over the period.
- In the high-growth scenario, the city's GDP growth would be $940 million larger than under current zoning, in 2025 dollars. Employment would be about 5,000 higher.
- Employment gains are expected in every sector, but would be most heavily concentrated in the construction, health care, real estate, and accommodations and food services sectors.
- Despite the displacement of businesses, retail trade is forecast to grow as a result of the population and economic growth created by the proposed rezoning, adding about 210 jobs in the low-growth scenario and about 350 jobs in the high-growth scenario.
- Like most major policies, the proposed rezoning involves benefits and costs. Our analysis suggests the proposed rezoning's positive impact on the city's economy, from lower housing prices and construction, outweighs the negative impact from displaced businesses, by a factor of approximately 22:1.

Conclusions

- The context for housing development in San Francisco has changed profoundly in the past several years. Since 2019, after adjusting for inflation, condo prices in San Francisco have dropped by 25%, while our blended construction cost index has risen by 8%.
- Given this starting point, an expansive rezoning effort, like the proposed Family Zoning plan, will be challenged to match the 2010s levels of new housing development in the city, even under an optimistic high-growth scenario.
- Nevertheless, under both scenarios considered in this report, the proposed rezoning would lead to a significant increase in the city's housing supply, and have broadly positive effects on housing prices and the city's broader economy. The benefits of new residential investments and lower housing prices are projected to outweigh the costs of business interruption and displacement by a factor of roughly 22:1.
- If market conditions were such that the 36,000 unit target was achieved, as a result of the rezoning, the economic impact on the city would likely be significantly more positive than the estimates in this report.

Footnotes

1. See, for example, Inclusionary Housing Working Group: Preliminary Report September 2016.
2. Three large parcels were excluded from the analysis: Laguna Honda Hospital, and the USF Main and Lone Mountain campuses. While all three parcels receive height increases in the proposed rezoning, their size and unique uses makes them unsuitable for the model. If the model could accurately estimate the amount of housing likely to occur on those parcels, the total housing estimate reported in this report would be larger.
3. These are the aggregate zoning classifications used by the model. See the Appendix for details.
4. See Potential Effects of Limiting Market-Rate Housing in the Mission.
5. Assuming 406,000 housing units in the city.
6. Based on Zillow's 2025 average condo prices for San Francisco.
7. Based on 2025 average apartment asking rents, from ApartmentList.

Appendix

- Housing Development Model
  - Methodology
  - Data sources
  - Model coefficients and performance
  - Scenario Inputs
  - Zoning District Classification
  - Logic of Applying the Model to the Proposed Rezoning
- Estimates of Business Interruption and Relocation Costs

Appendix: Housing Development Model: Methodology

- The housing development model is a two-stage step model. The first stage is a logistic regression, covering every parcel in the city, except those subject to a development agreement, over the 2004-2024 period.
- The dependent variable of the logistic regression is 1 if the parcel produced housing in a given year, and 0 otherwise. Parcels that produce housing in a given year were removed from the dataset for subsequent years. Independent variables, reflecting existing land use, market conditions, and zoning, are listed on the next page.
- The second stage is a regression model including all parcels that produced multifamily housing with more than 10 units, over the 2004-24 period. The dependent variable is the number of units produced on the parcel, and the independent variables are the parcel's "building envelope" (its area multiplied by its allowable height), and two interaction variables: the building envelope times a dummy indicating if the parcel was eligible for the State Density Bonus in that year, and the building envelope times a dummy indicating if the parcel was subject to density-restricted zoning in that year. The intercept of the model was fixed at zero.

Appendix: Housing Development Model: Methodology

- The models' coefficients were used in a forecast that calculated the log-likelihood of development for each rezoned parcel, in each of the forecast years 2026-2045, using the site and zoning information, and the price and cost assumptions for each year (shown on the next page). The log-likelihoods were converted into annual probabilities, from which a 20-year probability of development was calculated.
- The model coefficients were also used to calculate a units estimate; the 20-year probability times the units estimate is the expected number of units produced on that parcel in the 20-year forecast period.
- The forecast model was run for both the current and the proposed zoning. See the section "Logic of Applying the Model to the Proposed Rezoning" for more details.
- Three parcels were excluded from the forecast: Laguna Honda Hospital, the University of San Francisco Main Campus, and the University of San Francisco Lone Mountain Campus. While some housing may be built on those parcels in the forecast period, the model is not well-suited for large parcels with unique uses like these.

Appendix: Housing Development Model: Data Sources

Variable Description	Variable	Data Source
Height limit for site in ft	Height_Ft	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Area for lot in 1000 sq ft	Area_1000	Planning Department, Land Use Database 4/16/25
Extisting building square footage in 1000 sq ft	Bldg_SqFt_1000	Planning Department, Land Use Database 4/16/25
Residential Existing Use using ResUnits (Dummy)	Res_Dummy	Planning Department, Land Use Database 4/16/25
Historic Status for Parcel (Dummy)	Historic	Planning Department, Land Use Database 4/16/25
Real Construction Cost Variable, 2 years prior	Construc_Cost_Real	a 60/40 average of Real Construction Materials PPI and Real San Francisco MSA Construction Wages, 2016=100
10-Neighborhood Housing Price Index (Zillow), Real, 2 years prior	Zillow_Price_Real	SF real condo prices per Zillow, 2016=100
Dummy indicating eligibility for State Density Bonus, 2016 forward	SDB_2016_5Plus	Calculated from Zoning Districts
Zoning dummy: Office/Commercial	zp_OfficeComm	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Zoning dummy: Density Restricted Multifamily, RTO = Form Based	zp_DRMulti_RTO	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Zoning dummy: Form Based Multifamily, RTO = form based	zp_FBDMulti_RTO	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Zoning dummy: Industrial / Production, Distribution & Repair	zp_PDRInd	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Zoning dummy: Public/Open Space	zp_Public	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Zoning dummy: Redevelopment Area	zp_Redev	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Zoning dummy: Residential 2-Family (2 Units per Lot)	zp_RH2	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Zoning = Residential 3-Family or Res Mixed (1/800 sqft)	zp_RH3_RM1	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Planning District dummy variables	DIST_<District Name>	Planning District from Assessor's Secured Roll DB

Appendix: Logistic Regression Coefficients

Variable Description	Variable	Coeff	StdErr	WaldChiSq	Prob>Chi Sq
Intercept	Intercept	(1.6226)	1.2829	1.5998	0.2059
Height limit for site in ft	Height_Ft	0.0017	0.0007	4.9693	0.0258
Area for lot in 1000 sq ft	Area_1000	0.0049	0.0009	30.6563	0.0000
Envelope Area in 1000 sq ft (area/1000*ht/10)	Env_1000_Area_Height	0.0002	0.0001	5.0369	0.0248
Extisting building square footage in 1000 sq ft	Bldg_SqFt_1000	(0.0023)	0.0007	10.7241	0.0011
Residential Existing Use using ResUnits (Dummy)	Res_Dummy	(0.8231)	0.1222	45.3669	0.0000
Historic Status for Parcel (Dummy)	Historic	(1.0378)	0.1271	66.6847	0.0000
Real Construction Cost Variable	Construc_Cost_Real	(0.0992)	0.0129	58.8929	0.0000
SF Housing Price Index (Zillow), Real	Zillow_Price_Real	0.0143	0.0053	7.1326	0.0076
Dummy for State Density Bonus, 5+ Unit Sites, 2016 forward	SDB_2016_5Plus	0.6303	0.1608	15.3724	0.0000
Zoning = Office/Commercial	zp_OfficeComm	4.2634	0.4873	76.5337	0.0000
Zoning = Density Restricted Multifamily, RTO = Form Based	zp_DRMulti_RTO	4.2450	0.4523	88.0989	0.0000
Zoning = Form Based Multifamily, RTO = form based	zp_FBDMulti_RTO	5.0508	0.4640	118.4768	0.0000
Zoning = Industrial / Production, Distribution & Repair	zp_PDRInd	3.4115	0.4790	50.7257	0.0000
Zoning = Public/Open Space	zp_Public	1.2491	0.8385	2.2190	0.1363
Zoning = Redevelopment Area	zp_Redev	4.5361	0.4999	82.3213	0.0000
Zoning = Residential 2-Family (2 Units per Lot)	zp_RH2	0.2674	0.6672	0.1607	0.6885
Zoning = Residential 3-Family or Res Mixed (1/800 sqft)	zp_RH3_RM1	1.3187	0.6064	4.7289	0.0297

Appendix: Logistic Regression Coefficients (Continued)

Variable Description	Variable	Coeff	StdErr	WaldChiSq	Prob>Chi Sq
District = South Bayshore	DIST_SBayshore	(1.4824)	0.3179	21.7380	0.0000
District = Bernal Heights	DIST_BernalHts	(1.7011)	0.6087	7.8100	0.0052
District = South Central	DIST_Scentral	(1.7307)	0.3867	20.0267	0.0000
District = Central	DIST_Central	(1.1523)	0.3353	11.8102	0.0006
District = Buena Vista	DIST_BuenaVista	(2.5369)	1.0188	6.2010	0.0128
District = Northeast	DIST_Northeast	(1.4171)	0.2539	31.1439	0.0000
District = Western Addition	DIST_WestAddition	(0.6831)	0.2362	8.3630	0.0038
District = South of Market	DIST_SOMA	(0.0756)	0.1903	0.1579	0.6911
District = Inner Sunset	DIST_InnerSunset	(1.6187)	0.4882	10.9939	0.0009
District = Richmond	DIST_Richmond	(2.8019)	0.5355	27.3716	0.0000
District = Ingleside	DIST_Ingleside	(1.8670)	0.4925	14.3711	0.0002
District = Outer Sunset	DIST_OuterSunset	(2.6147)	0.6098	18.3867	0.0000
District = Marina	DIST_Marina	(1.2492)	0.3253	14.7457	0.0001
District = Mission	DIST_Mission	(1.0938)	0.2380	21.1176	0.0000

Omitted Variables for Groups of Dummy Variables:

Omitted zoning = RH1

Omitted district = Downtown

Appendix: Units Regression Coefficients

Variable Description	Variable	Coeff	St Error	T-Stat
Simple building envelope (area/1000 * ht/10)	Env_1000_Area_Height	0.4252	0.0159	26.72
State Density Bonus * Simple Bldg Envelope (5+ Unit Sites, 2016 forward)	SDB_2016_5Plus_EnvFull	0.4385	0.0389	11.28
Simple Bldg Envelope only if density-restricted	Zoning_DR_EnvFull	(0.1601)	0.0174	(9.22)

Note: Model removes largest 5% (Positive and Negative) residual outliers

Appendix: Model Performance

Logistic Regression	
Number of Observations	3,369,573
Number with Dependent Variable = 1	422
Pseudo R-Square	0.000611
Max Rescaled R-Square	0.244596

Units Regression	
Number of Observations	383
R-Sq	0.867779
Adj R-Sq	0.866735
Dependent Mean Value	81.87206
Standard Error of Regression	48.40184

Appendix: Zoning Classifications

- The table below shows the correspondence between the City's zoning districts, and the aggregate zoning variables in the model.

Zoning Variable	Zoning Districts
zp_RH1	C-2/RH-1(D); RH-1(D)/C-2; C-M/RH-1; M-1/RH-1; NC-1/RH-1; NC-1/RH-1/RH-2; NC-2/RH-1; NC-2/RH-1(D); NC-3/RH-1; NCD/RH-1; NCD/RH-1(D); NC-S/RH-1; NCT-OCEAN/RH-1(D); NCT/RH-1(D); P/P-W/RH-1; P/RH-1; P/RH-1(D); P/RH-1/RH-1(D); P/RH-1/RH-2; RH-1; RH-1(D); RH-1(D)/NC-2; RH-1(D)/RH-1; RH-2/RH-1; RH-2/RH-1(D); RH-1(D)/RH-2; RH-1(D)/RM-1; RH-1(S); RH-1/C-M; RH-1/M-1; RH-1/NC-1; RH-1/NC-2; RH-1/NC-3; RH-1/NC-S; RH-1/RH-1(D); RH-1/RH-2; RH-1/RH-2/RM-1; RH-1/RM-1; RM-1/RH-1; RH-3/RH-1
zp_RH2	NC-1/RH-1/RH-2; P/RH-1/RH-2; RH-2/RH-1; RH-2/RH-1(D); RH-1(D)/RH-2; RH-1/RH-2; RH-1/RH-2/RM-1; M-1/RH-2/RM-1; MUR/RH-2; NC-1/RH-2; NC-2/RH-2; NC-3/RH-2; NCD/RH-2; NC-S/RH-2; NCT-GLEN PARK/RH-2; NCT-OCEAN/RH-2; NCT/RH-2; P/RH-2; P/RM-1/RH-2; RH-2; RH-2/NC-1; RH-2/NC-2; RH-2/NC-3; RH-2/RH-3; RH-2/RM-1; RM-1/RH-2; RH-2/RM-2; RM-2/RH-2; RH-2/RM-3; RM-3/RH-2; RH-3/RH-2
zp_RH3_RM1	RH-1/RH-2/RM-1; M-1/RH-2/RM-1; P/RM-1/RH-2; RH-2/RH-3; RH-2/RM-1; RM-1/RH-2; RH-3/RH-2; RH-1(D)/RM-1; RH-1/RM-1; RM-1/RH-1; RH-3/RH-1; C-2/RH-3; C-2/RM-1; C-2/RM-1/RM-4; C-M/RM-1; HP-RA/RM-1; M-1/RM-1; M-2/RH-3; NC-1/RM-1; RM-1/NC-1; NC-2/RH-3; NC-2/RM-1; NC-3/RH-3; NC-3/RM-1; NCD/RH-3; NCD/RH-3/UPR MARKET; NCD/RH-3/UPR MARK; NCD/RH-3/VALENCIA; NCD/RM-1; NCD/RM-1/SACRAMENTO; NCD/SACRAMENTO ST; NCD/SACRAMENTO/RM-1; NCD/RM-1/SACRAMEN; NCT-DIVISADERO/RH-3; NCT-DIVISADERO/RM-1; NCT/RH-3; NCT/RM-1; P/PM-R/RM-1; P/RH-3; P/RM-1; PM-MU2/PM-OS/PM-R/RM-1; PM-R/RM-1; RH-3; RH-3/C-2; RH-3/HAYES; RH-3/M-2; RH-3/NC-2; RH-3/RM-1; RM-1/RH-3; RH-3/RM-2; RM-2/RH-3; RH-3/RM-3; RM-3/RH-3; RH-3/RSD; RH-3/VALENCIA; RM-1; RM-1/C-M; RM-1/C-M/M-1; RM-1/NC-3; RM-1/RM-2; RM-1/RM-3; RM-1/RM-4; RM-1/SACRAMENTO
zp_OfficeComm	C-2/RH-3; C-2/RM-1; C-2/RM-1/RM-4; C-M/RM-1; RH-3/C-2; RM-1/C-M; RM-1/C-M/M-1; C-2/RH-1(D); RH-1(D)/C-2; C-M/RH-1; RH-1/C-M; C-2; C-2/M-1; C-2/M-1/P; C-2/P; C-3-G; C-3-G/C-3-R; C-3-G/C-M; C-3-G/RC-4; C-3-O; C-3-O(SD); C-3-O(SD)/P; C-3-O(SD)/TB DTR; C-3-O/C-3-O(SD); C-3-O/C-3-R; C-3-O/C-3-S; C-3-O/C-3-S/P; C-3-O/TB DTR; C-3-R; C-3-S; C-3-S/P; C-M; C-M/M-1; CMUO; CMUO/MUR; CMUO/P; MUO; NCD/C-2; P/C-3-R; RM-3/C-2; RM-4/C-2; WMUO

Appendix: Zoning Classifications (Continued)

Zoning Variable	Zoning Districts
zp_DRMulti_RTO	NC-2/P; NC-3/P/RM-3; NCD/P; NC-S/P; P/NC-S; P/NC-2; P/RC-4; P/RM-2; P/RM-3; C-2/RM-1/RM-4; C-3-G/RC-4; NCD/C-2; RM-3/C-2; RM-4/C-2; NC-1/RM-1; RM-1/NC-1; NC-2/RH-3; NC-2/RM-1; NC-3/RH-3; NC-3/RM-1; NCD/RH-3; NCD/RH-3/UPR MARKET; NCD/RH-3/UPR MARK; NCD/RH-3/VALENCIA; NCD/RM-1; NCD/RM-1/SACRAMENTO; NCD/SACRAMENTO ST; NCD/SACRAMENTO/RM-1; NCD/RM-1/SACRAMEN; RH-3/HAYES; RH-3/NC-2; RH-3/RM-2; RM-2/RH-3; RH-3/RM-3; RM-3/RH-3; RH-3/RSD; RH-3/VALENCIA; RM-1/NC-3; RM-1/RM-2; RM-1/RM-3; RM-1/RM-4; RM-1/SACRAMENTO; NC-1/RH-1/RH-2; NC-1/RH-2; NC-2/RH-2; NC-3/RH-2; NCD/RH-2; NC-S/RH-2; RH-2/NC-1; RH-2/NC-2; RH-2/NC-3; RH-2/RM-2; RM-2/RH-2; RH-2/RM-3; RM-3/RH-2; NC-1/RH-1; NC-2/RH-1; NC-2/RH-1(D); NC-3/RH-1; NCD/RH-1; NCD/RH-1(D); NC-S/RH-1; RH-1(D)/NC-2; RH-1/NC-1; RH-1/NC-2; RH-1/NC-3; RH-1/NC-S; 24TH-MISSION; 24TH STREET- NOE VALL; 24TH-NOE; BROADWAY; BROADWAY NEIGHBORHOOD; C-2/RM-4; CASTRO STREET NEIGHBO; CASTRO; CCB; CRNC; CR-NC; CRNC/CVR; CR-NC/CVR; CRNC/RM-4; CVR; DTR/RC-4; FILLMORE; HAIGHT; HAIGHT STREET NEIGHBO; HAYES; HAIGHT STREET NEIGHBO; INNER CLEMENT; INNER CLEMENT STREET; INNER SUNSET; INNER SUNSET NEIGHBOR; M-1/NC-2; M-1/RM-2; M-1/RSD; NC-1; NC-1/RM-2; NC-1/RM-3; NC-2; NC-2/M-1; NC-2/NC-3; NC-3/NC-2; NC-2/RM-3; NC-2/RM-4; NC-3; NC-3/RC-4; NC-3/RM-3; NC-3/RM-4; NCD; NCD/; NCD/24TH STREET- NOE VALL; NCD/24TH STREET-; NCD/24TH-MISSION; NCD/24TH-NOE; NCD/24TH-NOE-VALLE; NCD/24TH-NOE-VALLEY; NCD/BROADWAY; NCD/BROADWAY NEIG; NCD/BROADWAY NEIGHBORHOOD; NCD/CASTRO; NCD/CASTRO STREET; NCD/CASTRO STREET NEIGHBO; NCD/EXCELSIOR OUTER MISSI; NCD/EXCELSIOR OUT; EXCELSIOR OUTER MISSI; NCD/FILLMORE; NCD/HAIGHT; NCD/HAIGHT STREET; NCD/HAIGHT STREET NEIGHBO; NCD/HAYES; NCD/HAYES NCT; NCD/HAYES NCT/RTO; NCD/INNER CLEMENT; NCD/INNER CLEMENT STREET; NCD/INNER SUNSET; NCD/INNER SUNSET NEIGHBOR; NCD/IRVING STREET NEIGHBO; NCD/IRVING STREET; NCD/IRVING; IRVING STREET NEIGHBO; NCD/JAPANTOWN NEIGHBORHOO; NCD/JAPANTOWN NEI; JAPANTOWN NEIGHBORHOO; NCD/JUDAH STREET NEIGHBOR; NCD/JUDAH; NCD/JUDAH STREET; JUDAH STREET NEIGHBOR; NCD/NC-1; NCD/NC-2; NCD/NC-3; NCD/NCT; NCD/NO BEACH; NCD/NORIEGA STREET NEIGHB; NCD/NORIEGA STREE; NCD/NORIEGA; NCD/NORTH BEACH NEIGHBORH; NCD/NORTH BEACH N; NCD/NORTH BEACH; NCD/NORTHBEACH; NCD/NORTH BEACH/RM-1; NCD/NORTHBEACH/RM-1; NCD/OUTER CLEMENT; NCD/OUTER CLEMENT STREET; NCD/OUTER CLEMENT STREET; NCD/PACIFIC; NCD/PACIFIC AVENU; NCD/PACIFIC/RM-3; NCD/PACIFIC;RM-3; NCD/PACIFIC AVENUE NEIGHB; NCD/POLK; NCD/POLK STREET N; NCD/POLK STREET NEIGHBORH; NCD/POLK/RC-3; NCD/POLK/RC-4; NCD/RC-3; NCD/RESIDENTIAL- HOUSE, O; NCD/RESIDENTIAL-; NCD/RM-2; NCD/RM-3; NCD/RM-3/PACIFIC; NCD/RTO; NCD/SACRAMENTO; NCD/SACRAMENTO STREET NEI; NCD/TARAVAL STREET NEIGHB; NCD/TARAVAL STREE; NCD/TARAVAL; NCD/UNION; NCD/UNION STREET; NCD/UNION STREET NEIGHBOR; NCD/UPPER FILLMORE NEIGHB; NCD/UPPER FILLMOR; NCD/UPPER FILLMORE; NCD/UPPERFILLMORE; NCD/UPPER MARKET STREET N; NCD/UPPER MARKET; NCD/UPR MARKET NC; NCD/UPR MARKET; NCD/UPR MARKET NCT; NCD/UPR MARKET NCT/; NCD/VALENCIA; NCD/WEST PORTAL; NCD/WEST PORTAL A; NCD/WEST PORTAL AVENUE NE; NCD/BAYVIEW; NCD/COLE VALLEY; NCD/CORTLAND AVENUE; NCD/GEARY BOULEVARD; NCD/GEARY BOULEVA; NCD/GEARY BOULEVARD/RH-2; NCD/GEARY BOULEVARD/RM-1; NCD/INNER BALBOA STREET; NCD/INNER BALBOA S; NCD/OUTER BALBOA STREET; NCD/ OUTER BALBOA STREET; NCD/OUTER BALBOA S; NCD/LOWER HAIGHT STREET; NCD/LOWER HAIGHT S; NCD/LOWER HAIGHT STREET/RH-3; NCD/LOWER POLK STREET; NCD/MISSION BERNAL; NCD/INNER TARAVAL STREET; NCD/INNER TARAVAL; NCD/SAN BRUNO AVENUE; NCD/LAKESIDE VILLAGE; NCD/LAKESIDE VILLAG; NC-S; NC-S/PM-R; NC-S/RM-3; NCT-DIVISADERO/RM-3; NCT/RM-3; NCT/RM-4; NO BEACH; OUTER CLEMENT; POLK; RC-3; RC-3/POLK; RC-3/RM-3; RC-4; RC-4/NC-3; RC-4/RH DTR; RC-4/RM-4; RED/SLR; RM-2; RM-2/M-1; RM-2/NC-1; RM-2/NC-2; RM-2/NO BEACH; RM-2/RM-3; RM-2/RM-4; RM-3; RM-3/NC-1; RM-3/NC-2; RM-3/NC-3; RM-3/NC-S; RM-3/RC-3; RM-3/RM-4; RM-4; RM-4/CR-NC; RM-4/NC-2; RM-4/NC-3; RM-4/RC-4; RSD; RSD/SLR; SACRAMENTO; SLR; SSO; UNION; UPR MARKET; VALENCIA; WEST PORTAL

Appendix: Zoning Classifications (Continued)

Zoning Variable	Zoning Districts
zp_Public	C-2/M-1/P; C-2/P; C-3-O(SD)/P; C-3-O/C-3-S/P; C-3-S/P; CMUO/P; P/C-3-R; P/RM-1/RH-2; P/PM-R/RM-1; P/RH-3; P/RM-1; PM-MU2/PM-OS/PM-R/RM-1; P/RH-1/RH-2; P/RH-2; P/P-W/RH-1; P/RH-1; P/RH-1(D); P/RH-1/RH-1(D); Remove; HP-RA/M-1/M-2/P; HP-RA/M-2/P; M-1/M-2/P; M-1/P; M-2/MB-OS; M-2/MB-RA/P; M-2/P; MB-O; MB-O/MB-RA; MB-OS; MB-RA/P; MUG/P; NC-2/P; NC-3/P/RM-3; NCD/P; NC-S/P; NCT/P; NCT-3/P; NCT-3/RTO; P; P/C-3-O(SD); P/M-1; P/M-2; P/MISS BAY S PL; P/MISS BAY S PLN; P/MUR; P/NC-S; P/NC-2; P/PDR-2; P/PM-OS; P/PM-OS/PM-R; P/P-W; P/RC-4; P/RM-2; P/RM-3; P/TB DTR; P/RTO-C; P, RTO-C; PM-CF; PM-CF/PM-OS; PM-CF/PM-OS/PM-R; PM-MU1/PM-OS; PM-MU2/PM-OS/PM-R; PM-OS; PM-OS/PM-R; PM-OS/PM-R/PM-S; PM-OS/PM-S; Public
zp_FBDMulti_RTO	DTR/RC-4; NCD/HAYES NCT; NCD/HAYES NCT/RTO; NCD/NCT; NCD/RTO; NCD/UPR MARKET NCT; NCD/UPR MARKET NCT/; NC-S/PM-R; NCT-DIVISADERO/RM-3; NCT/RM-3; NCT/RM-4; RC-4/RH DTR; RED/SLR; P/PM-R/RM-1; PM-MU2/PM-OS/PM-R/RM-1; MUG/P; NCT/P; NCT-3/P; NCT-3/RTO; P/MUR; P/PM-OS/PM-R; P/TB DTR; P/RTO-C; P, RTO-C; PM-CF/PM-OS/PM-R; PM-MU1/PM-OS; PM-MU2/PM-OS/PM-R; PM-OS/PM-R; PM-OS/PM-R/PM-S; C-3-O(SD)/TB DTR; C-3-O/TB DTR; CMUO/MUR; NCT-DIVISADERO/RH-3; NCT-DIVISADERO/RM-1; NCT/RH-3; NCT/RM-1; PM-R/RM-1; MUR/RH-2; NCT-GLEN PARK/RH-2; NCT-OCEAN/RH-2; NCT/RH-2; NCT-OCEAN/RH-1(D); NCT/RH-1(D); DTR; DTR/M-1; M-1/RH DTR; M-2/MR-MU; M-2/P70-MU; MB-RA/MR-MU; MR-MU; MUG; MUG/RED; MUR; NCT; NCT-DIVISADERO; NCT-FOLSOM; NCT-GLEN PARK; NCT-HAYES; NCT-HAYES/RTO; NCT-HAYES/RTO-1; NCT-MISSION; NCT-UPPER MARKET; NCT-UPPER MARKET;; NCT-UPPER MARKET/RH-2; NCT-UPPER MARKET/RH-3; NCT-OCEAN; NCT-SOMA; NCT/NCT-3; NCT/RCD; NCT/RED-MX; NCT/RTO; NCT/RTO-M; NCT/UMU; NCT-1; NCT-2; NCT-3; NCT-3/NCT-HAYES; RTO-1/NCT-3; RTO/NCT-3; P70-MU; PDR-1-D/UMU; PDR-1-G/UMU; PM-MU1; PM-MU1/PM-R; PM-MU2/PM-R; PM-MU2; PM-R; RCD; RED; RED-MX; RED-MX/WMUG; RH DTR; RH DTR/SB-DTR; RH DTR/TB DTR; RTO; RTO-1; RTO/NCT; RTO-1/RTO-C; RTO-C; RTO-M; SB-DTR; SPD; TB DTR; UMU; WMUG
zp_PDRInd	DTR/M-1; M-1/RH DTR; M-2/MR-MU; M-2/P70-MU; PDR-1-D/UMU; PDR-1-G/UMU; M-1/NC-2; M-1/RM-2; M-1/RSD; NC-2/M-1; RM-2/M-1; C-2/M-1/P; HP-RA/M-1/M-2/P; HP-RA/M-2/P; M-1/M-2/P; M-1/P; M-2/MB-OS; M-2/MB-RA/P; M-2/P; P/M-1; P/M-2; P/PDR-2; C-2/M-1; C-M/M-1; RH-1/RH-2/RM-1; M-1/RH-2/RM-1; M-1/RM-1; M-2/RH-3; RH-3/M-2; M-1/RH-1; RH-1/M-1; HP-RA/M-1; HP-RA/M-2; M-1; M-1/M-1; M-1/M-2; M-1/PDR-1-B; M-1/PDR-2; M-2; M-2 (MB); M-2/MB-RA; M-2/PDR-2; M-2/SLI; MISS BAY S PLN/M-2; MISS BAY S PL; MISS BAY S PLN; MISS BAY S PLN/M-; PDR-1; PDR-1/PDR-2; PDR-1-B; PDR-1-B/PDR-2; PDR-1-D; PDR-1-G; PDR-2; SALI; SLI; SLI/M-2
zp_Redev	HP-RA/M-1/M-2/P; HP-RA/M-2/P; M-2/MB-RA/P; HP-RA/M-1; HP-RA/M-2; M-2/MB-RA; MISS BAY S PLN/M-2; MISS BAY S PL; MISS BAY S PLN; MISS BAY S PLN/M-; MB-RA/MR-MU; MB-O/MB-RA; MB-RA/P; P/MISS BAY S PL; P/MISS BAY S PLN; HP-RA/RM-1; HP-RA; MB-RA; MISS BAY N RED; MISS BAY N RED PLN; MISS BAY N RED PL; MISS BAY S RED; MISS BAY S RED PLN; MISS BAY S RED PL

Appendix: Logic of Applying the Model

- This section of the appendix describes in more detail how the model was used to produce estimates of future housing production.
- For the existing zoning (“baseline”), the application of the model is straightforward. Current zoning was encoded using the zoning classification on the previous page, and current allowable height was used as the height variable in the logistic regression, and to calculate building envelope in the units regression.
- For the proposed rezoning (“policy”), the logic used was as follows: based on the units regression, each 1000 square feet of building envelope results in 0.42 units. The State Density Bonus adds an additional 0.44 units. Parcels that elect to use the Local Program therefore need to accommodate at least 0.44 additional units per 1000 square feet of envelope if developers are to choose this option. For parcels where the Local Program was more desirable, and on parcels that are ineligible for the SDB, because their zoning and size prevents them from building more than 5 units, the Local Program was applied. For all other parcels the SDB was used.

Appendix: Logic of Applying the Model (Continued)

- Probabilities and units for any parcel using the State Density Bonus were calculated by:
  - In the logistic regression, using the first new height in the rezoning table for Height_Ft and in the Env_1000_Area_Height calculation.
  - In the units regression, using the first new height in the rezoning table to calculate Env_1000_Area_Height;
  - Incorporating the SDB_2016_5Plus_EnvFull effect;
  - Incorporating the Zoning_DR_EnvFull if applicable (i.e. the parcel is density-restricted.

Appendix: Logic of Applying the Model (Continued)

- Probabilities and units for any parcel using the Local Program were calculated by:
  - In the logistic regression, setting zp_FBDMulti_RTO = 1, to account for the relaxation of density controls in the Local Program;
  - In the logistic regression, using the second new height in the rezoning table for Height_Ft and in the Env_1000_Area_Height calculation.
  - In the units regression, using the second new height in the rezoning table to calculate Env_1000_Area_Height;
  - In the units regression, removing the SDB_2016_5Plus_EnvFull effect;
  - In the units regression, removing the Zoning_DR_EnvFull effect.

Appendix: Business Disruption / Relocation Costs

- The analysis makes the following assumptions about business disruption and relocation costs:
  - Lost space will be 10% vacant, so 90% of the loss represents the loss of occupied space.
  - Lost business net income (for 6 months of disruption): $5/occupied square foot.
  - Fixed labor costs (for 6 months): $10/occupied square foot.
  - Moving costs and build-out of space at new premises: $175/occupied square foot

Staff Contact

Ted Egan, Ph.D., Chief Economist ted.egan@sfgov.org

From: Deldelp Medina
To: Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject: Without rent control I would be pushed out of the city
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 2:49:32 PM

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

Mr. Carroll,

I wanted to share with you my experiences and reality. I have been living in San Francisco for the last fifteen years, thanks to rent control. Without being able to live in locally owned apartments, I would not have been able to raise my family here. When new housing is built, it shouldn't be at the expense of units that are keeping folks rooted to their neighborhood. I support incentives to have folks build without displacing those of us who have created homes and communities.

Best,

Deldelp

--
Deldelp Medina
She/Her/Ella
My schedule/Mi Horario: Calendly_Deldelp

From:	Devon Bolla
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	Ryan Patterson; Ephraim Margolin; Sonja Trauss
Subject:	Proposed Family Zoning Plan and Housing Element Implementation: File Nos. 250700, 250701, 251071, 251073, 250985, and 250966
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 2:44:12 PM
Attachments:	2025.11.17 Ltr re SF Family Zoning Plan - RJP.pdf

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

Good afternoon,

Attached for your review is a memo regarding a proposed family zoning plan and housing element implementation.

Thank you,

Devon J. Bolla
(she/her)
Paralegal
Patterson & O'Neill, PC
Office: (415) 907-9110
Direct: (415) 907-7703
Fax: (415) 907-7704
235 Montgomery Street, Suite 950
San Francisco, CA 94104
devon@pattersononeill.com
www.pattersononeill.com

This email may contain privileged or confidential material for the sole use of the intended recipient. Review or distribution by others is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the original sender and delete all copies. Nothing in this email or any attachments should be regarded as tax advice unless expressly stated.

PATTERSON & O'NEILL, PC

235 Montgomery Street, Suite 950
San Francisco, CA 94104
Telephone: (415) 907-9110
Facsimile: (415) 907-7704

November 17, 2025

VIA EMAIL

Chair Myrna Melgar
Land Use and Transportation Committee
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
49 South Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94103
john.carroll@sfgov.org
Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Proposed Family Zoning Plan and Housing Element Implementation
File Nos. 250700, 250701, 251071, 251073, 250985, and 250966

Dear Chair Melgar and Honorable Supervisors:

Our office represents Yes In My Back Yard ("YIMBY Law"), a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization whose mission is to enforce state housing laws. We write to share our concerns regarding San Francisco's proposed Family Zoning Plan ("FZP"). Our comments incorporate the comments of YIMBY Action and its members, including the attached letters dated September 11, 2025 and October 29, 2025.

I. The City Will Violate the Housing Element Law if it Adopts the FZP Knowing that it Will Not Produce the Required Housing Units

The City's 6th cycle housing element noted that the City was unable to identify enough sites to accommodate the number of units for lower- and moderate-income households, including a 15% buffer, that it was assigned to plan for during its 6th cycle ("RHNA Shortfall"). The Department of Housing and Community Development, therefore, directed the City to include a program in its housing element identifying sites for rezoning to accommodate these units as mandated by the Housing Element Law. (Gov. Code § 65584.09(a)-(b); Gov. Code § 65583(c)(1); *Martinez v. City of Clovis* (2023) 90 Cal. App. 5th 193, 225.) However, the City's proposed rezoning program—Program 7.1.1— and the FZP, which implements Program 7.1.1, are inadequate because (1) the City's own analysis found that the FZP will not create enough units for the City to meet its RHNA Shortfall; (2) the FZP will not create sufficient capacity because it relies on density decontrol in residential neighborhoods without corresponding changes in development standards; and (3) the FZP's local alternative to the state Density Bonus Law will not increase

density because it is duplicative of existing capacity under the state Density Bonus Law.

A. The Chief Economist's Report Confirms that the FZP Will Not Create Enough Units for the City to Meet its RHNA Shortfall

On October 29, 2025, the City's Chief Economist published a report, which found that the FZP will produce **less than half** the number of housing units that the City is required to plan for to meet its RHNA Shortfall – in more than double the time allowed. The report concluded that in a best-case scenario, the FZP would only produce around 14,600 additional units over the next 20 years, representing just 40% of the 36,282 units the City is required to plan for over the next eight years. Under a low-growth scenario, the FZP would only produce 8,504 units over 20 years. Either scenario is inadequate and would be a spectacular failure of the City to comply with the Housing Element Law, which requires local governments to plan to meet their RHNA shortfall through rezoning programs. (Gov. Code § 65583(c)(1) and Gov. Code § 65583.2(h).)

B. The FZP Will Not Create Sufficient Capacity Because it Relies on Density Decontrol in Single-Family Neighborhoods But Does Not Create Room for Additional Density

The FZP uses form-based zoning without corresponding changes in development standards in single-family neighborhoods, which means developers cannot build in these areas. Therefore, the FZP does not actually increase capacity in these neighborhoods.

The FZP uses form-based zoning (also called density decontrol), which regulates the allowed density on a site by setting limits on height, bulk, setbacks, and other features (rather than setting numerical density limits). And while the City claims that the change from the existing numerical density limits to form-based zoning will produce additional units, its refusal to ease the existing limitations on height, bulk, and other standards that limit the buildable envelope for construction in these neighborhoods means there is no actual capacity to build additional units. For example, a lot with an existing single-family home that occupies most or all of the buildable area is unlikely to be redeveloped into multifamily housing because without easing height limits, setbacks, parking minimums, and the like, there will be no place to build the additional units.

The FZP promises to increase density, but its use of form-based density without easing height limits, setbacks, parking minimums, and other development standards will prevent building in the City's highest-resourced neighborhoods.

C. The FZP's Alternative to the State Density Bonus Law Does Not Add Sufficient Density

The City contends that its local alternative to the state Density Bonus Law will create additional capacity for housing production, and it relies on that claim to meet its RHNA shortfall. However, almost all of the capacity that the City is relying on is already available for housing production through the state Density Bonus Law, so the City's local alternative is duplicative of existing capacity under the state Density Bonus Law.

The state Density Bonus Law requires local agencies to grant density bonuses under the state law to qualifying projects. (Gov. Code § 65915(a)(1)-(b).)

The FZP would give applicants a local alternative to the state Density Bonus Law called Housing Choice-San Francisco ("HCSF"). Crucially, HCSF does not offer any increase in density beyond what is offered by the state Density Bonus Law in most locations. Moreover, when both the state Density Bonus Law and HCSF are available, applicants can only avail themselves of one.

The state Density Bonus Law is intended as a bonus on *top* of local rules. (Gov. Code § 65915(u)(1).) But the HCSF offers no increase in density beyond what developers are already entitled to under the state Density Bonus Law when a project is eligible for both. Therefore, the HCSF does not create the additional capacity required by the Housing Element Law.

II. The City Fails to Use the Required "Analytical Model" to Determine the Likelihood of Site Development

The FZP fails to use the "analytical model" required by the City's housing element. When a city includes a program in its housing element, the Housing Element Law makes it mandatory to implement the features of those programs. (Gov. Code § 65581(b); Gov. Code § 65583(c)(1); *Hoffmaster v. City of San Diego* (1997) 55 Cal.App.4th 1098.)

Program 7.1.1 of the City's housing element commits the City to implementing a rezoning program that "reasonably account[s] for sites' likelihood of development during the planning period using an analytical model." In addition to the Housing Element Law, which makes it mandatory for the City to use an "analytical model," the City's housing element uses mandatory language, stating that the City "shall" build its rezoning program around such a "probability-of-development" analysis. The FZP, however, fails to use an "analytical model," in violation of the housing element. Instead, the FZP uses three alternative methods to estimate how many housing units the FZP will produce, none of which meets the requirements of Program 7.1.1.

First, the City proposes using a "soft sites" method, which assumes that a site that is already developed with a residential use has a two percent probability of being redeveloped with the FZP's planned residential capacity, and a site that is already developed with a non-residential use has a seventy percent probability of redevelopment with a residential use. This assumption is just that, and not an analytical model. Such rigid calculations based on uniform, citywide assumptions about the odds of development on thousands of very different sites are not an "analytical model" and do not "reasonably account for sites' likelihood of development" as required by Program 7.1.1.

Second, the City assesses the likelihood of a given site being developed under the rezoning proposal using a model that evaluates whether new housing is financially feasible at a given site. The model assumes that two percent of sites currently occupied by residential uses and thirty-five percent of other sites will be redeveloped with economically feasible new housing developments. Again, this is not an "analytical model" that "reasonably account[s] for sites' likelihood of development" as required by Program 7.1.1 because its assumptions are not grounded in historical development standards in San Francisco, and its focus on financial feasibility is a distinct concept from focusing on "the probability of development." It may be financially feasible for a property to be redeveloped, but that same property can have a low likelihood of being redeveloped for a variety of reasons, especially for single-family homes that play a big role in the FZP, and which already contain high-value structures or the property owner faces financial constraints, lack of development experience, or the need to use the property for their own housing. Moreover, even if this method were accurate, it projects only 19,000 new units of housing over the planning period – far below the requirement of 36,282 new units.

The third model that the City relies on involves examining the rate at which units across the City were approved using historical data from 2005-2023 and multiplying that by the theoretical capacity of the sites. This model does not qualify as an "analytical model" because it ignores the fact that much of the development in the City in recent years has taken place on vacant sites or extremely underutilized land. In fact, around 25% of sites that were redeveloped from 2005-2023 had residential uses before redevelopment, while around 84% of sites under the FZP have residential uses. Non-vacant sites already containing residential uses are 70% less likely to be redeveloped according to the City's own analysis, and the FZP errs in assuming that non-vacant and vacant sites will be redeveloped at the same rate. (*See* Housing Element, Appendix B.2, Figure 2.) Since the FZP mostly contains parcels with residential uses, unlike past development, this approach of extrapolating from past development does not correspond to future development predictions.

The areas where housing would be built under the FZP already contain high-value structures, such as single-family homes, where the owners are unlikely or unable to redevelop the site as multi-family housing due to financial constraints, lack of development experience, and the need to use their properties for their own housing.

These areas will have much lower rates of redevelopment, which this model does not take into account. Moreover, this model has unrealistically low estimates of the City's residential zoning capacity in prior years (thus inflating the share of residential zoned capacity that has been built out) and the inclusion of residential projects built under development agreements, which do not correspond to rezonings, and which were separately counted towards the City's pre-existing residential zoned capacity in the housing element. These two reasons disqualify this model from being an "analytical model."

Additionally, the FZP does not create sufficient capacity because it assumes certain large pipeline projects will actually be constructed within the planning period, when in reality such development is exceedingly unlikely – if not impossible. For the Hunters Point/Candlestick project, approximately 3,500 units are located on Navy-owned parcels. The City will not even obtain control of these parcels until the Navy finishes remediation, which is estimated to take at least 11 more years. ("The Navy has recently informed OCII that completion of remediation and conveyance of all portions of the Shipyard Site, excluding Parcel F, to Developer will occur between 2036-2038 . . . ." (Resolution No. 26-2024, available at https://sfocii.org/sites/default/files/2024-08/5.%20RESO%2026-2024_HPS%20Approval%20of%20Amendments%20to%20Redevelopment%20Plan.pdf; *see also* https://www.sfchronicle.com/sf/article/hunters-point-shipyard-radioactive-materials-21129542.php.) Similarly, Treasure Island's phasing includes a maximum of 4,600 units completed before 2031, but the City is counting all 8,000 units toward the pipeline. (*See* https://media.api.sf.gov/documents/Ex._JJ_-_SOP.pdf; Treasure Island Sub-Phase Application 3, Schedule of Performance, Exh. JJ, Appendix B, https://media.api.sf.gov/documents/TI_Sub-Phase_Application_3_Book-Revision_1_-_reduced.pdf.)

Since none of the three models that the City considers qualifies as a reasonable "analytical model," the City is violating its legally binding commitment under Program 7.1.1.

III. The FZP Adds New Constraints On Housing Production and Fails to Analyze the Impact of These Constraints

The FZP adds new constraints on housing development, which were not analyzed in its housing element, in violation of the Housing Element Law and Senate Bill ("SB") 330.

A. The FZP's New Constraints Violate the Housing Element Law

The FZP adds new constraints on housing production, which it fails to analyze as required by the Housing Element Law. When considering rezoning plans, the Housing Element Law requires local governments to analyze new governmental constraints on housing production. (Gov. Code § 65583(a)(5); *see also Californians*

for Homeownership, Inc. v. City of Beverly Hills (2023) Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCP00143, at p. 6, [finding planned rezonings for housing element site inventory must analyze new constraints].)

The FZP adds new constraints on development that were not analyzed by the City's housing element, including caps on dwelling unit size, limits on curb cuts, lower parking maximums, and limits imposed by the City's local alternative to the state Density Bonus Law. As explained above, the FZP imposes new constraints because it deprives applicants of the ability to use the state Density Bonus Law in conjunction with the City's local alternative to the state Density Bonus Law, which reduces the number of units the FZP will produce. Other constraints reduce physical development capacity, e.g., caps on dwelling unit size that cannot accommodate larger families, and reduce the economic feasibility of developing housing. The FZP does *not* analyze the impact of these policies on housing production. The FZP, therefore, violates the Housing Element Law's requirement that local governments analyze new governmental constraints on housing production if they were not analyzed in a housing element. (Gov. Code § 65583(a)(5).)

B. The FZP's New Constraints Violate SB 330's Prohibition Against Rezonings Which Decrease Housing Intensity

The FZP's new constraints on housing violate SB 330's prohibition against rezonings which "lessen the intensity of housing." (Gov. Code § 66300(b)(1)(A).)

SB 330—also known as the Housing Crisis Act—prohibits local governments from enacting a development policy, standard, or condition that would "Chang[e] the general plan land use designation, specific plan land use designation, or zoning of a parcel or parcels of property to a less intensive use or reduc[e] the intensity of land use within an existing general plan land use designation, specific plan land use designation, or zoning district below what was allowed under the land use designation and zoning ordinances of the affected county or affected city, as applicable, as in effect on January 1, 2018[.]" (*Id.*) SB 330 defines "less intensive use" as including situations where a local government imposes reductions to the height, density, or floor area ratio, new or increased open space or lot size requirements, new or increased setback requirements, minimum frontage requirements, maximum lot coverage limitations, or "*any other action that would individually or cumulatively reduce [a] site's residential development capacity*." (*Id.*; emph. added.)

As mentioned above, the FZP contains new constraints on housing, including caps on dwelling unit size, limits on curb cuts, and lower parking maximums, reduces the number of units the FZP will produce. These new constraints run afoul of SB 330 because they reduce the size of units that applicants are able to construct, which physically reduces the intensity of residential use and reduces the financial viability of residential construction. The City has also conducted no analysis to show

that there will be a concurrent increase in intensity of land use to offset the decrease in intensity of land use caused by the FZP. (Gov. Code § 66300(h).)

IV. The FZP Violates the Housing Element Law By Relying on an Overlay for Nonvacant Sites Where Development of Nonresidential Uses Is Permitted

The FZP violates the recent decision in *New Commune v. City of Redondo Beach et al.* (2025) 337 Cal.Rptr.3d 782 that overlays cannot be used to meet minimum density requirements required by rezoning programs if they permit developers to redevelop sites for non-residential uses.

As explained above, when a local government cannot accommodate its RHNA Shortfall for lower-income households with a site inventory, it has to include a rezoning program in its housing element. The Housing Element Law also requires jurisdictions that must develop rezoning programs to ensure that at least 50% of the lower income housing the agency must plan for is "accommodated on sites designated for residential use and for which nonresidential uses or mixed uses are not permitted." (Gov. Code § 65583.2(h)(2).) As the City acknowledges in Program 7.1.1, it is subject to this statutory minimum density requirement.

In *New Commune*, the court ruled that residential "overlays are unlawful when they allow development below the statutory minimum density [required by Gov. Cod § 65583.2(h)(2)]." (*Id*. at 797.) The court in *New Commune* also noted that residential overlays are unlawful whether they are overlaid over a base zoning that permits residential or industrial and commercial uses. (*Id*.)

The FZP runs afoul of the *New Commune* decision and the Housing Element Law's minimum density requirement because it still permits nonresidential redevelopment of sites. The FZP is an overlay because it does not change the base zoning of properties, but is instead overlaid over existing zones, including non-residential zones. For instance, for properties subject to the FZP developers can still use the underlying C-2 and C-3 zoning to construct commercial structures, which would be below the statutory minimum density because no residential units would be constructed. By permitting developers to build nonresidential projects within the overlay, the FZP violates the Housing Element Law as explained by the court in *New Commune*.

V. The FZP Violates the Prohibition against Jurisdictions Forcing Applicants to Waive Their Right to Use the State Density Bonus Law

The FZP primarily relies on a local alternative to the state Density Bonus Law, which developers can only use if they waive their right to use the state Density Bonus Law. This is a violation of the state Density Bonus Law.

Local agencies are prohibited from adopting ordinances that conflict with the state Density Bonus Law or using their local alternative to impose development requirements that are more restrictive than the state Density Bonus Law. (*Schreiber v. City of Los Angeles* (2021) 69 Cal.App.5th 549.) The court in *Schreiber* made it clear that applicants have the right to use the state Density Bonus Law regardless of any local provisions, and that cities cannot deny, limit, or condition the use of the state Density Bonus Law by requiring an applicant to instead use a local alternative.

The FZP creates a local alternative to the state Density Bonus law called Housing Choice-San Francisco ("HCSF"). HCSF—proposed Planning Code Section 206.10(b)(5)—has only one criterion: that applicants agree to "not receive any density or development bonuses or relief from applicable Planning Code standards in any other State or local law or program[.]" HCSF violates the state Density Bonus Law's prohibition that local agencies cannot bar an applicant from using the state Density Bonus Law, regardless of any local provisions. The FZP illegally forces applicants to choose between the state Density Bonus Law and HCSF, which violates the rule that "an otherwise valid local ordinance that conflicts with the state Density Bonus Law is preempted." (*Latinos Unidos Del Valle De Napa Y Solano v. County of Napa* (2013) 217 Cal.App.4th 1160, 1169.) The City must amend the FZP so that the state Density Bonus Law can be used on *top* of the HCSF, which has the potential to create meaningful housing production.

VI. Conclusion

We urge the City to comply with the law and remedy the deficiencies in its rezoning plan. If the City fails to significantly increase its proposed residential capacity, there will be no realistic chance of meeting its RHNA obligations. YIMBY Law is prepared to take legal action to hold the City accountable for these clear violations of state housing law.

PATTERSON & O'NEILL, PC



Ryan J. Patterson
General Counsel for Yes In My Back Yard

CC CA Department of Housing and Community Development
Mayor Daniel Lurie

Encl. September 11, 2025 Letter from Yes In My Back Yard
October 29, 2025 Letter from Yes In My Back Yard
October 29, 2025 Report from the Chief Economist of San Francisco

EXHIBIT A

YIMBY Law

2261 Market Street STE 10416
San Francisco, CA 94114
hello@yimbylaw.org

YIMBY LAW

9/11/2025

San Francisco Planning Commission
400, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

(via email) commissions.secretary@sfgov.org

Re: San Francisco's Draft Housing Rezoning Program and Compliance with State Law

Dear Commissioners,

YIMBY Law is a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization dedicated to ensuring compliance with California's housing laws. We write today to express significant concerns regarding the City's proposed Housing Element Rezoning Program and the accompanying "Housing Choice–San Francisco" local bonus ordinance.

Summary

While the rezoning plan, including the local program, is a good step forward for housing in San Francisco, we are concerned that the plan does not actually fulfill what it promises to do. The city has produced no publicly available reports that show how the plan will be more capable of delivering the housing San Franciscans desperately need than what state laws already allow. While we support density decontrol, we do not believe the city has shown that the handful of incentives that are coupled with it will be enough to produce any more housing than state laws such as the Density Bonus Law already do.

Capacity Projections

San Francisco's Housing Element made a binding commitment to meet its Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) through a rezoning program rooted in a probabilistic analytical model Program 7.1.1. San Francisco did not base its rezoning on a site's inventory, but on the projected housing based on that model. The targets and assumptions it sets are enforced by Program 8.1.5. If San Francisco does not produce sufficient units, Program 8.1.5. applies additional upzoning requirements.

Despite the City's commitments to specific unit production, applying the city's own model used to determine the shortfall on the rezone sites, we can determine that the map would produce around 17k homes by 2031, or 47% of the 36k units promised by Program 7.1.1. That regression analysis was built on different logic than the Housing Element's existing capacity analysis. While the proposal does not clearly make up for the RHNA shortfall, its usefulness is difficult to gauge when it functions by different logic than the original rezoning analysis. In order to be comprehensible, realistic, and enforceable, San Francisco must produce a "realistic capacity" table for the rezoned sites that incorporates the Housing Element' regression analysis.

We understand that the City has conducted its own analysis that disputes these figures, but the methodology and details of this analysis have not been made publicly available; therefore we remain concerned and skeptical about the efficacy of the rezoning program in meeting the city's needed housing requirements under housing element law.

Compliance with State Law

San Francisco's rezoning program would institute a local density bonus program that, theoretically, according to the city's assertions (which are not supported by any publicly available information), would accommodate the City's RHNA shortfall. The practical and legal realities according to our analysis suggest that it would fail to produce housing at the suggested rates, and fail to meet statutory requirements.

The latest staff report associated with the September 11 Planning Commission hearing notes that 77% of parcels in the rezoning plan fall into the form based zoning code and will not have their heights increased, while for "the vast majority of residential sites, these changes are only available for projects opting into the local program."

Some proposed areas not eligible for the state bonus would benefit from San Francisco's local program. However, this local program would be exclusive to California's state density bonus law in all areas where both options are available. Whether or not the local program is superior to state incentives, the one cannot replace the other. State density bonus law is intended as a bonus on top of local rules, and should not be supplanted when it generally offers superior development potential.

San Francisco's density decontrol is generally less feasible than the state program. While we applaud the city for applying a local density bonus program to projects between 2-4 units, which are not otherwise eligible for the state density bonus, as well as allowing alternatives to providing on-site affordable units, such as off-site developments, for the vast majority of the city's proposed "rezoning" program, state density bonus law offers a superior alternative: unlimited waivers from local zoning and development standards,

providing limited discretion for local review. Comparatively, the local program is far more stringent. It contains strict rules about building size, setbacks, open space, dwelling unit exposure, and parking allowances. It contains only a 15% reduction of other development standards. The proposal would allow for greater than 15% reductions if approved by a discretionary process. Even if that expensive, time consuming process doesn't result in universal denials, it renders the project not code compliant, forcing the developer to lose protections under the Housing Accountability Act.

While we support the majority of the proposed staff changes made to the local program, we believe that they do not go far enough to ensure that the local program is a superior alternative to state density bonus law. For example, the proposal to require projects with 5+ units to reserve a minimum of 25% of the units for 2+BR units is a constraint that is not required under state density bonus law that will negatively impact density potential for the local program. Additionally, the proposed local program not only requires applicants to choose to give up their option to pursue waivers and incentives under state density bonus law, but *any other* state program that provides its own bonuses or waivers from local zoning, such as AB 2011, which offers waivers of local side and rear setback requirements when those requirements limit feasibility, limits front setback requirements, and allows 55 foot heights, which are greater than the 40 foot height limits proposed for the majority of the local program's rezoned sites.

This proposal not only replaces state density bonus allowances with a worse option, it places new constraints on any such developments via inclusionary requirements and requiring new wind studies on construction. These constraints were not reviewed in the Housing Element, meaning that they may not be imposed or that San Francisco must amend its Element to account for those constraints. New constraints must be accounted for in the Element, to demonstrate how San Francisco can realistically meet its RHNA requirements.

San Francisco must also analyze how this program would interact with existing land use regulations. Transfer taxes, inclusionary requirements, and impact fees are key drivers of unit loss, but have not been incorporated into any City analyses yet. We encourage the City Economist to incorporate them into any future analysis of this program.

Even if all of these deficiencies are corrected, they cannot make up for the requirement to change the base zoning of parcels, as required by Housing Element law and HCD interpretation. Under the new scheme, San Francisco would not change its zoned capacity, and therefore would not comply with state law. Density bonuses must add capacity on top of that allowed for in the zoning code.

Conclusion

Given the substantial deficiencies in San Francisco's rezoning program and the speculative nature of its local density bonus ordinance, the City's Housing Element certification is at risk. The burden is on San Francisco to demonstrate compliance. The use of analytical models that inflate development probability, the reliance on unproven local bonus mechanisms, and the introduction of new constraints all undermine that burden. In short, the program is not legally defensible as currently drafted, with the limited information supporting the city's conclusions that it exceeds the city's RHNA obligation

YIMBY Law has taken legal action against the City of Los Angeles for a similar failure to deliver a legally compliant rezoning program. We sincerely hope litigation will not be necessary in San Francisco. However, San Francisco will be vulnerable to lawsuits from parties working to ensure that the City complies with state law and delivers a realistic path toward housing affordability and accessibility.

We urge the Board to direct Planning to:

- Re-run the BlueSky regression analysis used for the Housing Element's "existing capacity" estimate on the rezoning proposal to produce a transparent, realistic capacity table that is made publicly available.

- Incorporate the waiver and incentive framework of SDBL into the local bonus program, or ensure that projects can access SDBL concurrently.

- Remove new constraints on development introduced by the ordinance.

- Ensure that the rezoning program meets or exceeds the 36,282-unit requirement via base zoning and that its methodology aligns with Program 7.1.1.

The stakes for San Francisco are high. We urge the City to correct course by allowing the use of density bonus and other state programs in combination with the local program.

Sincerely,

Jack Farrell, Esq.
Research Attorney
YIMBY Law

EXHIBIT B

From:	Jane Natoli
To:	paul.mcdougall@hcd.ca.gov
Cc:	gustavo.velasquez@hcd.ca.gov; melinda.coy@hcd.ca.gov; Zisser, David@HCD; megan.kirkeby@hcd.ca.gov; shannan.west@hcd.ca.gov; Frank, Lisa@HCD; Herrera, Fidel@HCD; matthew.struhar@doj.ca.gov; david.pai@doj.ca.gov; alex.fisch@doj.ca.gov; Annie Fryman; Tanner, Rachael (CPC); Chen, Lisa (CPC); Sonja Trauss; matt@caforhomes.org; senator.wiener@senate.ca.gov; Severiano.Christian@sen.ca.gov; Mohtashemi, Raayan; David Broockman; Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Supervisors; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Bonde, Aly (MYR); Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC)
Subject:	SF YIMBY"s letter on the City Economist"s report
Date:	Wednesday, October 29, 2025 4:13:34 PM
Attachments:	SF YIMBY FZP Letter October 29 2025.pdf

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

Hello,

We are writing to urgently draw your attention to the just released report from the City Economist that shows San Francisco's rezoning will not meet our state housing requirements. Please see our attached letter, and let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you,

--
Jane Natoli (she/her)
San Francisco Organizing Director
415-335-9950



Check out everything we achieved in 2024!

Paul McDougall, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Mayor Daniel Lurie
San Francisco Board of Supervisors (re: file #250700)
October 29, 2025

We write to urgently draw your attention to **an analysis the City of San Francisco ("SF") released that finds that its own rezoning plan would violate state law.** The Family Zoning Plan ("FZP") is a significant step forward, but the city's analysis found that it will not meet the city's Housing Element's 36,282-unit requirement. **According to the city's own numbers, state law requires the city to conduct additional rezoning beyond the FZP.**

As a reminder, in 2022, the California Department of Housing and Community Development ("HCD") suggested that, instead of a traditional sites inventory, SF instead pledge to assess the capacity of its rezoning using the method from its underutilized sites analysis (a model called BlueSky, which estimates the likelihood of development). Housing Element Program 7.1.1 thus committed that SF's rezoning "shall reasonably account for sites' likelihood of development during the planning period using an analytical model."

SF's August submission to HCD revealed that SF still had not done so (see Appendix). HCD thus instructed SF that "As part of Program 7.1.1 and using analytical models to account for a site's likelihood of development in the planning period, the city should continue to explore additional and multiple methods and make adjustments as appropriate."

Today, SF did so: its City Economist reported that he used an updated version of the BlueSky analytical model—the same method HCD originally suggested SF use—to estimate the number of units the FZP will likely develop. **He reported that, in the best case scenario, the City's analytical model finds that the FZP is only likely to develop 14,646 units by 2045, far less than the 36,282 required by 2031** under 7.1.1. In other words, **using the exact method HCD suggested SF use, the City itself has found that its rezoning plan does not meet Program 7.1.1's requirements, and is around 10 times too small.**

Gov. Code § 65588(e)(4)(C)(iii) states, "If a jurisdiction…fails to complete the required rezoning within the time period required, the jurisdiction's adopted housing element shall be subject to" the housing element decertification process. Thus, **if SF fails to expand its plan, HCD will be legally obliged to begin the decertification process**.

We encourage HCD to offer SF guidance about how to bring its proposed rezoning into compliance, building on HCD's recent guidance to the city to "make adjustments as appropriate" when more analysis was made available. For example, using recent changes in state law (e.g., SB 131, SB 79), additional rezoning or policy changes that supplement the FZP (e.g., reduced fees and exactions) could be passed within months. Given the timeline required for decertification, HCD could reasonably offer SF up to six months before the builders' remedy would apply to fully complete its "required rezoning" through such a supplement.

Confirming that SF must rely on the City Economist's updated BlueSky analytical model to assess the rezoning's capacity, as well as the actions taken to satisfy Program 8.1.5 (the "circuit breaker"), would also be consistent with HCD's recent direction to the city to "us[e] conservative assumptions…that facilitate the highest housing outcomes."

SF's actions risk paving a path for other cities to evade state law. In particular, rather than "demonstrat[ing] that the existing use [on each non-vacant site] does not constitute an impediment to additional residential development" (Gov. Code, § 65583.2(g)), cities will be tempted to follow SF: promise in a Housing Element to provide this evidence later in the form of statistical analysis—but then ignore what this evidence shows when rezoning.

Best regards,

Salim Damerdji
Volunteer Lead, San Francisco YIMBY

Jane Natoli
San Francisco Organizing Director,
YIMBY Action

CC: Gustavo Velasquez, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Megan Kirkeby, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Melinda Coy, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Shannan West, California Department of Housing and Community Development
David Zisser, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Lisa Frank, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Fidel Herrera, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Alex Fisch, California Department of Justice
Matthew Struhar, California Department of Justice
David Pai, California Department of Justice
Annie Fryman, SPUR
Aly Bonde, Office of Mayor Daniel Lurie
Sarah Dennis-Phillips, Rachael Tanner, and Lisa Chen, San Francisco Planning
Sonja Trauss, YIMBY Law
Matt Gelfand, Californians for Homeownership
Senator Scott Wiener

Appendix: Why the Planning Department's methods do not satisfy the Housing Element's requirement to "reasonably account for sites' likelihood of development during the planning period using an analytical model"

The San Francisco Planning Department's August 1 submission to HCD contained three analyses of the capacity provided by its rezoning. None of these analyses satisfy Program 7.1.1's commitment to "reasonably account for sites' likelihood of development during the planning period using an analytical model." The below details why each of the Planning Department's methods do not satisfy this requirement. Indeed, a closer look at the Planning Department's analyses suggests conclusions that are in line with the City Economist's finding that the rezoning is insufficient.

"Soft Sites Method"

Under this method, the vast majority of the rezoning's capacity is from sites without existing residential uses (but that largely have other uses). The Planning Department assumes that 70% of these sites will be developed to their maximum capacity during the planning period. This 70% assumption is not "reasonabl[e]" (and certainly not "conservative" like the city claims):

1. In San Francisco, fewer than 70% of entitled projects are ultimately developed — making it implausible that 70% of all sites without residential use will be developed, even those where no interest has been expressed in development or discontinuing existing uses. As another comparison, the Terner Center found that only 8.6% of LA's very best sites are developed over 5 years (versus SF's 70% assumption across a huge number of sites).
2. These sites largely do have other non-residential uses which make their development especially improbable. For example, the first page of SF's parcel list includes 1201-05 Columbus Avenue, a 3-story Travelodge in Fisherman's Wharf. The city assumes there is a 70% chance that properties like this will be redeveloped during the planning period.
3. The city's related assertion that 2% of sites with existing residential uses will be redeveloped during the planning period is similarly made without evidence.

This approach also allows the city to evade complying with GC 65583.2(g)'s requirement that the city provide substantial evidence that existing uses on "lower income" sites are likely to be discontinued during the planning period. The city has not provided site-specific evidence supporting their assertion that most sites with existing non-residential uses will be developed during the planning period. The lack of site-specific evidence would not be a problem if the city had provided statistical evidence (i.e., had statistically estimated what percent of these sites will have their existing use discontinued during the planning period based on historical data, as action 7.1.1 promises). But the Planning Department simply provides no evidence whatsoever that 70% of sites with existing non-residential uses will be developed, either site-specific or

statistical. This 70% figure is simply fabricated — not from "an analytical model," and it is not at all "reasonable."

"Citywide Capacity Method"

This method calculates what share of the city's remaining zoned capacity was developed annually over the last 18 years (2005-2023). It then assumes the new capacity created by the rezoning will be developed at a similar annual rate.

While reasonable in theory, there are several errors and problems with how the Planning Department is implementing this approach that make it not "reasonabl[e]" in practice:

1. The city has two versions of this approach, each with errors:
    a. The primary version (with "exclusions") divides citywide development by the amount of capacity on only a subset of parcels. This overstates the rate at which capacity historically translates into development because less capacity is considered despite all development being considered. This is like computing the average grades of all students in a class by adding up all students' grades but then dividing this total by half the number of students there are in the class.
    b. The city describes another version of the method that measures capacity on all parcels but uses Planning entitlements to measure development; during this period there were 90K entitlements but only 53K building permits. Using entitlements to measure development overstates the historical development rate, as in San Francisco many entitlements are never developed (in part due to constraints the city places on development).
2. The city's statistic that 53K units were constructed citywide 2005-2023 includes development from development agreements (DAs). By counting historical DA development when computing the rate at which historical zoned capacity is developed, the city therefore assumes that the rezoning will produce new DA development during this planning period. This is unreasonable, as DAs do not result from (re)zoning. Furthermore, the city's housing element already counted expected development from DAs during the planning period in its claims of existing capacity.
3. Parcels where projects have been proposed but have not received permits are excluded from the city's calculation of its historical capacity; this leads the city to underestimate how much historical capacity it had, and therefore overstate the development rate of its capacity.
4. The new rezoned capacity is also less developable than the existing remaining capacity. Specifically, according to the city's Bluesky model (the model it used for its underutilized sites analysis), the new capacity is about 20% less likely to be developed. This is because, for example, rezoned capacity is 3x more likely to be on sites with an existing residential use than existing capacity. It's therefore not entirely reasonable to assume that the city's historical rate of development will manifest for the new capacity.

5. The Planning Department is relying on its UrbanSim tool to measure its remaining zoned capacity (313K). But the city's housing element (Sites Inventory Appendix B2 p. 4) gives a much larger number for this (572K), as do our own calculations. Insofar as the city is now understating how much capacity it has, it is therefore overstating the rate at which that capacity has been developed. We have asked for data that would help us understand this discrepancy, but the city has indicated that its UrbanSim tool is unable to provide the underlying data that supports this 313K calculation.

When addressing the first four errors and issues above, and when using the city's housing element's estimate that the city has 572K units of capacity remaining (see point 5), the historical development rate is 0.4% and the adjusted capacity of the rezoning is therefore 10K units.

"Financial Feasibility Method"

The Planning Department has contracted with UrbanSim to estimate whether development will be economically feasible on rezoned parcels. While this analysis is welcome, there are several problems with this approach:

1. Totaling the amount of economically feasible development does not "account for sites' likelihood of development." Historically, only a fraction of economically feasible units are actually developed, and some research practitioners have advised us that there is nearly an order of magnitude difference between the two.
2. The Planning Department's economic assumptions are not "reasonabl[e]": the Department assumes that construction costs, interest rates, and developer return expectations will drop without providing evidence. It also assumes rents will jump. The Department justifies these optimistic assumptions by asserting that it is only responsible for making housing feasible to develop under better economic conditions than are likely during this planning period — but action 7.1.1 commits to providing enough capacity to make 36K units likely developed during this planning period. Furthermore, the city's poor economic environment for development reflects the city's constraints on development that Housing Element Law is supposed to remediate. I.e., the fact that the city so heavily constrains development makes more rezoning (and changes to its other policies) necessary, and cannot be ignored when considering the appropriate scope of actions to accommodate development.
3. The Department's submission describes a flawed approach for using UrbanSim's output to account for the likelihood of development: asserting that 2% of economically feasible projects will occur on sites with existing residential uses and 35% of economically feasible projects will occur on sites with other non-residential uses. These assumptions are not based on any evidence and, for the same reasons we described in the context of the "soft sites" method, are not reasonable.
4. After applying this flawed approach for accounting for the likelihood of development, the Planning Department nevertheless finds that only 19K units will be developed during the planning period. This is short of the 36K required by action 7.1.1. The Planning

Department argues that this is acceptable because the method must only demonstrate sufficient capacity for meeting the city's 16K RHNA shortfall in the Moderate and Above-Moderate income categories. But action 7.1.1 makes no reference to separate by-category targets, it simply states that the rezoning must "accommodate… approximately 36,282 new units." Furthermore, the Department's argument is also belied by the Housing Element Law and the No Net Loss Law, both of which contemplate development of market-rate and mixed-income projects on "lower income" sites (GC 65583.2(c) & (h); GC 65863(c)(2)).

EXHIBIT C

Family Zoning Plan: Economic Impact Report

Office of the Controller
Office of Economic Analysis

Items 250700 & 250701
October 29, 2025

Introduction

- Two proposed ordinances would change zoning controls to permit more housing on a large segment of San Francisco, particularly on the western half of the city. They implement changes to the Housing Element of the City's General Plan, a planning document whose revisions were adopted in 2023.
- The Ordinance in file #250700, the Zoning Map Amendment, would generally raise allowable building heights along commercial corridors and transit lines, to permit mid-rise and some high-rise development.
- The Ordinance in file #250701 implements the Housing Choice-San Francisco program, which offers an alternative to the State Density Bonus program.
- The Office of Economic Analysis (OEA) has prepared this report because the proposed legislation may have a material impact on the city's economy. This report uses a model that estimates potential new development, in order to assess economic impact. That model is not a replacement for the City's estimates of realistic capacity under Government Code § 65583.2.


Zoning Map Amendment: Key Provisions

- The Zoning Map Amendment would make changes to allowable building heights and bulk, and/or zoning districts, in over 92,000 parcels in the city.
- The vast majority are residential parcels, whose allowable heights would either remain at 40 feet, or rise to 50 or 65 feet.
- On these and many other rezoned parcels, the Housing Choice San Francisco program (described on the next page) relaxes existing controls on the number of housing units allowed on a parcel.
- Allowable heights are generally increased to 65 to 85 feet along many commercial corridors, with development along wider streets near transit stations or major lines increased to 85 feet.
- Heights above 140 feet are allowed on certain streets that currently allow high-rise development or have larger parcels, at key intersections, and near certain major transit routes and stations. The map on page 5 provides additional details.

Housing Choice San Francisco – Key Provisions

- The Housing Choice San Francisco program, or "Local Program", gives developers an alternative to the State Density Bonus.
- Many of the rezoned residential parcels are too small to be eligible for the State Density Bonus, but may achieve greater density through the use of the Local Program.
- Local Program users also gain benefits associated with housing unit mix, methods of complying with inclusionary housing requirements, rear-yard and setback requirements, broad code flexibility, and certain process changes.
- The ordinance has several other provisions, including limiting the maximum size of new residential units, reducing allowable parking, and restricting new curb cuts. These policy changes are not considered in this report.
- Additionally, the proposed ordinance gives displaced businesses the right to relocate anywhere in the city where their activity is permitted by zoning, without a conditional use permit, and waives development impact fees associated with the relocation.

Details of the Rezoning



The map to the left, from the City Planning department, indicates which parcels in the city will be rezoned, and to which heights. It reflects the plan as of July.

Gray parcels will be zoned for low-rise, 40-50 feet housing developments. This includes single-family residential zones, within which greater density will be permitted via the Local Program.

Yellow and orange parcels will be upzoned to mid-rise development of 65-105 feet.

Pink and purple parcels will have height limits ranging from 120-180 feet, and the blue and green parcels will be upzoned for high-rise development, of 240 feet or greater.

The Rezoning and the Regional Housing Needs Assessment

- Each jurisdiction in California is required to have its Housing Element be certified by the State's Housing and Community Development Department.
- Certification involves, among other things, ensuring that the City has the zoning capacity to meet the city's obligations under the State's Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA).
- RHNA is a Statewide planning process, in which future needs are forecasted for metropolitan areas, and then allocated to the individual cities and counties that administer land use planning.
- In San Francisco's case, the RHNA obligation requires the City to have realistic capacity for approximately 82,000 new housing units, at different economic levels, within an 8-year planning period ending in 2031.
- Of this 82,000 unit requirement, the City must create capacity for approximately 36,000 units.

Substitutions and Proposed Amendments

- On September 30, a new version of #250700 was substituted by Mayor Lurie, which made relatively minor zoning changes on a number of parcels. This analysis reflects those changes.
- On October 21, Supervisor Melgar proposed an amendment that would prohibit the use of the Local Program on any parcel containing more then two existing housing units, which would involve the demolition of a unit subject to rent control.
- Also on October 21, Supervisor Sauter introduced an amendment that creates incentives for developers to replace lost commercial space.
- As the language of these two amendments was made public less than one week ago, this report does not attempt to model their economic impact.

Economic Impact Factors

- When the City relaxes zoning controls, by reducing density restrictions or increasing allowable heights, more development projects will become financially feasible, and the supply of housing in the city will rise.
- This increased supply will put downward pressure on housing prices in the city. Cheaper housing benefits city residents who move within the city, and also makes San Francisco more affordable for new arrivals.
- The development of new housing also stimulates investment and employment in construction and related industries.
- The population growth associated with new housing also stimulates the local economy, by expanding the numbers of workers and consumers.
- On the other hand, the limited amount of vacant lots in the city means that new housing generally involves the loss of existing buildings, including both residential and commercial properties. This can impose relocation and other costs on residential and commercial tenants.

Estimating the Likelihood of New Housing Development

- The amount of new housing that the rezoning will produce is an important contributor to its economic impact. To estimate this, OEA refined a statistical model that it has used since 2016 to estimate the impact of policy changes on housing production in the city[1].
- The model was the result of statistical analysis of housing production in San Francisco over the 2004-2024 period. Technical details on the model are provided in the Appendix.
- The first part of the model estimates the likelihood that multifamily housing will be developed on a given parcel, in a given year. The statistical analysis found that a parcel is more likely to develop when:
  - it has smaller existing buildings (or is vacant), and is located closer to downtown.
  - its zoning allows for a greater height, makes it eligible for the State Density Bonus, and does not restrict the number of units that may be constructed.
  - housing prices are relatively high, and construction costs are relatively low, compared to other years.

Estimating the Number of Units Produced

- The second part of the model estimates the number of units that will be produced when a parcel does develop housing. Based on past experience, the statistical analysis found that a parcel developing housing will produce more units when:
  - its land area and allowable maximum height are greater;
  - it is eligible for the State Density Bonus;
  - its zoning does not restrict the number of units that may be built.
- The OEA used the first part of the model to estimate the probability that housing will be built on a parcel over the next twenty years[2]. That probability was multiplied by the estimate of housing units from the second part, to create an expected number of housing units generated for each parcel over twenty years. When this is summed across all parcels, a citywide housing total is generated.
- This method was used to create estimates of housing production under the existing zoning, and the proposed rezoning. The difference is the estimate of housing that could be produced as a result of the proposed zoning changes.


Limitations of the Housing Development Model

- The housing development model can forecast future housing development based on the city's past experience, but important caveats must be made.
- Because of data availability, not every factor that affects housing production could be included. Missing data may include features of the parcel itself, or policies that may have changed over the 2004-24 period, or vary within the aggregated zoning designations used by the model.
- Limited data also prevents the analysis of fine-grained policy changes in the proposed rezoning, such as restrictions on unit size and mix.
- Several new City and State policies that were intended to encourage housing production have been enacted in recent years, such as, for example, the City's 2023 Housing Production Ordinance (0248-23). The model may be unable to properly assess the impact of these policies in the future.
- Despite these limitations, the OEA believes this approach is well-suited to estimating housing production, for the purposes of economic impact reporting.

Future Housing Market Scenarios

- As noted earlier, the amount of housing that will be produced as a result of the rezoning, and its economic impact, will depend on future housing market conditions. This creates an additional level of uncertainty in the forecasts.
- Gauging future market conditions is further complicated by changes in the city's housing market since the COVID-19 pandemic, as described on the next page.
- To understand the scope of what could potentially happen, the OEA created two future scenarios for housing prices and costs in San Francisco.
- In a high-growth scenario, San Francisco's housing prices, relative to the U.S., return to pre-COVID levels by 2030, and grow at the city's pre-COVID rate after that. Construction costs are assumed to grow at the same rate as inflation.
- In a low-growth scenario, San Francisco's post-COVID relative housing prices are assumed to represent a "new normal," and housing prices are assumed to grow only at a national average level over the next twenty years. Construction costs are also assumed to grow at the same rate as inflation.

San Francisco and U.S. Housing Price Trends Since 2000




While San Francisco's housing has always been expensive, during the 2010s, average San Francisco condo prices rose much faster than the rest of the U.S., to as much as 5 times the typical U.S. price.

Since 2020, however, San Francisco condo prices have declined, despite rising inflation and rising U.S. condo prices. Adjusted for inflation, typical San Francisco condo prices in 2025 are 25% lower than they were in 2019.

Among other factors, the increase in remote office work during COVID has reduced the value of a residence near large office employment centers like downtown San Francisco.

Source: Zillow. Data retrieved October 1, 2025.

Housing Price Trends Within the City




Source: Zillow. Data retrieved October 1, 2025.

The reduced value of a downtown location has also shifted multifamily price patterns within the city.

Condos in neighborhoods like Downtown and South of Market have experienced inflation-adjusted price drops of more than 40% since 2016, while the Richmond and Sunset have fallen by far less.

Because most multifamily housing in the city is near downtown, but most of the proposed rezoning is not, the use of a citywide average condo price index is inappropriate. This analysis uses an average price across the 10 Zillow neighborhoods most affected by the zoning, which is somewhat higher than the citywide average.

High and Low Growth Scenario Price Forecasts




Our high-growth scenario assumes that San Francisco's housing prices, relative to the U.S., return to pre-pandemic levels by 2030, and then grow at the city's long-term average rate until 2045. This implies a rapid growth in housing prices over the next five years, of over 10% per year.

In the low-growth scenario, the post-COVID housing market represents a new normal, and San Francisco housing prices are assumed to grow only at the U.S. long-term rate at 1.8% per year, in inflation-adjusted dollars. Under this assumption, San Franciso housing prices would not recover to their pre-COVID peak, in inflation-adjusted dollars, until 2041.

Source: Zillow. 10 Neighborhoods are Buena Vista, Polk Gulch, Inner Sunset, Marina, Mission, North Waterfront, Outer Sunset, Outer Richmond, Inner Richmond, and Western Addition.

Construction Cost Trends and Scenarios



Source: Bureau of Economic Analysis; U.S. Census Bureau, "Quarterly Workforce Indicators

The housing development model uses two measures of construction costs: materials cost and local construction industry wages. They are blended into a single index for modeling purposes. Details are in the Appendix.

The cost of construction materials and local wages have grown faster than overall inflation, particularly in the last few years. In 2024, real construction materials costs were 18% higher, and real local wages were 10% higher, than they were in 2016.

In both the high-growth and low-growth scenarios, the blended index is assumed to grow at 0% (after inflation) over the 2026-2045 period. This reflects an assumption that both labor and material costs inflation will revert to the broader rate of inflation in the long term.

Housing Production Forecasts Under Current Zoning

Planning District	Historic, 2000-24	Low-Growth Scenario Forecast, 2026-45	High-Growth Scenario Forecast, 2026-45
Buena Vista	975	43	90
Central	72	192	390
Downtown	289	112	230
Ingleside	0	58	120
Inner Sunset	123	28	59
Marina	131	126	263
Mission	187	197	406
Northeast	449	136	283
Outer Sunset	15	16	33
Richmond	0	23	47
South Central	0	6	11
Western Addition	997	658	1,265
Total	3,238	1,594	3,199

Source: For historic housing production, San Francisco Planning Department

Generally, the housing development model forecasts that the current zoning will produce fewer units in the next 20 years than the numbers of units that were produced in the last 20 years.

The table to the left only covers the portion of each planning district that is in the proposed rezoning area. In total, under the current zoning, the model forecasts 1,594 or 3,199 units under the low- and high-growth forecasts, respectively, while 3,238 units were built in the same areas over the 2000-2024 period.

On the next two pages, the model's forecasts of the additional housing created by the proposed zoning is discussed.

Forecast Net Effect of the Zoning

- As shown in the table below, under the low-growth and high-growth scenarios described earlier, the rezoning would lead to 8,504 and 14,646 additional housing units, beyond what would be produced under current zoning, over the next 20 years.

Low Growth Scenario	**Units**
20-Year Housing Production, Existing Zoning	1,594
20-Year Housing Production, Proposed Rezoning	10,098
Effect of Proposed Rezoning	8,504

High Growth Scenario	**Units**
20-Year Housing Production, Existing Zoning	3,199
20-Year Housing Production, Proposed Rezoning	17,845
Effect of Proposed Rezoning	14,646

Summary by Current Zoning District

		Low-Growth			High-Growth		
Current Zoning[3]	Number of Parcels	Average Housing Likelihood, Current	Average Housing Likelihood, Proposed	Change in Housing Units	Average Housing Likelihood, Current	Average Housing Likelihood, Proposed	Change in Housing Units
RH1	43,009	0.001%	0.205%	798	0.003%	0.446%	1,731
RH2	26,486	0.002%	0.259%	576	0.005%	0.565%	1,250
RH3_RM1	13,741	0.009%	0.347%	547	0.018%	0.756%	1,186
Office/Commercial	114	0.570%	0.780%	48	1.185%	1.639%	104
Public	239	0.060%	1.450%	3,483	0.122%	2.560%	4,814
Density-Restricted Multifamily	7,079	0.336%	0.490%	3,007	0.674%	1.026%	5,467
Form-Based Multifamily	2,053	0.725%	0.725%	46	1.502%	1.502%	94
Total	92,721			8,504			14,646

The table to the left breaks out the results by current zoning. It illustrates how many rezoned parcels are in the RH-1, RH-2, and RH-3 or RM-1 residential zones, primarily in the western side of the city. These areas will see a substantial increase in the likelihood of developing housing over the next 20 years, but the chances are still small, so those 83,000+ parcels are only forecast to produce about additional 4,200 housing units by 2045, in the high growth scenario.

Fewer Public parcels (generally owned by the City or SFUSD) are larger, and more likely to develop housing through the rezoning, though this depends on the owner's decisions.

Estimating the Loss of Existing Residential Units

- To evaluate the economic impact, OEA calculated the net increase in housing units.
- In the low-growth scenario, 463 more units would be lost under the proposed zoning than under current zoning, over the 20-year forecast period. In the high-growth scenario, 1,031 more housing units would be lost. These losses represent a 6-8% of the housing units gained as a result of the rezoning. Amendments proposed on October 20th may reduce these losses, along with overall housing production.
- The loss of existing housing slightly dampens the housing price reductions associated with the rezoning, and may impose financial harms on existing tenants. City and State law heavily restricts, but does not prohibit, the eviction of tenants for the purpose of demolition, or the demolition of rent-controlled housing. These events have been quite rare in recent decades. If this occurs, tenants are entitled to relocation payments.
- Without any way to meaningfully estimate the number of evictions or demolitions of rent-controlled units, or the financial impact on tenants, this report does not attempt to quantify these potential costs.

Impacts on Housing Prices

- The responsiveness of housing prices to increases in housing supply is a function of price elasticities of supply and demand, which the OEA has estimated in past research[4].
- The elasticities imply that the proposed rezoning would lead to a -2.5% to -4.2% change in housing prices in the city, depending on the scenario. For context, those percentages are also expressed in terms of current housing prices and apartment rents.

	Low Growth Scenario	**High Growth Scenario**
Net Change in Housing Supply (units produced less demolitions)	8,041	13,615
Percentage Change in Housing Supply[5]	2.0%	3.4%
Price Elasticity of Demand	-0.7	-0.7
Price Elasticity of Supply	0.1	0.1
Percent change in housing prices	-2.5%	-4.2%
Corresponding change in condo prices[6]	-$24,500	-$41,600
Corresponding change in annual apartment market rents[7]	-$903	-$1,529

Estimating Relocation and Disruption Costs

- To account for the impact on commercial businesses, OEA estimated potential displacement costs. Details are provided in the Appendix.
- Displaced businesses are estimated to occupy commercial space ranging from approximately 1.5 to 2.6 million square feet, depending on the scenario. This displacement would occur over twenty years, and it is highly likely that the rezoning would lead to an increase in the amount of commercial space in the city.
- Annual business disruption and relocation costs range from $16 to $28 million, in today's dollars.

	Low Growth	High Growth
Loss of occupied commercial space (million sf)	1.5	2.6
Disruption-relocation cost/sf	$190	$190
Annual disruption/relocation cost (2025 $ million)	$16	$28

REMI Economic Impact Simulation

- Based on the economic impact factors described earlier, the OEA used the REMI model to measure the net economic impact of the changes associated with the high and low growth scenarios to the city's economy over the 2026-2045 period:
  - An increase in the city's residential capital stock of $8.0 billion (low growth) to $13.5 billion (high growth) in today's dollars, representing the investment associated with the new units forecast under the two scenarios. These figures are calculated by multiplying the net increase in units by average prices.
  - A reduction in citywide housing prices, reaching 2.5% (low growth) and 4.2% (high growth) by 2045.
  - Annual business disruption and relocation costs for retail businesses of $16 million (low growth) and $28 million (high growth) in today's dollars, until 2045.

Economic Impact Assessment

- In the low-growth scenario, the city's GDP would be $560 million larger, in today's dollars, on average over the 2026-45 period. Total employment in the city would be approximately 3,000 more than under the current zoning, on average over the period.
- In the high-growth scenario, the city's GDP growth would be $940 million larger than under current zoning, in 2025 dollars. Employment would be about 5,000 higher.
- Employment gains are expected in every sector, but would be most heavily concentrated in the construction, health care, real estate, and accommodations and food services sectors.
- Despite the displacement of businesses, retail trade is forecast to grow as a result of the population and economic growth created by the proposed rezoning, adding about 210 jobs in the low-growth scenario and about 350 jobs in the high-growth scenario.
- Like most major policies, the proposed rezoning involves benefits and costs. Our analysis suggests the proposed rezoning's positive impact on the city's economy, from lower housing prices and construction, outweighs the negative impact from displaced businesses, by a factor of approximately 22:1.

Conclusions

- The context for housing development in San Francisco has changed profoundly in the past several years. Since 2019, after adjusting for inflation, condo prices in San Francisco have dropped by 25%, while our blended construction cost index has risen by 8%.
- Given this starting point, an expansive rezoning effort, like the proposed Family Zoning plan, will be challenged to match the 2010s levels of new housing development in the city, even under an optimistic high-growth scenario.
- Nevertheless, under both scenarios considered in this report, the proposed rezoning would lead to a significant increase in the city's housing supply, and have broadly positive effects on housing prices and the city's broader economy. The benefits of new residential investments and lower housing prices are projected to outweigh the costs of business interruption and displacement by a factor of roughly 22:1.
- If market conditions were such that the 36,000 unit target was achieved, as a result of the rezoning, the economic impact on the city would likely be significantly more positive than the estimates in this report.

Footnotes

1. See, for example, Inclusionary Housing Working Group: Preliminary Report September 2016.
2. Three large parcels were excluded from the analysis: Laguna Honda Hospital, and the USF Main and Lone Mountain campuses. While all three parcels receive height increases in the proposed rezoning, their size and unique uses makes them unsuitable for the model. If the model could accurately estimate the amount of housing likely to occur on those parcels, the total housing estimate reported in this report would be larger.
3. These are the aggregate zoning classifications used by the model. See the Appendix for details.
4. See Potential Effects of Limiting Market-Rate Housing in the Mission.
5. Assuming 406,000 housing units in the city.
6. Based on Zillow's 2025 average condo prices for San Francisco.
7. Based on 2025 average apartment asking rents, from ApartmentList.

Appendix

- Housing Development Model
  - Methodology
  - Data sources
  - Model coefficients and performance
  - Scenario Inputs
  - Zoning District Classification
  - Logic of Applying the Model to the Proposed Rezoning
- Estimates of Business Interruption and Relocation Costs

Appendix: Housing Development Model: Methodology

- The housing development model is a two-stage step model. The first stage is a logistic regression, covering every parcel in the city, except those subject to a development agreement, over the 2004-2024 period.
- The dependent variable of the logistic regression is 1 if the parcel produced housing in a given year, and 0 otherwise. Parcels that produce housing in a given year were removed from the dataset for subsequent years. Independent variables, reflecting existing land use, market conditions, and zoning, are listed on the next page.
- The second stage is a regression model including all parcels that produced multifamily housing with more than 10 units, over the 2004-24 period. The dependent variable is the number of units produced on the parcel, and the independent variables are the parcel's "building envelope" (its area multiplied by its allowable height), and two interaction variables: the building envelope times a dummy indicating if the parcel was eligible for the State Density Bonus in that year, and the building envelope times a dummy indicating if the parcel was subject to density-restricted zoning in that year. The intercept of the model was fixed at zero.

Appendix: Housing Development Model: Methodology

- The models' coefficients were used in a forecast that calculated the log-likelihood of development for each rezoned parcel, in each of the forecast years 2026-2045, using the site and zoning information, and the price and cost assumptions for each year (shown on the next page). The log-likelihoods were converted into annual probabilities, from which a 20-year probability of development was calculated.
- The model coefficients were also used to calculate a units estimate; the 20-year probability times the units estimate is the expected number of units produced on that parcel in the 20-year forecast period.
- The forecast model was run for both the current and the proposed zoning. See the section "Logic of Applying the Model to the Proposed Rezoning" for more details.
- Three parcels were excluded from the forecast: Laguna Honda Hospital, the University of San Francisco Main Campus, and the University of San Francisco Lone Mountain Campus. While some housing may be built on those parcels in the forecast period, the model is not well-suited for large parcels with unique uses like these.

Appendix: Housing Development Model: Data Sources

Variable Description	Variable	Data Source
Height limit for site in ft	Height_Ft	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Area for lot in 1000 sq ft	Area_1000	Planning Department, Land Use Database 4/16/25
Extisting building square footage in 1000 sq ft	Bldg_SqFt_1000	Planning Department, Land Use Database 4/16/25
Residential Existing Use using ResUnits (Dummy)	Res_Dummy	Planning Department, Land Use Database 4/16/25
Historic Status for Parcel (Dummy)	Historic	Planning Department, Land Use Database 4/16/25
Real Construction Cost Variable, 2 years prior	Construc_Cost_Real	a 60/40 average of Real Construction Materials PPI and Real San Francisco MSA Construction Wages, 2016=100
10-Neighborhood Housing Price Index (Zillow), Real, 2 years prior	Zillow_Price_Real	SF real condo prices per Zillow, 2016=100
Dummy indicating eligibility for State Density Bonus, 2016 forward	SDB_2016_5Plus	Calculated from Zoning Districts
Zoning dummy: Office/Commercial	zp_OfficeComm	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Zoning dummy: Density Restricted Multifamily, RTO = Form Based	zp_DRMulti_RTO	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Zoning dummy: Form Based Multifamily, RTO = form based	zp_FBDMulti_RTO	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Zoning dummy: Industrial / Production, Distribution & Repair	zp_PDRInd	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Zoning dummy: Public/Open Space	zp_Public	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Zoning dummy: Redevelopment Area	zp_Redev	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Zoning dummy: Residential 2-Family (2 Units per Lot)	zp_RH2	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Zoning = Residential 3-Family or Res Mixed (1/800 sqft)	zp_RH3_RM1	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Planning District dummy variables	DIST_<District Name>	Planning District from Assessor's Secured Roll DB

Appendix: Logistic Regression Coefficients

Variable Description	Variable	Coeff	StdErr	WaldChiSq	Prob>Chi Sq
Intercept	Intercept	(1.6226)	1.2829	1.5998	0.2059
Height limit for site in ft	Height_Ft	0.0017	0.0007	4.9693	0.0258
Area for lot in 1000 sq ft	Area_1000	0.0049	0.0009	30.6563	0.0000
Envelope Area in 1000 sq ft (area/1000*ht/10)	Env_1000_Area_Height	0.0002	0.0001	5.0369	0.0248
Extisting building square footage in 1000 sq ft	Bldg_SqFt_1000	(0.0023)	0.0007	10.7241	0.0011
Residential Existing Use using ResUnits (Dummy)	Res_Dummy	(0.8231)	0.1222	45.3669	0.0000
Historic Status for Parcel (Dummy)	Historic	(1.0378)	0.1271	66.6847	0.0000
Real Construction Cost Variable	Construc_Cost_Real	(0.0992)	0.0129	58.8929	0.0000
SF Housing Price Index (Zillow), Real	Zillow_Price_Real	0.0143	0.0053	7.1326	0.0076
Dummy for State Density Bonus, 5+ Unit Sites, 2016 forward	SDB_2016_5Plus	0.6303	0.1608	15.3724	0.0000
Zoning = Office/Commercial	zp_OfficeComm	4.2634	0.4873	76.5337	0.0000
Zoning = Density Restricted Multifamily, RTO = Form Based	zp_DRMulti_RTO	4.2450	0.4523	88.0989	0.0000
Zoning = Form Based Multifamily, RTO = form based	zp_FBDMulti_RTO	5.0508	0.4640	118.4768	0.0000
Zoning = Industrial / Production, Distribution & Repair	zp_PDRInd	3.4115	0.4790	50.7257	0.0000
Zoning = Public/Open Space	zp_Public	1.2491	0.8385	2.2190	0.1363
Zoning = Redevelopment Area	zp_Redev	4.5361	0.4999	82.3213	0.0000
Zoning = Residential 2-Family (2 Units per Lot)	zp_RH2	0.2674	0.6672	0.1607	0.6885
Zoning = Residential 3-Family or Res Mixed (1/800 sqft)	zp_RH3_RM1	1.3187	0.6064	4.7289	0.0297

Appendix: Logistic Regression Coefficients (Continued)

Variable Description	Variable	Coeff	StdErr	WaldChiSq	Prob>Chi Sq
District = South Bayshore	DIST_SBayshore	(1.4824)	0.3179	21.7380	0.0000
District = Bernal Heights	DIST_BernalHts	(1.7011)	0.6087	7.8100	0.0052
District = South Central	DIST_Scentral	(1.7307)	0.3867	20.0267	0.0000
District = Central	DIST_Central	(1.1523)	0.3353	11.8102	0.0006
District = Buena Vista	DIST_BuenaVista	(2.5369)	1.0188	6.2010	0.0128
District = Northeast	DIST_Northeast	(1.4171)	0.2539	31.1439	0.0000
District = Western Addition	DIST_WestAddition	(0.6831)	0.2362	8.3630	0.0038
District = South of Market	DIST_SOMA	(0.0756)	0.1903	0.1579	0.6911
District = Inner Sunset	DIST_InnerSunset	(1.6187)	0.4882	10.9939	0.0009
District = Richmond	DIST_Richmond	(2.8019)	0.5355	27.3716	0.0000
District = Ingleside	DIST_Ingleside	(1.8670)	0.4925	14.3711	0.0002
District = Outer Sunset	DIST_OuterSunset	(2.6147)	0.6098	18.3867	0.0000
District = Marina	DIST_Marina	(1.2492)	0.3253	14.7457	0.0001
District = Mission	DIST_Mission	(1.0938)	0.2380	21.1176	0.0000

Omitted Variables for Groups of Dummy Variables:

Omitted zoning = RH1

Omitted district = Downtown

Appendix: Units Regression Coefficients

Variable Description	Variable	Coeff	St Error	T-Stat
Simple building envelope (area/1000 * ht/10)	Env_1000_Area_Height	0.4252	0.0159	26.72
State Density Bonus * Simple Bldg Envelope (5+ Unit Sites, 2016 forward)	SDB_2016_5Plus_EnvFull	0.4385	0.0389	11.28
Simple Bldg Envelope only if density-restricted	Zoning_DR_EnvFull	(0.1601)	0.0174	(9.22)

Note: Model removes largest 5% (Positive and Negative) residual outliers

Appendix: Model Performance

Logistic Regression	
Number of Observations	3,369,573
Number with Dependent Variable = 1	422
Pseudo R-Square	0.000611
Max Rescaled R-Square	0.244596

Units Regression	
Number of Observations	383
R-Sq	0.867779
Adj R-Sq	0.866735
Dependent Mean Value	81.87206
Standard Error of Regression	48.40184

Appendix: Zoning Classifications

- The table below shows the correspondence between the City's zoning districts, and the aggregate zoning variables in the model.

Zoning Variable	Zoning Districts
zp_RH1	C-2/RH-1(D); RH-1(D)/C-2; C-M/RH-1; M-1/RH-1; NC-1/RH-1; NC-1/RH-1/RH-2; NC-2/RH-1; NC-2/RH-1(D); NC-3/RH-1; NCD/RH-1; NCD/RH-1(D); NC-S/RH-1; NCT-OCEAN/RH-1(D); NCT/RH-1(D); P/P-W/RH-1; P/RH-1; P/RH-1(D); P/RH-1/RH-1(D); P/RH-1/RH-2; RH-1; RH-1(D); RH-1(D)/NC-2; RH-1(D)/RH-1; RH-2/RH-1; RH-2/RH-1(D); RH-1(D)/RH-2; RH-1(D)/RM-1; RH-1(S); RH-1/C-M; RH-1/M-1; RH-1/NC-1; RH-1/NC-2; RH-1/NC-3; RH-1/NC-S; RH-1/RH-1(D); RH-1/RH-2; RH-1/RH-2/RM-1; RH-1/RM-1; RM-1/RH-1; RH-3/RH-1
zp_RH2	NC-1/RH-1/RH-2; P/RH-1/RH-2; RH-2/RH-1; RH-2/RH-1(D); RH-1(D)/RH-2; RH-1/RH-2; RH-1/RH-2/RM-1; M-1/RH-2/RM-1; MUR/RH-2; NC-1/RH-2; NC-2/RH-2; NC-3/RH-2; NCD/RH-2; NC-S/RH-2; NCT-GLEN PARK/RH-2; NCT-OCEAN/RH-2; NCT/RH-2; P/RH-2; P/RM-1/RH-2; RH-2; RH-2/NC-1; RH-2/NC-2; RH-2/NC-3; RH-2/RH-3; RH-2/RM-1; RM-1/RH-2; RH-2/RM-2; RM-2/RH-2; RH-2/RM-3; RM-3/RH-2; RH-3/RH-2
zp_RH3_RM1	RH-1/RH-2/RM-1; M-1/RH-2/RM-1; P/RM-1/RH-2; RH-2/RH-3; RH-2/RM-1; RM-1/RH-2; RH-3/RH-2; RH-1(D)/RM-1; RH-1/RM-1; RM-1/RH-1; RH-3/RH-1; C-2/RH-3; C-2/RM-1; C-2/RM-1/RM-4; C-M/RM-1; HP-RA/RM-1; M-1/RM-1; M-2/RH-3; NC-1/RM-1; RM-1/NC-1; NC-2/RH-3; NC-2/RM-1; NC-3/RH-3; NC-3/RM-1; NCD/RH-3; NCD/RH-3/UPR MARKET; NCD/RH-3/UPR MARK; NCD/RH-3/VALENCIA; NCD/RM-1; NCD/RM-1/SACRAMENTO; NCD/SACRAMENTO ST; NCD/SACRAMENTO/RM-1; NCD/RM-1/SACRAMEN; NCT-DIVISADERO/RH-3; NCT-DIVISADERO/RM-1; NCT/RH-3; NCT/RM-1; P/PM-R/RM-1; P/RH-3; P/RM-1; PM-MU2/PM-OS/PM-R/RM-1; PM-R/RM-1; RH-3; RH-3/C-2; RH-3/HAYES; RH-3/M-2; RH-3/NC-2; RH-3/RM-1; RM-1/RH-3; RH-3/RM-2; RM-2/RH-3; RH-3/RM-3; RM-3/RH-3; RH-3/RSD; RH-3/VALENCIA; RM-1; RM-1/C-M; RM-1/C-M/M-1; RM-1/NC-3; RM-1/RM-2; RM-1/RM-3; RM-1/RM-4; RM-1/SACRAMENTO
zp_OfficeComm	C-2/RH-3; C-2/RM-1; C-2/RM-1/RM-4; C-M/RM-1; RH-3/C-2; RM-1/C-M; RM-1/C-M/M-1; C-2/RH-1(D); RH-1(D)/C-2; C-M/RH-1; RH-1/C-M; C-2; C-2/M-1; C-2/M-1/P; C-2/P; C-3-G; C-3-G/C-3-R; C-3-G/C-M; C-3-G/RC-4; C-3-O; C-3-O(SD); C-3-O(SD)/P; C-3-O(SD)/TB DTR; C-3-O/C-3-O(SD); C-3-O/C-3-R; C-3-O/C-3-S; C-3-O/C-3-S/P; C-3-O/TB DTR; C-3-R; C-3-S; C-3-S/P; C-M; C-M/M-1; CMUO; CMUO/MUR; CMUO/P; MUO; NCD/C-2; P/C-3-R; RM-3/C-2; RM-4/C-2; WMUO

Appendix: Zoning Classifications (Continued)

Zoning Variable	Zoning Districts
zp_DRMulti_RTO	NC-2/P; NC-3/P/RM-3; NCD/P; NC-S/P; P/NC-S; P/NC-2; P/RC-4; P/RM-2; P/RM-3; C-2/RM-1/RM-4; C-3-G/RC-4; NCD/C-2; RM-3/C-2; RM-4/C-2; NC-1/RM-1; RM-1/NC-1; NC-2/RH-3; NC-2/RM-1; NC-3/RH-3; NC-3/RM-1; NCD/RH-3; NCD/RH-3/UPR MARKET; NCD/RH-3/UPR MARK; NCD/RH-3/VALENCIA; NCD/RM-1; NCD/RM-1/SACRAMENTO; NCD/SACRAMENTO ST; NCD/SACRAMENTO/RM-1; NCD/RM-1/SACRAMEN; RH-3/HAYES; RH-3/NC-2; RH-3/RM-2; RM-2/RH-3; RH-3/RM-3; RM-3/RH-3; RH-3/RSD; RH-3/VALENCIA; RM-1/NC-3; RM-1/RM-2; RM-1/RM-3; RM-1/RM-4; RM-1/SACRAMENTO; NC-1/RH-1/RH-2; NC-1/RH-2; NC-2/RH-2; NC-3/RH-2; NCD/RH-2; NC-S/RH-2; RH-2/NC-1; RH-2/NC-2; RH-2/NC-3; RH-2/RM-2; RM-2/RH-2; RH-2/RM-3; RM-3/RH-2; NC-1/RH-1; NC-2/RH-1; NC-2/RH-1(D); NC-3/RH-1; NCD/RH-1; NCD/RH-1(D); NC-S/RH-1; RH-1(D)/NC-2; RH-1/NC-1; RH-1/NC-2; RH-1/NC-3; RH-1/NC-S; 24TH-MISSION; 24TH STREET- NOE VALL; 24TH-NOE; BROADWAY; BROADWAY NEIGHBORHOOD; C-2/RM-4; CASTRO STREET NEIGHBO; CASTRO; CCB; CRNC; CR-NC; CRNC/CVR; CR-NC/CVR; CRNC/RM-4; CVR; DTR/RC-4; FILLMORE; HAIGHT; HAIGHT STREET NEIGHBO; HAYES; HAIGHT STREET NEIGHBO; INNER CLEMENT; INNER CLEMENT STREET; INNER SUNSET; INNER SUNSET NEIGHBOR; M-1/NC-2; M-1/RM-2; M-1/RSD; NC-1; NC-1/RM-2; NC-1/RM-3; NC-2; NC-2/M-1; NC-2/NC-3; NC-3/NC-2; NC-2/RM-3; NC-2/RM-4; NC-3; NC-3/RC-4; NC-3/RM-3; NC-3/RM-4; NCD; NCD/; NCD/24TH STREET- NOE VALL; NCD/24TH STREET-; NCD/24TH-MISSION; NCD/24TH-NOE; NCD/24TH-NOE-VALLE; NCD/24TH-NOE-VALLEY; NCD/BROADWAY; NCD/BROADWAY NEIG; NCD/BROADWAY NEIGHBORHOOD; NCD/CASTRO; NCD/CASTRO STREET; NCD/CASTRO STREET NEIGHBO; NCD/EXCELSIOR OUTER MISSI; NCD/EXCELSIOR OUT; EXCELSIOR OUTER MISSI; NCD/FILLMORE; NCD/HAIGHT; NCD/HAIGHT STREET; NCD/HAIGHT STREET NEIGHBO; NCD/HAYES; NCD/HAYES NCT; NCD/HAYES NCT/RTO; NCD/INNER CLEMENT; NCD/INNER CLEMENT STREET; NCD/INNER SUNSET; NCD/INNER SUNSET NEIGHBOR; NCD/IRVING STREET NEIGHBO; NCD/IRVING STREET; NCD/IRVING; IRVING STREET NEIGHBO; NCD/JAPANTOWN NEIGHBORHOO; NCD/JAPANTOWN NEI; JAPANTOWN NEIGHBORHOO; NCD/JUDAH STREET NEIGHBOR; NCD/JUDAH; NCD/JUDAH STREET; JUDAH STREET NEIGHBOR; NCD/NC-1; NCD/NC-2; NCD/NC-3; NCD/NCT; NCD/NO BEACH; NCD/NORIEGA STREET NEIGHB; NCD/NORIEGA STREE; NCD/NORIEGA; NCD/NORTH BEACH NEIGHBORH; NCD/NORTH BEACH N; NCD/NORTH BEACH; NCD/NORTHBEACH; NCD/NORTH BEACH/RM-1; NCD/NORTHBEACH/RM-1; NCD/OUTER CLEMENT; NCD/OUTER CLEMENT STREET; NCD/OUTER CLEMENT STREET; NCD/PACIFIC; NCD/PACIFIC AVENU; NCD/PACIFIC/RM-3; NCD/PACIFIC;RM-3; NCD/PACIFIC AVENUE NEIGHB; NCD/POLK; NCD/POLK STREET N; NCD/POLK STREET NEIGHBORH; NCD/POLK/RC-3; NCD/POLK/RC-4; NCD/RC-3; NCD/RESIDENTIAL- HOUSE, O; NCD/RESIDENTIAL-; NCD/RM-2; NCD/RM-3; NCD/RM-3/PACIFIC; NCD/RTO; NCD/SACRAMENTO; NCD/SACRAMENTO STREET NEI; NCD/TARAVAL STREET NEIGHB; NCD/TARAVAL STREE; NCD/TARAVAL; NCD/UNION; NCD/UNION STREET; NCD/UNION STREET NEIGHBOR; NCD/UPPER FILLMORE NEIGHB; NCD/UPPER FILLMOR; NCD/UPPER FILLMORE; NCD/UPPERFILLMORE; NCD/UPPER MARKET STREET N; NCD/UPPER MARKET; NCD/UPR MARKET NC; NCD/UPR MARKET; NCD/UPR MARKET NCT; NCD/UPR MARKET NCT/; NCD/VALENCIA; NCD/WEST PORTAL; NCD/WEST PORTAL A; NCD/WEST PORTAL AVENUE NE; NCD/BAYVIEW; NCD/COLE VALLEY; NCD/CORTLAND AVENUE; NCD/GEARY BOULEVARD; NCD/GEARY BOULEVA; NCD/GEARY BOULEVARD/RH-2; NCD/GEARY BOULEVARD/RM-1; NCD/INNER BALBOA STREET; NCD/INNER BALBOA S; NCD/OUTER BALBOA STREET; NCD/ OUTER BALBOA STREET; NCD/OUTER BALBOA S; NCD/LOWER HAIGHT STREET; NCD/LOWER HAIGHT S; NCD/LOWER HAIGHT STREET/RH-3; NCD/LOWER POLK STREET; NCD/MISSION BERNAL; NCD/INNER TARAVAL STREET; NCD/INNER TARAVAL; NCD/SAN BRUNO AVENUE; NCD/LAKESIDE VILLAGE; NCD/LAKESIDE VILLAG; NC-S; NC-S/PM-R; NC-S/RM-3; NCT-DIVISADERO/RM-3; NCT/RM-3; NCT/RM-4; NO BEACH; OUTER CLEMENT; POLK; RC-3; RC-3/POLK; RC-3/RM-3; RC-4; RC-4/NC-3; RC-4/RH DTR; RC-4/RM-4; RED/SLR; RM-2; RM-2/M-1; RM-2/NC-1; RM-2/NC-2; RM-2/NO BEACH; RM-2/RM-3; RM-2/RM-4; RM-3; RM-3/NC-1; RM-3/NC-2; RM-3/NC-3; RM-3/NC-S; RM-3/RC-3; RM-3/RM-4; RM-4; RM-4/CR-NC; RM-4/NC-2; RM-4/NC-3; RM-4/RC-4; RSD; RSD/SLR; SACRAMENTO; SLR; SSO; UNION; UPR MARKET; VALENCIA; WEST PORTAL

Appendix: Zoning Classifications (Continued)

Zoning Variable	Zoning Districts
zp_Public	C-2/M-1/P; C-2/P; C-3-O(SD)/P; C-3-O/C-3-S/P; C-3-S/P; CMUO/P; P/C-3-R; P/RM-1/RH-2; P/PM-R/RM-1; P/RH-3; P/RM-1; PM-MU2/PM-OS/PM-R/RM-1; P/RH-1/RH-2; P/RH-2; P/P-W/RH-1; P/RH-1; P/RH-1(D); P/RH-1/RH-1(D); Remove; HP-RA/M-1/M-2/P; HP-RA/M-2/P; M-1/M-2/P; M-1/P; M-2/MB-OS; M-2/MB-RA/P; M-2/P; MB-O; MB-O/MB-RA; MB-OS; MB-RA/P; MUG/P; NC-2/P; NC-3/P/RM-3; NCD/P; NC-S/P; NCT/P; NCT-3/P; NCT-3/RTO; P; P/C-3-O(SD); P/M-1; P/M-2; P/MISS BAY S PL; P/MISS BAY S PLN; P/MUR; P/NC-S; P/NC-2; P/PDR-2; P/PM-OS; P/PM-OS/PM-R; P/P-W; P/RC-4; P/RM-2; P/RM-3; P/TB DTR; P/RTO-C; P, RTO-C; PM-CF; PM-CF/PM-OS; PM-CF/PM-OS/PM-R; PM-MU1/PM-OS; PM-MU2/PM-OS/PM-R; PM-OS; PM-OS/PM-R; PM-OS/PM-R/PM-S; PM-OS/PM-S; Public
zp_FBDMulti_RTO	DTR/RC-4; NCD/HAYES NCT; NCD/HAYES NCT/RTO; NCD/NCT; NCD/RTO; NCD/UPR MARKET NCT; NCD/UPR MARKET NCT/; NC-S/PM-R; NCT-DIVISADERO/RM-3; NCT/RM-3; NCT/RM-4; RC-4/RH DTR; RED/SLR; P/PM-R/RM-1; PM-MU2/PM-OS/PM-R/RM-1; MUG/P; NCT/P; NCT-3/P; NCT-3/RTO; P/MUR; P/PM-OS/PM-R; P/TB DTR; P/RTO-C; P, RTO-C; PM-CF/PM-OS/PM-R; PM-MU1/PM-OS; PM-MU2/PM-OS/PM-R; PM-OS/PM-R; PM-OS/PM-R/PM-S; C-3-O(SD)/TB DTR; C-3-O/TB DTR; CMUO/MUR; NCT-DIVISADERO/RH-3; NCT-DIVISADERO/RM-1; NCT/RH-3; NCT/RM-1; PM-R/RM-1; MUR/RH-2; NCT-GLEN PARK/RH-2; NCT-OCEAN/RH-2; NCT/RH-2; NCT-OCEAN/RH-1(D); NCT/RH-1(D); DTR; DTR/M-1; M-1/RH DTR; M-2/MR-MU; M-2/P70-MU; MB-RA/MR-MU; MR-MU; MUG; MUG/RED; MUR; NCT; NCT-DIVISADERO; NCT-FOLSOM; NCT-GLEN PARK; NCT-HAYES; NCT-HAYES/RTO; NCT-HAYES/RTO-1; NCT-MISSION; NCT-UPPER MARKET; NCT-UPPER MARKET;; NCT-UPPER MARKET/RH-2; NCT-UPPER MARKET/RH-3; NCT-OCEAN; NCT-SOMA; NCT/NCT-3; NCT/RCD; NCT/RED-MX; NCT/RTO; NCT/RTO-M; NCT/UMU; NCT-1; NCT-2; NCT-3; NCT-3/NCT-HAYES; RTO-1/NCT-3; RTO/NCT-3; P70-MU; PDR-1-D/UMU; PDR-1-G/UMU; PM-MU1; PM-MU1/PM-R; PM-MU2/PM-R; PM-MU2; PM-R; RCD; RED; RED-MX; RED-MX/WMUG; RH DTR; RH DTR/SB-DTR; RH DTR/TB DTR; RTO; RTO-1; RTO/NCT; RTO-1/RTO-C; RTO-C; RTO-M; SB-DTR; SPD; TB DTR; UMU; WMUG
zp_PDRInd	DTR/M-1; M-1/RH DTR; M-2/MR-MU; M-2/P70-MU; PDR-1-D/UMU; PDR-1-G/UMU; M-1/NC-2; M-1/RM-2; M-1/RSD; NC-2/M-1; RM-2/M-1; C-2/M-1/P; HP-RA/M-1/M-2/P; HP-RA/M-2/P; M-1/M-2/P; M-1/P; M-2/MB-OS; M-2/MB-RA/P; M-2/P; P/M-1; P/M-2; P/PDR-2; C-2/M-1; C-M/M-1; RH-1/RH-2/RM-1; M-1/RH-2/RM-1; M-1/RM-1; M-2/RH-3; RH-3/M-2; M-1/RH-1; RH-1/M-1; HP-RA/M-1; HP-RA/M-2; M-1; M-1/M-1; M-1/M-2; M-1/PDR-1-B; M-1/PDR-2; M-2; M-2 (MB); M-2/MB-RA; M-2/PDR-2; M-2/SLI; MISS BAY S PLN/M-2; MISS BAY S PL; MISS BAY S PLN; MISS BAY S PLN/M-; PDR-1; PDR-1/PDR-2; PDR-1-B; PDR-1-B/PDR-2; PDR-1-D; PDR-1-G; PDR-2; SALI; SLI; SLI/M-2
zp_Redev	HP-RA/M-1/M-2/P; HP-RA/M-2/P; M-2/MB-RA/P; HP-RA/M-1; HP-RA/M-2; M-2/MB-RA; MISS BAY S PLN/M-2; MISS BAY S PL; MISS BAY S PLN; MISS BAY S PLN/M-; MB-RA/MR-MU; MB-O/MB-RA; MB-RA/P; P/MISS BAY S PL; P/MISS BAY S PLN; HP-RA/RM-1; HP-RA; MB-RA; MISS BAY N RED; MISS BAY N RED PLN; MISS BAY N RED PL; MISS BAY S RED; MISS BAY S RED PLN; MISS BAY S RED PL

Appendix: Logic of Applying the Model

- This section of the appendix describes in more detail how the model was used to produce estimates of future housing production.
- For the existing zoning (“baseline”), the application of the model is straightforward. Current zoning was encoded using the zoning classification on the previous page, and current allowable height was used as the height variable in the logistic regression, and to calculate building envelope in the units regression.
- For the proposed rezoning (“policy”), the logic used was as follows: based on the units regression, each 1000 square feet of building envelope results in 0.42 units. The State Density Bonus adds an additional 0.44 units. Parcels that elect to use the Local Program therefore need to accommodate at least 0.44 additional units per 1000 square feet of envelope if developers are to choose this option. For parcels where the Local Program was more desirable, and on parcels that are ineligible for the SDB, because their zoning and size prevents them from building more than 5 units, the Local Program was applied. For all other parcels the SDB was used.

Appendix: Logic of Applying the Model (Continued)

- Probabilities and units for any parcel using the State Density Bonus were calculated by:
  - In the logistic regression, using the first new height in the rezoning table for Height_Ft and in the Env_1000_Area_Height calculation.
  - In the units regression, using the first new height in the rezoning table to calculate Env_1000_Area_Height;
  - Incorporating the SDB_2016_5Plus_EnvFull effect;
  - Incorporating the Zoning_DR_EnvFull if applicable (i.e. the parcel is density-restricted.

Appendix: Logic of Applying the Model (Continued)

- Probabilities and units for any parcel using the Local Program were calculated by:
  - In the logistic regression, setting zp_FBDMulti_RTO = 1, to account for the relaxation of density controls in the Local Program;
  - In the logistic regression, using the second new height in the rezoning table for Height_Ft and in the Env_1000_Area_Height calculation.
  - In the units regression, using the second new height in the rezoning table to calculate Env_1000_Area_Height;
  - In the units regression, removing the SDB_2016_5Plus_EnvFull effect;
  - In the units regression, removing the Zoning_DR_EnvFull effect.

Appendix: Business Disruption / Relocation Costs

- The analysis makes the following assumptions about business disruption and relocation costs:
  - Lost space will be 10% vacant, so 90% of the loss represents the loss of occupied space.
  - Lost business net income (for 6 months of disruption): $5/occupied square foot.
  - Fixed labor costs (for 6 months): $10/occupied square foot.
  - Moving costs and build-out of space at new premises: $175/occupied square foot

Staff Contact

Ted Egan, Ph.D., Chief Economist ted.egan@sfgov.org

From:	Carroll, John (BOS)
To:	Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Sciammas, Charlie (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Cooper, Raynell (BOS)
Cc:	stephenjontorres@gmail.com
Subject:	FW: Letter for today"s (11/17) agenda
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 2:06:00 PM
Attachments:	2025.11.17 Letter to BoS Land Use and Transpo Committee Re_ TPO and Decontrol Ammendments.pdf

---

From: Stephen Torres <stephenjontorres@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 17, 2025 2:05 PM
To: Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>
Subject: Letter for today's (11/17) agenda

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

Hello Clerk Carroll,

Please see the attached letter.

Best,

Stephen Torres

Stephen Torres
Mission District, San Francisco

November 17, 2025

The Land Use & Transportation Committee of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Room 250
City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Chairperson Melgar and Members of the Land Use and Transportation Committee,

I am writing to you to strongly urge that you move forward the amendments submitted by Supervisors Chan and Chen.

There has been a lot of time given to the obligations that our city has to the State and the mandates it has imposed on San Francisco and other municipalities across the state. Mandates that should have been challenged by the Board as other municipalities have. What has not been given appropriate consideration, however, is the obligations that the State has to this City. The obligations to meet the housing affordability crisis that continue to strangle average working class and vulnerable populations out of San Francisco.

Instead we are entertaining conversations about attracting new “vibrant” residents to replace the ones we have. The seniors who have worked their entire lives to age in place in the city they love. The working poor who continue to try and hold on even as hours decrease and jobs dry up. Even those of us that live in subsidized housing face higher rents and less wages with no protections because we have no rent control or tenants protections.

The idea that any San Franciscan is expendable in order to build housing with no guarantees on affordability or sustainability is unconscionable. This body, and by extension, the Board of Supervisors must ensure that all rent-controlled housing is exempt and push back against the State if need be. If we are to be accountable to the State, they and all theiragencies must likwise be accountable to us in full transparency.

You have been elected to represent the interests of your constituents and their future, but not at the expense of their present.

Sincerely,

Stephen Torres
Resident, District 9
Worker, Districts 8 & 9

From: Paul Wermer
To: Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject: FILE NO. 250701, Family Zoning Plan (2025-11 -17):
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 12:09:44 PM

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

17 November 2025

To: Land Use and Transportation Committee

From: Paul Wermer

Subject: FILE NO. 250701, Family Zoning Plan

I am concerned that the current up zoning plan inadvertently encourages the development of luxury flats in projects for fewer than 9 residential units. If the Residential Nexus study is correct, this will create a demand for 30-40% of the number of BMR Units – with no inclusionary housing provided.

This would aggravate the actual housing shortage and affordability crisis for over 70% of San Franciscan household incomes.

To prevent this, any upzoning must require an inclusionary housing component, and it must be a more meaningful contribution than the current $249.50/sf in-lieu fee. (That covers less than half the cost of a BMR unit)

Background: I have asked Planning staff about this and have received no response so far:

As I read the Family Zoning Plan (version 5 -12, BOS File 25071), my understanding is as follows:

a) Any project complying with the proposed HC-SF (206.10) and Height Limits (sec 263.19 (b)) qualifies for the local program height bonus. It only needs to add one or more units to a building with at least one existing residential unit.

b) By purchasing a 1 or 2 residential unit building (exempt for rent control protections) I could then take a currently zoned RH-2/40 ft height and by adding one additional unit to the project qualify for an 85' structure on a 25x 100 lot, with 18% rear yard, leaving me with at least 1500 sq ft of buildable lot area. At 85 ft height, that would allow 3 luxury units of 3500 - 4000 sq ft. (Condos and TICs, not being rent controlled units, means that multi unit buildings on larger lots are vulnerable as well)

c) There is no inclusionary housing requirement. Given the Residential Nexus report (2016), 3 luxury units would create a demand for somewhere between 0.9 - 1.2 BMR units.

If so, there is a risk of large numbers of projects for fewer than 10 units targeting the top 10% of incomes - which means that this "plan" will actually increase the already unmet demand for units affordable to the wide range of household incomes below $200K, aggravating

availability and affordability.

Has there been any analysis to look at exactly how many lots might be vulnerable to this incentive? This is especially an issue for lots in desirable locations – for example, Lincoln or Fulton with views of Golden Gate Park, and sites with views of the Bay or Ocean.

I should note that I am concerned that 4000 sq ft limit on qualifying residential units is also easily subverted by clever designs.

--
Paul Wermer
San Francisco,CA 94115

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); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations; BOS Legislation, (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject:	152 Letters regarding Zoning
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 12:02:13 PM
Attachments:	152 Letters regarding Zoning.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached for 152 letters regarding zoning.

File No. 250966, LUT Item No. 4: General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 250700, LUT Item No. 5: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan (Mayor, Sauter, Mahmood, Dorsey)

File No. 251071, LUT Item No. 6: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan (Mayor, Sauter, Mahmood, Dorsey)

File No. 250701, LUT Item No. 7: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan (Mayor)

File No. 251073, LUT Item No. 8: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations, Administrative Codes - Family Zoning Plan (Mayor)

File No. 251072: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan (Mayor)

Sincerely,

Joe Adkins
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From:	Nick Ferris
To:	Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS)
Cc:	Chan, Connie (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Re: Support for Chan and Chen Amendments to the Family Zoning Plan Land Use and Transportation Committee Agenda Items 4-7, November 17, 2025
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 8:24:17 AM
Attachments:	THD LUC Upzoning Plan 11.17.25.pdf

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

My apologies. I am adding correct email for President Mandelman.

Nick Ferris
President, Telegraph Hill Dwellers

On Mon, Nov 17, 2025 at 8:15 AM Nick Ferris <nicholashferris@gmail.com> wrote:

> Dear President Mandelman, Chair Melgar, and Members of the Land Use and Transportation Committee,
>
> The Telegraph Hill Dwellers (THD) continues to oppose the proposed Family Zoning Plan ("Upzoning Plan"), but we implore you to adopt the amendments offered by Supervisors Chan and Chen that will help to prevent the displacement of tenants and small businesses and provide a plan for development of the 100% affordable housing we so desperately need. We also continue to urge the Committee and Board of Supervisors to reverse the inclusion of Telegraph Hill, North Beach, and the Northern Waterfront in the Upzoning Plan, which was not contemplated in the 2022 Housing Element or Mayor Breed's zoning proposal.
>
> **President Mandelman, we urge you to please schedule a "Committee of the Whole" to consider all of the proposed amendments.** We are concerned that the Land Use and Transportation Committee may consider tabling and killing the Chan and Chen amendments in committee. We hope not. But, if so, you will have abdicated your responsibility to the democratic process. The full Board of Supervisors deserves a chance to consider these amendments. And, the public deserves to know where each supervisor stands.
>
> In any event, a vote to approve the Upzoning Plan is premature until you have full analysis and clarity on the implications of SB 79 for the Upzoning Plan, not just the 5-page fact-sheet summary prepared by the Planning Department.
>
> If you move forward with this Upzoning Plan, please adopt the following amendments:
>
> 1. **Approve Supervisors Chan's and Chen's Proposed Amendments:**
>   - **Exclude all historic resources,** including local historic districts and those eligible for the California and National Registers, from the Upzoning Plan (Chan File No. 251073).
>   - **Exclude All Existing Residential Units, including all rent-controlled units** from the Upzoning Plan (Chan File No. 251073).
>   - **Remove the Planning Equity Geography Special Use District** ("PEG SUD") from the Upzoning Plan (Chen File No. 251071).
>   - **Remove the Coastal Zone** from the Upzoning Plan (Chan File No. 251071).

- **Remove Form-Based Density in the Base Zoning in All Districts** (Chan File No. 251073).
- **Adopt a Progress Requirement** for obtaining a building permit within a time certain of project approval – "Use it or Lose It" (Chan File No. 251073)
- **Require Inclusionary Affordable Housing Within 1⁄2 Mile** of the development (Chan File No. 251073).

2. Amend Supervisor Melgar's Legislation to Remove All Rent-Controlled Housing
We appreciate Supervisor Melgar's amendment removing rent-controlled housing with three or more units but urge her to expand this amendment to exclude **all** rent-controlled housing with two or more units, not just three or more.

3. Approve Supervisor Chan's Legacy Business Controls
THD joins with Small Business Forward to support Supervisor Chan's legislation to extend the requirement for a Conditional Use Authorization for sites where a Legacy Business has been displaced. In absence of having any other tools available or financial resources to support the successful relocation of a Legacy Business within the community, the Conditional Use is an imperfect but necessary mechanism to discourage displacement of Legacy Businesses in the first place. That is why Small Business Forward supports the extension of the CU legislation until other more effective protection measures are in place, such as commercial rent control, the right of return, and adequate relocation assistance.

4. Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District and Funding Strategy.
We join with REP-SF and the Council of Community Housing Organizations (CCHO) to demand that the SFMTA-SUD be revised to provide that these publicly owned parcels be developed for 100% affordable and social housing. Under San Francisco's state-approved Housing Element, as mandated by the state, 57% of the 36,200 new housing units proposed to be developed under the Upzoning Plan—more than 20,000 units—must be affordable to low- and very-low-income households. Yet the Upzoning Plan has no funding strategy or realistic plan to produce those affordable homes. It risks satisfying Sacramento's procedural checklist while abandoning the substance of the law: to build housing for the people who need it most.

5. Remove North Beach, Telegraph Hill, and the Northern Waterfront from the Upzoning Plan.
THD continues to strongly oppose the late inclusion in the Upzoning Plan of major portions of Telegraph Hill, North Beach, and the Northern Waterfront, areas that were not included in the 2022 Adopted Housing Element ("2022 Housing Element") or considered in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR). These areas represent one of the densest neighborhoods in San Francisco, with roughly 82% of our residents currently living in existing pre-1979 multi-family, rent-controlled buildings housing our City's workforce and seniors, including a large immigrant Asian population. Based on the City's profiles of neighborhoods in San Francisco, there are **37,156** people per square mile in North Beach as compared to **17,325** people per square mile in San Francisco. The Planning Department's own data shows that rent-controlled buildings in District 3 (built before 1979 with 2+ units, excluding condos) represent approximately 32,340 individual units, 13,983 of which are located in the current version of the Upzoning Plan. **In other words, tenants occupying 13,983 units will be subject to potential eviction and displacement.**

And, although the 2022 Housing Element and EIR assumed that the Northeast Planning

District would provide net new housing units of only *800 units* by 2050, the Upzoning Plan suddenly increased that figure to *5,900 units*, a stunning *650% increase*. This is a far greater percentage increase than any other area in the City. The height and density increases represented by this increase will significantly impact existing tenants, small businesses, historic resources, parks and open spaces, and the diverse culture of District 3.

* * * * * * * *

In conclusion, THD believes that the Upzoning Plan, as proposed, threatens tenants and small businesses, pits neighborhoods against each other, and disregards decades of community-based policymaking that has built San Francisco into a resilient, vibrant city through a network of strong neighborhoods.

The proposed amendments from Supervisors Chan and Chen address these concerns by focusing on protecting tenants and rent-controlled housing citywide, supporting small businesses, and prioritizing the development of affordable housing. We urge this Committee to move these critical elements forward.

Sincerely,
Nick Ferris, President

November 16, 2025
Via Email

President Rafael Mandelman and
Members of the Land Use and Transportation Committee
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Rafael Mandelman – *Rafael.Mandleman@sfgov.org*
Myrna Melgar, Chair - *Myrna.Melgar@sfgov.org*
Chyanne Chen, Vice-Chair - *Chyanne.Chen@sfgov.org*
Bilal Mahmood, Member - *Bilal.Mahmood@sfgov.org*

RE: Support for Chan and Chen Amendments to the Family Zoning Plan
Land Use and Transportation Committee Agenda Items 4-7, November 17, 2025

Dear President Mandelman, Chair Melgar, and Members of the Land Use and Transportation Committee,

The Telegraph Hill Dwellers (THD) continues to oppose the proposed Family Zoning Plan ("Upzoning Plan"), but we implore you to adopt the amendments offered by Supervisors Chan and Chen that will help to prevent the displacement of tenants and small businesses and provide a plan for development of the 100% affordable housing we so desperately need. We also continue to urge the Committee and Board of Supervisors to reverse the inclusion of Telegraph Hill, North Beach, and the Northern Waterfront in the Upzoning Plan, which was not contemplated in the 2022 Housing Element or Mayor Breed's zoning proposal.

President Mandelman, we urge you to please schedule a "Committee of the Whole" to consider all of the proposed amendments. We are concerned that the Land Use and Transportation Committee may consider tabling and killing the Chan and Chen amendments in committee. We hope not. But, if so, you will have abdicated your responsibility to the democratic process. The full Board of Supervisors deserves a chance to consider these amendments. And, the public deserves to know where each supervisor stands.

In any event, a vote to approve the Upzoning Plan is premature until you have full analysis and clarity on the implications of SB 79 for the Upzoning Plan, not just the 5-page fact-sheet summary prepared by the Planning Department.

If you move forward with this Upzoning Plan, please adopt the following amendments:

1. **Approve Supervisors Chan's and Chen's Proposed Amendments:**

   - **Exclude all historic resources**, including local historic districts and those eligible for the California and National Registers, from the Upzoning Plan (Chan File No. 251073).

   - **Exclude All Existing Residential Units, including all rent-controlled units** from the Upzoning Plan (Chan File No. 251073).

- **Remove the Planning Equity Geography Special Use District** ("PEG SUD") from the Upzoning Plan (Chen File No. 251071).
- **Remove the Coastal Zone** from the Upzoning Plan (Chan File No. 251071).
- **Remove Form-Based Density in the Base Zoning in All Districts** (Chan File No. 251073).
- **Adopt a Progress Requirement** for obtaining a building permit within a time certain of project approval – "*Use it or Lose It*" (Chan File No. 251073)
- **Require Inclusionary Affordable Housing Within ½ Mile** of the development (Chan File No. 251073).

2. Amend Supervisor Melgar's Legislation to Remove All Rent-Controlled Housing

We appreciate Supervisor Melgar's amendment removing rent-controlled housing with three or more units but urge her to expand this amendment to exclude ***all*** rent-controlled housing with two or more units, not just three or more.

3. Approve Supervisor Chan's Legacy Business Controls

THD joins with Small Business Forward to support Supervisor Chan's legislation to extend the requirement for a Conditional Use Authorization for sites where a Legacy Business has been displaced. In absence of having any other tools available or financial resources to support the successful relocation of a Legacy Business within the community, the Conditional Use is an imperfect but necessary mechanism to discourage displacement of Legacy Businesses in the first place. That is why Small Business Forward supports the extension of the CU legislation until other more effective protection measures are in place, such as commercial rent control, the right of return, and adequate relocation assistance.

4. Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District and Funding Strategy.

We join with REP-SF and the Council of Community Housing Organizations (CCHO) to demand that the SFMTA-SUD be revised to provide that these publicly owned parcels be developed for 100% affordable and social housing. Under San Francisco's state-approved Housing Element, as mandated by the state, 57% of the 36,200 new housing units proposed to be developed under the Upzoning Plan—more than 20,000 units—must be affordable to low- and very-low-income households. Yet the Upzoning Plan has no funding strategy or realistic plan to produce those affordable homes. It risks satisfying Sacramento's procedural checklist while abandoning the substance of the law: to build housing for the people who need it most.

5. **Remove North Beach, Telegraph Hill, and the Northern Waterfront from the Upzoning Plan.**

THD continues to strongly oppose the late inclusion in the Upzoning Plan of major portions of Telegraph Hill, North Beach, and the Northern Waterfront, areas that were not included in the 2022 Adopted Housing Element ("2022 Housing Element") or considered in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR). These areas represent one of the densest neighborhoods in San Francisco, with roughly 82% of our residents currently living in existing pre-1979 multi-family, rent-controlled buildings housing our City's workforce and seniors, including a large immigrant Asian population. Based on the City's profiles of neighborhoods in San Francisco, there are **37,156** people per square mile in North Beach as compared to **17,325** people per square mile in San Francisco.[1] The Planning Department's own data shows that rent-controlled buildings in District 3 (built before 1979 with 2+ units, excluding condos) represent approximately 32,340 individual units, 13,983 of which are located in the current version of the Upzoning Plan. **In other words, tenants occupying 13,983 units will be subject to potential eviction and displacement.**

And, although the 2022 Housing Element and EIR assumed that the Northeast Planning District would provide net new housing units of only *800 units* by 2050, the Upzoning Plan suddenly increased that figure to *5,900 units*, a stunning *650% increase*. This is a far greater percentage increase than any other area in the City. The height and density increases represented by this increase will significantly impact existing tenants, small businesses, historic resources, parks and open spaces, and the diverse culture of District 3.

* * * * * * * *

In conclusion, THD believes that the Upzoning Plan, as proposed, threatens tenants and small businesses, pits neighborhoods against each other, and disregards decades of community-based policymaking that has built San Francisco into a resilient, vibrant city through a network of strong neighborhoods.

The proposed amendments from Supervisors Chan and Chen address these concerns by focusing on protecting tenants and rent-controlled housing citywide, supporting small businesses, and prioritizing the development of affordable housing. We urge this Committee to move these critical elements forward.

Sincerely,

Nick Ferris, President

ccs: Supervisor Connie Chan – *connie.chan@sfgov.org*
Clerk John Carroll - *John.Carroll@sfgov.org*
Members, San Francisco Board of Supervisors - *Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org*

[1] https://www.city-data.com/neighborhood/North-Beach-San-Francisco-CA.html

From:	Neighborhoods United SF
To:	MelgarStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; ChenStaff
Cc:	Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Segal, Ned (MYR); Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC); Tanner, Rachael (CPC); Switzky, Joshua (CPC); Chen, Lisa (CPC); So, Lydia (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Braun, Derek (CPC); Campbell, Amy (CPC); Imperial, Theresa (CPC); Mcgarry, Sean (CPC); Williams, Gilbert A (CPC); Ionin, Jonas (CPC); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); FielderStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS); Neighborhoods United - SF
Subject:	Support for Chan and Chen Amendments; Request for Pause, and HCD Oversight on Family Zoning Plan [Board File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966, "Family Zoning Plan"]
Date:	Saturday, November 15, 2025 10:03:21 AM
Attachments:	NUSF Letter to LUT_ Support for Chan and Chen Amendments and Request for Pause and HCD Oversight on the Family Zoning Plan.pdf

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

Dear Chairperson and Members of the LUT Committee,

On behalf of Neighborhoods United SF, we respectfully urge the Land Use and Transportation (LUT) Committee to take the following actions regarding Mayor Lurie's proposed Family Zoning Plan:

1. **Adopt the amendments** introduced by Supervisors Connie Chan and Chyanne Chen.
2. **Place a pause** on the process given the extraordinary and unsettled circumstances in District 4.
3. **Recommend a "Committee of the Whole"** session before forwarding this legislation to the full Board of Supervisors.
4. **Request an extension** from the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) to allow for full review, transparency, and participation.
5. **Require HCD leadership to attend** Land Use and Transportation hearings, the Committee of the Whole, and full Board meetings to provide clear, direct answers on state compliance criteria and housing capacity calculations.

Below is further context for each request:

1. Adopt the Chan and Chen Amendments
These amendments take essential steps to protect sound housing, historic resources, and

our shoreline, while helping ensure that new development truly serves working families and essential workers.

2. Pause the Process in Light of District 4 Circumstances
Given the extraordinary and unsettled conditions in District 4, including the lack of representation and multiple unresolved planning and mapping inconsistencies, it is imperative that the City pause the process. Proceeding without full district representation would be premature and would further erode public confidence in the City's planning process.

3. Convene a Committee of the Whole Session
We urge the LUT Committee to recommend a 'Committee of the Whole' session before the legislation advances to the full Board. This will allow all Supervisors to hear public testimony, fully deliberate the proposal, and give time for Mayor Lurie to appoint a new District 4 Supervisor, ensuring every district has representation before a citywide rezoning plan of this scale moves forward.

4. Request an Extension from HCD
We further request that the City seek an extension from the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) to allow adequate time for proper environmental review, public engagement, and a full evaluation of the proposed amendments' impacts on existing neighborhoods and housing capacity calculations. Transparency and thorough review should take precedence over arbitrary timelines.

5. Require HCD's Direct Participation
As you deliberate on the City's Family Zoning Plan and its relationship to the certified Housing Element, HCD leadership should be required to attend LUT hearings, Committee of the Whole, and the full Board meeting. Their participation is critical so that Supervisors and the public can receive direct, transparent answers on how housing capacity is being calculated, how compliance with state mandates is determined, and how proposed amendments will affect San Francisco's standing with the State.

While we support more housing through thoughtful, responsible planning, Neighborhoods United SF is firmly opposed to the Family Zoning Plan in its current form. The proposal goes far beyond what was envisioned in the certified Housing Element and would irreversibly reshape our city without delivering the affordability or equity it promises.

San Franciscans deserve clarity, accountability, and responsible planning, not conflicting interpretations of state requirements or exaggerated capacity figures that could reshape our city for generations.

Thank you for your leadership and commitment to transparent decision-making on behalf of the residents of San Francisco.

Sincerely,
Lori Brooke
Co-Founder, Neighborhoods United SF
neighborhoodsunitedsf.org

cc:
Mayor Daniel Lurie
Ned Segal, Chief of Housing and Economic Development
SF Planning Commission
SF Board of Supervisors
Sarah Dennis Phillips, Director, Planning Department
Rachael Tanner, Director of Citywide Planning, Planning Department
Joshua Switzky, Deputy Director of Citywide Policy, Planning Department
Lisa Chen, Principal Planner, Planning Department

Neighborhoods United SF Partner Organizations:

Aquatic Park Neighbors
Barbary Coast Neighborhood Association
Catalysts for Local Control
Cathedral Hill Neighborhood Association
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Cole Valley Improvement Association
Corbett Heights Neighbors
Cow Hollow Association
Cow Hollow-Marina Neighbors and Merchants
D2 United
D4ward
Diamond Heights Community Association
Dolores Heights Improvement Club
East Mission Improvement Association
Excelsior District Improvement Association
Forest Hill Association
Francisco Park Conservancy
Geary Boulevard Merchants and Property Owners Association
Golden Gate Heights Neighborhood Association
Golden Gate Valley Neighborhood Association
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council
Ingleside Terrace Homeowners Assoc
Jordan Park Improvement Association
Lakeside Property Owners Association
La Playa Park Coalition
La Playa Village

Laurel Heights Neighborhood Association
Lombard Hill Improvement Association
Marina - Cow Hollow Neighbors and Merchants
Marina Community Association
Mid-Sunset Neighborhood Association
Midtown Terrace Homeowners Association
Miraloma Park Improvement Club
Mission Dolores Neighborhood Association
Noe Valley Council
North Beach Tenants Committee
Oceanview/Merced Heights/Ingleside - Neighbors in Action
Our Neighborhood Voices
Pacific Avenue Neighborhood Association
Parkmerced Action Coalition
Planning Association for the Richmond
Rincon Point Neighborhood Association
Russian Hill Community Association
Russian Hill Improvement Association
San Francisco Land Use Coalition
San Francisco Tenants Union
Save Our Amazing Richmond
Save Our Neighborhoods SF
Sensible D7
St. Francis Homes Association
Small Business Forward
Sunset Heights Association of Responsible People
Sunset-Parkside Education & Action Committee
Sunset United Neighbors
Telegraph Hill Dwellers
University Terrace Association
Waterfront Action Committee
Westwood Park Association

November 15, 2025

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

Re: Support for Chan and Chen Amendments and Request for Pause and HCD Oversight on the Family Zoning Plan

Land Use and Transportation Committee Agenda Items 4-7, November 17, 2025, Board File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966, "Family Zoning Plan"

Dear Chairperson and Members of the Committee,

On behalf of Neighborhoods United SF, we respectfully urge the Land Use and Transportation (LUT) Committee to take the following actions regarding Mayor Lurie's proposed Family Zoning Plan:

1. **Adopt the amendments** introduced by Supervisors Connie Chan and Chyanne Chen.
2. **Place a pause** on the process given the extraordinary and unsettled circumstances in District 4.
3. **Recommend a "Committee of the Whole"** session before forwarding this legislation to the full Board of Supervisors.
4. **Request an extension** from the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) to allow for full review, transparency, and participation.
5. **Require HCD leadership to attend** Land Use and Transportation hearings, the Committee of the Whole, and full Board meetings to provide clear, direct answers on state compliance criteria and housing capacity calculations.

Below is further context for each request:

1. Adopt the Chan and Chen Amendments
These amendments take essential steps to protect sound housing, historic resources, and our shoreline, while helping ensure that new development truly serves working families and essential workers, not luxury developers.

2. Pause the Process in Light of District 4 Circumstances
Given the extraordinary and unsettled conditions in District 4, including the lack of representation and multiple unresolved planning and mapping inconsistencies, it is imperative that the City pause the process. Proceeding without full district representation would be premature and would further erode public confidence in the City's planning process.

3. Convene a Committee of the Whole Session
We urge the LUT Committee to recommend a 'Committee of the Whole' session before the legislation advances to the full Board. This will allow all Supervisors to hear public testimony, fully deliberate the proposal, and give time for Mayor Lurie to appoint a new District 4 Supervisor, ensuring every district has representation before a citywide rezoning plan of this scale moves forward.

4. Request an Extension from HCD
We further request that the City seek an extension from the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) to allow adequate time for proper environmental review, public engagement, and a full evaluation of the proposed amendments' impacts on existing neighborhoods and housing capacity calculations. Transparency and thorough review should take precedence over arbitrary timelines.

5. Require HCD's Direct Participation
As you deliberate on the City's Family Zoning Plan and its relationship to the certified Housing Element, HCD leadership should be required to attend LUT hearings, Committee of the Whole, and the full Board meeting. Their participation is critical so that Supervisors and the public can receive direct, transparent answers on how housing capacity is being calculated, how compliance with state mandates is determined, and how proposed amendments will affect San Francisco's standing with the State.

While we support more housing through thoughtful, responsible planning, Neighborhoods United SF is firmly opposed to the Family Zoning Plan in its current form. The proposal goes far beyond what was envisioned in the certified Housing Element and would irreversibly reshape our city without delivering the affordability or equity it promises.

San Franciscans deserve clarity, accountability, and responsible planning, not conflicting interpretations of state requirements or exaggerated capacity figures that could reshape our city for generations.

Thank you for your leadership and commitment to transparent decision-making on behalf of the residents of San Francisco.

Sincerely,
Lori Brooke
Co-Founder, Neighborhoods United SF
neighborhoodsunitedsf.org

cc:
Mayor Daniel Lurie
Ned Segal, Chief of Housing and Economic Development
SF Planning Commission
SF Board of Supervisors
Jonas P. Ionin, Commission Secretary, Planning Department

Sarah Dennis Phillips, Director, Planning Department
Rachael Tanner, Director of Citywide Planning, Planning Department
Joshua Switzky, Deputy Director of Citywide Policy, Planning Department
Lisa Chen, Principal Planner, Planning Department

Neighborhoods United SF Partner Organizations:
Aquatic Park Neighbors
Barbary Coast Neighborhood Association
Catalysts for Local Control
Cathedral Hill Neighborhood Association
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Cole Valley Improvement Association
Corbett Heights Neighbors
Cow Hollow Association
Cow Hollow-Marina Neighbors and Merchants
D2 United
D4ward
Diamond Heights Community Association
Dolores Heights Improvement Club
East Mission Improvement Association
Excelsior District Improvement Association
Forest Hill Association
Francisco Park Conservancy
Geary Boulevard Merchants and Property Owners Association
Golden Gate Heights Neighborhood Association
Golden Gate Valley Neighborhood Association
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council
Ingleside Terrace Homeowners Assoc
Jordan Park Improvement Association
Lakeside Property Owners Association
La Playa Park Coalition
La Playa Village
Laurel Heights Neighborhood Association
Lombard Hill Improvement Association
Marina - Cow Hollow Neighbors and Merchants
Marina Community Association
Mid-Sunset Neighborhood Association
Midtown Terrace Homeowners Association
Miraloma Park Improvement Club
Mission Dolores Neighborhood Association
Noe Valley Council
North Beach Tenants Committee
Oceanview/Merced Heights/Ingleside - Neighbors in Action

Our Neighborhood Voices
Pacific Avenue Neighborhood Association
Parkmerced Action Coalition
Planning Association for the Richmond
Rincon Point Neighborhood Association
Russian Hill Community Association
Russian Hill Improvement Association
San Francisco Land Use Coalition
San Francisco Tenants Union
Save Our Amazing Richmond
Save Our Neighborhoods SF
Sensible D7
St. Francis Homes Association
Small Business Forward
Sunset Heights Association of Responsible People
Sunset-Parkside Education & Action Committee
Sunset United Neighbors
Telegraph Hill Dwellers
University Terrace Association
Waterfront Action Committee
Westwood Park Association

From: molliespack@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Leslie Wong
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Friday, November 14, 2025 9:58:16 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am a resident of Distsrict 1 and support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers. The upzoning of areas like my district would be adversely affected by the proposed upzoning. Building up would ruin the community and unique character of our neighborhoods as well as straining the resources and infrastructure. There are other, more effective ways to provide more housing without destroying our neighborhoods.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Sincerely,
Leslie Wong
San Francisco, CA 94121

From:	troymcmahan22@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Troy McMahan
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Friday, November 14, 2025 8:28:21 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Troy McMahan
San Francisco, CA 94115

From: sf.lorna@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lorna Walker
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Friday, November 14, 2025 8:27:19 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments: I live on Bush Street and I'm not sure why your carved out my block as one of the few to be upsized. That is discrimination and clearly because we are in the poor part of District 2. It's. It fair to target the poor and protect the rich neighborhoods of Pacific Heights.

Sincerely,
Lorna Walker
San Francisco, CA 94115

From: Melissa Hernandez
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, November 14, 2025 8:05:10 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I write this as someone who lives in two-unit rent controlled housing! My neighbors and I don't want to be displaced. We live living in SF and in our neighborhood.

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the

private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Melissa

Melissa Hernandez
mghernandez117@gmail.com
256 Brighton Ave
San Francisco, California 94112

From: Kristi Dowler
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, November 14, 2025 7:59:37 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Kristi Dowler
kristdowler@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94123

From: Bunny McFadden
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, November 14, 2025 7:50:14 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Bunny McFadden
residue.wooden0h@icloud.com

San Francisco, California 94102

From: Myra Krieger
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: The Up Zoning in Russian Hill Alleys - Pls. Vote NO
Date: Friday, November 14, 2025 5:56:06 PM

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

Please Retain the 40 Foot

Height Limit on our ALLEYS.

If you allow Six Stories, then Prohibit On Street Parking for new Alley construction .

--
Myra Krieger, Staff Reporter
San Francisco Senior Beat
kriegermyra@gmail.com
415-776-7857

From: peter.yedidia@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Peter Yedidia
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Friday, November 14, 2025 5:42:49 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm proud to have lived in San Francisco for 50 years, presently in District 3, zip 94133. I dearly love our city and am passionate about the need for more affordable housing. Unfortunately, as written, the Mayor's "Family" upzoning plan will not make housing more affordable and will irreparably harm our name treasured neighborhoods.

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco’s historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

Finally, remove North Beach and Fisherman's Wharf from the upzoning map. They were not in the Housing Element and were surprisingly added at the last minute without consultation with neighborhood groups.

Respectfully, San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Sincerely,
Peter Yedidia
San Francisco, CA 94133

From:	manduin@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Morgan Weiss
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Friday, November 14, 2025 5:34:49 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

These changes are not yet well vetted, or if they are, then residents don't know enough about it. Understanding that there are some state level requirements, I am sure that with all the bureaucracy in our world there is room for a petition to the governor to limit, or at least delay, requirements until they are fully justified. These expensive projects do not demonstrably close the affordable housing gap. That cost is not just in money, but it is also in irreplaceable space, which, once made available to developers, will be virtually impossible to restore.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Morgan Weiss
San Francisco, CA 94110

From: Leah Higgins
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, November 14, 2025 5:33:45 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Leah Higgins
leaheloise@yahoo.com
524 Haight Street
San Francisco, 94117

From: Sachiel Rosen
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, November 14, 2025 5:33:07 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Sachiel Rosen
bagghead1@gmail.com
670 34TH AVE
San Francisco, California 94121

From: Samantha Malpiedi
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, November 14, 2025 5:00:32 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent in District 8, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Samantha Malpiedi
samantha.malpiedi@gmail.com
952 Guerrero Street
San Francisco, California 94110

From: kittym@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kitty Margolis
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Friday, November 14, 2025 4:57:01 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a North Beach lifer who has been both a renter and a property owner, I support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

I also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions. We do not deserve to have thoughtless "non-plans" rammed down our throats.

North Beach, a historically important community that was added in at the very last minute, shouldn't even be part of this upzoning conversation. There was no opportunity for community input. Please slow down!

Sincerely,
Kitty Margolis
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: Madison Steinke
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, November 14, 2025 4:55:30 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am begging you to please support Connie Chan's amendment and protect our beautiful city and its wonderful residents.
The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more

than ever!

Sincerely,

Madison Steinke
madisteinke@gmail.com
1251 24TH AVE
San Francisco, California 94122

From: Talia Banarie
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, November 14, 2025 4:10:10 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Talia Banarie
tbanarie@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94110

From:	bridget.maley@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Bridget Maley
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Friday, November 14, 2025 3:46:17 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Bridget Maley
San Francisco, CA 94123

From:	nuptial.51.boxes@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of stephanie de maria
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Friday, November 14, 2025 3:42:05 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco’s historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:

North Beach and Fisherman's wharf are SF Historical neighborhoods and have had that designation for years, in addition North Beach is the densest neighbor in San Francisco and home to many San Franciscans on rent control. Please support Supervisor Chan's ammendment and insist on HCD participation.

Sincerely,
stephanie de maria
San Francisco, CA 94133

From:	mark_keleher@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mark Keleher
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Friday, November 14, 2025 3:32:03 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Mark Keleher
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: juliedearborn@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Julie Dearborn
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Friday, November 14, 2025 12:59:02 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco’s historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:

I am a retired teachers living in a rent controlled apartment in the Richmond District. If I lose this apartment, I will not be able to afford another at market rate prices. Please support the Chan and Chen amendments. A plan to create housing should not displace people who have housing. I agree that some form of upzoning needs to happen, but it shouldn't threaten the homes of long term residents.

Sincerely,
Julie Dearborn
San Francisco, CA 94121

From:	editorial@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Harry Pariser
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Friday, November 14, 2025 12:10:18 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Please support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

Without an amendment prohibiting demolition of ALL rent controlled housing, many tenants and small businesses will be dislocated, neighborhood character all over SF will decline, but no truly affordable housing will be constructed!

Support the Chan and Chen amendments

Sincerely,
Harry Pariser
San Francisco, CA 94122

From:	gb_andrews@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Gandhia Andrews
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Friday, November 14, 2025 11:26:59 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Don't let this city be run over by a Weiner who is only trying to be another useless career politician. We have self governance laws that allow the city to regulate itself and not be bullied by the state or a Weiner.

Sincerely,
Gandhia Andrews
San Francisco, CA 94132

From: amy7w2m@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Amy Meyer
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Friday, November 14, 2025 11:26:00 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I live in Lincoln Manor on Clement Street. It is a planned development more than 100 years old. Like several families living here, I have a member of my extended family living with me. I am 92 years old and it makes my living here secure and happy. Otherwise I would have to go into a nursing home. It gives my young family member a place to live while she develops her career.

This neighborhood helped to get the Golden Gate National Recreation Area, a campaign in which I was a leader. It starts a few blocks from here. Neighbors did everything from testifying at hearings to typing the required letters to contributing funds for the campaign.

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco’s historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Sincerely,
Amy Meyer
San Francisco, CA 94121

From:	marymmoc@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mary OConnell
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Friday, November 14, 2025 10:50:18 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Everyone knows the city needs more housing, but this just gives developers over the top concessions. This can be done in a much more thoughtful manner. I hear calls from lots of people in the city, including the entertainment commission, calling for looser regulations so that San Francisco can be a world-class city, like New York. The thing that makes San Francisco so very special is that it's a livable city. Don't screw it up now

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco’s historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Mary OConnell
San Francisco, CA 94123

From:	jvmahoney67@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Mahoney
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Friday, November 14, 2025 9:05:26 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
John Mahoney
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: theharveysofsf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Thomas Harvey
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Friday, November 14, 2025 8:52:15 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments: I have written before with no changes; East of 15th avenue and Taraval are no buses or streetcars, however, the 65' proposed new height limits include three blocks East to Forest Side avenue.
The block between Funston Avenue and Forest Side Avenue should definitely not be included as it is well over 500' from MUNI.
Please respond.
My other comment is along 15th avenue from Ulloa to Taraval will completely block views for those East of 15th avenue looking West. The beautiful sunsets and seeing the ocean including Fort Funston will be gone.
With no additional infrastructure, all utilities and roads will make this area non-livable and unsafe, not where someone wants to raise a family.

Sincerely,
Thomas Harvey
San Francisco, CA 94116

From:	cjverb1@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Carol Verburg
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Friday, November 14, 2025 8:35:52 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Greetings from a San Francisco resident who first moved here in 1971 and has lived in the Sunset, Pacific Heights, and Russian Hill before settling in North Beach 29 years ago.

I have learned a great deal about the now very-much-outdated State Housing Mandate at neighborhood meetings around the City, and have continued to attend hearings at City Hall despite the conspicuous disappearance of the Land Use & Transportation members during public comment, because the absurd upzoning proposals being rammed down our throats by the Wiener-Lurie-Sauter group and their profiteering backers threaten to destroy the very assets that make SF so popular with the tech-bro crowd seeking new high-end housing, at the expense of the 700,000-plus residents who currently live and work here and love this City as it is.

This is to urge you to:

1. Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

2. Demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

3. In making decisions that will change San Francisco forever, base them on what kind of city works best for its residents, not on pandering or potential personal gain.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Sincerely,
Carol Verburg
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: litagent@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Cherie Fehrman
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Friday, November 14, 2025 7:32:53 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:
Protect the unique nature of our residential neighborhoods without rushing into changes that will forever alter San Francisco. Listen to what the people want. Let's not destroy historic structures for concrete and glass towers of questionable architectural value. More affordable housing may be needed but let's not throw out the baby with the bath water. In the past, many unfortunate changes were made which could have been avoided with a little more thought. Let's not make affordable housing forever change the character of our neighborhoods.

Sincerely,
Cherie Fehrman
San Francisco, CA 94118

From: mdarnton@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Margaret Blodgett
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Friday, November 14, 2025 2:14:03 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:

I live in a in clutch of historic homes called Lincoln Manor spanning a few blocks in the far Outer Richmond between Clement and Geary, 36th-38th Avenues. We host annual block parties and our children zip between the little grid our houses form, sometimes in bare feet, sometimes wobbling on their bikes. It's quiet and clean and safe enough for them to explore their independence as they learn to navigate the city. The stretch of Clement on the north end of our neighborhood is a dedicated bike lane and runs along a green corridor that used to be a Chinese cemetery, now a public golf course that occasionally chucks balls into our back yards. My children collect them and trade the brightly colored ones, which are by far the most coveted. We've set up lemonade stands at the golf course where my son and his best friend, who lives ten houses away within Lincoln Manor, sell used balls for 50 cents and Arnold Palmers - they donate the proceeds to charity and we reward them for their community service with Legos and Rice Crispy treats the size of their fists from Anne at the Garden House Cafe just down the block. We know our neighbors and throw their newspapers a little closer to their front doors, let their dogs out when they're stuck at work, water their plants when they travel... in other words, we've carved out a little slice of sweet, settled, civic life in this bustling, often anonymous and transient city. I cannot imagine how this will change once single family homes are boxed out by multi unit buildings and our little streets are choked with cars. Our backyards won't get sunlight, our children won't know their neighbors, and they won't feel safe practicing biking or dog walking amid the congestion and chaos. This city has many vacant apartments and homes and businesses. There are ample corridors suited for greater development untapped and unrealized - why alter the character and charm of some of San Francisco's little pocket communities just to meet some arbitrary development quota? This is the sort of action that forces young families, especially those that have a tenuous but faithful toehold, out of the city. We are voters and tax payers and community builders. We made the choice to live in this far flung, sleepy corner of the city and we beseech you to respect its integrity and character. Please don't box us out of a life we love.

Sincerely,
Margaret Blodgett
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: emailamr@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Ann Rubin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Friday, November 14, 2025 1:15:16 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments: We are going to look back on this as another era of Urban Renewal. We need to do better.

Sincerely,
Ann Rubin
Los Angeles, CA 90048

From: marycmcf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mary McFadden
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Friday, November 14, 2025 12:00:19 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

We cannot build our way out of an affordability crisis created by wealth disparity. Those who work for wages, who need mortgages to buy homes, cannot compete with billionaires who view property as houses as investment portfolios. Upzoning does not lower home prices, it raises them because the land value increases proportionately to the investment.

If a home is worth $1m, when that space is rezoned for 8 units (each worth $1m), that land, not eh home, becomes worth more than $8m. The highest bidder gets the land. Those who want homes are thrown out of the equation, thrown out of the city.

We who built this place, who made San Francisco are now being told to get out, to sell to the richest of the rich. As public servants, your job is to serve residents, not cowtow to international investment groups.

Sincerely,
Mary McFadden
San Francisco, CA 94115

From: molliespack@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Leslie Wong
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 9:40:33 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am a resident of District Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Leslie Wong
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: l_bluestone@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Louise Bluestone
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 9:22:33 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Louise Bluestone
San Francisco, CA 94115

From: vozalegre@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of L. Diaz
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 9:21:21 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
L. Diaz
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: dede.estey@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Deidre Estey
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 9:00:23 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments: I live in the Richmond ,near Fulton street alongside the Park.Huge high rises and tower aptments full of small 1 bedrooms will cause the whole area to change with little parking,already full buses during rush hours with a lot of standing already. The problem of destruction to glorious Edwardian homes alongside the park will will horrible! I chose the Richmond for a quiet,residential neighborhood,full of families, and good schools. The beauty of the natural environment will be forever changed and needs,Affordable family accommodations, not million dollar high rises ruining the sun/shade ratio along our streets.

Sincerely,
Deidre Estey
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: tevisajones@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Tevis Jones
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 7:33:36 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

PLEASE support the Chan and Chen amendments to PROTECT existing housing, PRESERVE San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of WORKING FAMILIES, NOT the wealthy citizens who have their hands in the $$pockets of Big Real Estate and always seem to win against the humble residents of San Francisco.

HCD leadership must appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how their housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance and benefit ALL residents of San Francisco, not just the wealthy scions who protect their wealth via real estate. The City of San Francisco (NOW SPONSORED BY PREDATORS) is using inaccurate data to force the working families of San Francisco's Westside to bend the knee to wealthy real estate political actors. HCD must justify their (faulty) numbers or the City will face a middle-class revolt against the wealthy San Francisco political class. (Take note, the hapless NON-Sunset millionaires who squandered big bucks to back Engardio.) This is a struggle for justice between San Francisco's middle class and the ruling oligarchy class of San Francisco for the true spirit of our city, and we're focused on activating justice for EVERYONE in this city, something that has been missing from San Francisco for a long time as it's sunk into cronyism and oligarchy.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions. DO NOT DESTROY THE REMAINING MIDDLE-CLASS OF SAN FRANCISCO IN THE WESTERN NEIGHBORHOODS!

Additional comments: I've lived in the Sunset for 30 years, and we've already been subjected to outsize housing with no onsite parking on a toxic site that San Francisco refused to deal with properly, plus City government threats of more community destruction. I do not trust San Francisco city government - it has become a creature of the bicycle coalition and the wealthy residents who are as undemocratic as the BOS in their attempts to manipulate middle class neighborhoods. San Francisco is completely disrespectful of the Sunset & the Richmond (is it due to our lack of wealth and/or your racism??)
**Thank you so much to Supervisors Connie Chan & Chyanne Chen, who respect & value San Francisco's diverse middle class and who refuse to bend the knee to the wealth-powered citizens of San Francisco & beyond (including the bicycle coalition & almost all elements of city government including sfrecpark) that are corruptly partnering with real estate magnates & wealthy parties to destroy the Western Neighborhoods where the remaining SF middle class resides. THIS is what the proliferation of aggressive coercive forcible housing actions (using maga tactics to bludgeon the middle class on the Westside) will create: the destruction of the middle class in San Francisco's Western Neighborhoods, and then the city that once stood on an alabaster hilll will lose sadly but justly its heart.

Sincerely,
Tevis Jones
San Francisco, CA 94122

From:	r9dennis@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Dennis Shiraki
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Thursday, November 13, 2025 6:50:25 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Dennis Shiraki
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: susanmackowski@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Susan Mackowski
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 6:34:05 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Susan Mackowski
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: em-s@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Emi Miyoshi-Shiraki
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 6:32:10 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Emi Miyoshi-Shiraki
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: jmmackowski@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Matthew Mackowski
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 6:09:59 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

For decades San Francisco has withstood attempts by developers to ruin the character of its neighborhoods in the pursuit of profit. Why now are you sacrificing the essence of what makes San Francisco unique? You can achieve more functional housing by working within existing zoning but removing regulation and delay that makes construction unnecessarily expensive.

I call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
John Matthew Mackowski
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: homeagain@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Michael Mazgai
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 6:09:24 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Michael Mazgai
San Francisco, CA 94117

From: jmmackowski@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Matthew Mackowski
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 5:52:34 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco’s historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

The upzoning plan as presented will destroy the character of San Francisco's north waterfront surrounding Telegraph Hill, North Beach and Russian Hill. It is a giveaway to developers at the expense of residents who pay the taxes that support city government.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Sincerely,
John Matthew Mackowski
San Francisco, CA 94133

From:	ferrante.lynn@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lynn Ferrante
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Thursday, November 13, 2025 5:44:13 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments: I am strongly opposed to making the Van Ness corridor into a Miami like setting with huge high rises. . This zoning is way too high and will ruin neighborhoods adjacent. Spread out in other areas instead of putting the majority of the burden on Van ness please.

Sincerely,
Lynn Ferrante
San Francisco, CA 94109

From:	kielygomes@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Karen Schwartz
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Thursday, November 13, 2025 5:39:11 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Karen Schwartz
San Francisco, CA 94114

From:	bdethiers@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Bernard Dethiers
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Thursday, November 13, 2025 5:30:54 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a long term North Beach resident, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Bernard Dethiers
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: natashjadewolf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Natashja Dewolfe
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 5:11:39 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I have lived in the Inner Sunset for 45 years, and in San Francisco for 54 years. I think this is a very wrong headed plan. Why not start with building by retrofitting the empty buildings downtown first? And start with empty spaces first?? I am really afraid I won't recognize not just my neighborhood, but my City!!

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments: Please rethink this. We need to prioritize rent controlled buildings and long term tenants!

Sincerely,
Natashja Dewolfe
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: Mikalis.Faklys@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Michael Faklis
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 4:59:58 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Michael Faklis
San Francisco, CA 94111

From: lehr.david@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Dave Lehr
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 4:40:31 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Please demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Thank you!

Sincerely,
Dave Lehr
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: vandana1@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Vandana Di Scala
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 4:39:03 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Sincerely,
Vandana Di Scala
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: shoshod5623@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of shoshanah dobry
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 4:29:49 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Dear Mayor Lurie, Board of Supervisors & the Planning Comission:

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

This plan doesn't seem to have any basis in the needs of the whole population of San Francisco. Once we have common sense planned buildings completed to meet the current needs of San Francisco then, we as a city, can look toward other building that might look toward the future and what the population might look like. We don't want to end up as a city like those around Lake Tahoe or others in Silicon Valley that don't have the housing to support all of the different "classes" of people needed to keep the city alive and thriving.

Thank you for reading my thoughts.

Sincerely,
shoshanah dobry
San Francisco, CA 94124

From:	ferrante.lynn@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lynn Ferrante
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Thursday, November 13, 2025 4:28:22 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps.
- Reconsider the proposed height of buildings along Van Ness. I am especially concerned that this plan will result in YEARS of destruction and construction in the Van Ness corridor already having had construction destroy businesses for the new bus lane. There are neighborhoods adjacent to the Van Ness corridor that will be destroyed by the excessive height of the buildings along Van Ness and stretching up the adjacent streets
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised

Sincerely,
Lynn Ferrante
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: scoopfoggy@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Shirley Fogarino
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 4:16:57 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Shirley Fogarino
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: dj@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Diane Josephs
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 4:15:15 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

I am concerned in general that upzoning is inequitable. The western Russian Hill Neighbors, will be drastically impacted and were never informed by planningn and still are unaware. it is no surprise that this occurred as this may be related to the fact that the extreme zoning has been dumped on our area. On 11/3 I submitted some of the names, addresses, phone numbers or emails to no avail.

Sincerely,
Diane Josephs
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: ThomasWeed@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Thomas Weed
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 4:03:17 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Thomas Weed

From: sfamc2@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Arnold Cohn
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 3:59:14 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

How would you feel if an eight story apartment building became your next door neighbor?

Protect existing San Francisco housing.

Sincerely,
Arnold Cohn

From: pattired12@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Patti McMahon
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 3:56:57 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:
Bringing more housing into the downtown San Francisco area is more realistic. High rise buildings
Are here and people living in the area are needed to make it more like New York City .

Sincerely,
Patti McMahon
San Francisco, CA 94121

From:	tessa_oleary@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of tessa oleary
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Thursday, November 13, 2025 3:56:29 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
tessa oleary
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: audreycrls@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Audrey Carlson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 3:54:51 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance. I am extremely concerned that our State Senator Scott Weiner will continue to layer additional bonus floors to what SF Planning says will be the highest building heights.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Audrey Carlson
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: ratt57@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Doug McKirahan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 3:54:36 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Doug McKirahan
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: timepuzzle@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Robert Smith
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 3:52:05 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
John Robert Smith
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: noguera@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Hatun Noguera
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 3:50:29 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Hatun Noguera
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: john33sf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Nulty
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 3:48:14 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Sincerely,
John Nulty
San Francisco, CA 94142

From: don.ayers@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Don Ayers
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 3:47:12 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Please support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Sincerely,
Don Ayers

From: kcdegnan@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of KC Degnan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Saturday, November 15, 2025 9:47:35 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Dear Mayor Lurie and San Francisco Supervisors:

There is a heart-breaking exhibit at the Museum of San Francisco (Commercial Street) about the "urban renewal" project that destroyed the Western Addition and Japantown in the 1960s in the name of "progress." Please, please do not make the same irreparable mistake again with a misguided (however well intentioned) "up zoning" plan that is not transparent or well thought-through. What has been proposed will not address the housing issue allegedly at stake. Listen to your constituents who will be impacted by this ill-conceived plan.

I urge you to support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

There are real and serious questions about this process. For this to be truly transparent, HCD leadership must appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance. It would be very helpful to explain other options that were considered and why they were rejected so citizens can better understand the proposed "strategy."

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions. Visit the exhibit at the Museum of San Francisco before you go down in history as making the same devastating mistake.

Sincerely,
KC Degnan
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: ckar101@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kim Russo
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Saturday, November 15, 2025 8:26:08 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Kim Russo
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: connie.rubiano@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Constance Rubiano
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 7:18:28 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I have lived in SF for 47 years. Please amend this proposal to include affordable housing for people who are not in the 1%.

We do need MORE HOUSING IN SF. BUT for whom? This upzoning SHOULD NOT INCLUDE DEMOLISHING EXISTING HOUSING, ESPECIALLY THAT WHICH IS NOW RENT-CONTROLLED.

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Sincerely,
Constance Rubiano
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: norkydeg@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Norman Degelman
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 4:49:04 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): The private sector will not solve the housing problem. They are more concerned with making a profit. They are not concerned with providing affordable housing for people.

Sincerely,
Norman Degelman
San Francisco, CA 94117

From: kathygee606@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kathleen Gee
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Sunday, November 16, 2025 9:46:42 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments: I was born and have lived in San Francisco for over 70 years, the majority in the Richmond district. I understand the desire for growth. The current proposal greatly increases height limits on every other block in the Richmond - Supposedly where the muni lines are. However, the 31 Balboa was eliminated for several years and the 2 Clement still has not returned. Will all bus lines be guaranteed ?
We do not need to give carte blanc to luxury developers, to build mostly tiny studios & one br apts while building heights that greatly impact the sunshine/light and create wind tunnels in the neighborhood. We should ensure our wondrous and unique vistas and neighborhoods. We should not be eliminating parking requirements to simply create more units for the developers. Elderly and citizens with disabilities need to be able to drive and park. Three blocks to a muni stop is too much of a barrier for many to maintain their independence for shopping and other ADL.
Any legislation needs to ensure that San Francisco retains its personality and is actually livable and not just a labyrinth of tiny overcrowded rabbit hutches

Sincerely,
Kathleen Gee
San Francisco, CA 94118

From: epaulshi@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Yang Deng
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Sunday, November 16, 2025 9:08:50 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to you in support of the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco’s historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

I demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Sincerely,
Yang Deng
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: leishi92@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lei Shi
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Sunday, November 16, 2025 9:07:48 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

I demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Sincerely,
Lei Shi
San Francisco, CA 94116

From:	Cici Lee
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	Sauter, Danny (BOS); SauterStaff; commission.secretary@sfgov.org
Subject:	Heigh Limit
Date:	Sunday, November 16, 2025 8:26:21 PM

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

Dear City Leaders;

Please retain the 40 foot height limit on our little streets. Raising the limit will turn our little alley into a dark and slot canyons that not one wants to live in.

Thanks,
Cici Lee
1332 Pacific Ave, San Francisco, CA 94109

From:	Cici Lee
To:	commission.secretary@sfgov.org; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS)
Subject:	height Limit
Date:	Sunday, November 16, 2025 8:17:40 PM

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

Dear City Leaders;

Please retain the 40 foot height limit on our little streets. Raising the limit will turn our little alley into a dark and slot canyons that not one wants to live in.

Thanks,
Cici Lee
1332 Pacific Ave, San Francisco, CA 94109

From:	Kathy Howard
To:	ChanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); MahmoodStaff; MandelmanStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); SherrilStaff@sfgov.org; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Lurie, Daniel (MYR)
Cc:	Mcgarry, Sean (CPC); Campbell, Amy (CPC); Imperial, Theresa (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Braun, Derek (CPC); So, Lydia (CPC); Williams, Gilbert A (CPC); Ionin, Jonas (CPC)
Subject:	BOS LUTC Family Zoning Plan items - Nov. 17, 2025
Date:	Sunday, November 16, 2025 7:11:06 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

The entire City voted on District 4's Great Highway, but once again **District 4**, through no fault of our own, **has NO voice in the upzoning legislation**. This is despite the fact that the upzoning legislation could result in bulldozing our entire neighborhood.

This is **upzoning without representation.** You should postpone this vote until the mayor acts on appointing a replacement. *We are tired of being ignored*.

I urge you to form a Committee of the Whole, including our new Supervisor, to allow all of the Supervisors to hear public testimony and fully deliberate the upzoning proposal. Our new Supervisor should also first spend time in our neighborhood, learning what our residents want to have happen to their home. Whether or not this person is a rubber-stamp for the zoning plan and ignores residents' concerns will determine their ability to be elected in June.

I also ask that the City seek an extension from the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) to allow adequate time for proper environmental review, public engagement, and a full evaluation of the proposed amendments' impacts on existing neighborhoods and housing capacity calculations. Transparency and thorough review should take precedence over arbitrary timelines.

HCD leadership should be required to attend BOS LUTC hearings, Committee of the Whole, and the full Board meeting. Their participation is critical so that ***all 11*** Supervisors and the public can receive direct, transparent answers on how housing capacity is being calculated, how compliance with state mandates is determined, and how proposed amendments will affect San Francisco's standing with the State.

As to the legislation, many changes must be made:

- **Eliminate in-lieu fees**. In-lieu fees delay affordable housing and create exclusive enclaves of luxury housing.

- **Dedicate all suitable public land – excluding parks and public open space - to 100%**

affordable housing.

- **Preserve the Coastal Zone as it is today.**
- **Prohibit upzoning in the Tsunami Zone.** It is reckless to increase building heights or density in areas at high risk of tsunami inundation.
- **Repair and reactivate the local tsunami warning system**.
- **Protect historic and culturally significant buildings, districts and open space.** All **Category A and A-eligible historic buildings, districts, and open space** should be exempted from upzoning. District 4's mid-century homes and civic buildings reflect our community's unique cultural heritage and deserve preservation.
- **Prevent height increases near parks and schools.** Casting shadows on open spaces and classrooms undermines the very "well-resourced" character of our district that the City claims to value.
- **Install the emergency firefighting system before more density is built, or a major quake and the ocean winds could result in an unstoppable fire that will run from west to east over all of San Francisco.**

Thank you for your consideration of these points.

Sincerely,

Katherine Howard

Outer Sunset

District 4

From:	Rick Bond
To:	Sauter, Danny (BOS); SauterStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); commission.secretary@sfgov.org
Subject:	No slot canyons!
Date:	Sunday, November 16, 2025 7:05:56 PM

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

City leaders,

Please retain the 40 foot height limit on our little streets. Raising the limit will turn them into dark, forbidding slot canyons.

Thanks,
Rick Bond
21 Russell St, San Francisco, CA 94109

From:	desireemiles@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Desiree Maggiora Miles
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Sunday, November 16, 2025 5:31:26 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):
To Mayor Lurie & Honorable SF Officials,
I take great pride in being a second generation San Franciscan, my parents being first born children of wonderful Italian Immigrants, our grandparents. On my son's paternal side, he is a Fifth Generation San Franciscan, also taking great pride in the fact that his great-grandfather and great uncles, The Miles Brothers , were well-known local photographers in San Francisco at the time of the Great Earthquake of 1906 and took humbling photos of our beloved City in ruins during the days following that historic event. The Miles Brothers sadly lost their studios as a result of the devastating quake but their photos of City Hall after the quake and Market Street a day before are indelible in archives of San Francisco history! I very much appreciate your kind review of my comments and background. The rich history that our families share and the amazing bond that we have with San Francisco is immeasurable. I urgently implore you, Mayor Lurie , and SF Supervisors ,Officials and Planners to RETHINK the plan for up zoning our great City neighborhoods. I vehemently reject the current planning proposals. They will decimate our neighborhood businesses, drive up affordability and not mitigate the issues that they claim to address. The flavor of our neighborhoods will be lost , as well as practical issues like parking spaces - destructive ideas like meters in residential neighborhoods - would wreak havoc on current residents as well as potential, future residents have already been proposed . Our beloved SF is a unique landscape and thus requires careful attention to details of locations, views, services needed to accommodate additional numbers of residents and many other factors that would impact affordability for anyone attempting to enter the rental or home ownership market in our varied neighborhoods. PLEASE fight back against Senator Scott Wiener's dictatorship of required housing in the State of CA and TAMP DOWN these unreasonable mandates to make our City more affordable to live in for some more residents and NOT UNAFFORDABLE FOR MANY!!!!! We have limited space which will impact affordability so a reasonable compromise will help additional residents-although mot many more- to be able to have an OPPORTUNITY to live in our amazing neighborhoods and thrive. Thank you again for your kind and prompts attention to this matter

Sincerely,
Desiree Maggiora Miles

San Francisco, CA 94123

From: PhilD01210@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Phil Dillard
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Sunday, November 16, 2025 4:56:07 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:
Monday's pending Planning Commission hearing on District 3 is, frankly, an abomination of process and a serious failure of representation. I say that as a proud American, a Navy veteran, a capitalist and entrepreneur, and a 17 year San Francisco resident who has lived more than 10 of those years on Green Street in North Beach.
I have already attended multiple hearings on this upzoning and related changes. At the last one, this item was pushed so far back on the agenda that, like many working residents, I had to leave for client meetings before public comment was called. The people who can stay all day tend to be retirees, union contingents, and insiders. Working age residents who are building businesses, paying high rents or mortgages, and raising families are effectively excluded.
And even when we do speak, it does not feel like public comment is taken seriously. Residents from across the neighborhood spoke clearly and in good faith. Commissioners and staff listened, then went right back to minutiae and a predetermined agenda. That is not genuine engagement. It is a box checked.
I am very active in my community. I attend Telegraph Hill Dwellers, Russian Hill and North Beach neighbors meetings. I volunteer with North Beach Citizens and talk with residents, seniors, families, workers and small business owners every week. I walk this city day and night and there is nothing like North Beach anywhere else in San Francisco.
Almost no one I know of working age is aware of the true scope of BOS File 250682 and the related upzoning proposals. When they do learn what is being proposed, they are unanimously opposed. They do not want the elimination of the North Beach Special Use District. They do not want larger commercial footprints that invite chains. They do not want the erosion of conditional use review that silences neighbors. They do not want priority processing that strips away notice and hearings.
They definitely do not want more speculative high rise development that produces empty "safe deposit boxes in the sky" for absentee investors. I live across from one of those towers. It is mostly dark. It does nothing for our housing crisis and nothing for our community.
I have seen this pattern before. I watched it in Chicago and Philadelphia. We have all heard the stories of Seattle and Vancouver, where once distinctive neighborhoods were hollowed out by high rise luxury development, chain retail, and absentee ownership. Within a decade, the culture and small business ecosystem that drew people there in the first place was pushed out.
North Beach is the opposite of that. It is one of the few truly thriving, mixed use, mixed income, small business driven neighborhoods left in this city. People come from all over San Francisco and all over the world to experience something authentic here. The legislation in BOS 250682 and the Upzoning Plan attack the very tools that protected this place for decades.
There is a deep hypocrisy in preaching local democracy, community voice, and equity while pushing top down state and mayoral mandates on the most densely populated district in the city, over the clear objections of the people who actually live and work here. North Beach is already dense. District 3 is already dense. We have existing underused

buildings and existing permits that could be activated without destroying the fabric of the neighborhood.
We are not anti housing. We are not anti development. We are against bad planning and lazy, one size fits all policy th

Sincerely,
Phil Dillard
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: Bridget Dyer
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Sunday, November 16, 2025 4:36:35 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge your support of the combined amendments of Supervisors Connie Chan and Chyanne Chen to Mayor Lurie's Upzoning Plan, specifically:

Don't Demolish Tenant Homes – Over 45,000 renters are at increased risk of displacement as a result of the Plan's increased incentives to demolish tenant-occupied flats in North Beach, Upper Chinatown, Noe Valley, Buena Vista, the Castro, the Sunset, the Marina and the Richmond. SF Planning confirmed in its original plan analysis that we did not need to redevelop rent-controlled homes to meet our unit count goal. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's common-sense amendment to remove all residential flats from the local plan, knowing we don't need to displace hard-working San Franciscans to build the housing we need.

Protect the Public Waterfront – San Francisco once led the nation with thoughtful and sustainable planning that kept our public coast and bay waterfronts safe from overdevelopment. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's proposed amendment to remove the coastal and waterfront parcels that would be exposed to Trumpian privatization and luxury development. We are not Mar-a-Lago!

Build Real Family-Sized Housing – The mayor's Plan currently has no mandatory unit requirements, but rather offers 2-bedroom units as an "option" for developers. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's proposed amendment to the new density decontrol provisions the mayor put into the plan this year, which incentivize more $4000/month "microunits" – instead of the 2- and 3-bedroom homes families need.

Comply With Housing Element, Preserve PEGs – The unanimously adopted Housing Element was clear: Priority Equity Geographies have already born the brunt of development displacement, and yet the mayor included PEG neighborhoods into his new map. This is not what the Board adopted and approved, with support from community. I support Supervisor Chyanne Chen's proposed amendment to protect the PEGs as previously adopted.

Preserve Our Cultural & Historic Assets – We can build the housing we need without destroying San Francisco's cultural and historic assets. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's amendment to protect historic resources in this plan.

Build the Affordable Housing We Need – The mayor has proposed selling off 27+ public sites, which are critical to the construction of the 46,000 units of affordable housing SF is required to build by 2031. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's proposal to create an Affordable Housing Special Use District to maximize our public land for affordable housing.

While we did not elect the anonymous Sacramento bureaucrats at the HCD, we elected you all to be legislators and policy-makers who will advocate for us to the State and do what's best for SF. The mayor claims our hands are tied and we have to let HCD write our laws or we will lose "local control" – if you have to run your emails by HCD officials for approval, it would appear we already have.

Politicians were given a clear mandate from voters this past Election Day – we will support you, when you stand up for us. Don't be the Democrats that bungle another opportunity to fight for real affordable housing for us all – please show some political willpower, moral courage and leadership. Don't let your legacy be making San Francisco a city only for millionaires.

Sincerely,
Bridget Dyer
Hans Hony
Renters

Bridget Dyer
bridgetdyer@gmail.com
14 Prospect Ave,
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Dean Brown
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Sunday, November 16, 2025 12:25:24 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

I live on Carl street and my wife and I often walk down Irving street and there's just tons of 1 story buildings where we could have 3 stories of housing on top and a commercial floor on the bottom. I have kids and grandkids and want them to have a chance to live here. One bedroom apartments rent for more than $2,000 per month and we need all types of housing.

This housing problem did not happen overnight and it won't be solve quickly. However, the Family Zoning Plan is an important step in the right direction and should be approved.

I support Supervisor Melgar's small-business fund, and Supervisors Sherrill and Sauter's amendment to encourage larger family units (2-3 bedrooms). These strengthen the plan without risking state compliance, and the Mayor has signaled support.
And I oppose Proposals to exclude nearly all residential sites from rezoning or impose restrictions that would undercut housing capacity and jeopardize our state approval.

We need to get moving on this housing issue and I am tired of how long it takes to get things done in San Francisco. Please pass this plan so we can move on to building more housing.

Thanks,

Dean

Dean Brown
mondean@gmail.com
458 Carl street
SAN FRANCISCO , California 94117

From: Simone Alberti
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Sunday, November 16, 2025 9:56:56 AM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Simone Alberti
simo.alb88@gmail.com
131 Noe St.
San Francisco, California 94114

From:	kumasong@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Karen Kirschling
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Saturday, November 15, 2025 8:04:06 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Karen Kirschling

From: dolbay@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Liam Hennessy
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Saturday, November 15, 2025 6:29:07 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Liam Hennessy
San Francisco, CA 94133

From:	lgpetty
To:	MelgarStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff
Cc:	Carroll, John (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; mahmoudstaff@sfgov.org; Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject:	All Tenant Protection Ordinance Amendments Require Due Deliberation
Date:	Saturday, November 15, 2025 5:33:17 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I write in support of Supervisor Cheyanne Chen's Tenant Protection Ordinance and to urge you not to "disappear" all the other amendments to it that have been proposed by Supervisors Chan and Chen.

In our democracy (yes we still have one) every serious proposal deserves serious consideration in a fair hearing and open decision process.

The public are entitled to know about all of the TPO amendment proposals -- in clear words, and in full. They are entitled to time and opportunity to examine them freely. People are entitled to express their opinions on them -- softly in writing; loudly in public. And, not least of all, the public are entitled to know the position of each of their representatives on each of the proposals.

Or has San Francisco fallen into an elitist shadow world where electeds get to ignore proposed legislation that might help the people, and hide the proposals so deeply that the people are forever denied them?

San Francisco government must not operate in secret.

Would any Supervisor take away the People's basic rights? For what reason? For "efficiency"? For political advantage? For monetary gain? For misguided fear of higher government reprisal? Or just because some can't stand the "noise" in a noisy, messy democracy?

I'll be delighted if you prove San Francisco is indeed still a democracy by giving all the Chan and Chen TPO amendments a full airing.

Lorraine Petty

-For Affordable Housing.
-Against Demolition of Sound Residential Housing.
-D2/5 Voter.

From:	nora.chin@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Nora Chin
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Saturday, November 15, 2025 4:29:50 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Nora Chin
San Francisco, CA 94118

From: brideynewman@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Bridget Newman
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Saturday, November 15, 2025 3:25:38 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am a District 1 resident; my family has lived in the Richmond District for 45 years. I support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers. I ask that you do the same. Beyond the fact that we lack fire-fighting infrastructure from 12th Avenue to the sea in the Richmond and 19th Avenue to the sea in the Sunset, building towers on sand is sheer folly.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

Ted Egan, San Francisco's Chief Economist, pointed out in his recent report that a high growth scenario under the Upzoning Plan that would include eliminating over 6,000 current rent-controlled housing units and demolishing the sites of hundreds of small businesses would decrease rent on the average apartment by $125/month. However, he also states that "Annual business disruption and relocation costs range from $16 to $28 million, in today's dollars." Density does not equal affordability.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Bridget Newman
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: Xoe Watchman
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Saturday, November 15, 2025 2:20:50 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge your support of the combined amendments of Supervisors Connie Chan and Chyanne Chen to Mayor Lurie's Upzoning Plan, specifically:

Don't Demolish Tenant Homes – Over 45,000 renters are at increased risk of displacement as a result of the Plan's increased incentives to demolish tenant-occupied flats in North Beach, Upper Chinatown, Noe Valley, Buena Vista, the Castro, the Sunset, the Marina and the Richmond. SF Planning confirmed in its original plan analysis that we did not need to redevelop rent-controlled homes to meet our unit count goal. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's common-sense amendment to remove all residential flats from the local plan, knowing we don't need to displace hard-working San Franciscans to build the housing we need.

Protect the Public Waterfront – San Francisco once led the nation with thoughtful and sustainable planning that kept our public coast and bay waterfronts safe from overdevelopment. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's proposed amendment to remove the coastal and waterfront parcels that would be exposed to Trumpian privatization and luxury development. We are not Mar-a-Lago!

Build Real Family-Sized Housing – The mayor's Plan currently has no mandatory unit requirements, but rather offers 2-bedroom units as an "option" for developers. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's proposed amendment to the new density decontrol provisions the mayor put into the plan this year, which incentivize more $4000/month "microunits" – instead of the 2- and 3-bedroom homes families need.

Comply With Housing Element, Preserve PEGs – The unanimously adopted Housing Element was clear: Priority Equity Geographies have already born the brunt of development displacement, and yet the mayor included PEG neighborhoods into his new map. This is not what the Board adopted and approved, with support from community. I support Supervisor Chyanne Chen's proposed amendment to protect the PEGs as previously adopted.

Preserve Our Cultural & Historic Assets – We can build the housing we need without destroying San Francisco's cultural and historic assets. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's amendment to protect historic resources in this plan.

Build the Affordable Housing We Need – The mayor has proposed selling off 27+ public sites, which are critical to the construction of the 46,000 units of affordable housing SF is required to build by 2031. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's proposal to create an Affordable Housing Special Use District to maximize our public land for affordable housing.

While we did not elect the anonymous Sacramento bureaucrats at the HCD, we elected you all to be legislators and policy-makers who will advocate for us to the State and do what's best for SF. The mayor claims our hands are tied and we have to let HCD write our laws or we will lose "local control" – if you have to run your emails by HCD officials for approval, it would appear we already have.

Politicians were given a clear mandate from voters this past Election Day – we will support you, when you stand up for us. Don't be the Democrats that bungle another opportunity to fight for real affordable housing for us all – please show some political willpower, moral courage and leadership. Don't let your legacy be making San Francisco a city only for millionaires.

Sincerely,

Xoe Watchman
xoewatchman@gmail.com
2008 BALBOA ST
San Francisco, California 94121

From: Andrew Nelson
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Saturday, November 15, 2025 2:10:12 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge your support of the combined amendments of Supervisors Connie Chan and Chyanne Chen to Mayor Lurie's Upzoning Plan, specifically:

Don't Demolish Tenant Homes – Over 45,000 renters are at increased risk of displacement as a result of the Plan's increased incentives to demolish tenant-occupied flats in North Beach, Upper Chinatown, Noe Valley, Buena Vista, the Castro, the Sunset, the Marina and the Richmond. SF Planning confirmed in its original plan analysis that we did not need to redevelop rent-controlled homes to meet our unit count goal. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's common-sense amendment to remove all residential flats from the local plan, knowing we don't need to displace hard-working San Franciscans to build the housing we need.

Protect the Public Waterfront – San Francisco once led the nation with thoughtful and sustainable planning that kept our public coast and bay waterfronts safe from overdevelopment. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's proposed amendment to remove the coastal and waterfront parcels that would be exposed to Trumpian privatization and luxury development. We are not Mar-a-Lago!

Build Real Family-Sized Housing – The mayor's Plan currently has no mandatory unit requirements, but rather offers 2-bedroom units as an "option" for developers. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's proposed amendment to the new density decontrol provisions the mayor put into the plan this year, which incentivize more $4000/month "microunits" – instead of the 2- and 3-bedroom homes families need.

Comply With Housing Element, Preserve PEGs – The unanimously adopted Housing Element was clear: Priority Equity Geographies have already born the brunt of development displacement, and yet the mayor included PEG neighborhoods into his new map. This is not what the Board adopted and approved, with support from community. I support Supervisor Chyanne Chen's proposed amendment to protect the PEGs as previously adopted.

Preserve Our Cultural & Historic Assets – We can build the housing we need without destroying San Francisco's cultural and historic assets. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's amendment to protect historic resources in this plan.

Build the Affordable Housing We Need – The mayor has proposed selling off 27+ public sites, which are critical to the construction of the 46,000 units of affordable housing SF is required to build by 2031. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's proposal to create an Affordable Housing Special Use District to maximize our public land for affordable housing.

While we did not elect the anonymous Sacramento bureaucrats at the HCD, we elected you all to be legislators and policy-makers who will advocate for us to the State and do what's best for SF. The mayor claims our hands are tied and we have to let HCD write our laws or we will lose "local control" – if you have to run your emails by HCD officials for approval, it would appear we already have.

Politicians were given a clear mandate from voters this past Election Day – we will support you, when you stand up for us. Don't be the Democrats that bungle another opportunity to fight for real affordable housing for us all – please show some political willpower, moral courage and leadership. Don't let your legacy be making San Francisco a city only for millionaires.

On a personal note, as residents of North Beach for almost two decades and recent small business owners in the neighborhood, the lack of protections for rent controlled units and small businesses in the mayor's big beautiful family zoning plan keeps my wife and I awake at night. As poets in one of the most important neighborhoods for art and poetry in the world, we will not accept any vision of our neighborhood that prioritizes the financial gain of a few real estate developers over the centuries of culture created by the artists & poets who have made our neighborhood so desirable to developers in the first place.

Sincerely,

Andrew Paul Nelson & Caitlyn Sky Wild
Owner/operators of Golden Sardine
362 Columbus Ave.

Andrew Nelson
afishwithfrogseyes@gmail.com
362 Columbus Ave
San Francisco, California 94133

From: joanneshanahan135@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of joanne shanahan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Saturday, November 15, 2025 1:38:54 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a 4th generation San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and will permanently change the whole feel out our neighborhoods. The one thing k I e always loved about SF is all the totally different neighborhoods we have. You can choose single family houses or downtown vibes.

We ask on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent.

I realize the need for more housing but is building high rises in neighborhoods where there isnt any the right thing to do? I think a scaled back version would better suit the city I live.
Thank you.

Sincerely,
joanne shanahan
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: Madhuri Mudaliar
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Saturday, November 15, 2025 1:18:14 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge your support of the combined amendments of Supervisors Connie Chan and Chyanne Chen to Mayor Lurie's Upzoning Plan, specifically:

Don't Demolish Tenant Homes – Over 45,000 renters are at increased risk of displacement as a result of the Plan's increased incentives to demolish tenant-occupied flats in North Beach, Upper Chinatown, Noe Valley, Buena Vista, the Castro, the Sunset, the Marina and the Richmond. SF Planning confirmed in its original plan analysis that we did not need to redevelop rent-controlled homes to meet our unit count goal. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's common-sense amendment to remove all residential flats from the local plan, knowing we don't need to displace hard-working San Franciscans to build the housing we need.

Protect the Public Waterfront – San Francisco once led the nation with thoughtful and sustainable planning that kept our public coast and bay waterfronts safe from overdevelopment. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's proposed amendment to remove the coastal and waterfront parcels that would be exposed to Trumpian privatization and luxury development. We are not Mar-a-Lago!

Build Real Family-Sized Housing – The mayor's Plan currently has no mandatory unit requirements, but rather offers 2-bedroom units as an "option" for developers. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's proposed amendment to the new density decontrol provisions the mayor put into the plan this year, which incentivize more $4000/month "microunits" – instead of the 2- and 3-bedroom homes families need.

Comply With Housing Element, Preserve PEGs – The unanimously adopted Housing Element was clear: Priority Equity Geographies have already born the brunt of development displacement, and yet the mayor included PEG neighborhoods into his new map. This is not what the Board adopted and approved, with support from community. I support Supervisor Chyanne Chen's proposed amendment to protect the PEGs as previously adopted.

Preserve Our Cultural & Historic Assets – We can build the housing we need without destroying San Francisco's cultural and historic assets. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's amendment to protect historic resources in this plan.

Build the Affordable Housing We Need – The mayor has proposed selling off 27+ public sites, which are critical to the construction of the 46,000 units of affordable housing SF is required to build by 2031. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's proposal to create an Affordable Housing Special Use District to maximize our public land for affordable housing.

While we did not elect the anonymous Sacramento bureaucrats at the HCD, we elected you all to be legislators and policy-makers who will advocate for us to the State and do what's best for SF. The mayor claims our hands are tied and we have to let HCD write our laws or we will lose "local control" – if you have to run your emails by HCD officials for approval, it would appear we already have.

Politicians were given a clear mandate from voters this past Election Day – we will support you, when you stand up for us. Don't be the Democrats that bungle another opportunity to fight for real affordable housing for us all – please show some political willpower, moral courage and leadership. Don't let your legacy be making San Francisco a city only for millionaires.

Sincerely,

Madhuri Mudaliar
mmmudaliar1998@gmail.com
2951 Bush Street
San Francisco , California 94115

From: Sultan Mirza
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please Retain the 40 Foot Height Limit on our ALLEYS - Russian Hill
Date: Saturday, November 15, 2025 11:34:48 AM

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

Good morning,

Please Retain the 40 Foot Height Limit on our ALLEYS in historic Russian Hill.

If you allow Six Stories, then Prohibit On Street Parking for new Alley construction.

Thank you,

Sultan Mirza
1218 Green St, San Francisco, CA 94109

From: Ciara Keegan
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Saturday, November 15, 2025 10:32:11 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge your support of the combined amendments of Supervisors Connie Chan and Chyanne Chen to Mayor Lurie's Upzoning Plan, specifically:

Don't Demolish Tenant Homes – Over 45,000 renters are at increased risk of displacement as a result of the Plan's increased incentives to demolish tenant-occupied flats in North Beach, Upper Chinatown, Noe Valley, Buena Vista, the Castro, the Sunset, the Marina and the Richmond. SF Planning confirmed in its original plan analysis that we did not need to redevelop rent-controlled homes to meet our unit count goal. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's common-sense amendment to remove all residential flats from the local plan, knowing we don't need to displace hard-working San Franciscans to build the housing we need.

Protect the Public Waterfront – San Francisco once led the nation with thoughtful and sustainable planning that kept our public coast and bay waterfronts safe from overdevelopment. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's proposed amendment to remove the coastal and waterfront parcels that would be exposed to Trumpian privatization and luxury development. We are not Mar-a-Lago!

Build Real Family-Sized Housing – The mayor's Plan currently has no mandatory unit requirements, but rather offers 2-bedroom units as an "option" for developers. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's proposed amendment to the new density decontrol provisions the mayor put into the plan this year, which incentivize more $4000/month "microunits" – instead of the 2- and 3-bedroom homes families need.

Comply With Housing Element, Preserve PEGs – The unanimously adopted Housing Element was clear: Priority Equity Geographies have already born the brunt of development displacement, and yet the mayor included PEG neighborhoods into his new map. This is not what the Board adopted and approved, with support from community. I support Supervisor Chyanne Chen's proposed amendment to protect the PEGs as previously adopted.

Preserve Our Cultural & Historic Assets – We can build the housing we need without destroying San Francisco's cultural and historic assets. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's amendment to protect historic resources in this plan.

Build the Affordable Housing We Need – The mayor has proposed selling off 27+ public sites, which are critical to the construction of the 46,000 units of affordable housing SF is required to build by 2031. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's proposal to create an Affordable Housing Special Use District to maximize our public land for affordable housing.

While we did not elect the anonymous Sacramento bureaucrats at the HCD, we elected you all to be legislators and policy-makers who will advocate for us to the State and do what's best for SF. The mayor claims our hands are tied and we have to let HCD write our laws or we will lose "local control" – if you have to run your emails by HCD officials for approval, it would appear we already have.

Politicians were given a clear mandate from voters this past Election Day – we will support you, when you stand up for us. Don't be the Democrats that bungle another opportunity to fight for real affordable housing for us all – please show some political willpower, moral courage and leadership. Don't let your legacy be making San Francisco a city only for millionaires.

Sincerely,

Ciara Keegan
ciaraksf@gmail.com
4225 23rd Street
San Francisco, California 94114

From:	terrencemchugh@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Terry McHugh
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 11:30:58 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments: With all the building that has already been approved and in the system, why are we in such a hurry to completely change Dist 4 and parts of Dist 7. People out here paid and are paying to be similar to what it is now. No one wants towers (remember The Pink Palace and Geneva Towers), views blocked, shadows in backyards and all new buildings with no parking.

Sincerely,
Terry McHugh
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: bettymillermd@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Betty miller Kolotkin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 11:28:41 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We’re hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won’t invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Betty miller Kolotkin

From:	frankblanket@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Derrick Scocchera
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 11:25:22 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

No one who lives in this city wants to spend the next decade or more living in a construction zone with constant noise, pollution, and disruption. All to benefit a few already obscenely wealthy developers, who have proven time and again that they have no interest in affordable housing or the history of this great city. As a 33 year resident of San Francisco, I feel that San Franciscans deserve transparent and accountable planning.

We’re hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won’t invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

Sincerely,
Derrick Scocchera
San Francisco, CA 94133

From:	nayrbgo@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Bryan Sanders
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 11:23:05 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We’re hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won’t invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Sincerely,
Bryan Sanders

From: natashjadewolf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Natashja Dewolfe
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 11:21:59 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Natashja Dewolfe
San Francisco, CA 94122

From:	DMacDonald@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Donald MacDonald
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 11:20:43 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:
I live in Pacific Heights and am very concerned about the current blanket approach to upzoning across the city. Specifically the provisions in the current plan to make every corner buildable to 65 feet. I foresee this provision having severely negative, unintended speculative consequences that not only destroy neighborhood character but also adjacent property values. This provision is going to upset everyone!! Another provision which will precipitate highly negative, unintended speculative consequences is increasing the buildable height to 65 feet for the Marina Safeway lot. The Marina Safeway is the only major grocery store with parking for the neighborhood. If this store were to close for redevelopment due to the increased allowable buildable height, the neighborhood would suffer a major amenity loss for which the neighborhood would bear a high, long-term cost and loss of value. Thank you for your consideration of these points of major concern.

Sincerely,
Donald MacDonald
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: kathygee606@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kathleen Gee
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 11:18:05 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We’re hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won’t invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:
Please let the unlicensed understand where and why each supervisor stands on this critical issue

Sincerely,
Kathleen Gee
San Francisco, CA 94118

From:	sflronline@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Herbert F Mintz II
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 11:17:07 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly. This is not right!

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands. Don't let those critical amendments die in committee!

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance. Don't let the HCD hide in the shadows!

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

I have spoken before this BOS committee about the fact that the City's Emergency Firefighting Water System infrastructure does not extend much into its western and southern neighborhoods. That is definitely a public safety issue that needs to be addressed. I still think this issue deserves a hearing before the full BOS.

However, right now give the Chan and Chen amendments the public debate they deserve!

Sincerely,
Herbert F Mintz II
San Francisco, CA 94116

From:	llakkis@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lisa Lakkis
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 11:10:45 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:
Blanket up-zoning has never been shown to be an effective means to solve housing shortages. San Francisco is a very beautiful, special city that should be protected and our supervisors and city officials should be fighting to protect it, not signing legislation to destroy it. 14 story buildings have no place being built on streets like Jackson, Broadway, and Pacific. My husband and I have recently relocated from Pittsburgh, PA and are living in a 7 story building on Jackson between Franklin and Gough. A 14 story building would be completely out of place in this neighborhood and would increase traffic, which is already too much and too fast in our residential neighborhood. There are no guarantees in your plan that would even require developers to build so-called "family housing" Random upzoning in inappropriate areas will not help. And to call this a transit corridor is ridiculous. It takes my husband 40 minutes to get to the Caltrain from here every morning. Anyone who thinks we should have 14 story buildings in our neighborhood or that is a transit corridor is not familiar enough with this neighborhood to make these momentous descisions.

Sincerely,
Lisa Lakkis
San Francisco, CA 94109

From:	cyssf2003@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Christina Shih
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 11:09:40 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

My addition to this email: I was active in the Engardio recall because his actions severely damaged the quality of life for the western side of SF by the closure of the Great Highway and his obvious allegiance to the anti-car activitists/tech money instead of his constituents. The so called Family Zoning plan is anything BUT a "family" plan with the upzoning that allows the demolition of single family homes, rent controlled units, and small business units. The amendments to limit the PERMANENT potential damage upzoning the "Family" zoning will allow must be included and even more amendments to protect historic buildings, green spaces, views.

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Christina Shih
San Francisco, CA 94121

From:	katmacdphoto@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kathryn MacDonald
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 11:08:40 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Kathryn MacDonald
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: sbackman@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Susan Backman
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 11:08:35 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Susan Backman
San Francisco, CA 94118

From:	bilgepump100@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Robert Hall
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 11:06:39 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We’re hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won’t invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Robert Hall
San Francisco, CA 94117

From:	breall@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sophie Breall
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 11:04:59 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

I'm a long time home owner in Balboa Terrace. While I appreciate the need for more housing, I want height limitations and input into design. Don't make this into Richmond Specials that are hideous and falling apart.

Sincerely,
Sophie Breall
San Francisco, CA 94127

From:	susanmackowski@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Susan Mackowski
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 11:04:41 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We’re hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won’t invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Susan Mackowski
San Francisco, CA 94133

From:	inor@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of R. Zierikzee
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 11:00:49 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We’re hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won’t invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Please don't block the amendments. This is a public issue. We want and need HCD to attend these upzoning meetings. Many seniors like myself are struggling just to survive in our current housing. If we were to lose it to upzoning we would become homeless and die. Please have mercy. Thank you.

Sincerely,
R. Zierikzee
San Francisco, CA 94118

From:	aebrooke98@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Audrey Brooke
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 10:59:36 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We’re hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won’t invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

I am a lifelong resident of san francisco and I hold dear the communities in our city. I do not want to see the zoning laws changed in the city as it will obviously result in demolishing of buildings, displacing residents and business and raising housing prices. Please consider these common sense amendments to protect the city we love.

Sincerely,
Audrey Brooke
San Francisco, CA 94133

From:	uluusurf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of BRETT GOBAR
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 10:59:26 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We’re hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won’t invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
BRETT GOBAR
Encinitas, CA 92024

From: noguera@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Hatun Noguera
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 10:44:26 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Hatun Noguera
San Francisco, CA 94127

From:	larry@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Larry Habegger
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 10:40:28 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I cannot make it to the hearing today, but I strongly support the amendments put forward by these two supervisors. Please add them to the resolution to create a more fair housing plan.

We’re hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won’t invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Larry Habegger
San Francisco, CA 94133

From:	acxavier@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Alice Xavier
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 10:40:04 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Sincerely,
Alice Xavier
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: antenored@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Dennis antenore
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 10:39:26 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We’re hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won’t invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Dennis antenore
San Francisco, CA 94122

From:	tesw@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Tes Welborn
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 10:36:44 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

I have heard for years that HCD/ABAG/etc. require San Francisco approve some 80,000 new housing units. Yet the state refuses to fund this mandate. And San Francisco has had a declining population for years. So, where is the pressure coming from?? I suspect the real estate industry. San Francisco's Planning Committee should hold a public meeting with HCD to explain their demands and who benefits.

Certainly the small businesses do not - and they are the job creators in San Francisco, not big corporations.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

I have heard for years that HCD/ABAG/etc. require San Francisco approve some 80,000 new housing units. Yet the state refuses to fund this mandate. And San Francisco has had a declining population for years. So, where is the pressure coming from?? I suspect the real estate industry. San Francisco's Planning Committee should hold a public meeting with HCD to explain their demands.

Sincerely,
Tes Welborn
San Francisco, CA 94117

From:	evajfortune@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Janice Altobelli
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 10:34:10 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:
Housing that is affordable, below market rate is what is needed,not housing for the rich . We need to maintain residential & commercial property which is already housing & serving the San Francisco residents that currently live & work here. The people of San Francisco absolutely need to have a voice in this what appears to be a land grab which will forever change the city we care for. This has been my neighborhood for over 30 years. Housing & improving the City is wonderful but the ideas that we've been able to see & perhaps will not continue to see seem hasty & Ill conceived. Go back to the drawing board , listen & implement the amendments Supervisor Chan & Chen have proposed & keep meetings with HCD Public . Common sense & careful planning is what we need . This is a city for people if all economic levels, don't shut out the average folks . We live in a city that celebrates diversity, let's maintain that in housing & businesses.. San Francisco is not a playground for the rich.Its for all of us.

Sincerely,
Janice Altobelli
San Francisco, CA 94121

From:	georgesery@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of George Sery
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 10:33:53 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
George Sery

From:	rogerh104@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Roger Hansen
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 10:33:22 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Roger Hansen
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: molliespack@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Leslie Wong
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 10:31:36 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am a born and raised San Franciscan, living in District 1 for 60 years. I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): our city is unique and the current upzonIng plan paved a way to destroying the history, charm and character of our smaller neighborhoods. There are other ways to provide more affordable housing; this will not provide for such. It may increase inventory of new, shiny residences that are not affordable to the working class, eliminate mom and pop businesses, eliminate affordable rentals, and destroy the community and character of our beloved city.

Sincerely,
Leslie Wong
San Francisco, CA 94121

From:	Judi Gorski
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff
Cc:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); Lurie, Daniel (MYR)
Subject:	Land Use and Transportation Meeting, 11/17/25, 1:30 pm - Take No Action on Upzoning Until D4 Has Representation
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 10:30:48 AM

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

To: myrna.melgar@sfgov.org
Chenstaff@sfgov.org
Mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org
John.Carroll@sfgov.org

Cc: Board of Supervisors
daniel.lurie@sfgov.org

From: Judi Gorski, D4 Resident
judigorski@gmail.com

Date: November 17, 2025

Re: Land Use and Transportation Meeting, 11/17/25, 1:30 pm - Take No Action on Upzoning Until D4 Has Representation

Dear Supervisors Melgar, Chen and Mandelman:

This is a request that you please postpone discussing and amending the Family Housing Plan and reschedule it to after the Mayor has appointed a Supervisor for District 4 and after District 4 constituents have had time to meet with their new Supervisor. District 4 wants to be a part of discussions concerning the Housing Plan and suggest amendments to it, but we do not have a representative to speak for us in City Hall yet. Please seriously consider postponing this to a later date. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Judi Gorski
District 4 Resident

From: victoria.giampaoli@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Victoria Giampaoli
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 10:27:18 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Please stop this upzoning it's a horrible idea and ruins the charm of this city. Do not go over 3- 4 stories—- we don't want this place to look like NY. There are tons of vacant buildings and many other areas of the city that this would not affect. Thank for your time.

Sincerely,
Victoria Giampaoli
San Francisco, CA 94123

From:	merlegoldstone2@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Merle Goldstone
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 10:26:36 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Merle Goldstone
San Francisco, CA 94133

From:	nhf009@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Nancy Fee
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 10:24:31 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We’re hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won’t invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning. Let’s protect and preserve what we all love about San Francisco and work together openly and with common sense to meet our actual and projected needs for affordable housing,

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Nancy Fee

From:	scarampi@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sebastiano Scarampi
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 10:23:45 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Sebastiano Scarampi
San Francisco, CA 94115

From:	scarampi@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sebastiano Scarampi
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 10:23:30 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Sebastiano Scarampi
San Francisco, CA 94115

From: dmscott01@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Diana Scott
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 10:23:13 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress. STOP DESTROYING OUR NEIGHBORHOOD! There are already sufficient units in the pipeline to satisfy state requirements, it's been shown - so move what's been approved, don't destroy and displace to satisfy greed.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Diana Scott
San Francisco, CA 94116

From:	gb_andrews@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Gandhia Andrews
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 10:22:22 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountability.

Sup. Melgar, do not block these amendments, please. This is the moment for you to prove you are as you declare, for the middle class and small businesses. Do not give in to the greed of developers and realtors.

Sincerely,
Gandhia Andrews
San Francisco, CA 94132

From:	margaret@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Margaret Bradley-Foley
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 10:21:39 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We’re hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won’t invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Margaret Bradley-Foley
San Francisco, CA 94123

From:	janrobbins7@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jan Robbins
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 10:21:28 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Jan Robbins

From:	erikafrick111@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Erika Frick
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 10:21:23 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a Nob Hill resident of over 25 years, I am extremely concerned about supervisors going along with upzoning that ruins the beauty of our City, creates condos very few people will ever be able to afford, and ignores common sense approaches like converting vacant office spaces. As well, all rent controlled housing should be preserved.

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Erika Frick
San Francisco, CA 94108

From:	janrobbins7@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jan Robbins
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 10:20:49 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We’re hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won’t invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Jan Robbins

From: diana.giampaoli@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of diana giampaoli
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 10:20:43 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS please take into consideration all the empty buildings that could be retrofitted for housing. If you need to build only 4 stories. We are not NY. Quit making these developers your friends richer. This won't house the homeless or low income.

Sincerely,
diana giampaoli
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: acxavier@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Alice Xavier
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 10:20:38 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Dear Mayor Lurie,

As a San Franciscan in D7, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Your upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement !

Sincerely,
Alice Xavier
San Francisco, CA 94122

From:	erin.dress@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Erin Dress
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 10:20:34 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Please bring greater transparency to this process so people know what is happening with these changes.

Sincerely,
Erin Dress
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: koelsch1886@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Leslie Koelsch
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 10:19:29 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We’re hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won’t invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Leslie Koelsch

From:	bette_stockton@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Bette Stockton
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 10:19:24 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

My husband and I have been residents of North Beach since 1970 and homeowners on Chestnut St. since 1991. These drastic changes to our neighborhood and other areas of San Francisco will not accomplish the most pressing needs - affordable housing and protection for long term residents under rent control. We are not against building but what is proposed so far is not in the City's best interests. We need accountable planning that is transparent.

Sincerely,
Bette Stockton
San Francisco, CA 94133

From:	dmscott01@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Diana Scott
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 10:18:21 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments: The West Side has become a political target for political ambitions - and blocking sensible amendments further insults West Side residents (who have recalled one supervisor for disregarding their input). It's time for the BOS and Supervisor Melgar to respect those residents, and stop caving to wealthy corporate interests, aided by those seeking higher political office.

Sincerely,
Diana Scott
San Francisco, CA 94116

From:	mkjanis@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of janis kaempfe
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 10:17:39 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a tenant in District 3 - North Beach I am appalled at this threat to myself and other tenants for continuing to live our apartments. This leaves tenants no recourse to remain in their rent controlled apartments, pushes to demolish buildings and replace them with buildings that only upper income residents can afford and the destruction of small businesses that are the life of our community. This is a move to force middle and lower income residents out of San Francisco!

You must vote against amendments that won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
janis kaempfe
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: hedarobi5@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of David Davies
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 10:17:29 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress

Thank you for hearing me. Thank you for your work. Please fight for low-income people. Please retain the diversity of San Francisco and keep the integrity of our neighborhoods.

Sincerely,
David Davies
San Francisco, CA 94116

From:	cdamkroger@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Courtney Damkroger
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 10:17:29 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning. Support a democratic process!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Courtney Damkroger
San Francisco, CA 94109

From:	randymazzei@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Randall Mazzei
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 10:16:58 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Randall Mazzei
San Francisco, CA 94116

From:	jennkroot@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jennifer Kroot
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 10:16:34 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:
PLEASE DON'T DEMOLISH SF, PRETENDING THAT IT WILL HELP ANYONE BUT DEVELOPERS AND POLITICIANS BACKED BY THEM.
I'm so angry about the power of the developers and real estate interests backing neo lib politicians and creating the mythology that building taller and denser will help unhoused folks and working class people. I know that you are aware that there are over 10k empty units right now and that Airbnb has taken thousands of units as well as the fact that there are tons of empty buildings throughout downtown that could be turned into housing.
Without the Chan/Chen amendments, your plan will displace more low income people. You are only helping developers and people who have the money to get 2nd homes (many of these new units end up being investment property and second homes and so many of them remain empty!!!!!). I'm sure you know this already.
I have a lot more that I'd like to say, but I doubt that you've even read what I've written here.
By the way, I'm a bay area native.

Sincerely,
Jennifer Kroot
San Francisco, CA 94117

From:	liberthson@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Dan Liberthson
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 10:16:23 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Apparently, Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

It is important that the Land Use Committee advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

It is vitally important for the livability of our city that tenants and sound structures be protected. SF should be SF, not Manhattan, which it could become in part if the State's housing mandates are allowed to go forward without reasonable assessment and restraints. San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Sincerely,
Dan Liberthson
San Francisco, CA 94127

From:	hedarobi5@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of David Davies
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 10:15:22 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

If my choice is between the State of California taking over our planning, the builder's remedy, and the Lurie plan, I'll take choose the State.

The Lurie plan might be called the Blackstone Plan as initially it just sets up speculators buy now and get richer when new zoning makes properties more valuable.

Sincerely,
David Davies
San Francisco, CA 94116

From:	marymmoc@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mary OConnell
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 10:15:22 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We’re hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won’t invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Mary OConnell
San Francisco, CA 94123

From:	leejohnj.lee@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Lee
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 10:13:30 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
John Lee
San Francisco, CA 94127

From:	leejohnj.lee@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Lee
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 10:12:30 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
John Lee
San Francisco, CA 94127

From:	films@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Judy Irving
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 9:55:31 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I can't attend in person because I work. PLEASE advance the proposed Chan and Chen amendments to the full Board. The public needs to see where every Supervisor stands.

We’re hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block these amendments and won’t invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly. HCD leadership needs to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning. You might think you're doing the right thing by refusing to listen to your constituents, but don't be surprised if lawsuits challenge your decisions.

Sincerely,
Judy Irving
San Francisco, CA 94133

From:	EmanuelaEstera@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Emanuela Neagu
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 9:50:01 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Emanuela Neagu
San Francisco, CA 94133

From:	EmanuelaEstera@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Emanuela Neagu
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 9:49:06 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We’re hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won’t invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Emanuela Neagu
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: erinaulairedonnelly@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Erin Donnelly
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 9:23:32 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments: City planning's stated intention and goal to protect rent controlled housing needs to be backed up with legislation.
Pass laws that protect all renters in our homes.
Renters are the majority in SF and we will vote only for those who support our rights.
Legislate protections for our vibrant small businesses and our precious coastline.
Support and protect your citizens and our beautiful city and coast from being sold off to the highest bidder and demolished.

Sincerely,
Erin Donnelly
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: marilee@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Marilee Gaffney
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 9:05:33 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Sincerely,
Marilee Gaffney
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: pmulholl@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Patrice Mulholland
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 8:54:33 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families who work in the city but cannot live here due to the high rents. Some of these workers make $70-75 annually. The city does not need more luxury apartments.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Let's keep San Francisco affordable and beautiful.

Sincerely,
Patrice Mulholland
San Francisco, CA 94133

From:	tia.lombardi@gmail.com
To:	Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS)
Cc:	Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject:	San Francisco Heritage Letter of Support
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 11:46:54 AM
Attachments:	SFHeritage-SUPPORT-Chan-Amendments.pdf

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

Dear Supervisors Melgar, Chen, Mahmood, and Chan:

Please accept San Francisco's letter of support for Supervisor Chan's proposed amendments to the Family Zoning Plan.

Thank you!

Tia Lombardi
San Francisco Heritage, Board Member

Sent from my iPhone

SF HERITAGE
www.sfheritage.org
2007 FRANKLIN STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94109
415 441 3000

November 12, 2025

Chair Myrna Melgar, Supervisors Chyanne Chen and Bilal Mahmood
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Land Use and Transportation Committee
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

RE: SUPPORT FOR SUPERVISOR CHAN'S AMENDMENTS
November 17, 2025 - Land Use and Transportation Committee Agenda "Family Zoning Plan"

Dear Chair Melgar and Supervisors Chen and Mahmood:

On behalf of our citywide constituency, San Francisco Heritage submits our strong support for Supervisor Chan's proposed amendments, consistent with the adopted Housing Element, for the treatment of historic resources in the Family Zoning Plan as set forth File No. 251073 as follows:

> On Page 12, Lines 13-24; and Page 30, Lines 17-25: "or substantially alter a historic resource that is: designated as a landmark or listed as a contributor to or located within a historic district under Article 10; listed as a Significant or Contributory Building under Article 11; listed in the California Register of Historical Resources or the National Register of Historic Places; identified in an adopted survey or historic context statement as potentially eligible for individual listing in the California Register of Historical Resources or the National Register of Historic Places; or, located within an historic district that is listed in, or identified in an adopted survey or historic context statement as potentially eligible for listing in, the California Register of Historical Resources or the National Register of Historic Places;

The current Family Zoning Plan includes significantly greater impacts to designated and potentially eligible historic and cultural resources than anticipated by the 2022 Housing Element and the certified Environmental Impact Report (EIR). Absent Supervisor Chan's proposed amendments, we believe that a Supplemental Environmental Impact Report ("SEIR"), rather than the Addendum, is warranted to analyze the Family Zoning Plan's impacts to San Francisco's historic and cultural resources.

We have appreciated the attention given by and our conversations with Mayor Lurie and President Mandelman on how we can address protections for historic resources in the Family Zoning Plan. Supervisor Chan's proposal conforms with standard historic preservation practices, and we believe offers the best path forward to ensure San Francisco's special places are preserved in our changing and growing city.

Sincerely,

Woody LaBounty

Woody LaBounty
President & CEO
wlabounty@sfheritage.org

From:	Judi Gorski
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff
Cc:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); Lurie, Daniel (MYR)
Subject:	Land Use and Transportation Meeting, 11/17/25, 1:30 pm - Take No Action on Upzoning Until D4 Has Representation
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 10:30:58 AM

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

To: myrna.melgar@sfgov.org
Chenstaff@sfgov.org
Mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org
John.Carroll@sfgov.org

Cc: Board of Supervisors
daniel.lurie@sfgov.org

From: Judi Gorski, D4 Resident
judigorski@gmail.com

Date: November 17, 2025

Re: Land Use and Transportation Meeting, 11/17/25, 1:30 pm - Take No Action on Upzoning Until D4 Has Representation

Dear Supervisors Melgar, Chen and Mandelman:

This is a request that you please postpone discussing and amending the Family Housing Plan and reschedule it to after the Mayor has appointed a Supervisor for District 4 and after District 4 constituents have had time to meet with their new Supervisor. District 4 wants to be a part of discussions concerning the Housing Plan and suggest amendments to it, but we do not have a representative to speak for us in City Hall yet. Please seriously consider postponing this to a later date. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Judi Gorski
District 4 Resident

From:	Sam Woodworth
To:	Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject:	One Last Chance to Stop the Destruction of San Francisco
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 10:27:25 AM

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

Supervisors,

Today is your chance to stop the destruction of San Francisco and avoid a legacy of infamy and ignominy that will endure for many decades to come. Over and over you've heard overwhelmingly from residents and business associations that neither the people of San Francisco nor the millions of tourists who undergird the city's economy are interested in walls of monolithic condo towers obliterating treasured public vistas, blocking out the sun, generating wind tunnels, displacing tenants and small businesses, and irreparably destroying the unique and world-class beauty of San Francisco -- all so that luxury developers and wealthy landowners can line their pockets.

The developer lobby wants you to believe that upzoning will promote affordability, but that argument has been thoroughly debunked, including by the Federal Reserve Bank-SF. https://www.frbsf.org/research-and-insights/publications/working-papers/2025/03/supply-constraints-do-not-explain-house-price-and-quantity-growth-across-u-s-cities/. Even the city's *own analysis* shows that this argument is a steaming pile of manure. https://newspack-missionlocal.s3.amazonaws.com/mission/wp-content/uploads/2025/10/250700_economic_impact_final.pdf

Will you stand with the people of San Francisco, or with developers, speculators, and the future buyers of luxury condos? Find the backbone to say "no" to this generationally short-sighted and catastrophic mistake. You are not powerless. The current plan drastically over-zones relative to State mandates and fails to count huge recent increases in zoned capacity. The City is not required to capitulate and should take the State to court if necessary.

At a bare minimum, support the Chan and Chen amendments, and require HCD to be present as you debate whether to drive a stake through the heart of San Francisco.

Thank you,
Sam Woodworth
Homeowner, Russian Hill

From: George Wooding
To: Carroll, John (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); George Wooding
Subject: 250966, 250700, 250701 written testimony for November 17, 2025 Land Use and Transportation
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 8:51:15 AM

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

Hi John, Please consider this my written testimony. I hope that all is well with you. Please consider me a disabled person and place me in front of the line

November 16, 2025

Dear Land Use and Transportation committee members.
Melgar, Chen and Mahmood,

Supervisor Connie Chan's amendments are vital for the mayor's family plan to succeed.

Vote No on the Mayor's failed Family Housing plan.

What happened to the "affordable housing" mandates? They have disappeared.

Here is what the Planning Department's new report, "Rezoning Capacity Calculations," doesn't say: under San Francisco's state-approved Housing Element, **57% of those new homes—more than 20,000 units—must be affordable** to low- and very-low-income households. That's not a suggestion; it's part of the state mandate.

The Family Zoning Plan has no funding strategy, no framework for public land, and no realistic plan to produce those affordable homes. It risks satisfying Sacramento's procedural checklist while abandoning the substance of the law: to build housing for the people who need it most. The city is relying completely on developers, grants, GOBs and subsidized funding from the MOHCD.

WHY WASN'T SAN FRANCISCO' CHIEF ECONOMIST CONSULTED ON AFFORDABLE HOUSING?

The balance between supply and demand

San Francisco Politicians and planners don't understand economics. They believe that if they build more units, the price of housing will decrease. This is not true in San Francisco due to market conditions.

Building more houses may not lower prices if there is a simultaneous increase in demand, or if sellers are unwilling to sell for less, a phenomenon known as "
downside stickiness". Other factors like high mortgage rates, rising construction costs, and localized market dynamics can also offset the downward pressure on prices that new supply would typically create.

In a basic economic model, increased supply would lead to lower prices if demand remains constant. However, a parallel increase in demand can keep prices stable or even cause them to rise, despite the new houses.

Rising demand: Population growth, wage increases, favorable

demographic trends, or an influx of institutional investors can drive up demand, absorbing new inventory as it enters the market.

Pent-up demand: In areas that have historically restricted development, a sudden increase in construction can be absorbed by years of pent-up demand, causing prices to plateau rather than fall.

The main cause of higher house prices in SF is the cost of land. Buildable Land is becoming so scarce that only Subsidized affordable housing will be built. The cost of affordable housing will continue to rise

Substitutions and proposed amendments On September 30, a new version of number 250700 was substituted by Mayor Lurie, which made relatively minor zoning changes on a number of parcels. The report analysis reflects those changes

On October 21, supervisor Melgar proposed an amendment that would prohibit the use of the local program on any parcel containing more than two existing housing units which would involve the demolition of a unit subject to rent control

Also, on October 21, supervisor Sauter introduced an amendment that creates incentives for developers to replace lost commercial space As the language of these two amendments were made public last week this report does not attempt to model there economic impact.

-developers are not building due to high land costs and the scarcity of buildable land, high interest rates and high construction costs

-There are almost no grants. Despite best efforts, The Mayors Office Of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD) is currently underfunded and has little ability to subsidize low-income housing in San Francisco.

The dearth of affordable housing was predictable.

-The CPC is currently not trying to attain more housing funding:

Affordable Housing General Obligation Bond (Prop A):
Approval: On March 5, 2024, San Francisco voters approved Proposition A, a $300 million bond to finance the construction, acquisition, and rehabilitation of affordable housing. The funding is on its first tranche--$147.2M

2019 Affordable Housing GOB ($600 million). Approximately $175.9 million remains outstanding, with a final issuance under consideration for late 2025. $55M is being held for the Mercy Housing build beside Laguna Honda Hospital for a senior center.

Voter approval is required: Parcel taxes are special taxes that require voter approval to be enacted. They are not tied to the value of your property.

Mayor Lurie and the MTC are also working on a Parcel tax that will generate $85M - $250M annually for eleven to 14 years. The parcel tax will be almost exclusively on property owners with little passthrough to renters, 2/3rds of SF residents are renters. This parcel tax needs a (50% + 1) citizens vote to pass on November, 2026. This tax is certain to pass.

AMENDMENT LANGUAGE

-Furthering demolition controls to protect tenants. Absolutely. Please don't forget to protect the landlords.

-Implementing Nexus studies and impact fees to ensure adequate infrastructure investment, especially given the fact the city is facing existing funding challenges to build out the emergency water firefighting system for well -resourced neighborhoods, a deficit in public transit, an increased risk of tenant and small business displacement;

The West side EWSS project is already corrupted. The City no

longer wants to build Kaboda piping for high water pressure. Cisterns allow 100 to 250 psi. Kaboda piping remains constant at 300 psi.The fire department is now building large cisterns filled with water and they are also purchasing pump trucks that will connect to other pump tracks. This will allow the fire department to purchase more fire trucks. The cisterns will be attached to the pump trucks which have a limited range. The Kubota piping would have been a much better delivery system but the fire department wanted the trucks. The West side of San Francisco is more in danger of burning than ever before.

The requested reports would be a great idea

-The Mayor's Family Plan does not require developers to build or fix infrastructure. The City will bear the full cost of repairs. This is wrong. The developer should bare the costs of their own project.

-Placing a shot clock to require developers to build within 30 months to boost housing production in the near future to meet the state mandated timeline of 2031; The Planning Department already has 70,000 stored at planning

Factors that influence review time

- **Project complexity:** The scope and size of a project are major factors in the review timeline. Simple projects may be approved more quickly "over the counter," while complex projects may involve multiple reviews and public hearings.
- **Other reviewing agencies:** Building permits must be reviewed by multiple city departments for safety and code compliance. A permit can be sent back to Planning for another review if changes are made to the plans.
- **Permit type:** The type of permit being applied for, such as a building permit, coastal zone permit, or variance, all have

different review processes and timeframes.

- **Application completeness:** Incomplete applications can significantly delay the review process. An application can go through multiple rounds of resubmissions before being accepted for review

LIMITING FORM BASED DENSITY:

Density decontrol is central to the Mayors' family zoning plan. This is the worst type of density planning. A developer can now add as many residential units as they want too. An eight story building can Have thirty units or only one unit. Density decontrol was added to the Mayor's family zoning plan so that San Francisco would have more units then SB 79. This will be uncontrolled density. The city will not stop this program as San Francisco planning is desperate not to be controlled by the state of California

"Density decontrol" was a core component of the initial "**Family "Zoning Plan** legislation introduced by Mayor Daniel Lurie at the Board of Supervisors on **June 24, 2025**.
The concept of density decontrol, which removes unit limits while maintaining existing height and form restrictions, was part of the plan from its formal introduction as legislation, and was also included in earlier draft proposals developed by the Planning Department under former Mayor London Breed. The legislation is currently under consideration by the Board of Supervisors.

"Form-based density" is not an inherently negative planning concept; rather, **specific implementations of form-based codes (FBCs) may face criticisms related to how density is managed, or some residents may object to the very idea of increased density** which FBCs often facilitate.
Common criticisms or perceived negative aspects related to form-based

codes and density include:

- **Community Opposition to Increased Density:** A primary objection from some local residents is that FBCs "promote density and population increases to the detriment of locals" or conflict with an existing "small-town feel". The perception of form-based codes mandating high density can lead to community pushback during the adoption process.
- **Potential for Gentrification:** By creating highly desirable, walkable communities, FBCs can inadvertently result in new developments that sell or rent at a premium, potentially pricing out lower-income residents if affordable housing provisions are not included in the code.
- **Complexity and Administration Challenges:** Form-based codes can be more complex to write and administer than conventional Euclidean zoning, requiring specialized training for planners and staff to interpret design standards objectively. This complexity can lead to confusion, increased review times, or a greater need for variances if the code is not carefully written.
- **"Locking in" Undesirable Existing Forms:** If a form-based code is based strictly on the current urban fabric of an area, it might inadvertently "lock in" low-density, car-dependent patterns, making it harder to densify those areas later if needed to address housing shortages or promote sustainability.
- **Ignoring Market Realities:** Critics sometimes argue that FBCs are overly prescriptive or ignore market demands, although proponents argue that market studies are often a key component of a well-crafted FBC. In some cases, a local market may not be able to support the specific mixed-use or retail components called for in the code.
- **Loss of Perceived "Local Control":** FBCs often streamline the approval process by making projects that meet the code "by-right" (administrative review without public hearings), which some residents or community groups may see as a reduction in public

participation and control over individual projects

There should be an amendment for form based density, but San Francisco well never pass this amendment.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,

George Wooding

415 695-1393

From:	D M LaPointe
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS)
Cc:	Wtpcc Delegates; Wtpcc Officers; Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Segal, Ned (MYR); Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC); Tanner, Rachael (CPC); Farrah, Michael (BOS)
Subject:	Family Zoning - continue item
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 8:33:06 AM
Attachments:	11-17 LU Hearing - WTPCC.docx

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

Please find attached a letter of concern from WTPCC on the Family Zoning Plan.

--
Denise M. LaPointe
President
WTPCC

West of Twin Peaks Central Council
A Resource for Neighborhood Organizations West of Twin Peaks in San Francisco since 1936

WTPCC
PO Box 27112
San Francisco, CA 94127
http://www.westoftwinpeaks.org/

November 17, 2025

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

Dear Chair Melgar and Members of the Land Use and Transportation Committee:

The West of Twin Peaks Central Council represents some of San Francisco's most longstanding and community-driven neighborhoods - places shaped over generations by residents who invested time, resources, and civic energy into making them safe, livable, and environmentally functioning. These neighborhoods work because they reflect thoughtful neighborhood stewardship, stable planning patterns, and infrastructure-supported growth.

The proposed Family Zoning Plan disregards that history. It subjects these neighborhoods to an extreme, ideology-driven experiment that ignores infrastructure limits, discards long-established planning principles, and threatens to permanently destabilize the Westside - all without delivering real affordability or meeting any demonstrated planning need.

At the same time, District 4 - ground zero for many of these proposed changes - currently lacks stable representation. Advancing a sweeping rezoning that disproportionately targets District 4 without its elected voice at the table is not only unjust; it violates the basic expectations of fairness and transparency that residents deserve from their government.

WTPCC has been firm and consistent: density decontrol does not belong in San Francisco's interior neighborhoods. It is unnecessary, it is harmful, and it is being directed intentionally at stable homeowner areas precisely because they have been successful.

SB 79 already imposes the largest mandatory rezoning the Westside has ever faced. This new state law forces dramatic, by-right density increases along major corridor - including Ocean Avenue, West Portal Avenue, and Sloat Boulevard - regardless of local concerns, transit capacity, or neighborhood conditions. These state mandates alone will accelerate teardown pressure, intensify construction, strain emergency response and school capacity, and overwhelm transit and utility systems that are already stretched thin.

The severity of SB 79 is not theoretical. Its impacts are imminent and unavoidable.

Recent representations from City Hall suggesting that the Family Zoning Plan is "better than SB 79," or that it must be passed for San Francisco to be exempt from SB 79's requirements, are simply not accurate. The exemption window created by SB 79 is temporary and expires in 2032 regardless of whether the Family Zoning Plan passes. In other words, the City will not avoid SB 79 by adopting an aggressive, citywide rezoning - state law

will still apply. What the Family Zoning Plan does is impose an additional, discretionary upzoning *on top of* SB 79, not in place of it.

Given the scale of these mandatory state changes, the City's choice to add an additional, discretionary layer of density decontrol in stable residential neighborhoods that SB 79 *does not* touch is unreasonable and heavy-handed. No planning rationale - not housing production, not compliance, not affordability - justifies piling a second wave of deregulation on top of a state mandate that is already transformative.

This is not responsible planning. It is punitive policymaking directed at long-established homeowner neighborhoods for ideological reasons, not practical ones.

Additional density decontrol would:

- Invite speculative teardowns and irreversible conversions
- Displace long-time families and erode community stability
- Reduce predictability for homeowners and property owners
- Undermine a century of intentional neighborhood planning
- Deliver no meaningful affordability or equity outcomes

Protecting historic resources and the architectural fabric of the Westside is essential to maintaining San Francisco's identity and livability. WTPCC neighborhoods include coherent planning patterns and intact early- and mid-century homes that embody the architectural fabric of the western neighborhoods. The Family Zoning Plan provides no meaningful safeguards against the permanent loss of these irreplaceable assets.

Infrastructure realities cannot be dismissed. The Westside already faces:

- Overloaded and unreliable transit
- Congested streets and inadequate traffic management
- Aging water and sewer systems never designed for unlimited growth
- Emergency response stretched thin across large geographic areas
- Schools operating at or beyond capacity

To assume that infrastructure will "catch up later" is not planning - it is negligence. Growth must follow infrastructure, not race ahead of it.

The City must also demand transparency from HCD. Conflicting and inflated capacity assumptions cannot be used to justify unnecessary upzoning. The City should:

- Seek an extension from HCD
- Require all compliance guidance to be made public
- Ensure the City is not pressured into upzoning beyond what state law actually requires

San Franciscans deserve honest planning - not shifting numbers used to justify a predetermined outcome.

For generations, WTPCC neighborhoods have served as anchors for San Francisco's middle-class and homeowner stability. They are not barriers to progress. They are the communities that make San Francisco livable, attractive, and sustainable.

We urge the Committee to take corrective action:

- Remove density decontrol from the Family Zoning Plan
- Restore meaningful protections for historic and architectural resources
- Address infrastructure deficits *before* approving any significant rezoning
- Seek an HCD extension and demand transparent guidance
- Guarantee full District 4 representation before advancing any westside upzoning

San Francisco can meet its housing goals without sacrificing the livability, architectural fabric, and stability of the West of Twin Peaks neighborhoods. We ask you to protect these neighborhoods and the families-homeowners and tenants alike-who have sustained them for generations.

Sincerely,
Denise LaPointe
President, West of Twin Peaks Central Council

Cc: Mayor Daniel Lurie

Supervisor Rafael Mandelman and Board of Supervisors

Ned Segal, Chief of Housing and Economic Development, City and County of San Francisco

Sarah Dennis Phillips, Planning Director

WTPCC Delegates

From:	Nick Ferris
To:	Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS)
Cc:	Chan, Connie (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Re: Support for Chan and Chen Amendments to the Family Zoning Plan Land Use and Transportation Committee Agenda Items 4-7, November 17, 2025
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 8:24:16 AM
Attachments:	THD LUC Upzoning Plan 11.17.25.pdf

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

My apologies. I am adding correct email for President Mandelman.

Nick Ferris
President, Telegraph Hill Dwellers

On Mon, Nov 17, 2025 at 8:15 AM Nick Ferris <nicholashferris@gmail.com> wrote:

> Dear President Mandelman, Chair Melgar, and Members of the Land Use and Transportation Committee,
>
> The Telegraph Hill Dwellers (THD) continues to oppose the proposed Family Zoning Plan ("Upzoning Plan"), but we implore you to adopt the amendments offered by Supervisors Chan and Chen that will help to prevent the displacement of tenants and small businesses and provide a plan for development of the 100% affordable housing we so desperately need. We also continue to urge the Committee and Board of Supervisors to reverse the inclusion of Telegraph Hill, North Beach, and the Northern Waterfront in the Upzoning Plan, which was not contemplated in the 2022 Housing Element or Mayor Breed's zoning proposal.
>
> **President Mandelman, we urge you to please schedule a "Committee of the Whole" to consider all of the proposed amendments.** We are concerned that the Land Use and Transportation Committee may consider tabling and killing the Chan and Chen amendments in committee. We hope not. But, if so, you will have abdicated your responsibility to the democratic process. The full Board of Supervisors deserves a chance to consider these amendments. And, the public deserves to know where each supervisor stands.
>
> In any event, a vote to approve the Upzoning Plan is premature until you have full analysis and clarity on the implications of SB 79 for the Upzoning Plan, not just the 5-page fact-sheet summary prepared by the Planning Department.
>
> If you move forward with this Upzoning Plan, please adopt the following amendments:
>
> 1. **Approve Supervisors Chan's and Chen's Proposed Amendments:**
>   - **Exclude all historic resources,** including local historic districts and those eligible for the California and National Registers, from the Upzoning Plan (Chan File No. 251073).
>   - **Exclude All Existing Residential Units, including all rent-controlled units** from the Upzoning Plan (Chan File No. 251073).
>   - **Remove the Planning Equity Geography Special Use District** ("PEG SUD") from the Upzoning Plan (Chen File No. 251071).
>   - **Remove the Coastal Zone** from the Upzoning Plan (Chan File No. 251071).

- **Remove Form-Based Density in the Base Zoning in All Districts** (Chan File No. 251073).
- **Adopt a Progress Requirement** for obtaining a building permit within a time certain of project approval – "Use it or Lose It" (Chan File No. 251073)
- **Require Inclusionary Affordable Housing Within 1⁄2 Mile** of the development (Chan File No. 251073).

2. Amend Supervisor Melgar's Legislation to Remove All Rent-Controlled Housing
We appreciate Supervisor Melgar's amendment removing rent-controlled housing with three or more units but urge her to expand this amendment to exclude **all** rent-controlled housing with two or more units, not just three or more.

3. Approve Supervisor Chan's Legacy Business Controls
THD joins with Small Business Forward to support Supervisor Chan's legislation to extend the requirement for a Conditional Use Authorization for sites where a Legacy Business has been displaced. In absence of having any other tools available or financial resources to support the successful relocation of a Legacy Business within the community, the Conditional Use is an imperfect but necessary mechanism to discourage displacement of Legacy Businesses in the first place. That is why Small Business Forward supports the extension of the CU legislation until other more effective protection measures are in place, such as commercial rent control, the right of return, and adequate relocation assistance.

4. Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District and Funding Strategy.
We join with REP-SF and the Council of Community Housing Organizations (CCHO) to demand that the SFMTA-SUD be revised to provide that these publicly owned parcels be developed for 100% affordable and social housing. Under San Francisco's state-approved Housing Element, as mandated by the state, 57% of the 36,200 new housing units proposed to be developed under the Upzoning Plan—more than 20,000 units—must be affordable to low- and very-low-income households. Yet the Upzoning Plan has no funding strategy or realistic plan to produce those affordable homes. It risks satisfying Sacramento's procedural checklist while abandoning the substance of the law: to build housing for the people who need it most.

5. Remove North Beach, Telegraph Hill, and the Northern Waterfront from the Upzoning Plan.
THD continues to strongly oppose the late inclusion in the Upzoning Plan of major portions of Telegraph Hill, North Beach, and the Northern Waterfront, areas that were not included in the 2022 Adopted Housing Element ("2022 Housing Element") or considered in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR). These areas represent one of the densest neighborhoods in San Francisco, with roughly 82% of our residents currently living in existing pre-1979 multi-family, rent-controlled buildings housing our City's workforce and seniors, including a large immigrant Asian population. Based on the City's profiles of neighborhoods in San Francisco, there are **37,156** people per square mile in North Beach as compared to **17,325** people per square mile in San Francisco. The Planning Department's own data shows that rent-controlled buildings in District 3 (built before 1979 with 2+ units, excluding condos) represent approximately 32,340 individual units, 13,983 of which are located in the current version of the Upzoning Plan. **In other words, tenants occupying 13,983 units will be subject to potential eviction and displacement.**

And, although the 2022 Housing Element and EIR assumed that the Northeast Planning

District would provide net new housing units of only *800 units* by 2050, the Upzoning Plan suddenly increased that figure to *5,900 units*, a stunning *650% increase*. This is a far greater percentage increase than any other area in the City. The height and density increases represented by this increase will significantly impact existing tenants, small businesses, historic resources, parks and open spaces, and the diverse culture of District 3.

* * * * * * * *

In conclusion, THD believes that the Upzoning Plan, as proposed, threatens tenants and small businesses, pits neighborhoods against each other, and disregards decades of community-based policymaking that has built San Francisco into a resilient, vibrant city through a network of strong neighborhoods.

The proposed amendments from Supervisors Chan and Chen address these concerns by focusing on protecting tenants and rent-controlled housing citywide, supporting small businesses, and prioritizing the development of affordable housing. We urge this Committee to move these critical elements forward.

Sincerely,
Nick Ferris, President

November 16, 2025
Via Email

President Rafael Mandelman and
Members of the Land Use and Transportation Committee
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Rafael Mandelman – *Rafael.Mandleman@sfgov.org*
Myrna Melgar, Chair - *Myrna.Melgar@sfgov.org*
Chyanne Chen, Vice-Chair - *Chyanne.Chen@sfgov.org*
Bilal Mahmood, Member - *Bilal.Mahmood@sfgov.org*

RE: Support for Chan and Chen Amendments to the Family Zoning Plan
Land Use and Transportation Committee Agenda Items 4-7, November 17, 2025

Dear President Mandelman, Chair Melgar, and Members of the Land Use and Transportation Committee,

The Telegraph Hill Dwellers (THD) continues to oppose the proposed Family Zoning Plan ("Upzoning Plan"), but we implore you to adopt the amendments offered by Supervisors Chan and Chen that will help to prevent the displacement of tenants and small businesses and provide a plan for development of the 100% affordable housing we so desperately need. We also continue to urge the Committee and Board of Supervisors to reverse the inclusion of Telegraph Hill, North Beach, and the Northern Waterfront in the Upzoning Plan, which was not contemplated in the 2022 Housing Element or Mayor Breed's zoning proposal.

President Mandelman, we urge you to please schedule a "Committee of the Whole" to consider all of the proposed amendments. We are concerned that the Land Use and Transportation Committee may consider tabling and killing the Chan and Chen amendments in committee. We hope not. But, if so, you will have abdicated your responsibility to the democratic process. The full Board of Supervisors deserves a chance to consider these amendments. And, the public deserves to know where each supervisor stands.

In any event, a vote to approve the Upzoning Plan is premature until you have full analysis and clarity on the implications of SB 79 for the Upzoning Plan, not just the 5-page fact-sheet summary prepared by the Planning Department.

If you move forward with this Upzoning Plan, please adopt the following amendments:

1. **Approve Supervisors Chan's and Chen's Proposed Amendments:**

   - **Exclude all historic resources**, including local historic districts and those eligible for the California and National Registers, from the Upzoning Plan (Chan File No. 251073).

   - **Exclude All Existing Residential Units, including all rent-controlled units** from the Upzoning Plan (Chan File No. 251073).

- **Remove the Planning Equity Geography Special Use District** ("PEG SUD") from the Upzoning Plan (Chen File No. 251071).
- **Remove the Coastal Zone** from the Upzoning Plan (Chan File No. 251071).
- **Remove Form-Based Density in the Base Zoning in All Districts** (Chan File No. 251073).
- **Adopt a Progress Requirement** for obtaining a building permit within a time certain of project approval – "*Use it or Lose It*" (Chan File No. 251073)
- **Require Inclusionary Affordable Housing Within ½ Mile** of the development (Chan File No. 251073).

2. Amend Supervisor Melgar's Legislation to Remove All Rent-Controlled Housing

We appreciate Supervisor Melgar's amendment removing rent-controlled housing with three or more units but urge her to expand this amendment to exclude ***all*** rent-controlled housing with two or more units, not just three or more.

3. Approve Supervisor Chan's Legacy Business Controls

THD joins with Small Business Forward to support Supervisor Chan's legislation to extend the requirement for a Conditional Use Authorization for sites where a Legacy Business has been displaced. In absence of having any other tools available or financial resources to support the successful relocation of a Legacy Business within the community, the Conditional Use is an imperfect but necessary mechanism to discourage displacement of Legacy Businesses in the first place. That is why Small Business Forward supports the extension of the CU legislation until other more effective protection measures are in place, such as commercial rent control, the right of return, and adequate relocation assistance.

4. Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District and Funding Strategy.

We join with REP-SF and the Council of Community Housing Organizations (CCHO) to demand that the SFMTA-SUD be revised to provide that these publicly owned parcels be developed for 100% affordable and social housing. Under San Francisco's state-approved Housing Element, as mandated by the state, 57% of the 36,200 new housing units proposed to be developed under the Upzoning Plan—more than 20,000 units—must be affordable to low- and very-low-income households. Yet the Upzoning Plan has no funding strategy or realistic plan to produce those affordable homes. It risks satisfying Sacramento's procedural checklist while abandoning the substance of the law: to build housing for the people who need it most.

5. **Remove North Beach, Telegraph Hill, and the Northern Waterfront from the Upzoning Plan.**

THD continues to strongly oppose the late inclusion in the Upzoning Plan of major portions of Telegraph Hill, North Beach, and the Northern Waterfront, areas that were not included in the 2022 Adopted Housing Element ("2022 Housing Element") or considered in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR). These areas represent one of the densest neighborhoods in San Francisco, with roughly 82% of our residents currently living in existing pre-1979 multi-family, rent-controlled buildings housing our City's workforce and seniors, including a large immigrant Asian population. Based on the City's profiles of neighborhoods in San Francisco, there are **37,156** people per square mile in North Beach as compared to **17,325** people per square mile in San Francisco.[1] The Planning Department's own data shows that rent-controlled buildings in District 3 (built before 1979 with 2+ units, excluding condos) represent approximately 32,340 individual units, 13,983 of which are located in the current version of the Upzoning Plan. **In other words, tenants occupying 13,983 units will be subject to potential eviction and displacement.**

And, although the 2022 Housing Element and EIR assumed that the Northeast Planning District would provide net new housing units of only *800 units* by 2050, the Upzoning Plan suddenly increased that figure to *5,900 units*, a stunning *650% increase*. This is a far greater percentage increase than any other area in the City. The height and density increases represented by this increase will significantly impact existing tenants, small businesses, historic resources, parks and open spaces, and the diverse culture of District 3.

* * * * * * * *

In conclusion, THD believes that the Upzoning Plan, as proposed, threatens tenants and small businesses, pits neighborhoods against each other, and disregards decades of community-based policymaking that has built San Francisco into a resilient, vibrant city through a network of strong neighborhoods.

The proposed amendments from Supervisors Chan and Chen address these concerns by focusing on protecting tenants and rent-controlled housing citywide, supporting small businesses, and prioritizing the development of affordable housing. We urge this Committee to move these critical elements forward.

Sincerely,

Nick Ferris, President

ccs: Supervisor Connie Chan – *connie.chan@sfgov.org*
Clerk John Carroll - *John.Carroll@sfgov.org*
Members, San Francisco Board of Supervisors - *Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org*

[1] https://www.city-data.com/neighborhood/North-Beach-San-Francisco-CA.html

From:	lgpetty
To:	MelgarStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff
Cc:	Carroll, John (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; mahmoudstaff@sfgov.org; Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject:	All Tenant Protection Ordinance Amendments Require Due Deliberation
Date:	Saturday, November 15, 2025 5:33:13 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I write in support of Supervisor Cheyanne Chen's Tenant Protection Ordinance and to urge you not to "disappear" all the other amendments to it that have been proposed by Supervisors Chan and Chen.

In our democracy (yes we still have one) every serious proposal deserves serious consideration in a fair hearing and open decision process.

The public are entitled to know about all of the TPO amendment proposals -- in clear words, and in full. They are entitled to time and opportunity to examine them freely. People are entitled to express their opinions on them -- softly in writing; loudly in public. And, not least of all, the public are entitled to know the position of each of their representatives on each of the proposals.

Or has San Francisco fallen into an elitist shadow world where electeds get to ignore proposed legislation that might help the people, and hide the proposals so deeply that the people are forever denied them?

San Francisco government must not operate in secret.

Would any Supervisor take away the People's basic rights? For what reason? For "efficiency"? For political advantage? For monetary gain? For misguided fear of higher government reprisal? Or just because some can't stand the "noise" in a noisy, messy democracy?

I'll be delighted if you prove San Francisco is indeed still a democracy by giving all the Chan and Chen TPO amendments a full airing.

Lorraine Petty

-For Affordable Housing.
-Against Demolition of Sound Residential Housing.
-D2/5 Voter.

From:	Sharon Ng
To:	Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS)
Cc:	Carroll, John (BOS); Rosa Chen
Subject:	Re: Family Zoning Plan (Board File #250966, 250700, 251071, 250701, 251073)
Date:	Friday, November 14, 2025 1:54:45 PM
Attachments:	CCDC Land Use & Transportation Committee FZP Letter 11.17.2025.pdf

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

(Including the attachment here)

Sharon Ng
Community Planner | Planning and Policy Team
Pronouns: s*he/her/hers*
Chinatown Community Development Center
615 Grant Avenue | San Francisco, CA | 94108

From: Sharon Ng
Sent: Friday, November 14, 2025 1:51 PM
To: Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; bilal.mahmood@sfgov.org <bilal.mahmood@sfgov.org>; chyanne.chen@sfgov.org <chyanne.chen@sfgov.org>
Cc: john.carroll@sfgov.org <john.carroll@sfgov.org>; Rosa Chen <rosa.chen@chinatowncdc.org>
Subject: Family Zoning Plan (Board File #250966, 250700, 251071, 250701, 251073)

Dear Supervisors and Clerk Carroll,

Please see CCDC's letter attached on the Family Zoning Plan scheduled for the November 17th Land Use and Transportation hearing, and please let us know if you have any questions or comments.

Thank you!
Sharon

Sharon Ng
Community Planner | Planning and Policy Team
Pronouns: s*he/her/hers*
Chinatown Community Development Center
615 Grant Avenue | San Francisco, CA | 94108

Chinatown Community Development Center
華 協 中 心

615 Grant Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94108
TEL 415.984.1450
FAX 415.362.7992
TTY 415.984.9910
www.chinatowncdc.org

November 14, 2025

San Francisco Planning Commission
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Re: Family Zoning Plan (Board File #250966, 250700, 251071, 250701, 251073)

Dear Supervisors,

Chinatown Community Development Center (CCDC) writes to express our concerns with the Family Zoning Plan. While we recognize the need for more housing, this plan as written does not center the needs of the city's working class and low-income residents.

We support the amendments for:

- Prohibiting the demolition of rent-controlled housing in the local program
- Removing form-based density in the base zoning
- Removing all Priority Equity Geographies from the rezoning

Through years of tenant counseling and community organizing, we've seen how sweeping zoning changes—without adequate tenant protections or affordable housing strategies—lead to demolitions, evictions, and displacement. This plan risks fueling speculation by giving developers new incentives to rebuild properties for profit through greater height and density, encouraging the removal of long-term renters—often low-income seniors and families—without providing full tenant protections.

Mrs. Lee's story is a notorious case that comes to mind. In 2013, CCDC supported Mr. and Mrs. Lee and their adult daughter with a disability when they were evicted from their home of over 30 years, where the developer planned to convert all rental units into high-end TICs. In the 10 years following the eviction, the family could not get into affordable housing. This particular case highlights the consequences of when displacement is coupled with the insufficient number of affordable units accessible to extremely low-income families.

In a city with an ever-increasing cost of living, rent controlled housing is one of the few avenues in which long-term residents can afford to continue living in the city. We recognize Supervisor Melgar's amendment exempting properties with 3+ units from use of the HC-SF program, as a step in the right direction, but hundreds of tenants in 2-unit properties remain at risk. While we appreciate the work that Supervisors Melgar and Chen have done to advance protections through the Tenant Protections and Demolitions Ordinance, loopholes such as Ellis Act evictions and the continued inclusion of 2-unit rent-controlled buildings in the upzoning plan leave many tenants vulnerable and unprotected. We ask

that all existing rent-controlled housing be exempt from the HC-SF program. This does not bar property owners from using programs like SDB and therefore should not be considered a constraint on development.

We also ask that form-based density is removed from the base zoning because when it is coupled with the HC-SF program or SDB, the potential for large profits may increase the risk of speculation.

The two aforementioned points are especially important in the context of the PEGs "comprised of areas or neighborhoods with a higher density of vulnerable populations," and where there has been a history of displacement. These areas typically have a high percentage of renters, many of which live in rent-controlled housing. Section 249.97 of the San Francisco Planning Code states "the City needs to expand permanently affordable housing investment" in these areas. This plan does not have a tangible affordable housing plan but rather functions merely as a market-rate housing initiative.

Relying on market-driven development and a 15% inclusionary requirement—most of which serve households between 55% and 200% of AMI—does not constitute an affordable housing strategy. The City's RHNA goals include the production of approximately 46,000 low- and moderate-income units. As it stands, there is no substantial plan to meet that goal. Units that are not deed-restricted affordable will ultimately be unaffordable to the lowest income folks. So, we ask that the PEGs be removed from the plan, per Supervisor Chen's amendment, and that the Board create true affordable housing solutions in the PEGs, and citywide.

We want to be explicit that we are not against building more housing, but the housing we build should be affordable to the communities we serve, existing community members and small businesses should have the right to remain in their neighborhoods, and units should suit the needs of everyday families.

Sincerely,



Rosa Chen

Director of Programs – Planning & Policy

From:	SON-SF SaveOurNeighborhoodsSF
To:	Lurie, Daniel (MYR)
Cc:	Zou, Han (MYR); Board of Supervisors (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; FielderStaff; MahmoodStaff; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); SherrillStaff; Melgar, Myrna (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); So, Lydia (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Braun, Derek (CPC); Campbell, Amy (CPC); Imperial, Theresa (CPC); Mcgarry, Sean (CPC); Williams, Gilbert A (CPC); Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject:	INTERIM D4 SUPERVISOR
Date:	Friday, November 14, 2025 1:48:37 PM

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

Dear Mayor Lurie,

SON-SF ~ Save Our Neighborhoods SF were very disappointed in the most recent appointment of Isabella "Beya" Alcaraz especially in-light of all the negative issues surrounding her business & personal life. *But, we are pleased that she resigned at your request!*

However, this once again leaves District 4 with NO representation that the community had any input on.

We would like to recommend that a Town Hall be held ASAP & all constituents should be invited to discuss this matter & make comment on.

Furthermore, in regards to the vote on **November 17th** at the Land use & Transportation Committee Hearing, we feel that as once more D4 has no representation to submit constituents suggested Amendments regarding the Family Zoning Plan. We feel it's necessary & appropriate to postpone this hearing & others until we have an Interim D4 Supervisor to voice our needs & concerns.

Sincerely,
Renee Lazear & Shawna McGrew
Co-Founders
SON-SF ~ Save Our Neighborhoods SF
sonsf.org

From: Holden Weisman
To: MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff; MahmoodStaff
Cc: Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject: Habitat for Humanity Greater San Francisco Letter of Support for the Family Zoning Plan
Date: Friday, November 14, 2025 1:07:34 PM
Attachments: Outlook-fchsxpx2.png
Habitat GSF Letter of Support for FZP 11142025.pdf

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

Members of the Land Use and Transportation Committee,

Please accept the attached letter of support from Habitat for Humanity Greater San Francisco relating to the Family Zoning Plan - Items 4 through 7 on the November 17, 2025 meeting agenda of the Land Use and Transportation Committee. If you have any questions or would like to follow up, please do not hesitate to contact me directly.

Thank you,
Holden Weisman

Holden Weisman | Director of Policy and Advocacy
He / Him / His
Habitat for Humanity Greater San Francisco
300 Montgomery Street, Suite 450, San Francisco, CA 94104
(415) 907-4435
• https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___www.habitatgsf.org___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzpiZGU4ZmMyM2M1NDY5NzIjYWYxZGEyZDA2OWJiMTY0ZTo3OmFkZjU6MDQ2ZDk2YmE3NWNiNjM2YzJmM2FkODJmMzBjZmYwN2MxYzFjMTFmYTQzNzk0M2Q5MmNhYWU5NWFlZWY5OTI5NTp0OlQ6Tg
• @Habitatgsf

We build and sustain affordable homeownership opportunities for families in San Francisco, San Mateo, and Marin counties.

Book time to meet with me

Habitat for Humanity®
Greater San Francisco

November 14, 2025

Supervisor Myrna Melgar
Chair, Land Use and Transportation Committee
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Chair Melgar,

On behalf of Habitat for Humanity Greater San Francisco (Habitat GSF), I would like to once again share our support for the Family Zoning Plan, including recent amendments. We believe the Family Zoning Plan will set San Francisco on a realistic path toward addressing the city's housing needs and will allow Habitat GSF to more effectively produce homes that fulfill these needs. We encourage you to vote to recommend the necessary legislation as amended to the full Board of Supervisors for consideration.


Habitat GSF builds homes and sustains affordable homeownership opportunities for families across San Francisco. However, our ability to continue to produce the kinds of 100% permanently affordable multiunit homes for ownership is increasingly limited to relatively few neighborhoods that meet our zoning needs. We also face the challenge all affordable homebuilders must grapple with – scarce availability of affordable land. Without such properties we will be further constrained from producing homes that would allow our homeowners to plant generational roots in well-resourced and transit-rich neighborhoods.

The Family Zoning Plan will open many more doors for Habitat GSF homeowners by dramatically increasing the number of zoned areas that would better meet our financial needs to produce more permanently affordable homeownership opportunities in every district. Further, the inclusion of Supervisor Chen's amendment to grant qualified nonprofits the first right of refusal for sales of property within the SFMTA SUD is invaluable and critical to making the kinds of developments we produce significantly more feasible.

It is for these reasons and for our strong conviction that homeownership is transformative for families' health, education, and building of generational wealth, that we ask that you recommend the Family Zoning Plan as amended to the full Board of Supervisors.

If you have any questions or would like to follow up on these comments, please reach out to me directly at hweisman@habitatgsf.org. Thank you on behalf of Habitat for Humanity Greater San Francisco and our future San Franciscan homeowners.

Sincerely,



Holden Weisman
Director of Policy Advocacy
Habitat for Humanity Greater San Francisco
hweisman@habitatgsf.org

Cc: Supervisor Chyanne Chen
Supervisor Bilal Mahmood
John Carroll, Clerk

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	BOS-Operations; Carroll, John (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS); Calvillo, Angela (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Entezari, Mehran (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS)
Subject:	13 Letters Regarding File Nos. 250700, 250701, 250966, 251071, 251072, and 251073
Date:	Thursday, November 13, 2025 12:18:51 PM
Attachments:	13 Letters Regarding Zoning.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached 13 letters regarding File Nos.:

250700: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan
250701: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan
250966: General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan
251071: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan
251072: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan
251073: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan

Regards,

John Bullock
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-5184
BOS@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

Disclosures: *Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: Maren Vanderkolk
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 3:30:49 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Maren Vanderkolk
mvanderkolk10@gmail.com
2250 Bay St
San Francisco, California 94123

From: Kayla Cranshaw-Craig
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 3:41:40 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Kayla Cranshaw-Craig
kacranshawcraig@gmail.com
1242 34th Ave
San Francisco, California 94122

From: danfoldes@gmail.com
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 9:37:46 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Dan

danfoldes@gmail.com
1430 Cole St Apt 2
San Francisco, California 94117

From: Monica Moore
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Wednesday, November 5, 2025 4:45:03 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

As a concerned constituent, I do not agree that the Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need. This is the antithesis of serving the San Franciscan public.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units.

I am requesting that you vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.

I am requesting that you require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Please truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses. Developers must be required to provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.

Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in our Mayor's Plan.

Given climate change, it is essential that the public access to our waterfront and environment be protected, especially for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.

Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Monica Moore

Monica Moore
monica1973moore@icloud.com
23 Mirabel Ave, # B
San Francisco , California 94110

From: Margo Aparicio
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Thursday, November 6, 2025 10:40:25 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!
As a below median income renter, I can only say this proposal to displace people in rent

controlled properties is an invitation to force tax paying tenants and families to leave San Francisco. Affordability is far more important an issue over high rent towers that like our own downtown will be riddled with empty apartments most people can't afford. Times are tough, so rather than increase homelessness with Mayor Lurie's proposal, please look alternatives. Has demolishing empty or near empty downtown office high rises buildings for high rise apartments even been considered? I'm not talking office building conversion, but instead NEW housing! You won't be displacing rent controlled units, the skyline won't change drastically, and more housing will be available without additional use of land space.
Sincerely,
Margo Aparicio

Margo Aparicio
margo21st@gmail.com
228 Duncan Street #202
San Francisco, California 94131

From: jonieisen@sbcglobal.net
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, November 11, 2025 11:00:55 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

jonieisen@sbcglobal.net
592 Pennsylvania Avenue
San Francisco, California 94107

From: Michael Taylor
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, November 11, 2025 11:45:39 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Michael Taylor
Nob Hill
San Francisco, CA

Michael Taylor
PHATMICHAELT@GMAIL.COM
1201 California St
San Francisco, California 94109

From: maxbmargolis@gmail.com
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, November 11, 2025 11:56:37 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Max Margolis

maxbmargolis@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94122

From: Tom Zimberoff
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, November 11, 2025 1:14:06 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Tom Zimberoff
tom@zimberoff.com
1364 45th Avenue
San Francisco, California 94122

From: Michael Nguyen
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, November 11, 2025 2:39:46 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Michael Nguyen
mike14780@gmail.com
785 Burnett Ave , #8
San Francisco, California 94131

From: LissaIvy Tiegel
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Wednesday, November 12, 2025 1:08:27 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Lissalvy Tiegel
tinydiagram@gmaiL.com
201 Roanoke Street, 1a
San Francisco, California 94131

From: Jonathan Hsieh
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Wednesday, November 12, 2025 10:36:29 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Jonathan Hsieh
jzhsieh@gmail.com
1688 PINE ST, UNIT W404
San Francisco, California 94109

From: Cody Vaughn
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 1:00:24 AM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Cody Vaughn
vaughnburger01@gmail.com
1451 Guerrero St, Apt. 3
San Francisco, California 94110-4360

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	BOS-Operations; Carroll, John (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS); Calvillo, Angela (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Entezari, Mehran (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS)
Subject:	20 Letters Regarding File Nos. 250700, 250701, 250966, 251071, 251072, and 251073
Date:	Wednesday, November 12, 2025 3:23:01 PM
Attachments:	20 Letters Regarding Zoning.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached 29 letters regarding File Nos.:

250700: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan
250701: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan
250966: General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan
251071: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan
251072: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan
251073: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan

Regards,

John Bullock
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-5184
BOS@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

Disclosures: *Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: Matthew Castillon
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Sunday, November 9, 2025 2:56:49 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Matthew Castillon
mcastillon10@gmail.com
550 Battery St
San Francisco, California 94111

From: Eric Brooks
To: Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff
Subject: Public Comment: Nov 3 Amendments Not Enough! Replace Mayor"s Disastrous Zoning Plan With Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701
Date: Monday, November 10, 2025 8:53:45 PM

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

Hi again Supervisors,

The amendments that were added on November 3rd to Mayor Lurie's so called 'housing plan' are not remotely enough!

The City Economist's report shows clearly that Lurie's plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing.

We still have 2 months to replace the Mayor's plan with one that will work. Here's a real strategy to solve the City's affordable housing crisis.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units. Together these are more than enough to fulfill state mandates. (Yet instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Lurie's plan moves zoning rules around like deck chairs on the Titanic, does almost nothing to increase affordable housing, and increases the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing over-supply [now at 150%] while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods.)

Now that the City Economist has shown that Lurie's plan won't work, it is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the 'Family Zoning' plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing approved housing permits, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year, in a way that will fully meet state mandates. **And make certain that all affordable housing produced fits the accepted definition of costing only 30% of the income of its residents.**

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put

almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible, instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood, and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

The Mayor's plan would build more excess housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators. **Please REPLACE the text in the Mayor's unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural and community integrity, with text that will truly produce affordable housing and get State bureaucrats off of San Francisco's back.**

Thank you,

Eric Brooks
Our City SF
San Francisco CEQA Defenders
415-756-8844

http://our-city.org

From: Teresa Palmer
To: Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff
Subject: Public Comment: Replace Mayor Lurie"s Disastrous Zoning Plan With A Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701
Date: Tuesday, November 11, 2025 1:00:30 AM

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

Public Comment: Replace Mayor Lurie's Disastrous Zoning Plan With A Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701

Dear Supervisors,

The amendments that were added on November 3rd to Mayor Lurie's so called 'housing plan' are not remotely enough!

The City Economist's report shows clearly that Lurie's plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing.

We still have 2 months to replace the Mayor's plan with one that will work. Here's a real strategy to solve the City's affordable housing crisis.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units. Together these are more than enough to fulfill state mandates. (Yet instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Lurie's plan moves zoning rules around like deck chairs on the Titanic, does almost nothing to increase affordable housing, and increases the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing over-supply [now at 150%] while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods.)

Now that the City Economist has shown that Lurie's plan won't work, it is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the 'Family Zoning' plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing approved housing permits, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year, in a way that will fully meet state mandates. And make certain that all affordable housing produced fits the accepted definition of costing only 30% of the income of its residents.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public

hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible, instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood, and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

The Mayor's plan would build more excess housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators. **Please REPLACE the text in the Mayor's unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural and community integrity, with text that will truly produce affordable housing and get State bureaucrats off of San Francisco's back.**

Thank you,

Teresa Palmer M.D.

1845 Hayes St. San Francisco, California 94117

From:	Kathryn Hyde
To:	Press Office, Mayor (MYR); Severiano.Christian@sen.ca.gov; Raayan.Mohtashemi@sen.ca.gov
Cc:	Carroll, John (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); radhika.gawde@sen.ca.gov
Subject:	housing SF
Date:	Tuesday, November 11, 2025 7:50:24 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

The City Economist's report shows clearly that Lurie's plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing.

- We do not have the infrastructure, police force, roads, parking and water to support this plan.
- Structures should be limited to 5 stories to preserve lighting and wind
- We are only 7 x 7 square miles. SF is not like ares that have space
- Concerns about earthquakes
- There is space to build on vacant lots, Walgreens sites, 7/11 on Clment/9th Ave., etc.
- No buildings close to the shoreline
- We still have 2 months to replace the Mayor's plan with one that will work. Here's a real strategy to solve the City's affordable housing crisis.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units. Together these are more than enough to fulfill state mandates. (Yet instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Lurie's plan moves zoning rules around like deck chairs on the Titanic, does almost nothing to increase affordable housing, and increases the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing over-supply [now at 150%] while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods.)

Now that the City Economist has shown that Lurie's plan won't work, it is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the 'Family Zoning' plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing approved housing permits, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year, in a way that will fully meet state mandates. And make certain that all affordable housing produced fits the accepted definition of costing only 30% of the income of its residents.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible, instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood, and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

The Mayor's plan would build more excess housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators.

Thank you!

Kathryn Hyde
130 Frederick St SF 94117

Kathryn Hyde | 415.359.7971 | IG @reenvisionrepair |
https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___www.reenvisionrepair.com___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzo4NWYyNGNiZmQ1YTZhY2YwMjUwMDE5YzkzZTk4MTRlMjo3OmQ5Nzg6ZjM5MmFmZGJkYTVkZjk5ZTQ0MDA3M2QyNzI3YjAwYjEwNWVjYTc5YWEzYzNiMDVmOTQxYjdlNmM0ODhkYjUzMDp0OlQ6Tg

From: Alan Billingsley
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, November 11, 2025 11:27:13 AM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Alan Billingsley
alanbillingsley215@gmail.com
215 Eureka St
San Francisco , California 94114

From: Anthony Criscione
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Support Family Zoning-San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, November 11, 2025 11:31:50 AM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Anthony Criscione
acriscione1997@gmail.com
145 San Jose Ave
San Francisco , California 94110

From: Phillip Raffle
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, November 11, 2025 11:59:31 AM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Phillip Raffle
phillip.d.raffle@gmail.com
1466 Dolores Street
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Marty Cerles
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, November 11, 2025 12:01:06 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Marty Cerles
martycerles@gmail.com
2940 Turk Blvd
San Francisco, California 94118

From: Julia Diaz
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, November 11, 2025 1:44:32 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Julia Diaz
jmdiaz2016@g.ucla.edu
3841 24th st
San Francisco , California 94114

From: Todor Markov
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, November 11, 2025 2:57:42 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I've called San Francisco home since 2017. I live in Rincon Hill, and I'm writing to voice my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.
I've watched this city change over the past eight years, and one thing has become crystal clear: we need more housing. I've seen friends leave because they couldn't afford to stay. I've watched young families struggle to find space to grow. And I've seen how the lack of housing options makes this city less accessible to the people who make it vibrant and diverse.
That's why I support the Family Zoning Plan. This isn't just policy to me—it's about making sure San Francisco remains a place where everyone can afford to live, not just the wealthy. I want more homes in Rincon Hill and across the city. I want my neighbors to be able to build in-law units for aging parents or backyard cottages for adult children. I want teachers, artists, service workers, and young professionals to have a real shot at living here.
This plan gives families flexibility and expands housing choices in the neighborhoods where people actually want to live—near transit, jobs, and schools. It's a positive step toward a more livable, affordable, and inclusive San Francisco.
I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan. Let's build a city where everyone can belong.
Thank you for listening.
Sincerely,
Todor Markov

Todor Markov
todor.m.markov@gmail.com
301 Main Street #32F
San Francisco, California 94105

From: Justin Truong
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, November 11, 2025 5:21:07 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Justin Truong
justintruong56@gmail.com
33 Junior Terrace
San Francisco, California 94112

From: Patrick Le
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, November 11, 2025 5:39:33 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my very strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more housing, and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

Let's build a San Francisco that will continue to grow and where everyone can belong. It just makes sense to build more housing. More people, more revenue from taxes and local businesses to fund essential services. Why do we want the population to shrink and still have it be so expensive to live here? Please do the right thing.

Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Patrick Le
patrickle1994@gmail.com
511 Eureka St.
San Francisco, California 94114

From: Annette Billingsley
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, November 11, 2025 5:43:55 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Annette Billingsley
ab94115@gmail.com
2821 Pine Street
San Francisco, California 94115

From: Meghan Warner
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, November 11, 2025 6:32:29 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Best,
Meghan Warner, PhD
D4 Resident

Meghan Warner
meghanowarner@gmail.com
2610 47th ave
San Francisco, California 94116

From: Paul Foppe
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, November 11, 2025 7:52:15 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,
As the middle of a sandwich family raising a first grader while taking care of a mother-in-law with alzheimer's dementia, I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan. We need more housing of all types for all income levels for renters and for purchase.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us forward. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Paul Foppe
hugfoppe@gmail.com
2301 Lincoln Way
SAN FRANCISCO, California 94122

From: Alex Wong
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Wednesday, November 12, 2025 12:11:39 AM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

Last Tuesday's elections in NJ, VA and NYC only reinforced an issue that has plagued San Franciscans for decades: the issue of affordability.

When the most expensive expense of any person's paycheck is housing, we have to build much more homes if we have any hope of reining in costs.

The Family Zoning Plan will expand housing choices across the city, especially near transit, jobs, and schools.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Alex Wong
mr.alexander.wong@gmail.com
1539 24th Ave
San Francisco, California 94122

From: Lisa Zahner
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Wednesday, November 12, 2025 9:02:37 AM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Lisa Zahner
lisa@cityrealestatesf.com
348 Scott St
San Francisco, California 94117

From:	Bruce Wolfe N6BMW
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff
Subject:	URGENT! Public Comment: Replace Mayor Lurie"s Disastrous Zoning Plan With A Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701
Date:	Wednesday, November 12, 2025 12:29:06 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

The amendments that were added on November 3rd to Mayor Lurie's so called 'housing plan' are not remotely enough!

The City Economist's report shows clearly that Lurie's plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing.

We still have 2 months to replace the Mayor's plan with one that will work. Here's a real strategy to solve the City's affordable housing crisis.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units. Together these are more than enough to fulfill state mandates. (Yet instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Lurie's plan moves zoning rules around like deck chairs on the Titanic, does almost nothing to increase affordable housing, and increases the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing over-supply [now at 150%] while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods.)

Now that the City Economist has shown that Lurie's plan won't work, it is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the 'Family Zoning' plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing approved housing permits, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year, in a way that will fully meet state mandates. And make certain that all affordable housing produced fits the accepted definition of costing only 30% of the income of its residents.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as

possible, instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood, and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

The Mayor's plan would build more excess housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators. **Please REPLACE the text in the Mayor's unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural and community integrity, with text that will truly produce affordable housing and get State bureaucrats off of San Francisco's back.**

Thank you,

Bruce

94117

From: Maika Pinkston
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Wednesday, November 12, 2025 12:43:06 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Maika Pinkston

Maika Pinkston
maikapinkston@gmail.com
37 Commer CT. #329
San Francisco, California 94124

From: Edward Sullivan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Wednesday, November 12, 2025 2:40:20 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Edward Sullivan
efsullyjr@aol.com
2448 Great Hwy Apt 14
San Francisco, California 94116

From:	Bruce Wolfe N6BMW
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff
Subject:	URGENT! Public Comment: Replace Mayor Lurie"s Disastrous Zoning Plan With A Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701
Date:	Wednesday, November 12, 2025 12:29:03 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

The amendments that were added on November 3rd to Mayor Lurie's so called 'housing plan' are not remotely enough!

The City Economist's report shows clearly that Lurie's plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing.

We still have 2 months to replace the Mayor's plan with one that will work. Here's a real strategy to solve the City's affordable housing crisis.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units. Together these are more than enough to fulfill state mandates. (Yet instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Lurie's plan moves zoning rules around like deck chairs on the Titanic, does almost nothing to increase affordable housing, and increases the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing over-supply [now at 150%] while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods.)

Now that the City Economist has shown that Lurie's plan won't work, it is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the 'Family Zoning' plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing approved housing permits, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year, in a way that will fully meet state mandates. And make certain that all affordable housing produced fits the accepted definition of costing only 30% of the income of its residents.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as

possible, instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood, and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

The Mayor's plan would build more excess housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators. **Please REPLACE the text in the Mayor's unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural and community integrity, with text that will truly produce affordable housing and get State bureaucrats off of San Francisco's back.**

Thank you,

Bruce

94117

From:	Woody LaBounty
To:	Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS)
Cc:	Carroll, John (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); isabella.alcaraz@sfgov.org; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS)
Subject:	Land Use Mtg on 11/17: SF Heritage Supports Supervisor Chan"s Amendments
Date:	Tuesday, November 11, 2025 6:46:24 PM
Attachments:	image001.png SFHeritage-SUPPORT-Chan-Amendments.pdf

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

SUPPORT FOR SUPERVISOR CHAN'S AMENDMENTS
November 17, 2025 - Land Use and Transportation Committee Agenda "Family Zoning Plan"

Dear Chair Melgar and Supervisors Chen and Mahmood:

On behalf of our citywide constituency, San Francisco Heritage submits our strong support for Supervisor Chan's proposed amendments, consistent with the adopted Housing Element, for the treatment of historic resources in the Family Zoning Plan as set forth File No. 251073 as follows:

> On Page 12, Lines 13-24; and Page 30, Lines 17-25: "or substantially alter a historic resource that is: designated as a landmark or listed as a contributor to or located within a historic district under Article 10; listed as a Significant or Contributory Building under Article 11; listed in the California Register of Historical Resources or the National Register of Historic Places; identified in an adopted survey or historic context statement as potentially eligible for individual listing in the California Register of Historical Resources or the National Register of Historic Places; or, located within an historic district that is listed in, or identified in an adopted survey or historic context statement as potentially eligible for listing in, the California Register of Historical Resources or the National Register of Historic Places;

The current Family Zoning Plan includes significantly greater impacts to designated and potentially eligible historic and cultural resources than anticipated by the 2022 Housing Element and the certified Environmental Impact Report (EIR). Absent Supervisor Chan's proposed amendments, we believe that a Supplemental Environmental Impact Report ("SEIR"), rather than the Addendum, is warranted to analyze the Family Zoning Plan's impacts to San Francisco's historic and cultural resources.

We have appreciated the attention given by, and our conversations with, Mayor Lurie and

President Mandelman on how we can address protections for historic resources in the Family Zoning Plan. Supervisor Chan's proposal conforms with standard historic preservation practices, and we believe offers the best path forward to ensure San Francisco's special places are preserved in our changing and growing city.

Sincerely,

Woody LaBounty
President & CEO
wlabounty@sfheritage.org

SF HERITAGE

Woody LaBounty
President & CEO
he/him/his

SAN FRANCISCO HERITAGE
On Unceded Ramaytush Ohlone Land
HAAS-LILIENTHAL HOUSE
2007 FRANKLIN STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94109
P: 415.441.3000 x 104

www.sfheritage.org
wlabounty@sfheritage.org

Join Heritage Now

SF HERITAGE
www.sfheritage.org
2007 FRANKLIN STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94109
415 441 3000

November 12, 2025

Chair Myrna Melgar, Supervisors Chyanne Chen and Bilal Mahmood
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Land Use and Transportation Committee
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

RE: SUPPORT FOR SUPERVISOR CHAN'S AMENDMENTS
November 17, 2025 - Land Use and Transportation Committee Agenda "Family Zoning Plan"

Dear Chair Melgar and Supervisors Chen and Mahmood:

On behalf of our citywide constituency, San Francisco Heritage submits our strong support for Supervisor Chan's proposed amendments, consistent with the adopted Housing Element, for the treatment of historic resources in the Family Zoning Plan as set forth File No. 251073 as follows:

> On Page 12, Lines 13-24; and Page 30, Lines 17-25: "or substantially alter a historic resource that is: designated as a landmark or listed as a contributor to or located within a historic district under Article 10; listed as a Significant or Contributory Building under Article 11; listed in the California Register of Historical Resources or the National Register of Historic Places; identified in an adopted survey or historic context statement as potentially eligible for individual listing in the California Register of Historical Resources or the National Register of Historic Places; or, located within an historic district that is listed in, or identified in an adopted survey or historic context statement as potentially eligible for listing in, the California Register of Historical Resources or the National Register of Historic Places;

The current Family Zoning Plan includes significantly greater impacts to designated and potentially eligible historic and cultural resources than anticipated by the 2022 Housing Element and the certified Environmental Impact Report (EIR). Absent Supervisor Chan's proposed amendments, we believe that a Supplemental Environmental Impact Report ("SEIR"), rather than the Addendum, is warranted to analyze the Family Zoning Plan's impacts to San Francisco's historic and cultural resources.

We have appreciated the attention given by and our conversations with Mayor Lurie and President Mandelman on how we can address protections for historic resources in the Family Zoning Plan. Supervisor Chan's proposal conforms with standard historic preservation practices, and we believe offers the best path forward to ensure San Francisco's special places are preserved in our changing and growing city.

Sincerely,

Woody LaBounty

Woody LaBounty
President & CEO
wlabounty@sfheritage.org

From:	Kathryn Hyde
To:	Press Office, Mayor (MYR); Severiano.Christian@sen.ca.gov; Raayan.Mohtashemi@sen.ca.gov
Cc:	Carroll, John (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); radhika.gawde@sen.ca.gov
Subject:	housing SF
Date:	Tuesday, November 11, 2025 7:50:22 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

The City Economist's report shows clearly that Lurie's plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing.

- We do not have the infrastructure, police force, roads, parking and water to support this plan.
- Structures should be limited to 5 stories to preserve lighting and wind
- We are only 7 x 7 square miles. SF is not like ares that have space
- Concerns about earthquakes
- There is space to build on vacant lots, Walgreens sites, 7/11 on Clment/9th Ave., etc.
- No buildings close to the shoreline
- We still have 2 months to replace the Mayor's plan with one that will work. Here's a real strategy to solve the City's affordable housing crisis.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units. Together these are more than enough to fulfill state mandates. (Yet instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Lurie's plan moves zoning rules around like deck chairs on the Titanic, does almost nothing to increase affordable housing, and increases the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing over-supply [now at 150%] while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods.)

Now that the City Economist has shown that Lurie's plan won't work, it is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the 'Family Zoning' plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing approved housing permits, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year, in a way that will fully meet state mandates. And make certain that all affordable housing produced fits the accepted definition of costing only 30% of the income of its residents.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible, instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood, and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

The Mayor's plan would build more excess housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators.

Thank you!

Kathryn Hyde
130 Frederick St SF 94117

Kathryn Hyde | 415.359.7971 | IG @reenvisionrepair |
https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___www.reenvisionrepair.com___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzpmZGY1NDI5NWVjZTU4NmFjODVkZWUyZTc0OTY4OTVkYzo3OjVmMWI6ZjY1NDE2ODMwNDEwNTUzOTZmMWE5NWY5NWZmODc5M2Q5NjNjZDY1MjNlNWFiNTY5NGQ4OWM4Y2EyOGZiZTQ3Mjp0OlQ6Tg

From: Teresa Palmer
To: Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff
Subject: Public Comment: Replace Mayor Lurie"s Disastrous Zoning Plan With A Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701
Date: Tuesday, November 11, 2025 1:00:27 AM

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

Public Comment: Replace Mayor Lurie's Disastrous Zoning Plan With A Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701

Dear Supervisors,

The amendments that were added on November 3rd to Mayor Lurie's so called 'housing plan' are not remotely enough!

The City Economist's report shows clearly that Lurie's plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing.

We still have 2 months to replace the Mayor's plan with one that will work. Here's a real strategy to solve the City's affordable housing crisis.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units. Together these are more than enough to fulfill state mandates. (Yet instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Lurie's plan moves zoning rules around like deck chairs on the Titanic, does almost nothing to increase affordable housing, and increases the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing over-supply [now at 150%] while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods.)

Now that the City Economist has shown that Lurie's plan won't work, it is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the 'Family Zoning' plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing approved housing permits, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year, in a way that will fully meet state mandates. And make certain that all affordable housing produced fits the accepted definition of costing only 30% of the income of its residents.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public

hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible, instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood, and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

The Mayor's plan would build more excess housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators. **Please REPLACE the text in the Mayor's unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural and community integrity, with text that will truly produce affordable housing and get State bureaucrats off of San Francisco's back.**

Thank you,

Teresa Palmer M.D.

1845 Hayes St. San Francisco, California 94117

From: Eric Brooks
To: Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff
Subject: Public Comment: Nov 3 Amendments Not Enough! Replace Mayor"s Disastrous Zoning Plan With Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701
Date: Monday, November 10, 2025 8:53:45 PM

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

Hi again Supervisors,

The amendments that were added on November 3rd to Mayor Lurie's so called 'housing plan' are not remotely enough!

The City Economist's report shows clearly that Lurie's plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing.

We still have 2 months to replace the Mayor's plan with one that will work. Here's a real strategy to solve the City's affordable housing crisis.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units. Together these are more than enough to fulfill state mandates. (Yet instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Lurie's plan moves zoning rules around like deck chairs on the Titanic, does almost nothing to increase affordable housing, and increases the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing over-supply [now at 150%] while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods.)

Now that the City Economist has shown that Lurie's plan won't work, it is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the 'Family Zoning' plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing approved housing permits, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year, in a way that will fully meet state mandates. **And make certain that all affordable housing produced fits the accepted definition of costing only 30% of the income of its residents.**

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put

almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible, instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood, and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

The Mayor's plan would build more excess housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators. **Please REPLACE the text in the Mayor's unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural and community integrity, with text that will truly produce affordable housing and get State bureaucrats off of San Francisco's back.**

Thank you,

Eric Brooks
Our City SF
San Francisco CEQA Defenders
415-756-8844

http://our-city.org

From:	David Romano
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff
Subject:	Public Comment: Please vote no on Mayor Lurie"s Family Zoning Plan and replace It with a Real Affordable Housing Plan
Date:	Saturday, November 1, 2025 4:05:25 PM

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

Dear Supervisors, et al:

The City Economist just released a report showing that Mayor Lurie's 'Family Zoning' plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing.

We still have 3 months to replace the Mayor's plan with one that will work. Here's a real strategy to solve the affordable housing crisis.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units - together more than enough to fulfill state mandates.

Now that the City Economist has shown that Lurie's plan won't work, it is imperative that you stop seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the 'Family Zoning' plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing housing approvals, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year in a way that will fully meet state mandates.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible, instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood, and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

The Mayor's plan would build more excess housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to corporate real estate speculators. Please REPLACE the text in this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural and community integrity, with text that will truly produce affordable housing.

Thank you,

David Romano
San Francsico CA

From:	Elliot Helman
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff
Subject:	Public Comment: VOTE NO On Lurie"s Recipe For Housing Failure & Replace It With A Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701
Date:	Saturday, November 1, 2025 2:48:55 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

The City Economist just released a report showing that Mayor Lurie's 'Family Zoning' plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing.

We still have 3 months to replace the Mayor's plan with one that will work. Here's a real strategy to solve the affordable housing crisis.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units - together more than enough to fulfill state mandates. (Yet instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Lurie's plan simply moves zoning rules around like deck chairs on the Titanic, does almost nothing to increase affordable housing, and increases the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing over-supply [now at 150%] while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods.)

Now that the City Economist has shown that Lurie's plan won't work, it is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the 'Family Zoning' plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing housing approvals, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year in a way that will fully meet state mandates.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible, instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood, and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

The Mayor's plan would build more excess housing for the wealthy, create more

homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators. **Please REPLACE the text in this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural and community integrity, with text that will truly produce affordable housing and get State bureaucrats off of San Francisco's back.**

Thank you,

Elliot Helman
Mission Bay SF 94158

From:	David Kaskowitz
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff
Subject:	Public Comment: VOTE NO On Lurie"s Recipe For Housing Failure & Replace It With A Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701
Date:	Saturday, November 1, 2025 10:10:37 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

It is time to finally adopt a plan that effectively addresses the housing crisis in San Francisco. Mayor Lurie's 'Family Zoning' plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing, as the City Economist recently released report demonstrates.

We still have 3 months to replace the Mayor's plan with one that will work. Here's a real strategy to solve the affordable housing crisis.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units - together more than enough to fulfill state mandates. (Yet instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Lurie's plan simply moves zoning rules around like deck chairs on the Titanic, does almost nothing to increase affordable housing, and increases the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing oversupply [now at 150%] while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods.)

Now that the City Economist has shown that Lurie's plan won't work, it is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the 'Family Zoning' plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing housing approvals, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year in a way that will fully meet state mandates.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible, instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood, and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

The Mayor's plan would build more excess housing for the wealthy, create more

homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators. **Please REPLACE the text in this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural and community integrity, with text that will truly produce affordable housing and get State bureaucrats off of San Francisco's back.**

Thank you,

David Kaskowitz

306 Park St
San Francisco, CA 94110

From: Jeanette Traverso
To: Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject: Fwd: A North Beach Resident"s Perspective on Upzoning
Date: Wednesday, November 5, 2025 5:55:34 PM

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

Hello, John. My apols for the typo in your email address. Pls see below. Many thx! Best, Jeanette

---------- Forwarded message ---------
From: **Jeanette Traverso** <jeanettetraverso@gmail.com>
Date: Wed, Nov 5, 2025 at 5:47 PM
Subject: A North Beach Resident's Perspective on Upzoning
To: <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>, connie.chan@sfgov.org <connie.chan@sfgov.org>, <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>, <stephen.sherrill@sfgov.org>, <danny.sauter@sfgov.org>, <bilal.mahmood@sfgov.org>, matt.dorsey@sfgov.org <matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>, <john.carrroll@sfgov.org>

Hello. My name is Jeanette Traverso. I attended the 11/3/25 Land Use & Transportation Committee hearing for 3.5 hours last Monday, but had to leave before I could give my public comments on upzoning. Please see my perspective below:

My Italian relatives have lived in North Beach for generations. I am one of ten children, & the first & only one of ten to graduate college. I went on to get a law degree from Hastings, now UC Law SF.

Thirty years ago, my husband & I researched neighborhoods throughout San Francisco & chose North Beach for its walkability, identity & waterfront.

We strived to buy a three-unit residential building on Francisco @ Grant, and have lived in one of the units ever since. It's where we raised our two sons.

I have spent decades walking from North Beach to work at a law firm downtown. I still walk through the neighborhood daily & it always gives me a renewed sense of well-being when I walk down Grant & see the water before me.

I recently hosted a sister from the beautiful state of Hawaii, & she was awed by all the charming nooks & crannies of our incredible North Beach neighborhood.

I am in favor of affordable housing, but the proposed upzoning plan is misguided. It will allow speculators to build tall buildings for the rich. It will ruin the beloved character of the neighborhood. It WILL NOT create affordable housing. Hence, there is no good reason to destroy the low-rise, historic architecture of our coveted neighborhood. We all can see that modern high rises on Columbus shadowing the streets, or soulless buildings dwarfing Coit Tower, will be devastating. Likewise, it will be a travesty to allow formula retail to replace our unique cafes, restaurants, clubs & shops.

We have lots of empty commercial buildings throughout the City. We should get creative & convert these underutilized resources to affordable housing.

I am informed that Supervisor Sauter unilaterally put North Beach on the upzoning map, without adequate input from his constituents. This makes me irate.

I urge that the North Beach neighborhood be removed from the upzoning map, so that we can preserve this incredible neighborhood for those of us here today, & for generations to come.

Thank you for your consideration.

Best, Jeanette Traverso

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	BOS-Operations; Carroll, John (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS); Calvillo, Angela (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Entezari, Mehran (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS)
Subject:	29 Letters Regarding File Nos. 250700, 250701, 250966, 251071, 251072, and 251073
Date:	Friday, November 7, 2025 10:38:21 AM
Attachments:	29 Letters Regarding the Family Zoning Plan.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached 29 letters regarding File Nos.:

250700: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan
250701: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan
250966: General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan
251071: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan
251072: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan
251073: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan

Regards,

John Bullock
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-5184
BOS@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

Disclosures: *Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From:	tvobsf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Anthony Villa
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 3, 2025 1:11:22 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): Don't ruin the neighborhoods by turning them into downtown!

Sincerely,
Anthony Villa
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: eliseravel3@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Elise Ravel
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 3, 2025 1:49:16 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Elise Ravel

From:	peterboothlee@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Peter Lee
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 3, 2025 2:53:44 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

No Bulldozers! Historic buildings Must Be Preserved! We will Never build beautiful Victorians again!
And Protect Rent Controlled Buildings! Half of SF Needs These!
As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Peter Lee
San Francisco, CA 94118

From: johnmclemore@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John McLemore
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 3, 2025 2:57:30 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a SF resident, I strongly oppose Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters & small businesses & transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:
- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary Jan 2026 upzoning deadline

Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to SF's land use—going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:
I am outraged at the proposed upzoning all over SF. The proposed height increases have massive ramifications for our City. Our height limits are essential to the character & charm of SF.

I want to specifically address my neighborhood, Aquatic Park/Fisherman's Wharf & how doubling the height limits for those areas to 65+ feet would be devastating to these neighborhoods.

If you love SF at all, you love the iconic hills & priceless beauty of our waterfront rising dramatically from the Bay waters & seemingly all the way to the clouds. Our waterfront is what songs, poems & movies are written about.

From the water, views of those neighborhoods have been photographed a million times over. Every year, hundreds of thousands of tourists marvel at them from cruise ships & Bay cruises & locals from private watercraft. Videos of them compliment nearly every sports broadcast. I am disgusted to think, so many decades ago, views of our majestic hills & alternatively from land our breathtaking SF Bay, were nearly completely obliterated by skyrises, like the horrendous Fontana buildings, nicknamed the "buck teeth" by all locals not selfish or affluent enough to live in them. These types of Miami-style towers were initially planned to encase the entire northern coastline of SF, effectively creating a "wall on the waterfront."

Additionally, I have not heard a single authority figure involved with the disastrous upzoning "plan" address the ramifications of extreme upzoning creating wind tunnels or light shadows, a serious issue in the recent overzealous, overbuilding around NYC's Central Park where it is killing trees, plants, grass & wildlife either from being scorched by refractions or by lack of sunlight. Or that the overdevelopment in NYC has created a massive "land grab" wars over air rights, which allows developers the "right" to build even higher than the original zoning would have allowed & charge renters even higher premiums. Nor have I heard anyone provide any consideration to the FACT that SF exists in a dangerous earthquake zone & how building higher is a VERY risky endeavor on our steep hills. All I've heard from politicians & developers is "build, build, build." There seems to be no care, no consideration, no foresight for ANY long-term consequences. Take HEED & LEARN from the colossal mistakes of other cities, like NYC & Vancouver.

The height limits established in our neighborhoods have made SF arguably one of the most beautiful cities in the world. Please do not let “NOT-MY-MAYOR” Lurie’s SHAMEFUL, LAND-GRAB, DEVELOPER-ENRICHING, SHORT-SIGHTED, UNINFORMED, DISASTOROUS "plan," destroy the very thing that makes SF iconic—its landscapes & views, by obliterating them with obtrusive, obstructive, unnecessary & unjustified skyrises.

Why are we here again?! I have only 1 conclusion—GREED. This is NOT about building more housing, affordable housing or benefitting communities. Its only intention is to make money for those in power & for the people in the pockets of or influencing those in power. Please reconsider your appalling massive height limit increases. SF is NOT FOR SALE!

Sincerely,
John McLemore
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: jillkb@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jill Bittner
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 3, 2025 3:01:27 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a resident, I strongly oppose Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters & small businesses & transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:
- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to SF's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition & luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers & billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning—it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:
I am outraged at the proposed upzoning all over SF. The proposed height increases have massive ramifications for our City. Our height limits are essential to the character & charm of SF.

I want to specifically address my neighborhood, Aquatic Park/Fisherman's Wharf & how doubling the height limits for those areas to 65+ feet would be devastating to these neighborhoods.

If you love SF at all, you love the iconic hills & priceless beauty of our waterfront rising dramatically from the Bay waters & seemingly all the way to the clouds. Our waterfront is what songs, poems & movies are written about.

From the water, views of those neighborhoods have been photographed a million times over. Every year, hundreds of thousands of tourists marvel at them from cruise ships & Bay cruises & locals from private watercraft. Videos of them compliment nearly every sports broadcast. I am disgusted to think, so many decades ago, views of our majestic hills & alternatively from land our breathtaking SF Bay, were nearly completely obliterated by skyrises, like the horrendous Fontana buildings, nicknamed the "buck teeth" by all locals not selfish or affluent enough to live in them. These types of Miami-style towers were initially planned to encase the entire northern coastline of SF, effectively creating a "wall on the waterfront."

Additionally, I have not heard a single authority figure involved with the disastrous upzoning "plan" address the ramifications of extreme upzoning creating wind tunnels or light shadows, a serious issue in the recent overzealous, overbuilding around NYC's Central Park where it is killing trees, plants, grass & wildlife either from being scorched by refractions or by lack of sunlight. Or that the overdevelopment in NYC has created a massive "land grab" wars over air rights, which allows developers the "right" to build even higher than the original zoning would have allowed & charge renters even higher premiums. Nor have I heard anyone provide any consideration to the FACT that SF exists in a dangerous earthquake zone & how building higher is a VERY risky endeavor on our steep hills. All I've heard from politicians & developers is "build, build, build." There seems to be no care, no consideration, no foresight for ANY long-term consequences. Take HEED & LEARN from the colossal mistakes of other cities, like NYC & Vancouver.

The height limits established in our neighborhoods have made SF arguably one of the most beautiful cities in the world. Please do not let “NOT-MY-MAYOR” Lurie’s SHAMEFUL, LAND-GRAB, DEVELOPER-ENRICHING, SHORT-SIGHTED, UNINFORMED, DISASTOROUS "plan," destroy the very thing that makes SF iconic—its landscapes & views, by obliterating them with obtrusive, obstructive, unnecessary & unjustified skyrises.

Why are we here again?! I have only 1 conclusion—GREED. This is NOT about building more housing, affordable housing or benefitting communities. Its only intention is to make money for those in power & for the people in the pockets of or influencing those in power. Please reconsider your appalling massive height limit increases. SF is NOT FOR SALE!

Sincerely,
Jill Bittner
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: jknjl127@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Joe Schmoe
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 3, 2025 3:03:38 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a resident, I strongly oppose Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters & small businesses & transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:
- Drastically scale back Lurie's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to SF's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition & luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers & billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning—it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:
I am outraged at the proposed upzoning all over SF. The proposed height increases have massive ramifications for our City. Our height limits are essential to the character & charm of SF.

I want to specifically address my neighborhood, Aquatic Park/Fisherman's Wharf & how doubling the height limits for those areas to 65+ feet would be devastating to these neighborhoods.

If you love SF at all, you love the iconic hills & priceless beauty of our waterfront rising dramatically from the Bay waters & seemingly all the way to the clouds. Our waterfront is what songs, poems & movies are written about.

From the water, views of those neighborhoods have been photographed a million times over. Every year, hundreds of thousands of tourists marvel at them from cruise ships & Bay cruises & locals from private watercraft. Videos of them compliment nearly every sports broadcast. I am disgusted to think, so many decades ago, views of our majestic hills & alternatively from land our breathtaking SF Bay, were nearly completely obliterated by skyrises, like the horrendous Fontana buildings, nicknamed the "buck teeth" by all locals not selfish or affluent enough to live in them. These types of Miami-style towers were initially planned to encase the entire northern coastline of SF, effectively creating a "wall on the waterfront."

Additionally, I have not heard a single authority figure involved with the disastrous upzoning "plan" address the ramifications of extreme upzoning creating wind tunnels or light shadows, a serious issue in the recent overzealous, overbuilding around NYC's Central Park where it is killing trees, plants, grass & wildlife either from being scorched by refractions or by lack of sunlight. Or that the overdevelopment in NYC has created a massive "land grab" wars over air rights, which allows developers the "right" to build even higher than the original zoning would have allowed & charge renters even higher premiums. Nor have I heard anyone provide any consideration to the FACT that SF exists in a dangerous earthquake zone & how building higher is a VERY risky endeavor on our steep hills. All I've heard from politicians & developers is "build, build, build." There seems to be no care, no consideration, no foresight for ANY long-term consequences. Take HEED & LEARN from the colossal mistakes of other cities, like NYC & Vancouver.

The height limits established in our neighborhoods have made SF arguably one of the most beautiful cities in the world. Please do not let “NOT-MY-MAYOR” Lurie’s SHAMEFUL, LAND-GRAB, DEVELOPER-ENRICHING, SHORT-SIGHTED, UNINFORMED, DISASTOROUS "plan," destroy the very thing that makes SF iconic—its landscapes & views, by obliterating them with obtrusive, obstructive, unnecessary & unjustified skyrises.

Why are we here again?! I have only 1 conclusion—GREED. This is NOT about building more housing, affordable housing or benefitting communities. Its only intention is to make money for those in power & for the people in the pockets of or influencing those in power. Please reconsider your appalling massive height limit increases. SF is NOT FOR SALE!

Sincerely,
Joe Schmoe
93123

From: jnsjl65@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jim Kilton
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 3, 2025 3:06:05 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a resident, I strongly oppose Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters & small businesses & transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:
- Drastically scale back Lurie's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to SF's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition & luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers & billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning—it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:
I am outraged at the proposed upzoning all over SF. The proposed height increases have massive ramifications for our City. Our height limits are essential to the character & charm of SF.

I want to specifically address my neighborhood, Aquatic Park/Fisherman's Wharf & how doubling the height limits for those areas to 65+ feet would be devastating to these neighborhoods.

If you love SF at all, you love the iconic hills & priceless beauty of our waterfront rising dramatically from the Bay waters & seemingly all the way to the clouds. Our waterfront is what songs, poems & movies are written about.

From the water, views of those neighborhoods have been photographed a million times over. Every year, hundreds of thousands of tourists marvel at them from cruise ships & Bay cruises & locals from private watercraft. Videos of them compliment nearly every sports broadcast. I am disgusted to think, so many decades ago, views of our majestic hills & alternatively from land our breathtaking SF Bay, were nearly completely obliterated by skyrises, like the horrendous Fontana buildings, nicknamed the "buck teeth" by all locals not selfish or affluent enough to live in them. These types of Miami-style towers were initially planned to encase the entire northern coastline of SF, effectively creating a "wall on the waterfront."

Additionally, I have not heard a single authority figure involved with the disastrous upzoning "plan" address the ramifications of extreme upzoning creating wind tunnels or light shadows, a serious issue in the recent overzealous, overbuilding around NYC's Central Park where it is killing trees, plants, grass & wildlife either from being scorched by refractions or by lack of sunlight. Or that the overdevelopment in NYC has created a massive "land grab" wars over air rights, which allows developers the "right" to build even higher than the original zoning would have allowed & charge renters even higher premiums. Nor have I heard anyone provide any consideration to the FACT that SF exists in a dangerous earthquake zone & how building higher is a VERY risky endeavor on our steep hills. All I've heard from politicians & developers is "build, build, build." There seems to be no care, no consideration, no foresight for ANY long-term consequences. Take HEED & LEARN from the colossal mistakes of other cities, like NYC & Vancouver.

The height limits established in our neighborhoods have made SF arguably one of the most beautiful cities in the world. Please do not let “NOT-MY-MAYOR” Lurie’s SHAMEFUL, LAND-GRAB, DEVELOPER-ENRICHING, SHORT-SIGHTED, UNINFORMED, DISASTOROUS "plan," destroy the very thing that makes SF iconic—its landscapes & views, by obliterating them with obtrusive, obstructive, unnecessary & unjustified skyrises.

Why are we here again?! I have only 1 conclusion—GREED. This is NOT about building more housing, affordable housing or benefitting communities. Its only intention is to make money for those in power & for the people in the pockets of or influencing those in power. Please reconsider your appalling massive height limit increases. SF is NOT FOR SALE!

Sincerely,
Jim Kilton
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: joeaschmoe@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Joe Schmell
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 3, 2025 3:13:01 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a resident, I strongly oppose Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters & small businesses & transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:
- Drastically scale back Lurie's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to SF's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition & luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers & billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning—it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:
I am outraged at the proposed upzoning all over SF. The proposed height increases have massive ramifications for our City. Our height limits are essential to the character & charm of SF.

I want to specifically address my neighborhood, Aquatic Park/Fisherman's Wharf & how doubling the height limits for those areas to 65+ feet would be devastating to these neighborhoods.

If you love SF at all, you love the iconic hills & priceless beauty of our waterfront rising dramatically from the Bay waters & seemingly all the way to the clouds. Our waterfront is what songs, poems & movies are written about.

From the water, views of those neighborhoods have been photographed a million times over. Every year, hundreds of thousands of tourists marvel at them from cruise ships & Bay cruises & locals from private watercraft. Videos of them compliment nearly every sports broadcast. I am disgusted to think, so many decades ago, views of our majestic hills & alternatively from land our breathtaking SF Bay, were nearly completely obliterated by skyrises, like the horrendous Fontana buildings, nicknamed the "buck teeth" by all locals not selfish or affluent enough to live in them. These types of Miami-style towers were initially planned to encase the entire northern coastline of SF, effectively creating a "wall on the waterfront."

Additionally, I have not heard a single authority figure involved with the disastrous upzoning "plan" address the ramifications of extreme upzoning creating wind tunnels or light shadows, a serious issue in the recent overzealous, overbuilding around NYC's Central Park where it is killing trees, plants, grass & wildlife either from being scorched by refractions or by lack of sunlight. Or that the overdevelopment in NYC has created a massive "land grab" wars over air rights, which allows developers the "right" to build even higher than the original zoning would have allowed & charge renters even higher premiums. Nor have I heard anyone provide any consideration to the FACT that SF exists in a dangerous earthquake zone & how building higher is a VERY risky endeavor on our steep hills. All I've heard from politicians & developers is "build, build, build." There seems to be no care, no consideration, no foresight for ANY long-term consequences. Take HEED & LEARN from the colossal mistakes of other cities, like NYC & Vancouver.

The height limits established in our neighborhoods have made SF arguably one of the most beautiful cities in the world. Please do not let “NOT-MY-MAYOR” Lurie’s SHAMEFUL, LAND-GRAB, DEVELOPER-ENRICHING, SHORT-SIGHTED, UNINFORMED, DISASTOROUS "plan," destroy the very thing that makes SF iconic—its landscapes & views, by obliterating them with obtrusive, obstructive, unnecessary & unjustified skyrises.

Why are we here again?! I have only 1 conclusion—GREED. This is NOT about building more housing, affordable housing or benefitting communities. Its only intention is to make money for those in power & for the people in the pockets of or influencing those in power. Please reconsider your appalling massive height limit increases. SF is NOT FOR SALE!

Sincerely,
Joe Schmell
San Francisco, CA 94109

From:	Lupe Velez
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff
Subject:	Public Comment: VOTE NO On Lurie"s Recipe For Housing Failure & Replace It With A Real Affordable Housing Plan
Date:	Monday, November 3, 2025 3:19:33 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

The City Economist just released a report showing that Mayor Lurie's 'Family Zoning' plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing.

We still have 3 months to replace the Mayor's plan with one that will work. Here's a real strategy to solve the affordable housing crisis.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units - together more than enough to fulfill state mandates. (Yet instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Lurie's plan simply moves zoning rules around like deck chairs on the Titanic, does almost nothing to increase affordable housing, and increases the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing oversupply [now at 150%] while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods.)

Now that the City Economist has shown that Lurie's plan won't work, it is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the 'Family Zoning' plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing housing approvals, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year in a way that will fully meet state mandates.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible, instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood, and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

The Mayor's plan would build more excess housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and

corporate real estate speculators. **Please REPLACE the text in this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural and community integrity, with text that will truly produce affordable housing and get State bureaucrats off of San Francisco's back.**

--

Guadalupe Velez
Communications Director
(She/Her/Hers)
Coalition on Homelessness
280 Turk Street, San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 346-3740 x305



From: kzhuravleva@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Karina Zhuravleva
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 3, 2025 5:56:43 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Karina Zhuravleva
San Francisco, CA 94121

From:	Caizhuming888@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Zhu ming Cai
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Tuesday, November 4, 2025 10:07:07 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Zhu ming Cai
San Francisco, CA 94112

From: ms.pedroni@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lilianna Pedroni
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Wednesday, November 5, 2025 8:56:24 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I grew up in North Beach and continue to live here with my family. I'm writing to express concern about proposed changes that could alter the character of this neighborhood. Please preserve North Beach's authentic architecture and avoid turning the waterfront into a wall of tall, generic buildings. The views, historic charm, and human scale are what make this area special—and what draw visitors to it in the first place.

Rather than large-scale redevelopment, what this neighborhood truly needs is improved public transportation access. Enhancing connectivity would benefit both residents and visitors while maintaining the integrity of North Beach's unique identity.

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Lilianna Pedroni
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: carobikam@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Robert Heisler
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Wednesday, November 5, 2025 1:33:36 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress. Democracy in matters such as this no longer exists in San Francisco. Instead we have "citizens united" on full display. If allowed to proceed unhindered, the end result will be a clear definition of SOCIAL CLEANSING.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Robert Heisler
San Francisco, CA 94116

From:	margsmay@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Margot May
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Wednesday, November 5, 2025 7:38:40 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Margot May
San Francisco, CA 94108

From:	rekathryn@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kathryn Hyde
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Thursday, November 6, 2025 7:31:43 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a long time reident of the Richmond and Cole Valley neighborhoods, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

I believe in affordable housing - there are many vacant lots and old buildings were housing could be added (or refurbished) - limit to 5-6 stories to preserve SF.

SF does not have enough police patrol, water, grocery stores in needed areas, parking, and MUNI lines to support 100,000 more residents.

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Kathryn Hyde
San Francisco, CA 94117

From: terridaysf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Terri James-Day
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, November 6, 2025 10:12:54 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Terri James-Day
San Francisco, CA 94112

From:	David Woo
To:	Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS)
Cc:	Raquel Redondiez; Carroll, John (BOS); Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	SOMA Pilipinas Letter RE "Family Zoning Plan"
Date:	Monday, November 3, 2025 12:42:28 PM
Attachments:	SOMA Pilipinas Letter_Family Zoning Plan 11.3.25.pdf

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

President Mandelman and Members of the Board, please see our letter below regarding the "Family Zoning Plan."

November 3, 2025

RE: Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan"

President Mandelman and Members of the Board of Supervisors,

SOMA Pilipinas, the Filipino Cultural Heritage District, is opposed to the proposed upzoning plan. The upzoning plan will lead to the displacement of residents and small businesses, and encourages real estate speculation, harming the South of Market and neighborhoods across the city. The current plan, coupled with numerous cuts to affordable housing and impact fees that have already occurred, highlight how the city's Housing Element and the state co-opt the language of racial and social equity to further deregulation. We are also opposed to the blatant giveaway in Western SOMA of mainly increasing base heights, which will be used with the state density bonus, resulting in basically two upzonings from this plan for SOMA.

We must instead prioritize developing 100% affordable housing, preserving and protecting existing housing, protecting existing residents and small businesses from displacement, and engaging in community based planning. The current upzoning is failing on these fronts. We support the amendments put forward by Supervisor Chan and Supervisor Chen as they constitute a logical baseline of what should be included in such a sweeping upzoning proposal.

The city's Housing Element, mandated by the state, calls for 57% affordable housing to be built. As there is no affordable housing component to this plan, it is clear that it is a market-rate housing plan. The city economist Ted Egan acknowledges that market-rate housing will not get built at the levels "required" by the state, because developers and investors can not get the profit that is desired from these projects, stating the plan will only produce 8,500-14,600 units over the next 20 years. Affordable housing developers, however, are ready and willing to build housing. According to the city's 2024 Housing Inventory Report, affordable housing production accounted for 64% of all new housing production in 2024; as market-rate housing stalled because of lack of return on investment, affordable housing production continued.

If the city and state are really concerned about "building housing," the focus would be on building affordable housing. However, it is clear that the real desire is not simply to "build housing," but instead to provide the best scenario for private developers, investors, and

speculators to make money off of the real estate market in San Francisco.

We must focus on creating 100% affordable housing, protecting our neighborhoods that are composed of residents, small businesses, and neighborhood based organizations, and engaging in community based planning that focuses on the needs of the most vulnerable and marginalized.

Thank you,

David Woo
Community Development and Policy Coordinator
SOMA Pilipinas

--
David Woo
Community Development and Policy Coordinator
SOMA Pilipinas Cultural Heritage District

November 3, 2025

RE: Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan"

President Mandelman and Members of the Board of Supervisors,

SOMA Pilipinas, the Filipino Cultural Heritage District, is opposed to the proposed upzoning plan. The upzoning plan will lead to the displacement of residents and small businesses, and encourages real estate speculation, harming the South of Market and neighborhoods across the city. The current plan, coupled with numerous cuts to affordable housing and impact fees that have already occurred, highlight how the city's Housing Element and the state co-opt the language of racial and social equity to further deregulation. We are also opposed to the blatant giveaway in Western SOMA of mainly increasing base heights, which will be used with the state density bonus, resulting in basically two upzonings from this plan for SOMA.

We must instead prioritize developing 100% affordable housing, preserving and protecting existing housing, protecting existing residents and small businesses from displacement, and engaging in community based planning. The current upzoning is failing on these fronts. We support the amendments put forward by Supervisor Chan and Supervisor Chen as they constitute a logical baseline of what should be included in such a sweeping upzoning proposal.

The city's Housing Element, mandated by the state, calls for 57% affordable housing to be built. As there is no affordable housing component to this plan, it is clear that it is a market-rate housing plan. The city economist Ted Egan acknowledges that market-rate housing will not get built at the levels "required" by the state, because developers and investors can not get the profit that is desired from these projects, stating the plan will only produce 8,500-14,600 units over the next 20 years. Affordable housing developers, however, are ready and willing to build housing. According to the city's 2024 Housing Inventory Report, affordable housing production accounted for 64% of all new housing production in 2024; as market-rate housing stalled because of lack of return on investment, affordable housing production continued.

If the city and state are really concerned about "building housing," the focus would be on building affordable housing. However, it is clear that the real desire is not simply to "build housing," but instead to provide the best scenario for private developers, investors, and speculators to make money off of the real estate market in San Francisco.

We must focus on creating 100% affordable housing, protecting our neighborhoods that are composed of residents, small businesses, and neighborhood based organizations, and engaging in community based planning that focuses on the needs of the most vulnerable and marginalized.

Thank you,

David Woo
Community Development and Policy Coordinator
SOMA Pilipinas

From: molinelli@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Amy Molinelli
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Saturday, November 1, 2025 10:09:40 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Dear Mayor Lurie, Supervisor Chan, Planner Chen and other elected officials,

I am a third generation San Franciscan. I live in my grandparents home off of Clement Street. In fact my Italian grandfather washed every window on every storefront on Clement. I chuckle every summer at the tourists eating at our amazing restaurants and coming to walk in Mountain Lake Park and see our neighborhood. I also am amazed at the thriving small businesses, diversity of income and cultures of our neighborhood and multigenerational families who can only afford to live in San Francisco because of THIS neighborhood. I myself, run a small non-profit that serves underserved communities with music, arts and education programming. I work often with districts like SFUSD, Daly City and OUSD.

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors. I am deeply aware of the complex issues but I also have witnessed the history of corruption and developers who promise low-income housing but then somehow it's never enough. Until you can answer why we aren't filling the vacancies in the overflow of luxury housing that already exists in this city and repurposing what we ALREADY have I will not support this demonization of the low and middle class who are trying to survive.

You will demolish what makes San Francisco great and not solve the problems. We read about solutions from the long-term low income housing groups in San Francisco and not from YIMBY which is funneling money from developers and a high powered group of business owners and weaponizing grassroots organizing. This is not the way.

Talk to your small business associations, talk to your communities and please serve the people who live here as well as those who want to live here. Right now it is clear the people who want to make money are being served by using divisive words that tear our communities apart.

I work with teachers, families and the constituents you these developers say they will serve. Families who have working parents, uber drivers, food-service workers, health care workers - with small kids - they need parking and housing and there is housing to be had. Please answer why 15-20 percent of our luxury housing sits empty.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Amy Molinelli
San Francisco, CA 94118

From:	David Kaskowitz
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff
Subject:	Public Comment: VOTE NO On Lurie"s Recipe For Housing Failure & Replace It With A Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701
Date:	Saturday, November 1, 2025 10:10:34 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

It is time to finally adopt a plan that effectively addresses the housing crisis in San Francisco. Mayor Lurie's 'Family Zoning' plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing, as the City Economist recently released report demonstrates.

We still have 3 months to replace the Mayor's plan with one that will work. Here's a real strategy to solve the affordable housing crisis.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units - together more than enough to fulfill state mandates. (Yet instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Lurie's plan simply moves zoning rules around like deck chairs on the Titanic, does almost nothing to increase affordable housing, and increases the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing oversupply [now at 150%] while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods.)

Now that the City Economist has shown that Lurie's plan won't work, it is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the 'Family Zoning' plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing housing approvals, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year in a way that will fully meet state mandates.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible, instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood, and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

The Mayor's plan would build more excess housing for the wealthy, create more

homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators. **Please REPLACE the text in this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural and community integrity, with text that will truly produce affordable housing and get State bureaucrats off of San Francisco's back.**

Thank you,

David Kaskowitz

306 Park St
San Francisco, CA 94110

From: parack@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Patricia Arack
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Saturday, November 1, 2025 6:13:47 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

PARKING ONSITE IS ESSENTIAL!!!!!!
The lack of parking in these new hi rise buildings will have a chilling effect on the purchase or renting of these new units. Those who live in D4 know that a car is a necessity. If there is no parking the units will sit empty, like the eyesore on Sloat and 48th. Muni is inadequate and not safe. Bikes are no good for taking care of school, shopping, medical appointments. It is beyond foolhardy to eliminate on site parking. PEOPLE NEED THEIR CARS OUT HERE AND NEW BUILDINGS NEED PARKING!!!! LISTEN TO D4!!

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Patricia Arack
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: janesmalley1@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jane E Smalley
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Sunday, November 2, 2025 7:10:33 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Jane E Smalley
San Francisco, CA 94118

From: diana.giampaoli@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of diana giampaoli
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 3, 2025 9:37:26 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

HOW COULD YOU ALLOW ONLY 3 STORIES IN THE PRESIDIO AND BUILD OVER 3 STORIES ON LOMBARD. THIS IS INSANE. NOTHING SHOULD BE OVER 4 STORIES ON LOMBARD. PLEASE LISTEN TO US AND NOT THE BUILDERS WHO ARE IN EVERYONES POCKETS. THIS WILL BE HIGH RENTS AND WON'T WORK. WHY DON'T YOU BUILD ON CALIFORNIA STREET THE OLD FIREMANS FUND BUILDING AND CPMC CALIFORNIA CAMPUS. THERE IT WOULD WORK. IT CAN BE LOTS OF HOUSING. BUT MY VIEW IS EVERYONE IS IN EVERYONES POCKETS.....

Sincerely,
diana giampaoli
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: shop@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of beth weissman
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 3, 2025 9:53:44 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
beth weissman
San Francisco, CA 94115

From: jkj2000@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Larry Quantz
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 3, 2025 10:30:53 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors, which, if they don't sell, will become eyesores and attract the Wrong Crowd.

May I ask that you:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Larry Quantz
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: andreacgalvin@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Andrea Galvin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 3, 2025 10:36:51 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am a 35 year resident of San Francisco and am absolutely disgusted that this destructive, ghastly upzoning plan is about to be pushed through with NO real democratic input and based on arbitrary building targets set by an unelected panel of ideologues. If you vote to approve this, as seems to be the foreordained result (as surely as Putin and Maduro, would "win" re-election tomorrow if a vote were held) you will have forfeited every shred of democratic legitimacy you might have left. Mayor Lurie can go down in history as man who destroyed this city of once legendary beauty and charm.

You claim "your hands are tied" by the all mighty Scott Weiner? You can't find the courage push back on a corrupt CA state senator, but yet you proudly "resist" President Trump's offer to deport the illegal Honduran drug dealers who have killed 4,300 San Francisco residents in this decade alone, something most San Francisco's want done? Shame on you. And, do you really think we the citizens are too stupid to see what is going on?

Legitimacy once lost will be difficult to restore.

Mayor Lurie and the Board of Super

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Andrea Galvin
San Francisco, CA 94121

From:	mkjanis@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of janis kaempfe
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 3, 2025 10:41:32 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors. So I urge you to:

1. Exclude parcels in the Priority Equity Geographies SUD.

2. Exclude all rent-controlled housing with two or more units, not just 3.

3. Require all publicly owned parcels, like the SFMTA ones, to be 100% affordable housing.

4. Exclude all historic resources from the Upzoning Plan, including local historic districts and those eligible for the California and National Registers.

5. Limit form-based density (density decontrol) and height increases to the Local Plan.

6. Require inclusionary affordable housing to be located on site or nearby within ½ mile of the development.

7. Ted Egan's report from the Controller's office says that housing will unlikely be built no matter what unless rents and sales prices rise. That's just now but well into the future. This plan is one created in quicksand,

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
janis kaempfe
San Francisco, CA 94133

From:	pat.huey@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Patricia Huey
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 3, 2025 10:56:51 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

This housing crisis is a myth from greedy real estate developers. We have plenty of housing. The Park Merced apartments have some 3200 apartments available. We have many in-law apartments that no one wants to rent out because small landlords have so few rights. For example, to evict an undesirable tenant, they must pay them $20,000. No small landlord can afford that.

Sincerely,
Patricia Huey
San Francisco, CA 94117

From: cbonavico@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Christopher Bonavico
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 3, 2025 11:58:33 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

The proposed new heights along Lombard street are a horrible idea because 1) there is no planning for the additional traffic, 2) no planning for the water issues especially as area sewer pipe is in a terrible state of disrepair so adding new water stress will be a major negative factor, and 3) the plans proposed are for luxury condominiums - they certainly will not helping lower income individuals find housing. This appears to be a monetary windfall to the contractots and developers - and the public officials they donate to. Shame !

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Christopher Bonavico
San Francisco, CA 94123

Request for Notice and Community Feedback on Proposed Upzoning

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2025 NOV 03 PM03:36

Background

The undersigned residents wish to formally express concern regarding the process surrounding the proposed upzoning within the Family Zoning Plan. To date, we have not received reasonable notice regarding this proposal, especially in terms of how it may affect our neighborhood. Furthermore, residents have not been provided with sufficient opportunity to offer meaningful feedback on the proposed changes.

Neighborhood Boundaries

Our neighborhood encompasses the area extending from Van Ness Avenue to Polk/Larkin Streets, spanning from Pacific/Broadway to Greenwich. This includes prominent cross-streets such as Filbert, Union, Bonita, Green, and Vallejo. See MAP, attached

Request for Information

We respectfully request the provision of detailed information addressing the potential impacts of the proposed upzoning, particularly concerning the Van Ness corridor and its immediate surroundings. Comprehensive data and clear communication are essential to enable residents to contribute informed perspectives and feedback before any final decisions are made regarding the Family Zoning Plan.

Name	Address	Phone/email
Diane Joseph	1436 Union St	415-596-9641 djoejandblaw@yahoo.com
Dennis Blum	1438 Union Street	415 577-2438
JOAN ALBERTSON joan albertson	1438 UNION ST.	415 3070934
MIRIAM KASDAN	1440 Union St	415-350-7591
JEFF NOVICK	1412 Union St.	415 756-5710


Name	Address	Phone/email
Cynthia Chin	1414 Union St	415-832-0450
Janet Song	10 BONITA ST	650-201-8844
CASSANDRA HARVELL	2430 VAN NESS AVE	510 910 1559
Allison Bowden	1770 Pine St	850-443-2084
Ronald Smith	626 POLK ST	415 441 7470
Ruth Waddington	1340 Clay St.	
Deborah Birnbaum	1950 Clay St. #204	dlbirnbaum@yahoo
Meghan Ministeri	1335 Union St #1	650 787 4841
Lynn Ferrante (Lynn Fenante)	1335 UNION ST #7	4156011555
Madeline Crowley	2652 Polk #2	415 218-3250
DONNA MACHESNEY	1845 FRANKLIN ST #604	4158790852
Allen Zigman	1440 Union St	4156522217
Reed Connell	1450 Taylor St	570 387 7518
Kristy Eiffert	1455 Union St #12	(661) 703-8672
DAN KUPSCO	1822 POWELL	415.660.6424
~~Zoe Jacobs~~	400 Vallejo St. SF CA 94133	(415) 706-6383
Maggie Quinn	733 Chestnut St.	614-949-0732
Ricky Mueller	" "	707-484-6171
Monica Pelayo	000 Chestnut	6507906548
David Rapp-Kirshner	600 Chestnut	315 415 4112
Lisa Rudd	2656 Van Ness	415-673-1773
DAVID OH	1440 Union St APT 103	213-393-5744
[illegible]	1[illegible]4 Union St	415-544-[illegible]
Andrea D. Gonzalez	2560 Polk St #4	917 715 5403

Name	Address	Phone/email
Sebrina Lonergan	2761 Van Ness	8178210457
[illegible]	869 Hyde St #64	WATSONAMY@MSN.COM
DAN Kilwarski	2355 Polk St. #206	516 812-1250
Sara Draper	1060 Sacramento St	
Karan Malhotra	1080 Sutter St. #201	408-599-8040
Jin Rickard	1455 Vallejo St.	kinjojinzen@outlook.com
David Fine	2539 Polk SF CA	323 [illegible]
Susan Untermann	3048 Polk St, # 212	(628) 249-5594
Lucy Bell	1845 Market St.	415-216-5469
[illegible]	1590 BROADWAY # 226	415-517-2572
Elder Pederson	1458 Union St SF, CA 94109	415-531-4022

Name	Address	Phone/email
Francell K. Haskins	1335 Union St #6	fran.kh@sbcglobal.net
MARIO RUIZ	1835 UNION #4	6509066729

Proposed Zoning Map
Local Program Heights
DRAFT September 30, 2025

Board file 250700 v.3
Graphic Source: San Francisco Planning Department



Proposed Local Program Height Limits

- 40' Local Program Height
- 50' Local Program Height
- 65' Local Program Height
- 85' Local Program Height
- 105' Local Program Height
- 120' Local Program Height
- 130' Local Program Height
- 140' Local Program Height
- 160' Local Program Height
- 180' Local Program Height
- 240' Local Program Height
- 250' Local Program Height
- 300' Local Program Height
- 350' Local Program Height
- 450' Local Program Height
- 490' Local Program Height
- 500' Local Program Height
- 650' Local Program Height

Supervisor District

Housing Opportunity Areas

NOTES:

In addition to heights shown here, the following lots get a minimum height of 65' through the Local Program: Lots 8,000sf or larger, and Corner lots.

All projects using the Local Program are subject to form-based density (ie density decontrol) regardless of height limit or underlying zoning district.

This map represents heights available to projects that opt into the Local Program. They are generally equivalent to heights projects may receive if using the State Density Bonus or other state bonus program.

0 0.5
Miles

LEARN MORE:
sfplanning.org/sf-family-zoning-plan

Comments to the Land Use Committee on November 3, 2025
Jessica Vistnes

My name is Jessica Vistnes and I'm from District 2. I am speaking today in strong opposition to the current version of the proposed upzoning plan. I fully support more housing in my neighborhood – I just want it to be thoughtful and in scale.

I am distressed about the increased heights in many parts of District 2, but with only 2 minutes to speak I want to focus on the proposed zoning for 14-story buildings on Lombard Street, starting at Laguna and going east. This change in heights there seems to have only been added in 2025– and my understanding is that it occurred because heights were lowered at the west end of Lombard near the Palace of Fine Arts and as a result heights were simply popped up at the other end to 14 stories to maintain the count – which does not seem like a very thoughtful approach to rezoning Lombard Street.

My understanding from talking with Supervisor Sherrill is that he expects there might be potentially 10 14-story buildings on the three blocks of Lombard from Laguna to Franklin. Many people, even those in favor of the zoning

plan, view the Fontana Towers as eyesores. To me, 14-story towers on Lombard Street, while they are not 18 stories like the Fontana Towers, is just like putting possibly 10 eyesores in an area that would block some of the nicest views in San Francisco so only a privileged few can see them. And people living in the new luxury apartments on floors 7 through 14 of these towers are probably unlikely to be taking the bus on the transit friendly Lombard Street that is the reason for allowing such tall buildings there in the first place.

I live on Vallejo Street and have been paying attention, as I walk around, to the beautiful views at the intersections of Vallejo and Broadway Streets with Laguna, Octavia, Gough, and Franklin streets that would be OBLITERATED with such tall buildings. Apart from residents enjoying views of THE CITY BY THE BAY, there go views for the tourists as they walk around Pacific Heights or drive around in those cute little yellow cars. Lowering heights on three blocks doesn't seem like it would upset the apple cart for this plan with the state and I urge you to consider it.

I am submitting This letter with my public Comments because I agree with The Proposed revisions

Jessica Vistnes District 2

COW HOLLOW ASSOCIATION
P.O. BOX 471136 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94147

April 30, 2025

Supervisor Stephen Sherrill
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Proposed Revisions to the Upzoning Map to Reflect District 2's Community Planning, Safety, and Growth Objectives

Dear Supervisor Sherrill,

Thank you for your engagement with our neighborhood as we collectively work toward a vision of housing growth that respects San Francisco's history, diverse communities, scale, and distinctive public spaces.

As SF Planning continues to revise the proposed Upzoning Map, we request a series of specific, actionable changes critical to maintaining the identity, livability, and uniqueness of this part of San Francisco. We look forward to working with you to:

- Maintain Lombard Street as a Scenic Gateway to San Francisco
- Protect Existing Housing and Prioritize Safety
- Safeguard Neighborhood-Serving Retail Corridors
- Remove Density Decontrol Provisions

This part of District 2 features some of San Francisco's most iconic landmarks—from the Bay and the Palace of Fine Arts to the Golden Gate Bridge. As drivers enter the city via the Presidio Parkway, they experience a rare blend of hillside housing and urban density, evoking the charm of Europe's great coastal cities. The combination of natural setting, architectural rhythm, and cultural legacy makes this area both a world-class tourist destination and a cherished residential neighborhood.

For over a century, development west of Van Ness has followed the city's natural topography, integrating the urban grid with the land's slope, sunlight, and airflow. This is no accident—it is the result of organic, community-guided planning. Taller buildings crown the hilltops, gradually stepping down to 40 feet as the land slopes toward the Bay. Where this balance has been ignored, the consequences have been damaging.

COW HOLLOW ASSOCIATION
P.O. BOX 471136 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94147



As the city updates its zoning map to meet housing goals, it has both the opportunity and the obligation to respect this historic, context-sensitive development pattern. A one-size-fits-all approach invites speculative land grabs, drives up land costs, and risks replacing community-serving homes and businesses with unaffordable, investor-driven development.

Requested Map Changes & Policy Adjustments

1. Maintain Lombard Street as a Scenic Gateway to San Francisco

Lombard Street forms a gateway into San Francisco from the Golden Gate Bridge, framing iconic landmarks like the Palace of Fine Arts. Longstanding planning principles recognize that such landmarks must retain their visual prominence within the surrounding cityscape.

The proposed Upzoning Map undermines those principles by allowing buildings 6 to 8 stories tall—or more—immediately adjacent to or within the vicinity of lower-scale blocks and historic landmarks. These oversized structures, up to 100% larger than their surroundings, would crowd and compete with iconic features like the Palace of Fine Arts—a City Landmark that has long defined San Francisco's northern waterfront. Its visual stature depends on a built environment that respects both scale and setting. A blunt, uniform upzoning to 85 feet disregards topography and erodes the historic character that makes this area both livable and globally recognized.

We recommend a tapered height approach: 40 feet near the Palace, rising gradually to 50 and then 65 feet approaching Van Ness. This reflects the area's historical development pattern and ensures a balanced transition from the waterfront to the city's interior.

Recommended Height Limits:

- Limit building height to 40' on Richardson Avenue and on Lombard Street (starting at the Lombard Gate) to Webster Street
- Allow gradual increases beyond Webster to Van Ness:
    - 50' between Webster and Gough
    - 65' between Gough and Van Ness

This part of San Francisco — including Cow Hollow, the Marina, and Pacific Heights — has been assigned thousands of new units of housing capacity through broad density decontrol and increased height allowances, all contributing to the state's RHNA targets. It is more than our fair share in one of the city's most densely populated neighborhoods. These policies, when done properly, could enable new growth by allowing duplexes, triplexes, and small multi-unit buildings across the neighborhood.



In addition, Lombard is home to many small, independent motels dating back to the era of the Golden Gate Bridge — a rare remnant of San Francisco's history of welcoming visitors within neighborhood settings. Lombard is one of the last Motorways in the country that captures that hope-filled era of travel in mid-century America, rebuilding after World War II. These motels provide reasonably priced rooms and proximity to a major tourist destination, and support for our local businesses. Several of these motels have already been converted to student housing for the Academy of Art University. Losing others will result in losing tourism to our community and neighborhoods.

These recommendations align with the Planning Department's stated goals under the General Plan to preserve neighborhood character, maintain economic diversity, and enhance citywide view corridors.

2. Protect Existing Housing and Prioritize Safety

Lombard Street already has many residents living in rent-controlled apartments. These homes are essential to neighborhood stability and affordability, and support a vibrant mix of retail, services, and housing. Let's ensure long-time tenants in older rent-controlled buildings will not be quietly displaced through buyouts and demolitions.

As the upzoning plans allowed for more residents, we need to ensure the safety of those residents. The Planning Department must consider the serious risk of liquefaction in these areas. Much of the low-lying Marina and Cow Hollow was built on infill and remains vulnerable to seismic activity.

Aside from Lombard being a liquefaction zone, fire response time is a consideration. Cow Hollow boasts a newly rebuilt fire station on Greenwich Street. However, the fire truck ladders at this station can only service buildings as tall as 6-7 stories. If the building heights nearby are raised to 85' or taller, trucks must come from other neighborhoods, increasing the response time and endangering residents and visitors. This public safety issue has not been addressed anywhere in the city where buildings are proposed for drastic height increases.

These issues point to the need for thoughtful major corridor plans along not only Lombard, but Geary, 19th, and Taraval, among others, to ensure that urban planning practices can be implemented with the public input and care that went into the Market-Octavia or Central SOMA Plans of recent years.

3. Safeguard Neighborhood-Serving Retail Corridors

Chestnut, Union, and Fillmore streets are economic and cultural anchors. Their small-scale, sunlit retail corridors support thousands of jobs and contribute significantly to neighborhood livability and a large contingent of the city's 20+ million visitors that further contribute to supporting local employment and small businesses.



Upzoning these corridors would trigger redevelopment that almost always begins with demolition—many of these buildings are historic one-story Art Deco structures that currently house thriving small businesses. These businesses will not survive the transition, and adjacent shops are often dragged down by years of construction-related disruption. Noise, fencing, blocked sidewalks, lost parking, and reduced foot traffic can destabilize entire commercial blocks. The result is not affordable housing—it is the slow erosion of the vitality and street life that make these neighborhoods work.

The Marina Safeway site is another concern. While redevelopment may be considered, its location and current use are vital for residents—especially seniors and families without access to private transportation. A high-rise would be inappropriate and disruptive in this context.

Recommended Height Limits:

- Limit height to 40 feet on:
    - Union Street
    - Chestnut Street
    - Lower Fillmore Street (within the Marina and Cow Hollow)
    - Upper Fillmore Street (from Jackson to Bush)
    - Safeway site (corner of Laguna and Marina Blvd)

4. Remove Density Decontrol Provisions

To promote transparency and encourage meaningful neighborhood engagement, urge SF Planning to update the current interactive Upzoning Map to clearly reflect the two key provisions. Most San Franciscans are unfamiliar with these kinds of online tools and may not realize they need to click the "Info" button in the left-hand legend to uncover the proposed changes.

Currently, if someone clicks on a corner lot within the density decontrol area, the map still shows a proposed height of 40 feet—rather than the actual 65 feet being contemplated. This creates confusion and obscures the true scope of the changes. Failure to make these provisions plainly visible may not meet the standards of procedural transparency or informed public review expected under CEQA and other land use statutes. Complete clarity is essential.

But clarity alone is not enough. These provisions are deeply flawed and should be removed:

Recommended Changes:



- **Remove the provision that allows 65' heights on corners lots.** This will result in taller, randomly-placed towers among otherwise consistent 1-4 story residential blocks — with no relationship to neighborhood form or any broader planning vision.

- **Remove the provision that allows lots 8,000 sq. ft. or greater to automatically rise to 65'.** This provision encourages lot mergers that will invade the unique and vital greenbelts, backyards, and trees that provide vital open space in dense urban living.

Conclusion

We support new housing through thoughtful, context-sensitive growth. Like the city, we believe in expanding housing opportunities through planning that respects topography, preserves neighborhood identity, and safeguards essential services.

This area has already added housing capacity through the 4- and 6-plex legislation led by Supervisor Mandelman and adopted in 2023. We welcome further improvements that recognize Lombard Street's role as a scenic gateway.

But the current map goes too far. It invites speculation, drives up land costs, and encourages the demolition of sound housing—quietly displacing tenants and small businesses in favor of unaffordable luxury towers. These are the very people and places that give our neighborhoods their life and character.

Incorporating the revisions we've outlined will build public trust, reflect sound planning, and reduce the risk of unnecessary conflict or delay.

We urge you to support a smarter, long-term strategy—one that protects what makes San Francisco unique: its layered history, diverse communities, small businesses, and walkable, human-scale neighborhoods that reflect generations of thoughtful planning—while ensuring that truly affordable housing is the outcome, not just the promise, of these efforts.

Sincerely,

Lori Brooke
President, Cow Hollow Association

cc:
CHA Association Board and Membership
Mayor Daniel Lurie
Ned Segal, Chief of Housing and Economic Development
Rich Hillis, Director, Planning Department
Rachael Tanner, Director of Citywide Planning, Planning Department
Joshua Switzky, Deputy Director of Citywide Policy, Planning Department
Lisa Chen, Principal Planner, Planning Department

Bellaire Tower Homeowners' Association

1101 Green St.

San Francisco, CA 94109

Sent via E-Mail

October 31, 2025

San Francisco Mayor's Office
Mayor Daniel Lurie
Ned Segal
Chief Housing and Economic Development

San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Re: Land Use and Transportation Committee
Meeting, November 3rd 1:30 pm
Agenda Item 6, 250966 General Plan Amendments Family Zoning Plan

Dear Mayor Lurie, Chief Segal, and Board of Supervisors:

I write this letter on behalf of Bellaire Towers Homeowners' Association, 64 owners and residents of our 20 story historic high rise at Green and Leavenworth at the top of Russian Hill.

The original Family Zoning Plan heights for the six square blocks: Leavenworth on the east, Larkin to the west, Filbert to the north and Vallejo to the south maintained the current 40 foot height.

Without explanation or comment, in late 2024, the Family Zoning Plan Map increased zoning height in this six square block area from 40 feet to 65 feet.

We respectfully request the original Family Zoning Plan zoning height of 40 feet be reinstated for this six square block area.

Our request is modest and historically correct according to the Family Zoning Plan's own records.

There is substantial Russian Hill community support for retaining this 40 foot limit for this six block area.

On May 6, 2025, (attached)the 600 member Russian Hill Neighbors wrote the San Francisco Planning Department noting the unexpected reversal of the original Family Zoning Plan in the six block area, noting in the penultimate paragraph of their letter:

"Lastly, we were surprised to see that heights were increased from 4 to 6 storys in the approximately 6 blocks centered on Hyde and Union Streets shown in Area A. This appears to be a reversal from the outcome of several discussions we had with Planning on this issue. These blocks are similar in character to the adjacent multi-block areas of Russian Hill immediately to the north and east which remain at 4-5 stories. These are all finely-grained residential areas among the city's densest. As we had mentioned in earlier letters, the availability of "soft" parcels more likely to be candidates for development are extremely limited here, significantly reducing the benefit of any proposed height increases in these blocks. We support density decontrol here, but urge retaining the current 4-story limit in this area."[1]

[1] It is expected a representative of the separate and also largely representative Russian Hill Community Association will be present at this meeting in support of the reinstatement of the 40 foot zoning in the six block area.

There are at least three separate and compelling arguments from a land use perspective in retaining the 40 foot height limit in this six block area:

First, this zoning height increase in this six square block area will not lead to affordable housing. To the opposite, it will only lead to gross speculation by developers. Bellaire's representative, Rajan Edwards, so testified at the original SF Planning Commission hearing and the last Land Use and Transportation Committee hearing.

Second, this is an historic district and stable residential neighborhood. Specifically, to the immediate east of Bellaire Tower is the designated historic district, the "Paris Block" legacy residences that survived the 1906 earthquake. Bellaire Tower itself has already obtained an Historic Resource Evaluation and is seeking state and national landmark status with the noted preservation architects Page & Turnbull. Interspersed in the six block square area are other historic or historically evaluated residences. There is significant Russian Hill community support for designating the entire area down to Hyde street with its cable car route an historic district. This entire neighborhood should not be disturbed and irrevocably changed by prospective development.

Third, and finally, increasing the zoning height by 25 feet in this six block area, in all probability, makes no economic sense even to developers. Bellaire has consulted a number of established and knowledgeable developers in San Francisco, who inform us this marginal 25 foot zoning height increase makes no economic sense from a developer's standpoint, given the already high land acquisition cost and the marginal increase in density, making multi-family, as opposed to single family re-development a losing proposition.

I will be personally in attendance at the meeting and would like to testify and answer any questions on this matter.

Respectfully Submitted,

Niels L. Pearson

Niels Pearson

President,

Bellaire Tower Homeowners' Association

Encl.

RUSSIAN HILL
NEIGHBORS

May 6, 2025

Lisa Chen, Principal Planner
San Francisco Planning Department
49 South Van Ness Ave., Suite 1400
San Francisco, CA 94103
lisa.chen@sfgov.org

Subject: **Comments on April 2025 Draft of Proposed Zoning Map**

Dear Lisa:

Building upon our meetings and reviews of last year's drafts of the rezoning, we have reviewed the current iteration of April 2025. While encouraged that the current map reflects a number of our earlier comments, we have remaining concerns over what appear to be several reversals and height increases compared to the February 2024 draft.

We have consistently been supportive of reasonable density and height increases along main commercial and transit corridors, including Van Ness Ave. and Polk St. We are pleased to see that heights along upper- and mid-Polk St. have been limited to 8 stories, as we had recommended, rather than the 14 stories originally proposed that we felt were excessive. However, along Van Ness, heights have grown from 8 to 14 stories at the intersection with Lombard St., and from 25 to 35 stories south of Broadway. We urge a much more gradual transition in these locations. Please see Areas C1 and C2 on the attached map.

Closer to the waterfront, we were gratified to see the blocks along Bay St. reduced from 6 to 4-stories, as we had requested. However, the blocks north of North Point remain at 6-stories which we find problematic as they include Ghirardelli Sq. and are adjacent to Aquatic Park, as shown on Area B in the attachment. We recommend retaining the 4-story limit here.

Lastly, we were surprised to see that heights were increased from 4 to 6 stories in the approximately 6 blocks centered on Hyde and Union Streets shown in Area A. This appears to be a reversal from the outcome of several discussions we had with Planning on this issue. These blocks are similar in character to the adjacent multi-block areas of Russian Hill immediately to the north and east which remain at 4-5 stories. These are all finely-grained residential areas among the city's densest. As we had mentioned in earlier letters, the availability of "soft" parcels more likely to be candidates for development are extremely limited here, significantly reducing the benefit of any proposed height increases in these blocks. We support density decontrol here, but urge retaining the current 4-story limit in this area.

Thank you once again for considering our comments, and please let me know if you have any questions.

Cordially,
Carol Ann Rogers, President
president@rhnsf.org
415-902-3980

Attachments (2)

cc: Rich Hillis, Director rich.hillis@sfgov.org
Commission Affairs commissions.secretary@sfgov.org
Supervisor Danny Sauter sauterstaff@sfgov.org
Supervisor Stephen Sherrill sherrillstaff@sfgov.org

Russian Hill Neighbors ▪ 1819 Polk Street #221 ▪ San Francisco, CA 94109

SAN FRANCISCO
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Historic Resource Evaluation Response

1650 Mission St.
Suite 400
San Francisco,
CA 94103-2479

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

Date	September 28, 2015
Case No.:	**2014-001259ENV**
Project Address:	**60 Russell Street**
Zoning:	RH-2 (Residential House, Two-Family) 40-X Height and Bulk District
Block/Lot:	0123/009
Staff Contact:	Gretchen Hilyard (Preservation Planner) (415) 575-9109 gretchen.hilyard@sfgov.org

PART I: HISTORIC RESOURCE EVALUATION

Buildings and Property Description

The subject property, 60 Russell Street, is located on a rectangular-shaped lot measuring 20 feet by 60 feet on the north side of Russell Street, an alley located between Hyde Street and Eastman Alley in the Russian Hill neighborhood of San Francisco. The property is located within an RH-2 (Residential-House, Two-Family) Zoning District and a 40-X Height and Bulk District.

The subject property is occupied by a one-story over raised basement, single family, wood frame residence constructed in ca. 1906. The residence was originally designed as a flat-front Italianate cottage that was very similar to 64 Russell Street—featuring the same side entry porch, projecting cornice, and façade configuration. Known alterations to the property include: relocation of partition walls, addition of two rooms and three exterior decks, window and door replacement, re-cladding the exterior in wood shingles, and replacement of wall boards and trim (1963); reroofing (1992); and dry rot repair (2006). Other alterations include removal of the period elements of the entry vestibule at an unknown date.

Pre-Existing Historic Rating / Survey

The subject property is considered a "Category B" property (Properties Requiring Further Consultation and Review) for the purposes of the Planning Department's California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review procedures due to its age (constructed in ca. 1906).

On July 8, 2010, the Department issued a Historical Resource Evaluation Response (HRER) for a proposed project at 1945 Hyde Street (Planning Case #2010.0162E), which identified the subject block as part of an eligible historic district. The Historic Resource Evaluation prepared for the project (by Kelley & VerPlanck, dated February 2010) found that Russell Street (from Eastman Alley to Hyde Street) contains "a high concentration of residential buildings constructed in the early years of reconstruction after the 1906 Earthquake and Fire...The buildings within this area are unified historically by theme and form, and therefore could be a potential district."[1] The subject property is located within the boundaries of this identified district. See evaluation section below for further analysis.

[1] Kelley & VerPlanck, Historic Resource Evaluation for 1945 Hyde Street, (February 2010).

Neighborhood Context and Description

The subject property is located on a single-block alley on the western side of Russian Hill in San Francisco. The immediate context is characterized by primarily residential land uses with buildings dating from 1906 to the late-1920s. Buildings are generally one to three stories in height and some commercial properties are located along the major streets. The larger neighborhood is generally characterized by its steeply sloping terrain and a wide range of building types and styles dating from 1850-1930, with a scattering of more contemporary buildings throughout. While portions of the Russian Hill neighborhood have been surveyed as potential historic districts (specifically the older buildings at the top of the hill), the immediate blocks surrounding the subject property have not been formally surveyed.

CEQA Historical Resource(s) Evaluation

Step A: Significance

Under CEQA section 21084.1, a property qualifies as a historic resource if it is "listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in, the California Register of Historical Resources." The fact that a resource is not listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in, the California Register of Historical Resources or not included in a local register of historical resources, shall not preclude a lead agency from determining whether the resource may qualify as a historical resource under CEQA.

Individual		Historic District/Context	
Property is individually eligible for inclusion in a California Register under one or more of the following Criteria:		Property is eligible for inclusion in a California Register Historic District/Context under one or more of the following Criteria:	
Criterion 1 - Event:	☐ Yes ☒ No	Criterion 1 - Event:	☒ Yes ☐ No
Criterion 2 - Persons:	☐ Yes ☒ No	Criterion 2 - Persons:	☐ Yes ☒ No
Criterion 3 - Architecture:	☐ Yes ☒ No	Criterion 3 - Architecture:	☒ Yes ☐ No
Criterion 4 - Info. Potential:	☐ Yes ☒ No	Criterion 4 - Info. Potential:	☐ Yes ☒ No
Period of Significance: N/A		Period of Significance: 1906-1911 ☐ Contributor ☒ Non-Contributor	

Based on the information provided in the Historic Resource Evaluation prepared for the subject property by Tim Kelley Consulting (dated June 2014), additional research by staff, and information found in the Planning Department files; staff finds that the subject building is eligible for inclusion on the California Register as a non-contributor to an eligible historic district under California Register Criteria 1 and 3.

Criterion 1: Property is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history, or the cultural heritage of California or the United States.

To be eligible under the event Criterion, the building cannot merely be associated with historic events or trends but must have a specific association to be considered significant.

According to the *Historic Resource Evaluation* prepared by Tim Kelley Consulting, Russian Hill first developed in late-19th century and many of its early residents were prominent members of the Bay Area's artistic, literary, artistic, and intellectual traditions. Early residents of Russian Hill included

Swedenborgian minister Joseph Worcester, architect Willis Polk, writer Gelett Burgess, photographer Dorothea Lane, and painter and poet Maynard Dixon.[2] The Russian Hill neighborhood was severely damaged by the 1906 Earthquake and Fire and all but a few buildings at the summit of the hill were destroyed. After this catastrophic event, residents quickly rebuilt and the subject property was constructed as part of the reconstruction effort that stretched from 1906 to ca. 1915. Many of the reconstruction-era buildings in Russian Hill were built quickly after the event to meet the high need for housing in San Francisco. The subject building did not individually contribute to the pattern of reconstruction of the Russian Hill neighborhood after the 1906 Earthquake and Fire such that it would be individually eligible for listing in the California Register under this criterion. However, the building is part of a collection of buildings that represent this pattern of development and are more appropriately analyzed for eligibility as a historic district (see historic district evaluation below).

Staff finds that 60 Russell Street does not have a specific association with an event such that it would qualify individually under Criterion 1.

Criterion 2: Property is associated with the lives of persons important in our local, regional or national past.
Building permit records indicate that the original owners of 60 Russell Street were Ernest and Marguerite Guinard, who purchased the property in 1906 and sold it in 1911. The early owners and occupants of the subject property and neighboring properties on Russell Street were generally blue-collar workers (carpenters, laborers, etc). Records do not indicate that any of the owners or occupants of the subject property are important to local, regional or national past. Therefore, 60 Russell Street is not eligible under Criterion 2.

Criterion 3: Property embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values.
60 Russell Street is a one-story over raised basement, single family, wood frame residence originally designed as a flat-front Italianate cottage. The building was constructed in ca. 1906, at the beginning of the reconstruction of the Russian Hill neighborhood after the 1906 Earthquake and Fire. The building retains its original form and some architectural features, such as the projecting cornice, but many of the exterior façade materials have been removed or were covered over by wood shingles in 1963.

Based on information outlined in the Historic Resource Evaluation prepared for the project (Tim Kelley Consulting, June 2014), and additional research by staff, the subject property at 60 Russell Street is not individually eligible for inclusion in the California Register under Criterion 3 (Architecture), since the building does not possess high artistic value, nor individually embody distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction.

Criterion 4: Property yields, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.
The subject building is not significant under Criterion 4, since this significance criterion typically applies to rare construction types when involving the built environment. The subject building is not an example of a rare construction type. Evaluation of archeological resources is outside of the scope of this review.

---

[2] Ibid, 5.

Historic District Evaluation

The subject property is part of a single-block alley of small-scale residential properties that are thematically and architecturally associated with the San Francisco's rebuilding after the 1906 Earthquake and Fire. The development of Russell Street followed a city-wide pattern of residential and commercial buildings construction spanning from 1906 to ca. 1915 to provide housing and services to displaced residents after the disaster. Today, Russell Street displays the architectural congruity necessary to qualify for listing under Criterion 1 (Events) representing a significant pattern of development after the 1906 Earthquake and Fire. The block is also eligible for listing under Criterion 3 (Design/Architecture) due to its high concentration of architecturally unified buildings with shared architectural characteristics, form, historic context and period.

Although a survey has not yet been completed, the boundaries of the historic district would include properties on both sides of Russell Street from Eastman Alley to Hyde Street. Based upon the historic context themes associated with the neighborhood, contributing buildings to the potential historic district would include intact multi- and single-family dwellings constructed on Russell Street between 1906 and 1911, the date the last reconstruction-era residence was completed on the street. As a result of this development pattern, there is a considerable degree of visual harmony among the residential properties along Russell Street and the buildings have experienced few exterior alterations. The building styles include Italianate, Classical Revival, Queen Anne, Craftsman, and Edwardian architectural styles. Most buildings still display a high level of historic architectural integrity; while there have been some alterations, the majority of the buildings still possess the basic form and architectural detailing associated with their style from the period of significance. The subject property was constructed during the period of significance, but due to exterior alterations, the building has lost integrity to this period and is considered a non-contributor to the eligible historic district.

***Note: The eligible Russell Street historic district has not been formally surveyed or evaluated. For the purposes of this HRER, the subject property at 60 Russell Street was examined for its possible contribution to the historic district and no other buildings within the district boundary were evaluated in detail.

Step B: Integrity

To be a resource for the purposes of CEQA, a property must not only be shown to be significant under the California Register of Historical Resources criteria, but it also must have integrity. Integrity is defined as "the authenticity of a property's historic identity, evidenced by the survival of physical characteristics that existed during the property's period of significance." Historic integrity enables a property to illustrate significant aspects of its past. All seven qualities do not need to be present as long the overall sense of past time and place is evident.

Location:	☒ Retains	☐ Lacks	**Setting:**	☒ Retains	☐ Lacks
Association:	☒ Retains	☐ Lacks	**Feeling:**	☒ Retains	☐ Lacks
Design:	☐ Retains	☒ Lacks	**Materials:**	☐ Retains	☒ Lacks
Workmanship:	☐ Retains	☒ Lacks			

The street-facing façade of the subject property (60 Russell Street) has undergone many alterations since it was originally constructed in ca. 1906, including replacement of original wood-sash double-hung windows with aluminum sliders, reduction in the size of original window openings, removal of decorative window and door surrounds, modification of the projecting cornice detailing, and covering

the original horizontal wood siding with wood shingles. Although the original building form and scale are evident and some of the original cladding and trim materials may exist underneath the current cladding, in its current state, the building does not retain sufficient integrity to contribute to the eligible historic district.

Step C: Historic District Character Defining Features

For the eligible Russell Street Historic District, the character-defining features would include but are not limited to:

- Location on Russell Street;
- Residential use (single-family or multi-family flats);
- One-to-three story height;
- Wood frame construction;
- Lack of architectural bays (mostly flat facades facing alley with an occasional shallow angled bay);
- Raised basements;
- Horizontal wood cladding;
- Gable or flat roof forms;
- Elevated and recessed entries (some recessed entries feature decorative vestibule panels);
- Wood entry stairs;
- Queen Anne, Craftsman, Classical Revival, Italianate or Edwardian-era architectural detailing;
- Arched Classical Revival style entry surrounds with flanking columns or pilasters;
- Projecting, decorative wood window and door hoods;
- Flat or slightly molded wood board window and door surrounds;
- Wood-sash windows (double-hung and casement), some with multi-lite upper sashes and ogee lugs;
- Paneled and partially glazed wood entry doors;
- Projecting, denticulated cornices with square modillions; and
- Free-standing planter boxes or retaining walls in front setback, or no front setback.

CEQA Historic Resource Determination

☒ Historical Resource Present
- ☐ Individually-eligible Resource
- ☐ Contributor to an eligible Historic District
- ☒ Non-contributor to an eligible Historic District

☐ No Historical Resource Present

PART I: SENIOR PRESERVATION PLANNER REVIEW

Signature: _____ Date: 10-5-2015

Tina Tam, *Senior Preservation Planner*

cc: Nicholas Foster, Current Planning

GH: G:\Documents\HRER\60 Russell\HRER\60 Russell Street_HRER Part I.doc

IMAGES



Subject property looking northwest.
Image courtesy of Google Maps, 2015.

From:	Lupe Velez
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff
Subject:	Public Comment: VOTE NO On Lurie"s Recipe For Housing Failure & Replace It With A Real Affordable Housing Plan
Date:	Monday, November 3, 2025 3:19:24 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

The City Economist just released a report showing that Mayor Lurie's 'Family Zoning' plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing.

We still have 3 months to replace the Mayor's plan with one that will work. Here's a real strategy to solve the affordable housing crisis.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units - together more than enough to fulfill state mandates. (Yet instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Lurie's plan simply moves zoning rules around like deck chairs on the Titanic, does almost nothing to increase affordable housing, and increases the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing oversupply [now at 150%] while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods.)

Now that the City Economist has shown that Lurie's plan won't work, it is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the 'Family Zoning' plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing housing approvals, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year in a way that will fully meet state mandates.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible, instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood, and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

The Mayor's plan would build more excess housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and

corporate real estate speculators. **Please REPLACE the text in this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural and community integrity, with text that will truly produce affordable housing and get State bureaucrats off of San Francisco's back.**

--

Guadalupe Velez
Communications Director
(She/Her/Hers)
Coalition on Homelessness
280 Turk Street, San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 346-3740 x305



From:	David Woo
To:	Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS)
Cc:	Raquel Redondiez; Carroll, John (BOS); Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	SOMA Pilipinas Letter RE "Family Zoning Plan"
Date:	Monday, November 3, 2025 12:42:26 PM
Attachments:	SOMA Pilipinas Letter_Family Zoning Plan 11.3.25.pdf

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

President Mandelman and Members of the Board, please see our letter below regarding the "Family Zoning Plan."

November 3, 2025

RE: Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan"

President Mandelman and Members of the Board of Supervisors,

SOMA Pilipinas, the Filipino Cultural Heritage District, is opposed to the proposed upzoning plan. The upzoning plan will lead to the displacement of residents and small businesses, and encourages real estate speculation, harming the South of Market and neighborhoods across the city. The current plan, coupled with numerous cuts to affordable housing and impact fees that have already occurred, highlight how the city's Housing Element and the state co-opt the language of racial and social equity to further deregulation. We are also opposed to the blatant giveaway in Western SOMA of mainly increasing base heights, which will be used with the state density bonus, resulting in basically two upzonings from this plan for SOMA.

We must instead prioritize developing 100% affordable housing, preserving and protecting existing housing, protecting existing residents and small businesses from displacement, and engaging in community based planning. The current upzoning is failing on these fronts. We support the amendments put forward by Supervisor Chan and Supervisor Chen as they constitute a logical baseline of what should be included in such a sweeping upzoning proposal.

The city's Housing Element, mandated by the state, calls for 57% affordable housing to be built. As there is no affordable housing component to this plan, it is clear that it is a market-rate housing plan. The city economist Ted Egan acknowledges that market-rate housing will not get built at the levels "required" by the state, because developers and investors can not get the profit that is desired from these projects, stating the plan will only produce 8,500-14,600 units over the next 20 years. Affordable housing developers, however, are ready and willing to build housing. According to the city's 2024 Housing Inventory Report, affordable housing production accounted for 64% of all new housing production in 2024; as market-rate housing stalled because of lack of return on investment, affordable housing production continued.

If the city and state are really concerned about "building housing," the focus would be on building affordable housing. However, it is clear that the real desire is not simply to "build housing," but instead to provide the best scenario for private developers, investors, and

speculators to make money off of the real estate market in San Francisco.

We must focus on creating 100% affordable housing, protecting our neighborhoods that are composed of residents, small businesses, and neighborhood based organizations, and engaging in community based planning that focuses on the needs of the most vulnerable and marginalized.

Thank you,

David Woo
Community Development and Policy Coordinator
SOMA Pilipinas

--
David Woo
Community Development and Policy Coordinator
SOMA Pilipinas Cultural Heritage District

November 3, 2025

RE: Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan"

President Mandelman and Members of the Board of Supervisors,

SOMA Pilipinas, the Filipino Cultural Heritage District, is opposed to the proposed upzoning plan. The upzoning plan will lead to the displacement of residents and small businesses, and encourages real estate speculation, harming the South of Market and neighborhoods across the city. The current plan, coupled with numerous cuts to affordable housing and impact fees that have already occurred, highlight how the city's Housing Element and the state co-opt the language of racial and social equity to further deregulation. We are also opposed to the blatant giveaway in Western SOMA of mainly increasing base heights, which will be used with the state density bonus, resulting in basically two upzonings from this plan for SOMA.

We must instead prioritize developing 100% affordable housing, preserving and protecting existing housing, protecting existing residents and small businesses from displacement, and engaging in community based planning. The current upzoning is failing on these fronts. We support the amendments put forward by Supervisor Chan and Supervisor Chen as they constitute a logical baseline of what should be included in such a sweeping upzoning proposal.

The city's Housing Element, mandated by the state, calls for 57% affordable housing to be built. As there is no affordable housing component to this plan, it is clear that it is a market-rate housing plan. The city economist Ted Egan acknowledges that market-rate housing will not get built at the levels "required" by the state, because developers and investors can not get the profit that is desired from these projects, stating the plan will only produce 8,500-14,600 units over the next 20 years. Affordable housing developers, however, are ready and willing to build housing. According to the city's 2024 Housing Inventory Report, affordable housing production accounted for 64% of all new housing production in 2024; as market-rate housing stalled because of lack of return on investment, affordable housing production continued.

If the city and state are really concerned about "building housing," the focus would be on building affordable housing. However, it is clear that the real desire is not simply to "build housing," but instead to provide the best scenario for private developers, investors, and speculators to make money off of the real estate market in San Francisco.

We must focus on creating 100% affordable housing, protecting our neighborhoods that are composed of residents, small businesses, and neighborhood based organizations, and engaging in community based planning that focuses on the needs of the most vulnerable and marginalized.

Thank you,

David Woo
Community Development and Policy Coordinator
SOMA Pilipinas

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: The FZP - Stop Fighting Each Other Over Capacity. Fight the RHNA"s Illegality Instead. Adopt the Humane, Protective Chan, Chen, and Melgar Amendments
Date:	Monday, November 3, 2025 12:12:18 PM

Dear Supervisors,

Please see below communication regarding File Nos. 250700, 251071; 250701, 251072, 251073; 250966; and 251071.

File No. 250700: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 251071: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 250701: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 251072: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 251073: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 250966: General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 251071: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan

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: lgpetty <lgpetty@juno.com>
Sent: Saturday, November 1, 2025 2:03 AM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; BOS-Legislative Aides <bos-legislative_aides@sfgov.org>; Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>
Subject: Re: The FZP - Stop Fighting Each Other Over Capacity. Fight the RHNA's Illegality Instead. Adopt the Humane, Protective Chan, Chen, and Melgar Amendments

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

Dear Land Use Committee Members and all other Supervisors,

I urged in an October 17 email letter that the Board write its own zoning plan to include strong anti-displacement protections for tenants and small businesses, with a prioritized affordable housing funding & site plan.

Thank you, Supervisors Chan, Chen and Melgar, for attempting to inject decency into the FZP.

Thank you Supervisors Chan and Chen for recognizing that the concepts of compliance and capacity can only be met through a clear-eyed lens of San Francisco's actual needs. Not through the distorted view of those who would profit from unlimited removal and replacement of people and their homes with wealthy people and impossibly costly generic "units."

Capacity and compliance are currently based on a numerical fiction... the made-up structure of "State-Mandated RHNA numbers."

We must stop fighting each other in a futile race to rack up housing unit numbers we were never meant to achieve. RHNA's were designed to be impossibly high -- setting up the City to fail -- so that the State would have a rationale to remove all locally-determined regulations via a State-imposed "builders' remedy."

The RHNA's, even if created with good intentions, have been proven irrelevant by Covid impacts, tariff and construction cost inflation, and the loss of an investor-driven economy.

Let's stop chasing this non-existent RHNA capacity holy grail. Let's turn our efforts instead toward establishing the illegality of the RHNA numbers in court.

Let's stop being afraid.

Refine and strengthen tenant and small business protection Amendments for a revised FZP in the meantime. Create a better, uniquely San Francisco zoning plan that provides mostly affordable housing and does it without destroying ourselves and our City.

Thank you for your consideration.

Lorraine Petty

D2/5 senior, renter & voter
Affordable Housing Advocate
Seniors and Tenants Advocate
Member, SFTU & SDA

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); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations; BOS Legislation, (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject:	37 Letters regarding File Nos. 250700, 251071; 250701, 251072, 251073; 250966; and 251071 as of 11/3/25 12 noon
Date:	Monday, November 3, 2025 12:00:35 PM
Attachments:	37 letters.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached for 37 Letters regarding File Nos. 250700, 251071; 250701, 251072, 251073; 250966; and 251071.

File No. 250700: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 251071: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 250701: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 251072: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 251073: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 250966: General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 251071: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan

Regards,

Richard Lagunte
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Voice (415) 554-5184 | Fax (415) 554-5163
bos@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

Pronouns: he, him, his

Disclosures: *Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written*

or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors' website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.

From: denniseblum@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Dennis Blum
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 30, 2025 1:19:35 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):My home as well as my rental unit on Union Street between Polk and Van Ness will be destroyed and put in nearly constant shadow and darkness by the proposed towering height of the adjacent properties.

Sincerely,
Dennis Blum
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: scoopfoggy@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Shirley Fogarino
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 30, 2025 2:00:12 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Shirley Fogarino
San Francisco, CA 94123

From:	sigimcc@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sigrid Bull-McCarthy
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Thursday, October 30, 2025 2:08:23 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Sigrid Bull-McCarthy
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: sigimcc@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sigrid Bull-McCarthy
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 30, 2025 2:08:57 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Sigrid Bull-McCarthy
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: Ravit Shrivastav
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Thursday, October 30, 2025 3:30:11 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Ravit Shrivastav
ravitshrivastav@gmail.com
101 Rivoli Street
San Francisco, California 94117

From: soaring_leap@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lauren Meredith
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 30, 2025 3:50:06 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

If one of these monstrosities goes up next door to us, we'll definitely leave. I won't live in the shadow of a high rise. We honestly bought our home because of all the light and the beauty of looking out at Golden Gate Park. So, our two little gardens and our tree (we call him Barkleaf) will die that will be the end of that. It just won't be the nice quiet neighborhood we planned to live in forever. We're getting ready to retire soon and really hope the city won't force us out to make room for rich folks' condos.

As a resident of the Richmond near Fulton St, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Lauren Meredith
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: Lori Milburn
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Thursday, October 30, 2025 4:36:43 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Lori Milburn

Lori Milburn
lbzmilburn@gmail.com
2395 24th Ave. Apt. 4
San Francisco, California 94116

From: soccercycle1@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mark Keith
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 30, 2025 6:35:17 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Francisco person.,
As long as the affordable housing gets replaced it’s ok. There’s loads of free space by ccsf.

We call on you to:

- make the upcoming maps apparent and available for public viewing. People need to move in A fare amount of time. Keep doing a good job. Reviving market street will take some work. Don’t drive out the poor responsible citizens. All those drugies have been the people that make the art you love so please some compassion. Not everyone has the tech skills to make it in computer software database world. The Loin knows it’s time to mix it up and some of those 6 story buildings should have been 10 or higher. Don’t forget to tell your mom you love her cuz she’s old. Ok have a good day. It takes a lot of work for city that hits harder than its weight class. Keep the focus on the tourism that really separates it from other places, ooh and Sunday brunch.

Sincerely,
Mark Keith
San Francisco, CA 94108

From: yglaros@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of yvonne glaros
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 30, 2025 8:27:50 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
yvonne glaros
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: askalice@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Alice Polesky
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 30, 2025 10:59:15 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Alice Polesky
San Francisco, CA 94107

From: emailamr@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Ann Rubin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 30, 2025 11:36:38 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

We must avoid repeating the past with this new version of Urban Renewal.

Sincerely,
Ann Rubin
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: thealohaangel@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Margo Goldman
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Friday, October 31, 2025 9:07:13 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I have lived in San Francisco for 55 years. I have worked to keep as much as possible the San Francisco charm. It is sad and disturbing that Mayor Lurie's plan has come about. The destruction to neighborhoods, victorians, and other beautiful San Francisco structures are getting torn down to put up which horrible, cooky cutter high-rise buildings....What for....there are many other areas where you could put up housing and create another new area...but why in already beautiful neighborhoods that do not need to be changed or congested.
I voted for you Mayor Lurie..and I am sadden by the turn you are taking...PLEASE STOP THIS CONGESTIVE BUILDING MADDNESS!

Cut back on all this rezoning, take more time to plan this out.
Stop this devastating change to our culturally beautiful San Francisco...
We do not need such a gross amount of Cookie Cutter Luxury Buildings..
Stop ruining our wonderful neighborhoods..

Consider looking at spaces to develop where there is more land and less residential structures
There is all that land by the old shipyards...why not create a new neighborhood there...

Sincerely,
Margo Goldman
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: R. Zierikzee
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 31, 2025 10:42:30 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

R. Zierikzee
inor@earthlink.net
845 Euclid Ave Apt 4
San Francisco, California 94118

From:	Eric Brooks
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff
Subject:	Public Comment: VOTE NO On Lurie"s Recipe For Housing Failure & Replace It With A Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701
Date:	Friday, October 31, 2025 6:18:38 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

The City Economist just released a report showing that Mayor Lurie's 'Family Zoning' plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing.

We still have 3 months to replace the Mayor's plan with one that will work. Here's a real strategy to solve the affordable housing crisis.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units - together more than enough to fulfill state mandates. (Yet instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Lurie's plan simply moves zoning rules around like deck chairs on the Titanic, does almost nothing to increase affordable housing, and increases the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing over-supply [now at 150%] while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods.)

Now that the City Economist has shown that Lurie's plan won't work, it is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the 'Family Zoning' Ordinance and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing housing approvals, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year in a way that will fully meet state mandates.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible, instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood, and diesel construction equipment, releasing major greenhouse gas emissions.

The Mayor's plan would build more excess housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and

corporate real estate speculators. **Please REPLACE the text in this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural, and community integrity, with text that will truly produce affordable housing and get State bureaucrats off of San Francisco's back.**

Thank you,

Eric Brooks, Campaign Coordinator
Our City SF and San Francisco CEQA Defenders
415-756-8844

From: Ann Cabral
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Upcoming "Family Housing Zones" measure proposed by Mayor Lurie
Date: Friday, October 31, 2025 6:34:06 PM

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

I am not likely to be able to attend this coming Monday, 11/ 3/25 Board meeting where it is my understanding there will be discussions about the proposed changes to zoning in our Sunset district, as well as other neighborhood districts. I cannot stand for long periods, or crowded areas.

It is not acceptable for many of us living in single family, or in R2 zones, to have larger unit buildings and increased height permitted, especially when it increases demand on our very aged infrastructure and traffic management cannot be adapted. Many corner lots already have 3 or more stories, or even 4-5 stories on inner Sunset transit lines. A proposal to increase heights even further, demolish our outer neighborhoods to become more commercially profitable is not why we bought here almost 30 years ago. Sunset has become more crowded and traffic noticeably increased just in the past decade, especially with the Great Highway issues now added. The State may be pressuring San Francisco to build, build, build more housing capacity but it cannot be at the expense of destroying our neighborhoods. Keep the housing increases on already major commercial areas where one expects it to be. Don't take away the special uniqueness of the outer districts. There are already efforts to increase housing capacity even with our single family properties where "in law" units can be created more easily. We are not a metropolis like Los Angeles, San Diego, etc, where there was space to expand, and we do not want to become a "Malibu" of the north along the Great Highway.

This type of proposal to increase housing density is just not acceptable.

Regards, Sunset resident & tax payer, Ann Cabral

Sent from my iPad

From:	Francesca Pastine
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff; Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject:	SF Supervisors Support Mayor Lurie"s Affordable Housing and SF Neighborhoods Plan
Date:	Friday, October 31, 2025 7:35:00 PM

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

Hello All,

As you may know, Mayor Lurie's *Family Housing Plan* will go before the Land Use & Transportation Committee this Monday, November 3, sometime after 2 p.m. I fully support this plan. It's time for San Francisco to take real steps toward building enough housing—especially in the low-density neighborhoods on the west side of the city.

While the City Economist, Ted Egan, recently noted that the plan alone will not meet the city's full housing mandates, it represents an essential step toward building the infrastructure we need for future growth.

Let's create a San Francisco where working-class families and future generations can afford to live and thrive.

Best,

Francesca Pastine

1183 Shotwell Street

415 596 5543

--
https://www.francescapastine.com/
www.pastineprojects.com
IN THE MAKE
http://francescapastine.blogspot.com
http://www.innermissionneighborhood.com
www.hillaryronenmission.com

Life is short
Art is long
Opportunity fleeting
Experience treacherous
Judgment difficult

Hippocrates 400 b.c.

From: Magick Altman
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Family Housing
Date: Friday, October 31, 2025 8:28:32 PM

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

To whom in may concern, you can usually tell when something is against the people's interest when its called "Family planning". This is a scam to get quick approval of the destruction of our neighborhoods, affordable housing and protections for small businesses. North Beach is fine. LEAVE IT ALONE. There is purpose to the so=called red tape. To make sure the people win and not the developers, who could care less about our neighborhoods.
Stop this illegal and immoral action.
Be Leery of Lurie, Money doesn't talk it Swears.
Yours in Truth,
Magick Altman

From:	Todd
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff
Subject:	Public Comment: VOTE NO On Lurie"s Recipe For Housing Failure & Replace It With A Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701
Date:	Friday, October 31, 2025 8:38:28 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

As a resident of San Francisco (District 2) and a stakeholder, I demand that you adopt a plan that prioritizes **affordable housing**!

The City Economist just released a report showing that Mayor Lurie's 'Family Zoning' plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing.

We still have 3 months to replace the Mayor's plan with one that will work. Here's a real strategy to solve the affordable housing crisis.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units - together more than enough to fulfill state mandates.

Yet instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Lurie's plan simply moves zoning rules around like deck chairs on the Titanic, does almost nothing to increase affordable housing, and increases the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing over-supply [now at 150%] while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods

Now that the City Economist has shown that Lurie's plan won't work, it is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the 'Family Zoning' plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing housing approvals, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year in a way that will fully meet state mandates.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible, instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood, and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

The Mayor's plan would build more excess housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators.

Please REPLACE the text in this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural and community integrity, with text that will truly produce affordable housing and get State bureaucrats off of San Francisco's back.

Thank you,
Todd Snyder
1941 Turk street Apt 4

From:	lgpetty
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides; Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject:	Re: The FZP - Stop Fighting Each Other Over Capacity. Fight the RHNA"s Illegality Instead. Adopt the Humane, Protective Chan, Chen, and Melgar Amendments
Date:	Saturday, November 1, 2025 2:04:08 AM

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

Dear Land Use Committee Members and all other Supervisors,

I urged in an October 17 email letter that the Board write its own zoning plan to include strong anti-displacement protections for tenants and small businesses, with a prioritized affordable housing funding & site plan.

Thank you, Supervisors Chan, Chen and Melgar, for attempting to inject decency into the FZP.

Thank you Supervisors Chan and Chen for recognizing that the concepts of compliance and capacity can only be met through a clear-eyed lens of San Francisco's actual needs. Not through the distorted view of those who would profit from unlimited removal and replacement of people and their homes with wealthy people and impossibly costly generic "units."

Capacity and compliance are currently based on a numerical fiction... the made-up structure of "State-Mandated RHNA numbers."

We must stop fighting each other in a futile race to rack up housing unit numbers we were never meant to achieve. RHNA's were designed to be impossibly high -- setting up the City to fail -- so that the State would have a rationale to remove all locally-determined regulations via a State-imposed "builders' remedy."

The RHNA's, even if created with good intentions, have been proven irrelevant by Covid impacts, tariff and construction cost inflation, and the loss of an investor-driven economy.

Let's stop chasing this non-existent RHNA capacity holy grail. Let's turn our efforts instead toward establishing the illegality of the RHNA numbers in court.

Let's stop being afraid.

Refine and strengthen tenant and small business protection Amendments for a revised FZP in the meantime. Create a better, uniquely San Francisco zoning plan that provides mostly affordable housing and does it without destroying ourselves and our City.

Thank you for your consideration.

Lorraine Petty

D2/5 senior, renter & voter
Affordable Housing Advocate

Seniors and Tenants Advocate
Member, SFTU & SDA

From: Judi Gonski
To: Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Meilan, Marina (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Wong, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Busch, Percy (BOS); WaltonStaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Haney, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Roos, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Sauter, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Melgoza, Abril (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Bardis, Pascal (BOS); Kaplan, Michelle (BOS); EasterStaff
Subject: Public Comment: VOTE NO on Mayor Lurie's Family Housing Plan and Replace it with a Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701 - Land Use and Transportation Meeting, Monday, Nov. 3, 2025, 1:30 pm
Date: Saturday, November 1, 2025 10:01:32 AM

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

To:
John.Carroll@sfgov.org , board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org , Marina.Meilan@sfgov.org , Jen.Low@sfgov.org , MelgarStaff@sfgov.org , connie.chan@sfgov.org , Frances.Hsieh@sfgov.org , ChanStaff@sfgov.org , rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org , mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org , Calvin.Ho@sfgov.org , Jackie.Fielder@sfgov.org , Jennifer.Ferrigno@sfgov.org , fielderstaff@sfgov.org , shamann.walton@sfgov.org , Percy.Burch@sfgov.org , waltonstaff@sfgov.org , Chyanne.Chen@sfgov.org , Jackie.Haney@sfgov.org , ChenStaff@sfgov.org , Stephen.Sherrill@sfgov.org , Lorenzo.Rosas@sfgov.org , SherrillStaff@sfgov.org , matt.dorsey@sfgov.org , Madison.B.Tam@sfgov.org , dorseystaff@sfgov.org , Abril.Melgoza@sfgov.org , Sam.Logan@sfgov.org , MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org , Danny.Sauter@sfgov.org , Michelle.Andrews@sfgov.org , EasterStaff@sfgov.org

From:
Judi Gonski, District 4; zip code 94116

Date: November 1, 2025

Subject: Public Comment: VOTE NO on Mayor Lurie's Family Housing Plan and Replace it with a Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701 - Land Use and Transportation Meeting, Monday, Nov. 3, 2025, 1:30 pm

Dear Supervisors,

As a District 4 San Franciscan without representation on the Board of Supervisors, I am writing to ask you to strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's Family Upzoning Plan as it currently exists. As it is now written, the Plan incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

I speak for myself, my family, and many of my neighbors to respectfully ask you to:

- Require adequate infrastructure to be built PRIOR to building any additional housing
- Refuse to allow the use of *geo grouting to harden the earth and sand beneath proposed new housing building sites as it poisons our groundwater (See geo-grouting info at end of this email.)
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

As currently written, this Plan clears the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices and the safety of the very communities they are supposed to represent.

Our far western District 4 does not have existing infrastructure to support these new high-rises, and infrastructure needs to be designed, funded and built first. Circumventing CEQA requirements in a rush to build jeopardizes our safety.

We still have three months to replace the Mayor's Plan with one that will work.

The City Economist recently released a report that shows the Mayor's Plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because **zoning changes do not produce new housing**. Therefore, it is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the Family Zoning Plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing housing approvals, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year in a way that will fully meet state mandates.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units - together more than enough to fulfill state mandates. Instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Lurie's plan just moves the zoning rules around and does little to increase affordable housing. It increases instead the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing over-supply (now at 150%) while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods.

Let us not build more excess housing for the wealthy that will create more homelessness and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to corporate real estate speculators.

Please RELACE the text in this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco homeowners, tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural, and community integrity, with text that will truly produce housing and get State bureaucrats off of San Francisco's back.

Thank you,

Judi Gonski
SF District Resident 47 years , 94116

*CEQA requires that any project involving geo-grouting that requires a discretionary approval by a public agency undergo an environmental review process to identify and mitigate potential environmental impacts.

How geo-grouting can contaminate groundwater:

Toxic additives: Many chemical and cement-based grouts contain additives that can be toxic or carcinogenic and may leach into the surrounding groundwater.

Drilling and installation: The process of drilling holes for grouting can create pathways for surface contaminants to travel directly into aquifers, especially if the boreholes are not sealed properly.

Contaminant pathways: Grouting operations can create or worsen fractures in the ground, creating direct routes for contaminants to flow into groundwater sources.

Chemical reactions: The chemical reactions that occur during the hydration of cement-based grouts can alter the chemistry of the groundwater, potentially increasing dissolved solids and changing its overall characteristics.

Improper disposal: Improper disposal of grout waste can also lead to secondary contamination of soil and water.

From: Patrick Le
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Saturday, November 1, 2025 10:53:51 AM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan. We need to just get this through the Land Use Committee and passed with minimal revisions/amendments as possible. The longer we wait, the longer we are in this affordability crisis that is causing San Francisco to lose thousands of people each year and make it harder for the citizens who live here to survive. Perfection is the enemy of good, and we need to make good progress.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Patrick Le
patrickle1994@gmail.com
511 Eureka St
San Francisco, California 94114

From: Patrick Le
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Saturday, November 1, 2025 10:55:40 AM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan. We just need to stop messing around and get this passed with minimal amendments and revisions as possible. The longer we wait, the more people will leave SF. Perfection is the enemy of good and we just need to build more housing of all different stocks asap.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Patrick Le
patrickhle00@gmail.com
411 Eureka St
San Francisco, California 94114

From: Stephen Gorski
To: Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Wong, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ms. Ellick (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); WaltonStaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Engardio, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Kaplan, Lawrence (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Fieber, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Lopez, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); BoardStaff
Subject: Public Comment: VOTE NO on Mayor Lurie's Family Housing Plan and Replace it with a Real Affordable Housing Plan – File #250701 – Land Use and Transportation Meeting, Monday, Nov. 3, 2025, 1:30 pm
Date: Saturday, November 1, 2025 12:02:53 PM

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

To:
John.Carroll@sfgov.org ; board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org ; Myrna.Melgar@sfgov.org ; Jen.Low@sfgov.org ; MelgarStaff@sfgov.org ; connie.chan@sfgov.org ; Frances.Hsieh@sfgov.org ; ChanStaff@sfgov.org ; rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org ; mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org ; Calvin.Ho@sfgov.org ; jackie.fielder@sfgov.org ; jennifer.ferrigno@sfgov.org ; fielderstaff@sfgov.org ; shamann.walton@sfgov.org ; Percy.Burch@sfgov.org ; waltonstaff@sfgov.org ; Chyanne.Chen@sfgov.org ; jackie.fraser@sfgov.org ; ChenStaff@sfgov.org ; Stephen.Sherrill@sfgov.org ; lawrence.Kwan@sfgov.org ; SherrillStaff@sfgov.org ; matt.dorsey@sfgov.org ; Madison.Fieber@sfgov.org ; dorseystaff@sfgov.org ; bilal.Mahmood@sfgov.org ; sam.lopez@sfgov.org ; MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org ; Danny.Sauter@sfgov.org ; Michelle.Andrews@sfgov.org ; SauterStaff@sfgov.org

From:
Stephen J. Gorski, District 4; zip code 94116

Date: November 1, 2025

Subject: Public Comment: VOTE NO on Mayor Lurie's Family Housing Plan and Replace it with a Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701 - Land Use and Transportation Meeting, Monday, Nov. 3, 2025, 1:30 pm

Dear Supervisors,

As a District 4 San Franciscan without representation on the Board of Supervisors, I am writing to ask you to strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's Family Upzoning Plan as it currently exists. As it is now written, the Plan incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

I speak for myself, my family, and many of my neighbors to respectfully ask you to:

- Require adequate infrastructure to be built PRIOR to building any additional housing
- Refuse to allow the use of *geo grouting to harden the earth and sand beneath proposed new housing building sites as it poisons our groundwater(See geo-grouting info at end of this email.)
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

As currently written, this Plan clears the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices and the safety of the very communities they are supposed to represent.

Our far western District 4 does not have existing infrastructure to support these new high-rises, and infrastructure needs to be designed, funded and built first. Circumventing CEQA requirements in a rush to build jeopardizes our safety.

We still have three months to replace the Mayor's Plan with one that will work.
The City Economist recently released a report that shows the Mayor's Plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because **zoning changes do not produce new housing**. Therefore, it is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the Family Zoning Plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing housing approvals, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year in a way that will fully meet state mandates.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units - together more than enough to fulfill state mandates. Instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Lurie's plan just moves the zoning rules around and does little to increase affordable housing. It increases instead the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing over-supply (now at 150%) while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods.

Let us not build more excess housing for the wealthy that will create more homelessness and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to corporate real estate speculators.

Please RELACE the text in this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco homeowners, tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural, and community integrity, with text that will truly produce housing and get State bureaucrats off of San Francisco's back.

Thank you,

Stephen J. Gorski, Esq.
SF District Resident 47 years , 94116

*CEQA requires that any project involving geo-grouting that requires a discretionary approval by a public agency undergo an environmental review process to identify and mitigate potential environmental impacts.

How geo-grouting can contaminate groundwater:

- Toxic additives: Many chemical and cement-based grouts contain additives that can be toxic or carcinogenic and may leach into the surrounding groundwater.
- Drilling and installation: The process of drilling holes for grouting can create pathways for surface contaminants to travel directly into aquifers, especially if the boreholes are not sealed properly.
- Contaminant pathways: Grouting operations can create or worsen fractures in the ground, creating direct routes for contaminants to flow into groundwater sources.
- Chemical reactions: The chemical reactions that occur during the hydration of cement-based grouts can alter the chemistry of the groundwater, potentially increasing dissolved solids and changing its overall characteristics.
- Improper disposal: Improper disposal of grout waste can also lead to secondary contamination of soil and water.

Sent from my iPad

From:	Stardust Doherty
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff; Stardust
Subject:	Public Comment: VOTE NO On Lurie"s Recipe For Housing Failure & Replace It With A Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701
Date:	Saturday, November 1, 2025 1:42:02 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

The City Economist just released a report showing that Mayor Lurie's 'Family Zoning' plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing.

We still have 3 months to replace the Mayor's plan with one that will work. Here's a real strategy to solve the affordable housing crisis.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units - together more than enough to fulfill state mandates. (Yet instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Lurie's plan simply moves zoning rules around like deck chairs on the Titanic, does almost nothing to increase affordable housing, and increases the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing over-supply [now at 150%] while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods.)

Now that the City Economist has shown that Lurie's plan won't work, it is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the 'Family Zoning' plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing housing approvals, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year in a way that will fully meet state mandates.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible, instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood, and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

The Mayor's plan would build more excess housing for the wealthy, create more

homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators. **Please REPLACE the text in this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural and community integrity, with text that will truly produce affordable housing and get State bureaucrats off of San Francisco's back.**

Thank you,

Stardust Doherty
SF 94110

From:	Elliot Helman
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff
Subject:	Public Comment: VOTE NO On Lurie"s Recipe For Housing Failure & Replace It With A Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701
Date:	Saturday, November 1, 2025 2:48:56 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

The City Economist just released a report showing that Mayor Lurie's 'Family Zoning' plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing.

We still have 3 months to replace the Mayor's plan with one that will work. Here's a real strategy to solve the affordable housing crisis.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units - together more than enough to fulfill state mandates. (Yet instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Lurie's plan simply moves zoning rules around like deck chairs on the Titanic, does almost nothing to increase affordable housing, and increases the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing over-supply [now at 150%] while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods.)

Now that the City Economist has shown that Lurie's plan won't work, it is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the 'Family Zoning' plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing housing approvals, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year in a way that will fully meet state mandates.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible, instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood, and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

The Mayor's plan would build more excess housing for the wealthy, create more

homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators. **Please REPLACE the text in this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural and community integrity, with text that will truly produce affordable housing and get State bureaucrats off of San Francisco's back.**

Thank you,

Elliot Helman
Mission Bay SF 94158

From:	David Romano
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff
Subject:	Public Comment: Please vote no on Mayor Lurie"s Family Zoning Plan and replace It with a Real Affordable Housing Plan
Date:	Saturday, November 1, 2025 4:05:29 PM

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

Dear Supervisors, et al:

The City Economist just released a report showing that Mayor Lurie's 'Family Zoning' plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing.

We still have 3 months to replace the Mayor's plan with one that will work. Here's a real strategy to solve the affordable housing crisis.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units - together more than enough to fulfill state mandates.

Now that the City Economist has shown that Lurie's plan won't work, it is imperative that you stop seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the 'Family Zoning' plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing housing approvals, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year in a way that will fully meet state mandates.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible, instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood, and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

The Mayor's plan would build more excess housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to corporate real estate speculators. Please REPLACE the text in this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural and community integrity, with text that will truly produce affordable housing.

Thank you,

David Romano
San Francsico CA

From:	Dave Rhody
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff
Subject:	Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701
Date:	Sunday, November 2, 2025 1:20:00 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

The City Economist just released a report showing that Mayor Lurie's 'Family Zoning' plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing.

We still have 3 months to replace the Mayor's plan with one that will work. Here's a real strategy to solve the affordable housing crisis:

- San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units - together more than enough to fulfill state mandates.

- Instead of Lurie's plan which simply moves zoning rules around like deck chairs on the Titanic, we need to focus on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so.

You need to stop negotiating mere amendments to the 'Family Zoning' plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing housing approvals, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year in a way that will fully meet state mandates.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible, instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood, and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

The Mayor's plan would build more excess housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators. Please replace the text in this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural and community integrity, with text that will truly produce affordable housing and get State bureaucrats off of San Francisco's back.

- Thank you,
Dave Rhody

SF Policy Co-Chair
Climate Reality Project

From:	Carolyn Kenady
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff
Cc:	<board@doloresheights.org>
Subject:	Oppose Mayor"s Upzoning Plan - File #250701
Date:	Sunday, November 2, 2025 4:05:57 PM

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

To the members of the Board of Supervisors -

I am Carolyn Kenady, chair of the Dolores Heights Improvement Club (DHIC) in District 8. We oppose this Upzoning Plan and urge you to amend it to address the issues below.

DHIC opposes this strategy to upzone hundreds of thousands of SF properties because it's:

- Overkill: To meet its housing mandate, San Francisco only needs to approve 36,200 additional projects by 2032. Blanket upzoning allows demolition of existing housing - which is our most affordable housing

- Doesn't produce enough affordable units: 80% of the projects needed to reach this 36K goal must be affordable housing. The affordable requirements and subsidies provided by the proposed program won't produce the required 29k affordable units.

- Not increase market production or reduce housing costs: Per SF Planning's own feasibility study, only slightly improved economic assumptions, will developers undertake market-rate multi-unit projects (1-2 BR, avg $4600 monthly.) The City Economist's impact analysis shows very little impact on rents or prices for housing. (see pages 34 - 63 of SF Planning memo to SF Planning Commissioners, dated June 26, 2025 and the City Economist's Report, page 21, October 2025)

- Displacing tenant and small businesses: in my neighborhood shopping districts - Church & 24th Streets and the Castro NCDs are proposed for 65 foot heights. Most renters and small local businesses displaced by new construction won't be able to afford the new rents. Our small local businesses that attract shoppers and tourists to our neighborhoods will be driven out.

This plan caters to developers. It does not align with our City's housing needs: keeping existing housing – our most affordable resource, preserving the historic and cultural

resources enjoyed by visitors and residents alike, and being more strategic about where to add height vs. blanket zoning large areas of our City. Please revise this plan to protect our key resources, add sufficient affordability, and use height strategically. Thank you.

Carolyn

Carolyn Kenady
carolynkenady@gmail.com
408-218-3115
http://www.linkedin.com/in/ckenady

From:	Nick Ferris
To:	Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS)
Cc:	Chan, Connie (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	COMMENTS ON PROPOSED FAMILY ZONING PLAN Amendments in File Nos. 251071, 251072, and 251073
Date:	Monday, November 3, 2025 7:22:43 AM
Attachments:	THD Land Use Transportation Upzoning Plan 11.3.pdf

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

Dear Chair Melgar and Members of the Committee,

Telegraph Hill Dwellers (THD) continues to oppose the Mayor's proposed Family Zoning Plan ("Upzoning Plan"). As set forth below, we urge the Committee and Board of Supervisors to reverse the last-minute inclusion of Telegraph Hill, North Beach, and the Northern Waterfront in the Upzoning Plan. Further, we implore you to amend the Upzoning Plan to prevent the displacement of tenants and small businesses, and to provide for a real plan for development of the affordable housing we so desperately need by approving amendments related legisnation offered by Supervisors Chan and Chen.

1. Remove North Beach, Telegraph Hill, and the Northern Waterfront from the Upzoning Plan.

THD continues to strongly oppose the late inclusion in the Upzoning Plan of major portions of Telegraph Hill, North Beach, and the Northern Waterfront, areas that were not included in the 2022 Adopted Housing Element ("2022 Housing Element") nor considered in the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR). These areas were not considered for inclusion in the Housing Element because they are one of the densest neighborhoods in San Francisco, with roughly 82% of our residents currently living in existing pre-1979 multi-family, rent-controlled buildings housing our City's workforce and seniors, including a large immigrant Asian population. Based on the City's profiles of neighborhoods in San Francisco, there are 37,156 people per square mile in North Beach as compared to 17,325 people per square mile in San Francisco. The Planning Department's own data shows that rent-controlled buildings in District 3 (built before 1979 with 2+ units, excluding condos) represent approximately 32,340 individual units, 13,983 of which are located in the current version of the Upzoning Plan. In other words, the tenants occupying 13,983 units will be subject to potential eviction and displacement.

And, although the Housing Element and FEIR assumed that the Northeast Planning District would provide net new housing units of only 800 units by 2050, the Upzoning Plan suddenly increased that figure to 5,900 units, a stunning 650% increase. The height and density increases represented by this increase will significantly impact existing tenants, small businesses, historic resources, parks and open spaces, and the diverse culture of District 3.

2. Support for Supervisors Chan's and Chen's Proposed Amendments:

Although we continue to oppose the Upzoning Plan, we appreciate Supervisor Chan and Chen's leadership in introducing critical amendments to strengthen tenant protections, prioritize affordable housing, support small businesses, and create real family-sized housing.

We urge this Committee to move these amendments forward, including those that follow:

(a) Exclude all historic resources, including local historic districts and those eligible for the California and National Registers. from the Upzoning Plan (File No. 251073).

(b) Exclude from the Upzoning Plan all development that would demolish, remove, or convert to another use any existing dwelling unit(s) or residential flat, including rent-controlled units.

(c) Remove areas within the Planning Equity Geography Special Use District ("PEG SUD") from the Upzoning Plan consistent with the 2022 Housing Element (File No. 251071)

(d) Remove areas in the Coastal Zone from the Upzoning Plan (File No. 251071)

(e) Adopt a Progress Requirement or "shot clock" for obtaining a building permit within a time certain of project approval (File No. 251073)

(f) Require inclusionary housing to be located nearby within ½ mile of the development (File No. 251073).

(g) Eliminate form-based density from Neighborhood Commercial Districts and ROTCs because we want family housing not dorm rooms (File No. 251073).

3. THD Urges Supervisor Melgar to Protect All Rent-Controlled Housing

We appreciate Supervisor Melgar's amendment removing rent controlled housing with three or more units but urge her to expand this amendment to exclude all rent-controlled housing with two or more units, not just three or more.

4. Support for Supervisor Chan's Legacy Business Controls

THD joins with Small Business Forward to support Supervisor Chan's legislation to extend the requirement for a Conditional Use Authorization for sites where a Legacy Business has been displaced. In absence of having any other tools available or financial resources to support the successful relocation of a Legacy Business within the community, the Conditional Use is an imperfect but necessary mechanism to discourage displacement of Legacy Businesses in the first place. That is why Small Business Forward supports that the extension of the CU legislation until other more effective protection measures are in place, such as commercial rent control, the right of return, and adequate relocation assistance.

5. Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District and Funding Strategy.

We join with REP-SF and the Council of Community Housing Organizations to demand that the SFMTA-SUD be revised to provide that these publicly owned parcels be developed for 100% affordable and social housing. Under San Francisco's state-approved Housing Element, as mandated by the state, 57% of the 36,200 new housing units proposed to be developed under the Upzoning Plan—more than 20,000 units—must be affordable to low- and very-low-income households. Yet the Upzoning Plan has no funding strategy or realistic plan to produce those affordable homes. It risks satisfying Sacramento's procedural checklist while abandoning the substance of the law: to build housing for the people who need it most.

* * * * * * * *

In conclusion, THD believes that the Upzoning Plan, as proposed, threatens tenants and small businesses, pits neighborhoods against each other, and disregards decades of community-based policymaking that has built San Francisco into a resilient, vibrant city through a network of strong neighborhoods.

The proposed amendments from Supervisors Chan and Chen address these concerns by focusing on protecting tenants and rent-controlled housing citywide, supporting small businesses, and prioritizing the development of affordable housing. We urge this Committee to move these critical elements forward.

Finally, we urge this Committee to recommend that Telegraph Hill, North Beach, and the Northern Waterfront be removed from the Upzoning Plan consistent with the 2022 Housing Element adopted by the Board of Supervisors and approved by HCD.

Sincerely,
Nick Ferris, *President*
Telegraph Hill Dwellers

November 3, 2025
Via Email

Myrna Melgar, Chair - *Myrna.Melgar@sfgov.org*

Chyanne Chen, Vice-Chair - *Chyanne.Chen@sfgov.org*

Bilal Mahmood, Member - *Bilal.Mahmood@sfgov.org*
Land Use and Transportation Committee
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

RE: COMMENTS ON PROPOSED FAMILY ZONING PLAN
Amendments in File Nos. 251071, 251072, and 251073

Dear Chair Melgar and Members of the Committee,

Telegraph Hill Dwellers (THD) continues to oppose the Mayor's proposed Family Zoning Plan ("Upzoning Plan"). As set forth below, we urge the Committee and Board of Supervisors to reverse the last-minute inclusion of Telegraph Hill, North Beach, and the Northern Waterfront in the Upzoning Plan. Further, we implore you to amend the Upzoning Plan to prevent the displacement of tenants and small businesses, and to provide for a real plan for development of the affordable housing we so desperately need by approving amendments related legisnation offered by Supervisors Chan and Chen.

1. **Remove North Beach, Telegraph Hill, and the Northern Waterfront from the Upzoning Plan.**

THD continues to strongly oppose the late inclusion in the Upzoning Plan of major portions of Telegraph Hill, North Beach, and the Northern Waterfront, areas that were not included in the 2022 Adopted Housing Element ("2022 Housing Element") nor considered in the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR). These areas were not considered for inclusion in the Housing Element because they are one of the densest neighborhoods in San Francisco, with roughly 82% of our residents currently living in existing pre-1979 multi-family, rent-controlled buildings housing our City's workforce and seniors, including a large immigrant Asian population. Based on the City's profiles of neighborhoods in San Francisco, there are **37,156** people per square mile in North Beach as compared to **17,325** people per square mile in San Francisco.[1] The Planning Department's own data shows that rent-controlled buildings in District 3 (built before 1979 with 2+ units, excluding condos) represent approximately 32,340 individual units, 13,983 of which are located in the current version of the Upzoning Plan. **In other words, the tenants occupying 13,983 units will be subject to potential eviction and displacement.**

[1] https://www.city-data.com/neighborhood/North-Beach-San-Francisco-CA.html

And, although the Housing Element and FEIR assumed that the Northeast Planning District would provide net new housing units of only *800 units* by 2050, the Upzoning Plan suddenly increased that figure to *5,900 units*, a stunning *650% increase*. The height and density increases represented by this increase will significantly impact existing tenants, small businesses, historic resources, parks and open spaces, and the diverse culture of District 3.

2. Support for Supervisors Chan's and Chen's Proposed Amendments:

Although we continue to oppose the Upzoning Plan, we appreciate Supervisor Chan and Chen's leadership in introducing critical amendments to strengthen tenant protections, prioritize affordable housing, support small businesses, and create real family-sized housing. We urge this Committee to move these amendments forward, including those that follow:

(a) Exclude all historic resources, including local historic districts and those eligible for the California and National Registers. from the Upzoning Plan (File No. 251073).

(b) Exclude from the Upzoning Plan all development that would demolish, remove, or convert to another use any existing dwelling unit(s) or residential flat, including rent-controlled units.

(c) Remove areas within the Planning Equity Geography Special Use District ("PEG SUD") from the Upzoning Plan consistent with the 2022 Housing Element (File No. 251071)

(d) Remove areas in the Coastal Zone from the Upzoning Plan (File No. 251071)

(e) Adopt a Progress Requirement or "shot clock" for obtaining a building permit within a time certain of project approval (File No. 251073)

(f) Require inclusionary housing to be located nearby within ½ mile of the development (File No. 251073).

(g) Eliminate form-based density from Neighborhood Commercial Districts and ROTCs because we want family housing not dorm rooms (File No. 251073).

3. THD Urges Supervisor Melgar to Protect All Rent-Controlled Housing

We appreciate Supervisor Melgar's amendment removing rent controlled housing with three or more units but urge her to expand this amendment to exclude ***all*** rent-controlled housing with two or more units, not just three or more.

4. **Support for Supervisor Chan's Legacy Business Controls**

THD joins with Small Business Forward to support Supervisor Chan's legislation to extend the requirement for a Conditional Use Authorization for sites where a Legacy Business has been displaced. In absence of having any other tools available or financial resources to support the successful relocation of a Legacy Business within the community, the Conditional Use is an imperfect but necessary mechanism to discourage displacement of Legacy Businesses in the first place. That is why Small Business Forward supports that the extension of the CU legislation until other more effective protection measures are in place, such as commercial rent control, the right of return, and adequate relocation assistance.

5. **Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District and Funding Strategy.**

We join with REP-SF and the Council of Community Housing Organizations to demand that the SFMTA-SUD be revised to provide that these publicly owned parcels be developed for 100% affordable and social housing. Under San Francisco's state-approved Housing Element, as mandated by the state, 57% of the 36,200 new housing units proposed to be developed under the Upzoning Plan—more than 20,000 units—must be affordable to low- and very-low-income households. Yet the Upzoning Plan has no funding strategy or realistic plan to produce those affordable homes. It risks satisfying Sacramento's procedural checklist while abandoning the substance of the law: to build housing for the people who need it most.

* * * * * * *

In conclusion, THD believes that the Upzoning Plan, as proposed, threatens tenants and small businesses, pits neighborhoods against each other, and disregards decades of community-based policymaking that has built San Francisco into a resilient, vibrant city through a network of strong neighborhoods.

The proposed amendments from Supervisors Chan and Chen address these concerns by focusing on protecting tenants and rent-controlled housing citywide, supporting small businesses, and prioritizing the development of affordable housing. We urge this Committee to move these critical elements forward.

Finally, we urge this Committee to recommend that Telegraph Hill, North Beach, and the Northern Waterfront be removed from the Upzoning Plan consistent with the 2022 Housing Element adopted by the Board of Supervisors and approved by HCD.

Sincerely,

Nick Ferris, President

ccs: Supervisor Connie Chan – *connie.chan@sfgov.org*
Clerk John Carroll - *John.Carroll@sfgov.org*
Members, San Francisco Board of Supervisors - *Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org*

From: aeboken
To: BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Strongly OPPOSING Land Use and Transportation Committee Meeting November 3, 2025 Agenda Item #6 [General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan] File #250966
Date: Monday, November 3, 2025 8:13:34 AM

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 Board of Supervisors

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

RE: Land Use and Transportation Committee Meeting November 3, 2025 Agenda Item #6
[General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan] File #250966

Position: Strongly OPPOSING

To the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors, we didn't elect you to play the part of victims.

You tell us to swallow the poison pill and support the upzoning because the only other option is for the State and Builders Remedy to take over our planning process.

Are you unwilling to sue the State or fight back if the State attempts a hostile takeover of our planning process?

If you were willing to call out the proposed hostile takeover by the National Guard, then this should also be on the table.

Don't say you're going to come back next year and review the current proposed upzoning with the possibility of down zoning.

SB330 (Skinner) (2019) expressly prohibits down zoning.

And finally, the Planning Department has acknowledged that the upzoning maps don't include Special Use Districts (SUD).

In District 4, the SUD is defined in BOS File #230808.

It allows the upzoning of corner lots as well as the lot merger of up to three lots on either side of that corner lot.

An example would be the Gus's Market project at 3701 Noriega.

This is the poster child for gentrification in District 4.

The apartments are all market rate.

The amenities include an onsite fitness center and rooftop lounge.

There is onsite parking for the market but not for the apartments.

The Gus's market is high end.

The massive four story building towers over other structures.

It has no step down to transition to lower heights buildings surrounding it.

###

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

From: aeboken
To: BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Strongly OPPOSING Land Use and Transportation Committee Meeting November 3, 2025 Agenda Item #7 [Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan] File #250700
Date: Monday, November 3, 2025 8:17:50 AM

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 Board of Supervisors members

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

RE: Land Use and Transportation Committee Meeting November 3, 2025 Agenda Item #7 [Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan] File #250700

Position: Strongly OPPOSING

The Planning Department has stated that it has learned from the mistakes it made in the past in redevelopment.

For the proposed upzoning on the Westside, in general, and the Coastal Zone, in particular, the past mistakes of redevelopment seem to be playing out once again.

The Lurie plan focuses upzoning heavily on the Westside including the Coastal Zone.

In two meetings on the Westside, the Mayor has stated that the current amendments should be approved to meet the HCD deadline and can be revisited next year.

The Planning Department staff at one Westside meeting even went so far as to state that down zoning next year would be possible.

This contradicts SB330 (Skinner) (2019) which expressly prohibits down zoning.

The Family Zoning Plan even contradicts itself with family zoning which are larger units and density decontrol which are smaller units.

In proposed ordinance 250700, the following text is potentially problematic:

- Page 7 lines 14 - 22 regarding Local Coastal Program (LCP) rezoning height and bulk to R-4 and RTO-C.

- Page 11 lines 7 - 17 LCP Height Maps HT01 - HT13.

- Page 13 lines 11 - 16. Housing Choice SF (HC-SF)

- Page 15 lines 5 - 7 HC-SF

- Page 17 lines 20 - 22 HC-SF

- Page 20 lines 1 - 4 LCP Zoning Use District Map ZN13 & Height and Bulk District Map HT13.

- Page 21 lines 4 - 5 "All properties in the Coastal Zone are in the new Height and Bulk District R-4".

Are these amendments designed to change Ocean Beach into Miami Beach?

###

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

From:	aeboken
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject:	Strongly OPPOSING Land Use and Transportation Committee Meeting November 3, 2025 Agenda Item #9 [Planning, Business and Tax Regulations - Family Zoning Plan] File #250701
Date:	Monday, November 3, 2025 8:22:25 AM

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 Board of Supervisors

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

RE: Land Use and Transportation Committee Meeting November 3, 2025 Agenda Item #9
[Planning, Business and Tax Regulations - Family Zoning Plan] File #250701

Position: Strongly OPPOSING

SB828 (Wiener) (session 2017 - 2018) has caused the current housing numbers required by the State to more than double for San Francisco.

The Embarcadero Institute analysis states that the housing numbers required by the State (Regional Housing Needs Allocation aka RHNA) for all municipalities skyrocketed in part because of requirements in SB828 (Wiener).

SB828 (Wiener) added in new overcrowding and cost burdening numbers even though these numbers were already in the Department of Finance numbers which the DofF provides to the Department of Housing and Community Development for RHNA.

This results in double counting.

SB828 (Wiener) also used an incorrect vacancy rate as it failed to differentiate between vacancy rates for rental and homeowner housing units.

It uses only the higher rate for rentals when calculating vacancy rates for both rental and homeowner housing unit.

This also results in overcounting.

Even though Scott Wiener is aware of these issues with SB828, he hasn't introduced any "clean-up" bills.

The State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) allocated 441,000 housing units for the current RHNA cycle #6 to the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG).

ABAG could have appealed this number to HCD as being too high but chose not to.

ABAG created a methodology to allocate RHNA numbers to the different Bay Area municipalities.

ABAG allocated 82,000 units to San Francisco.

San Francisco could have appealed this number to ABAG as being too high but chose not to.

San Francisco has about 10% of the Bay Area's population but was allocated about 18% of the region's RHNA housing units.

This alone should have been justification for the City to appeal to ABAG.

Since San Francisco is a charter city, why isn't the City suing the state?

Other municipalities in SoCal have successfully sued the State over SB9 (Atkins) (session 2021-2022).

###

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

From:	aeboken
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject:	Strongly OPPOSING Land Use and Transportation Committee Meeting November 3, 2025 Agenda Item #11 [Local Coastal Program - Family Zoning Plan] File #250985
Date:	Monday, November 3, 2025 8:27:44 AM

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 Board of Supervisors

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

RE: Land Use and Transportation Committee Meeting November 3, 2025 Agenda Item #11
[Local Coastal Program - Family Zoning Plan] File #250985

Position: Strongly OPPOSING

The City could place itself in legal jeopardy by transmitting the proposed Local Coastal Program amendments to the Coastal Commission.

The citation of the California Public Resources Code is incorrect notably California Public Resources Code 30604 (g).

San Francisco has no authority to amend the California Public Resources Code through what appears to be an intentionally incorrect citation.

By default, the California Public Resources Code issue makes the proposed Local Coastal Program amendments inconsistent with the Coastal Act.

The Planning Department hasn't had staff knowledgeable in the Coastal Act since 2018.

Therefore, the revisions to the City's Local Coastal Program have been questionable.

The Planning Commission, Board of Supervisors and Board of Appeals also lack expertise in the Coastal Act.

As currently drafted, the proposed Local Coastal Program amendments are inconsistent with the General Plan and its 8 priority policies.

All of these issues would result in the Local Coastal Program being bastardized as well as changing Ocean Beach into Miami Beach.

###

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

From:	aeboken
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject:	Strongly OPPOSING Land Use and Transportation Committee Meeting November 3, 2025 Agenda Item #11 [Local Coastal Program - Family Zoning Plan] File #250985
Date:	Monday, November 3, 2025 8:27:44 AM

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 Board of Supervisors

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

RE: Land Use and Transportation Committee Meeting November 3, 2025 Agenda Item #11
[Local Coastal Program - Family Zoning Plan] File #250985

Position: Strongly OPPOSING

The City could place itself in legal jeopardy by transmitting the proposed Local Coastal Program amendments to the Coastal Commission.

The citation of the California Public Resources Code is incorrect notably California Public Resources Code 30604 (g).

San Francisco has no authority to amend the California Public Resources Code through what appears to be an intentionally incorrect citation.

By default, the California Public Resources Code issue makes the proposed Local Coastal Program amendments inconsistent with the Coastal Act.

The Planning Department hasn't had staff knowledgeable in the Coastal Act since 2018.

Therefore, the revisions to the City's Local Coastal Program have been questionable.

The Planning Commission, Board of Supervisors and Board of Appeals also lack expertise in the Coastal Act.

As currently drafted, the proposed Local Coastal Program amendments are inconsistent with the General Plan and its 8 priority policies.

All of these issues would result in the Local Coastal Program being bastardized as well as changing Ocean Beach into Miami Beach.

###

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

From:	Erica Zweig
To:	Connie Chan; ChanStaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Lurie, Daniel (MYR)
Cc:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject:	11/3 D4ward Position "Family" Housing plan
Date:	Monday, November 3, 2025 10:24:30 AM
Attachments:	D4ward letter on upzoning.pdf

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

Sent from AT&T Yahoo Mail on Android

D4ward is a grassroots network of Sunset District neighbors working to keep our community a place where regular people can afford to live, thrive, and have a real say in what happens here. We support affordable housing, stand up to big-money influence in San Francisco politics, protect workers, defend our coastline, and fight for community needs over corporate interests.

We are deeply concerned that, due to the delay in appointing a new District 4 Supervisor, our district is now being upzoned **without representation** on the current Board of Supervisors. Proceeding with this legislation under these circumstances amounts to **government without representation**. The Board should **postpone all hearings and votes on District 4 zoning changes until a new Supervisor is seated.**

D4ward's Key Positions and Priorities

In general, D4ward supports the **amendments proposed by Supervisors Connie Chan and Chyanne Chen** at the first Land Use and Transportation Committee hearing on the Mayor's upzoning plan. We urge the Board to incorporate these changes to protect affordability, safety, and neighborhood integrity.

Our specific priorities are:

1. Accelerate downtown office-to-housing conversions.
Before targeting stable, working-class neighborhoods like ours for massive rezoning, the City must aggressively pursue the conversion of empty downtown office buildings into housing.

2. Protect small businesses and tenants in District 4.
Under the Mayor's plan, our unique small businesses would become targets for demolition along all commercial corridors. We strongly support the **Race and Equity in All Planning Coalition (REP-SF)** and Supervisor Chan's **Tenant Protection Ordinance** to safeguard both tenants and neighborhood-serving businesses.

3. Eliminate in-lieu fees.
Developers must not be allowed to "fee out" of affordable housing requirements. In-lieu fees only produce delayed, off-site projects and create enclaves of market-rate luxury housing.

4. Dedicate all suitable public land for 100% affordable housing.
All appropriate public land—excluding parks and open space—should be reserved for **100% affordable housing** serving a full range of incomes, from middle-income working families to deeply affordable and supportive housing.

5. Preserve the Coastal Zone.
No land should be removed from the existing Coastal Zone boundaries. Coastal protections are essential for public safety, environmental resilience, and equity.

6. Prohibit upzoning in the Tsunami Zone.
It is reckless to increase building heights or density in areas at high risk of tsunami inundation. The City must also repair and reactivate the local tsunami warning system.

7. Ensure fire safety before allowing large-scale development.
No significant new upzoning should take effect until a secure **emergency firefighting water system** is installed in the Sunset and Parkside Districts, which are already vulnerable to wildfire and earthquake-related fires.

8. Protect historic and culturally significant buildings.
All **Category A and A-eligible historic buildings and districts** should be exempted from upzoning. District 4's mid-century homes and civic buildings reflect our community's unique cultural heritage and deserve preservation.

9. Prevent excessive height near parks and schools.
Properties bordering the southern edges of our parks and schools should not be upzoned for additional height. Casting shadows on open spaces and classrooms undermines the very "well-resourced" character the City claims to value.

Erica Zweig
Corresponding Secretary

From:	James Lloyd
To:	Chen, Lisa (CPC); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Supervisors; ChanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); MahmoodStaff; MandelmanStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Cc:	Carroll, John (BOS); Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC); Cityattorney
Subject:	Re: public comment re items 6-11 for today"s Land Use Committee meeting
Date:	Monday, November 3, 2025 11:40:14 AM
Attachments:	San Francisco - Housing Choice SF Letter - BoS Land Use Committee 2025.11.03.pdf

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

Please disregard the previous message.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

The California Housing Defense Fund submits the attached public comment for today's Land Use and Transportation Committee meeting regarding the Family Zoning plan, agendized as items 6 through 11.

Sincerely,

James M. Lloyd
Director of Planning and Investigations
California Housing Defense Fund
james@calhdf.org
CalHDF is grant & donation funded
Donate today - https://calhdf.org/donate/

On Mon, Nov 3, 2025 at 11:35 AM James Lloyd <james@calhdf.org> wrote:

> Dear San Francisco City Council,
>
> The California Housing Defense Fund submits the attached public comment for today's City Council Land Use and Transportation Committee meeting regarding the Family Zoning plan, agendized as items 6 through 11.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> James M. Lloyd
> Director of Planning and Investigations
> California Housing Defense Fund
> james@calhdf.org
> CalHDF is grant & donation funded
> Donate today - https://calhdf.org/donate/

Nov 3, 2025

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
49 South Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94103

Re: Housing Element Implementation

By email: Lisa.chen@sfgov.org, Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org, bos@sfgov.org, bos-supervisors@sfgov.org, ChanStaff@sfgov.org, ChenStaff@sfgov.org, DorseyStaff@sfgov.org, Jackie.Fielder@sfgov.org, MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org, MandelmanStaff@sfgov.org, MelgarStaff@sfgov.org, SauterStaff@sfgov.org, SherrillStaff@sfgov.org, Shamann.Walton@sfgov.org

Cc: john.carroll@sfgov.org; sarah.dennis-phillips@sfgov.org; cityattorney@sfcityatty.org

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

The California Housing Defense Fund ("CalHDF") writes in advance of the Land Use and Transportation Committee meeting scheduled for November 3, 2025 at 1:30pm. CalHDF writes to warn the Committee, as well as the larger Board, that certain elements of the proposed Housing Choice-San Francisco ("HCSF") plan – which is, in turn, part of the overall Family Zoning Plan – violate state law. The HCSF program, in its current form, would explicitly forbid the application of state housing laws and/or require housing project applicants to waive protections they and their projects are entitled to under state law. The City, however, lacks authority to enact a program with these restrictions.

If the City does not obey the law, CalHDF will challenge the City in court. Such a lawsuit would expose the City to penalties for failure to comply with housing element law. The City would also be ordered to grant development applicants access to *both* the HCSF program *and* state laws, including the Statewide Density Bonus Law (the "SDBL"). CalHDF urges the City to avoid such needless litigation and instead comply with the law in the first instance. The City should drop the HCSF program's effort to carve itself out of the SDBL and other state laws.

//

2201 Broadway, PH1, Oakland, CA 94612
www.calhdf.org

State Law Limits Certain Aspects of the Proposed Housing Choice–San Francisco Bonus Program

The proposed HCSF bonus program provides additional residential zoning capacity for projects that meet certain criteria. Overall, this is good. However, one of the HCSF eligibility criteria poses a problem: the requirement, found in section 206.10(b)(5), that an HCSF project "not receive any density or development bonuses or relief from applicable Planning Code standards in any other State or local law or program." This requirement is unenforceable to the extent it pertains to state law, and, should it be enacted, developers will have the option to ignore it.

This is for four reasons. First, the City "cannot choose to forgo application of land use policies imposed by the Legislature." (*Ailanto Properties, Inc. v. City of Half Moon Bay* (2006) 142 Cal.App.4th 572, 595.) Second, just as the City cannot waive state law's application, project applicants cannot waive protections to which they are entitled under state law, since those protections are designed to serve the public interest. (See Civ. Code, § 3513 ["a law established for a public reason cannot be contravened by a private agreement"].) Third, the SDBL includes explicit rules for local density bonus programs: such programs must build on, rather than supplant, the SDBL. Finally, even if the first three points are ignored, the SDBL allows project applicants to waive the HCSF eligibility requirement forbidding the use of state bonuses. (Gov. Code, § 65915, subd. (e).) Legal interpretations from the California Department of Housing and Community Development ("HCD"), the state agency charged with interpreting and enforcing state housing law, support these conclusions.

Background

State law contains many provisions that grant rights and protections to proposed housing developments and applications for proposed housing developments. These include AB 2011, codified at Government Code section 65912.100 et seq., the SDBL, codified at Government Code section 65915 et seq., SB 35, codified at Government Code section 65913.4, and more besides. These laws accomplish a variety of pro-housing policies by, among other things, allowing proposed housing developments that meet certain criteria (such as the inclusion of affordable units) to reduce or avoid local zoning and other land use restrictions. In some cases, whether a project is eligible for state law protections and the extent to which it may reduce or avoid local rules depends on the generosity of the local zoning code. For example, the SDBL calculates density bonuses using a "base density," defined as "the greatest number of units allowed under the zoning ordinance, specific plan, or land use element of the general plan." (Gov. Code, § 65915, subd. (o)(6).)

The proposed HCSF program expands the San Francisco zoning code's accommodation for denser housing in much of the City. The aforementioned state laws then further expand the allowed range of housing projects, providing for even greater density and even more

forgiving standards for projects. But there is a catch: the HCSF program attempts to forestall these state laws, in section 206.10(b)(5). If not for proposed section 206.10(b)(5), housing project applicants would be able to propose projects under the HCSF rules and avail themselves of the full range of state law protections. Thus, the critical question is: does proposed section 206.10(b)(5) have any legal effect? As explained below, the answer is no. Developers may use both the HCSF rules and any state law bonuses or protections that apply.

The City Cannot Forgo the Application of State Law

State law preempts local law. (Cal. Const., art. XI, § 7.) This is a foundational constitutional principle, and it is no less true in the land use context than anywhere else. As a corollary to this principle, local governments "cannot choose to forgo application of land use policies imposed by the Legislature." (*Ailanto Properties*, *supra*, 142 Cal.App.4th at 595.) Proposed section 206.10(b)(5), however, attempts to do exactly that: it states, in effect, that state land use laws do not apply to projects proceeding under the HCSF program. The City is careful to word the section to dance around the point, perhaps in recognition of the legal consequences, but the section's intended purpose is unmistakably to "forgo application of land use policies imposed by the Legislature," as caselaw and the California constitution forbid. (*Ibid.*)

As explained above, numerous state laws – particularly the SDBL – grant certain housing projects legal protections. None of these state laws allows local governments to circumvent or opt out of these rules. The attempt to do so, in section 206.10(b)(5) of the proposed HCSF program, does not pass legal muster, and project applicants will be entitled to ignore it.

Project Applicants Cannot Waive State Law Protections to Which They Are Entitled

Just as the City cannot waive the application state land use and housing laws, neither can developers. "[A] law established for a public reason cannot be contravened by a private agreement." (Civ. Code, § 3513.) In other words, if a law is designed to accomplish a public benefit (possibly in addition to private benefits), the law's provisions cannot be waived. (See, e.g., *County of Riverside v. Superior Court* (2000) 86 Cal.App.4th 211, 220 [holding employment protections for public safety officers, although they benefitted individual officers, also served a broader public purpose and could not be waived].) The legislature has made clear that pro-housing laws serve the broader public interest.[1] (See, e.g., Gov. Code, §§ 65915, subd. (u); 65913.4, subd. (u); 65582.1; Stats. 2024, ch. 294, § 1; Stats. 2023, ch. 783, § 1.) The legislative history for these laws, moreover, confirms they are intended to serve the public by

[1] On one occasion, California courts found that a law establishing time limits for housing permit application processing primarily benefitted project applicants and not the general public, and hence project applicants could waive them. (*Bickel v. City of Piedmont* (1997) 16 Cal.4th 1040, 1049-1052.) The legislature immediately rebuked the Courts and overturned the *Bickel* holding through legislation. (See *Riverwatch v. County of San Diego* (1999) 76 Cal.App.4th 1428, 1439.)

expanding the supply of housing and affordable housing. (See *Doskocz v. ALS Lien Services* (2024) 102 Cal.App.5th 107, 115-116 [legislative history is relevant in deciding whether law serves a public purpose and hence cannot be waived].) Hence, project applicants have no authority to disclaim the application of these laws, as the City's proposed HCSF program would have them do.

Two additional reasons prevent project applicants from waiving their right to pursue state law protections.

First, as with all legal waivers, such a waiver must be voluntary. (*Harvey v. County of Kern* (1930) 107 Cal.App. 590, 597.) As currently framed, the HCSF program does not ask project applicants to voluntarily waive their state law rights. It instead makes waiver *mandatory* for any project applicant. No waiver can occur through such an ultimatum; to the extent that the issue is unclear, moreover, the ambiguity resolves against the existence of a waiver. (See *Perini v. Perini* (1964), 225 Cal.App.2d 399.)

Second, waiver requires "an abandonment of a right that could be enforced or a privilege that could be exercised." (*Estate of Goyette* (1971) 14 Cal.App.3d 224, 232 [internal citations omitted].) Thus, for an applicant to be able to waive the application of state law to an HCSF project, it must be the case that the applicant could, absent the waiver, enforce the application of the relevant state law. And it must be the case, from there, that the applicant could choose *not* to waive their rights and instead apply state law protections and bonuses to their project. In this way, the City faces a catch-22, and however it resolves the dilemma, developers will be able to use both the HCSF program and state law.

The State Density Bonus Law Creates Narrow Guidelines for Local Bonus Programs, Which the HCSF Program Does Not Obey

The SDBL does allow local governments to implement local bonus programs. It includes strict rules for such programs, however, which the proposed HCSF program does not meet. Local bonus programs must add to, rather than supplant, the SDBL. Government Code section 65915, subdivision (n), states: "nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit a city, county, or city and county from granting a density bonus *greater than* what is described in this section for a development that meets the requirements of this section" (emphasis added). By negative implication, local governments are forbidden from offering density bonuses that do not incorporate, at minimum, the bonuses allowed by the SDBL. Local bonus programs must add to the SDBL; they cannot displace it in favor of an entirely separate density bonus scheme. As described above, moreover, preemption principles prevent local governments from evading the SDBL, and this language in the SDBL confirms that outcome.

The SDBL includes stronger language too. Government Code section 65917 states:

> In enacting this chapter it is the intent of the Legislature that the density bonus or other incentives offered by the city, county, or city and county pursuant to this chapter shall contribute significantly to the economic feasibility of lower income housing in proposed housing developments. **In the absence of an agreement by a developer in accordance with Section 65915, a locality shall not offer a density bonus or any other incentive that would undermine the intent of this chapter.**

(Emphasis added.) In other words, if San Francisco wishes to offer a density bonus to developers, it must first allow them any protections they are entitled to under the SDBL. Only then can it offer a local bonus program. The law establishes a clear baseline: project applicants may avail themselves of any bonuses and benefits they are entitled to under the SDBL, and further local bonuses and benefits must come on top of the SDBL.

These rules are especially important in San Francisco. HCD has found that the SDBL is "critical" for developers navigating San Francisco's complex zoning rules and extensive procedural hurdles. (See "Examining Local Law, Policy, and Planning Practice on Development in San Francisco Using CALES," O'Neill et al., pp. 38-39 (available here).) In some cases, HCD has issued Notices of Violation to San Francisco for impeding housing development by refusing to grant bonuses, incentives, and waivers allowed by the SDBL. (See, e.g., California Department of Housing and Community Development, Letter to Kate Conner, December 29, 2022 (available here).) These HCD findings and Notices of Violation confirm the SDBL's importance in producing housing in San Francisco.

The proposed HCSF program, by attempting to displace the SDBL entirely, violates the SDBL's explicit rules for local bonus program. This violation carries particular significance for San Francisco, where project applicants often rely on the SDBL to navigate a complex zoning code and approval process. If San Francisco wishes to implement a local bonus program, it must stack that program on top of the SDBL. It cannot offer an "alternative" bonus program, such as the proposed HCSF program, that attempts to remove SDBL eligibility for projects that are eligible for SDBL protections.

In closing this section, CalHDF notes that HCD has weighed in on the question of whether local governments may enact zoning bonus programs that serve as alternatives to state law. In a letter to Menlo Park (available here), the Department wrote: "[T]he City's Affordable Housing Overlay states that the overlay will be an alternative to state density bonus law. **This is in conflict with state law and must be revised."** (Emphasis added.)[2] HCD's view warrants substantial deference as the interpretation of a "technical, obscure, [or] complex" statutory

[2] Separately, as explained later in this letter, HCD's Site Inventory Guidebook (available here) analyzes whether zoning overlays or other local zoning programs established by a city's housing element may supplant or displace the SDBL and firmly establishes that they cannot. (See pages 14-15 of the guidebook.) This analysis is more relevant to the question of how the HCSF program will affect the City's compliance with the Housing Element Law, but this analysis also underscores the specific point that the City may not wriggle out of state law.

scheme by the agency charged with enforcing it. (See *Boling v. Public Employment Relations Bd.* (2018) 5 Cal.5th 898, 911 [citing *Yamaha Corp. of America v. State Bd. of Equalization* (1998) 19 Cal.4th 1, 12]; *Hoffmaster v. City of San Diego* (1997) 55 Cal.App.4th 1098, 1113, fn. 13 ["We substantially rely on the Department of Housing and Community Development's interpretation [...] regarding compliance with the housing element law"].)

Even if the City Can Prohibit the Application of State Law, the Density Bonus Law Gives Project Applicants the Legal Right to Circumvent the City's Prohibition

Even if the above legal rules do not neutralize the City's attempt to avoid state law, any project eligible for the SDBL will be able to defeat the application of proposed section 206.10(b)(5). The SDBL states: "In no case may a city, county, or city and county apply any development standard that will have the effect of physically precluding the construction of a development meeting the criteria of subdivision (b) at the densities or with the concessions or incentives permitted by this section." (Gov. Code, § 65915, subd. (e)(1).) If a proposed project complies with the HCSF except for section 206.10(b)(5) – because it seeks benefits under the SDBL or another state law – and the application of section 206.10(b)(5) would physically preclude the project by eliminating its eligibility for the HCSF, then the City cannot apply that section to the project. To the extent the City doubts or intends to contest this, CalHDF reminds the City that the SDBL, by its terms, "shall be interpreted liberally in favor of producing the maximum number of total housing units." (*Id.* at subd. (r).) Flouting the law on this point also carries severe penalties, including mandatory payment of attorney's fees to a project applicant who challenges the City in court. (*Id.* at subd. (e)(1).)

The HCSF Program Violates the Housing Element Law

Furthermore, the HCSF violates the Housing Element Law (Gov. Code, § 65580 et seq.). Rezoning programs enacted pursuant to a housing element, such as the proposed Family Zoning Plan and its component HCSF program, may not exempt themselves from state law's application, as HCD has explained in its Site Inventory Guidebook (available here – see pages 14-15). Pursuing the HCSF program as it is currently designed would violate this rule and risk the City's housing element compliance. This would expose it to a range of penalties, including the "builder's remedy."

The City Should Take Care to Comply with New Caselaw Concerning Housing Element Rezonings

Lastly, the City should take care to ensure that the rezoning complies with housing element law requiring minimum residential density on low-income sites. The newly published Court of Appeal decision *New Commune DTLA LLC v. City of Redondo Beach* (Oct. 10, 2025, No. B336042) ___ Cal.App.5th ___ makes clear that in order to comply with minimum density requirements, local zoning must require that all new development include a minimum

density of residential use. Zoning "overlays" that allow for 100% non-residential development on a site fail to comply with housing element law. The proposed zoning includes many low-income sites that are given additional residential density on top of base commercial zoning. In order to comply with housing element law, the City should make clear that all new development of these sites must include the minimum density of residential use, and that 100% commercial development is prohibited.

‹ ›


As you are well aware, California remains in the throes of a statewide crisis-level housing shortage. New multifamily housing in San Francisco a public benefit: it will help satisfy demand for housing near jobs and transit, thereby reducing displacement pressure; and it will also cut down on transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions by providing housing in a major metro area, as opposed to farther-flung regions in the state (and out of state). CalHDF therefore urges the City to follow through on the commitments in its housing element, as the law requires, and obey state law in drafting and enforcing its land use regulations.

CalHDF is a 501(c)(3) non-profit corporation whose mission includes advocating for increased access to housing for Californians at all income levels, including low-income households. You may learn more about CalHDF at www.calhdf.org.

Sincerely,



Dylan Casey
CalHDF Executive Director



James M. Lloyd
CalHDF Director of Planning and Investigations

Nov 3, 2025

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
49 South Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94103

Re: Housing Element Implementation

By email: Lisa.chen@sfgov.org, Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org, bos@sfgov.org, bos-supervisors@sfgov.org, ChanStaff@sfgov.org, ChenStaff@sfgov.org, DorseyStaff@sfgov.org, Jackie.Fielder@sfgov.org, MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org, MandelmanStaff@sfgov.org, MelgarStaff@sfgov.org, SauterStaff@sfgov.org, SherrillStaff@sfgov.org, Shamann.Walton@sfgov.org

Cc: john.carroll@sfgov.org; sarah.dennis-phillips@sfgov.org; cityattorney@sfcityatty.org

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

The California Housing Defense Fund ("CalHDF") writes in advance of the Land Use and Transportation Committee meeting scheduled for November 3, 2025 at 1:30pm. CalHDF writes to warn the Committee, as well as the larger Board, that certain elements of the proposed Housing Choice-San Francisco ("HCSF") plan – which is, in turn, part of the overall Family Zoning Plan – violate state law. The HCSF program, in its current form, would explicitly forbid the application of state housing laws and/or require housing project applicants to waive protections they and their projects are entitled to under state law. The City, however, lacks authority to enact a program with these restrictions.

If the City does not obey the law, CalHDF will challenge the City in court. Such a lawsuit would expose the City to penalties for failure to comply with housing element law. The City would also be ordered to grant development applicants access to *both* the HCSF program *and* state laws, including the Statewide Density Bonus Law (the "SDBL"). CalHDF urges the City to avoid such needless litigation and instead comply with the law in the first instance. The City should drop the HCSF program's effort to carve itself out of the SDBL and other state laws.

//

2201 Broadway, PH1, Oakland, CA 94612
www.calhdf.org

State Law Limits Certain Aspects of the Proposed Housing Choice–San Francisco Bonus Program

The proposed HCSF bonus program provides additional residential zoning capacity for projects that meet certain criteria. Overall, this is good. However, one of the HCSF eligibility criteria poses a problem: the requirement, found in section 206.10(b)(5), that an HCSF project "not receive any density or development bonuses or relief from applicable Planning Code standards in any other State or local law or program." This requirement is unenforceable to the extent it pertains to state law, and, should it be enacted, developers will have the option to ignore it.

This is for four reasons. First, the City "cannot choose to forgo application of land use policies imposed by the Legislature." (*Ailanto Properties, Inc. v. City of Half Moon Bay* (2006) 142 Cal.App.4th 572, 595.) Second, just as the City cannot waive state law's application, project applicants cannot waive protections to which they are entitled under state law, since those protections are designed to serve the public interest. (See Civ. Code, § 3513 ["a law established for a public reason cannot be contravened by a private agreement"].) Third, the SDBL includes explicit rules for local density bonus programs: such programs must build on, rather than supplant, the SDBL. Finally, even if the first three points are ignored, the SDBL allows project applicants to waive the HCSF eligibility requirement forbidding the use of state bonuses. (Gov. Code, § 65915, subd. (e).) Legal interpretations from the California Department of Housing and Community Development ("HCD"), the state agency charged with interpreting and enforcing state housing law, support these conclusions.

Background

State law contains many provisions that grant rights and protections to proposed housing developments and applications for proposed housing developments. These include AB 2011, codified at Government Code section 65912.100 et seq., the SDBL, codified at Government Code section 65915 et seq., SB 35, codified at Government Code section 65913.4, and more besides. These laws accomplish a variety of pro-housing policies by, among other things, allowing proposed housing developments that meet certain criteria (such as the inclusion of affordable units) to reduce or avoid local zoning and other land use restrictions. In some cases, whether a project is eligible for state law protections and the extent to which it may reduce or avoid local rules depends on the generosity of the local zoning code. For example, the SDBL calculates density bonuses using a "base density," defined as "the greatest number of units allowed under the zoning ordinance, specific plan, or land use element of the general plan." (Gov. Code, § 65915, subd. (o)(6).)

The proposed HCSF program expands the San Francisco zoning code's accommodation for denser housing in much of the City. The aforementioned state laws then further expand the allowed range of housing projects, providing for even greater density and even more

forgiving standards for projects. But there is a catch: the HCSF program attempts to forestall these state laws, in section 206.10(b)(5). If not for proposed section 206.10(b)(5), housing project applicants would be able to propose projects under the HCSF rules and avail themselves of the full range of state law protections. Thus, the critical question is: does proposed section 206.10(b)(5) have any legal effect? As explained below, the answer is no. Developers may use both the HCSF rules and any state law bonuses or protections that apply.

The City Cannot Forgo the Application of State Law

State law preempts local law. (Cal. Const., art. XI, § 7.) This is a foundational constitutional principle, and it is no less true in the land use context than anywhere else. As a corollary to this principle, local governments "cannot choose to forgo application of land use policies imposed by the Legislature." (*Ailanto Properties*, *supra*, 142 Cal.App.4th at 595.) Proposed section 206.10(b)(5), however, attempts to do exactly that: it states, in effect, that state land use laws do not apply to projects proceeding under the HCSF program. The City is careful to word the section to dance around the point, perhaps in recognition of the legal consequences, but the section's intended purpose is unmistakably to "forgo application of land use policies imposed by the Legislature," as caselaw and the California constitution forbid. (*Ibid.*)

As explained above, numerous state laws – particularly the SDBL – grant certain housing projects legal protections. None of these state laws allows local governments to circumvent or opt out of these rules. The attempt to do so, in section 206.10(b)(5) of the proposed HCSF program, does not pass legal muster, and project applicants will be entitled to ignore it.

Project Applicants Cannot Waive State Law Protections to Which They Are Entitled

Just as the City cannot waive the application state land use and housing laws, neither can developers. "[A] law established for a public reason cannot be contravened by a private agreement." (Civ. Code, § 3513.) In other words, if a law is designed to accomplish a public benefit (possibly in addition to private benefits), the law's provisions cannot be waived. (See, e.g., *County of Riverside v. Superior Court* (2000) 86 Cal.App.4th 211, 220 [holding employment protections for public safety officers, although they benefitted individual officers, also served a broader public purpose and could not be waived].) The legislature has made clear that pro-housing laws serve the broader public interest.[1] (See, e.g., Gov. Code, §§ 65915, subd. (u); 65913.4, subd. (u); 65582.1; Stats. 2024, ch. 294, § 1; Stats. 2023, ch. 783, § 1.) The legislative history for these laws, moreover, confirms they are intended to serve the public by

[1] On one occasion, California courts found that a law establishing time limits for housing permit application processing primarily benefitted project applicants and not the general public, and hence project applicants could waive them. (*Bickel v. City of Piedmont* (1997) 16 Cal.4th 1040, 1049-1052.) The legislature immediately rebuked the Courts and overturned the *Bickel* holding through legislation. (See *Riverwatch v. County of San Diego* (1999) 76 Cal.App.4th 1428, 1439.)

expanding the supply of housing and affordable housing. (See *Doskocz v. ALS Lien Services* (2024) 102 Cal.App.5th 107, 115-116 [legislative history is relevant in deciding whether law serves a public purpose and hence cannot be waived].) Hence, project applicants have no authority to disclaim the application of these laws, as the City's proposed HCSF program would have them do.

Two additional reasons prevent project applicants from waiving their right to pursue state law protections.

First, as with all legal waivers, such a waiver must be voluntary. (*Harvey v. County of Kern* (1930) 107 Cal.App. 590, 597.) As currently framed, the HCSF program does not ask project applicants to voluntarily waive their state law rights. It instead makes waiver *mandatory* for any project applicant. No waiver can occur through such an ultimatum; to the extent that the issue is unclear, moreover, the ambiguity resolves against the existence of a waiver. (See *Perini v. Perini* (1964), 225 Cal.App.2d 399.)

Second, waiver requires "an abandonment of a right that could be enforced or a privilege that could be exercised." (*Estate of Goyette* (1971) 14 Cal.App.3d 224, 232 [internal citations omitted].) Thus, for an applicant to be able to waive the application of state law to an HCSF project, it must be the case that the applicant could, absent the waiver, enforce the application of the relevant state law. And it must be the case, from there, that the applicant could choose *not* to waive their rights and instead apply state law protections and bonuses to their project. In this way, the City faces a catch-22, and however it resolves the dilemma, developers will be able to use both the HCSF program and state law.

The State Density Bonus Law Creates Narrow Guidelines for Local Bonus Programs, Which the HCSF Program Does Not Obey

The SDBL does allow local governments to implement local bonus programs. It includes strict rules for such programs, however, which the proposed HCSF program does not meet. Local bonus programs must add to, rather than supplant, the SDBL. Government Code section 65915, subdivision (n), states: "nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit a city, county, or city and county from granting a density bonus *greater than* what is described in this section for a development that meets the requirements of this section" (emphasis added). By negative implication, local governments are forbidden from offering density bonuses that do not incorporate, at minimum, the bonuses allowed by the SDBL. Local bonus programs must add to the SDBL; they cannot displace it in favor of an entirely separate density bonus scheme. As described above, moreover, preemption principles prevent local governments from evading the SDBL, and this language in the SDBL confirms that outcome.

The SDBL includes stronger language too. Government Code section 65917 states:

> In enacting this chapter it is the intent of the Legislature that the density bonus or other incentives offered by the city, county, or city and county pursuant to this chapter shall contribute significantly to the economic feasibility of lower income housing in proposed housing developments. **In the absence of an agreement by a developer in accordance with Section 65915, a locality shall not offer a density bonus or any other incentive that would undermine the intent of this chapter.**

(Emphasis added.) In other words, if San Francisco wishes to offer a density bonus to developers, it must first allow them any protections they are entitled to under the SDBL. Only then can it offer a local bonus program. The law establishes a clear baseline: project applicants may avail themselves of any bonuses and benefits they are entitled to under the SDBL, and further local bonuses and benefits must come on top of the SDBL.

These rules are especially important in San Francisco. HCD has found that the SDBL is "critical" for developers navigating San Francisco's complex zoning rules and extensive procedural hurdles. (See "Examining Local Law, Policy, and Planning Practice on Development in San Francisco Using CALES," O'Neill et al., pp. 38-39 (available here).) In some cases, HCD has issued Notices of Violation to San Francisco for impeding housing development by refusing to grant bonuses, incentives, and waivers allowed by the SDBL. (See, e.g., California Department of Housing and Community Development, Letter to Kate Conner, December 29, 2022 (available here).) These HCD findings and Notices of Violation confirm the SDBL's importance in producing housing in San Francisco.

The proposed HCSF program, by attempting to displace the SDBL entirely, violates the SDBL's explicit rules for local bonus program. This violation carries particular significance for San Francisco, where project applicants often rely on the SDBL to navigate a complex zoning code and approval process. If San Francisco wishes to implement a local bonus program, it must stack that program on top of the SDBL. It cannot offer an "alternative" bonus program, such as the proposed HCSF program, that attempts to remove SDBL eligibility for projects that are eligible for SDBL protections.

In closing this section, CalHDF notes that HCD has weighed in on the question of whether local governments may enact zoning bonus programs that serve as alternatives to state law. In a letter to Menlo Park (available here), the Department wrote: "[T]he City's Affordable Housing Overlay states that the overlay will be an alternative to state density bonus law. **This is in conflict with state law and must be revised."** (Emphasis added.)[2] HCD's view warrants substantial deference as the interpretation of a "technical, obscure, [or] complex" statutory

[2] Separately, as explained later in this letter, HCD's Site Inventory Guidebook (available here) analyzes whether zoning overlays or other local zoning programs established by a city's housing element may supplant or displace the SDBL and firmly establishes that they cannot. (See pages 14-15 of the guidebook.) This analysis is more relevant to the question of how the HCSF program will affect the City's compliance with the Housing Element Law, but this analysis also underscores the specific point that the City may not wriggle out of state law.

scheme by the agency charged with enforcing it. (See *Boling v. Public Employment Relations Bd.* (2018) 5 Cal.5th 898, 911 [citing *Yamaha Corp. of America v. State Bd. of Equalization* (1998) 19 Cal.4th 1, 12]; *Hoffmaster v. City of San Diego* (1997) 55 Cal.App.4th 1098, 1113, fn. 13 ["We substantially rely on the Department of Housing and Community Development's interpretation [...] regarding compliance with the housing element law"].)

Even if the City Can Prohibit the Application of State Law, the Density Bonus Law Gives Project Applicants the Legal Right to Circumvent the City's Prohibition

Even if the above legal rules do not neutralize the City's attempt to avoid state law, any project eligible for the SDBL will be able to defeat the application of proposed section 206.10(b)(5). The SDBL states: "In no case may a city, county, or city and county apply any development standard that will have the effect of physically precluding the construction of a development meeting the criteria of subdivision (b) at the densities or with the concessions or incentives permitted by this section." (Gov. Code, § 65915, subd. (e)(1).) If a proposed project complies with the HCSF except for section 206.10(b)(5) – because it seeks benefits under the SDBL or another state law – and the application of section 206.10(b)(5) would physically preclude the project by eliminating its eligibility for the HCSF, then the City cannot apply that section to the project. To the extent the City doubts or intends to contest this, CalHDF reminds the City that the SDBL, by its terms, "shall be interpreted liberally in favor of producing the maximum number of total housing units." (*Id.* at subd. (r).) Flouting the law on this point also carries severe penalties, including mandatory payment of attorney's fees to a project applicant who challenges the City in court. (*Id.* at subd. (e)(1).)

The HCSF Program Violates the Housing Element Law

Furthermore, the HCSF violates the Housing Element Law (Gov. Code, § 65580 et seq.). Rezoning programs enacted pursuant to a housing element, such as the proposed Family Zoning Plan and its component HCSF program, may not exempt themselves from state law's application, as HCD has explained in its Site Inventory Guidebook (available here – see pages 14-15). Pursuing the HCSF program as it is currently designed would violate this rule and risk the City's housing element compliance. This would expose it to a range of penalties, including the "builder's remedy."

The City Should Take Care to Comply with New Caselaw Concerning Housing Element Rezonings

Lastly, the City should take care to ensure that the rezoning complies with housing element law requiring minimum residential density on low-income sites. The newly published Court of Appeal decision *New Commune DTLA LLC v. City of Redondo Beach* (Oct. 10, 2025, No. B336042) ___ Cal.App.5th ___ makes clear that in order to comply with minimum density requirements, local zoning must require that all new development include a minimum

density of residential use. Zoning "overlays" that allow for 100% non-residential development on a site fail to comply with housing element law. The proposed zoning includes many low-income sites that are given additional residential density on top of base commercial zoning. In order to comply with housing element law, the City should make clear that all new development of these sites must include the minimum density of residential use, and that 100% commercial development is prohibited.

‹ ›


As you are well aware, California remains in the throes of a statewide crisis-level housing shortage. New multifamily housing in San Francisco a public benefit: it will help satisfy demand for housing near jobs and transit, thereby reducing displacement pressure; and it will also cut down on transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions by providing housing in a major metro area, as opposed to farther-flung regions in the state (and out of state). CalHDF therefore urges the City to follow through on the commitments in its housing element, as the law requires, and obey state law in drafting and enforcing its land use regulations.

CalHDF is a 501(c)(3) non-profit corporation whose mission includes advocating for increased access to housing for Californians at all income levels, including low-income households. You may learn more about CalHDF at www.calhdf.org.

Sincerely,



Dylan Casey
CalHDF Executive Director



James M. Lloyd
CalHDF Director of Planning and Investigations

From:	James Lloyd
To:	Chen, Lisa (CPC); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Supervisors; ChanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); MahmoodStaff; MandelmanStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Cc:	Carroll, John (BOS); Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC); Cityattorney
Subject:	Re: public comment re items 6-11 for today"s Land Use Committee meeting
Date:	Monday, November 3, 2025 11:40:15 AM
Attachments:	San Francisco - Housing Choice SF Letter - BoS Land Use Committee 2025.11.03.pdf

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

Please disregard the previous message.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

The California Housing Defense Fund submits the attached public comment for today's Land Use and Transportation Committee meeting regarding the Family Zoning plan, agendized as items 6 through 11.

Sincerely,

James M. Lloyd
Director of Planning and Investigations
California Housing Defense Fund
james@calhdf.org
CalHDF is grant & donation funded
Donate today - https://calhdf.org/donate/

On Mon, Nov 3, 2025 at 11:35 AM James Lloyd <james@calhdf.org> wrote:

> Dear San Francisco City Council,
>
> The California Housing Defense Fund submits the attached public comment for today's City Council Land Use and Transportation Committee meeting regarding the Family Zoning plan, agendized as items 6 through 11.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> James M. Lloyd
> Director of Planning and Investigations
> California Housing Defense Fund
> james@calhdf.org
> CalHDF is grant & donation funded
> Donate today - https://calhdf.org/donate/

From: Robyn Tucker
To: MelgarStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; ChenStaff
Cc: Carroll, John (BOS); SauterStaff; kcourtney@xdm.com
Subject: Agenda Item 6, 250966 General Plan Amendments Family Zoning Plan
Date: Monday, November 3, 2025 11:59:18 AM

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

Sent via Email

November 2, 2025

From: The Pacific Avenue Neighborhood Association (PANA)

To: SF Board of Supervisors Land Use and Transportation Committee

I am writing on behalf of the Pacific Avenue Neighborhood Association and our 300+ supporters to request preservation of our 40 feet height limits and 45% rear yard setbacks for the Pacific Avenue Neighborhood Commercial District.

Pacific Avenue History
From 2004 through 2009, PANA leadership worked shoulder to shoulder with a designated member from the San Francisco Planning Department to plan and design our neighborhood to better serve our community then and in the future. The result of our collaboration was legislation establishing the Pacific Avenue Neighborhood Commercial District. The legislation's key elements set building heights at 40 feet, rear yard setbacks at 45% for specific lots to encourage contiguous green open space, and businesses that would best serve and protect our neighborhood.

In addition, in legislation notesthat taller buildings should be at located at corners to minimize impact on the entire surrounding residential blocks and under no circumstance should taller buildings be located mid block. Hence, the design would be one of staggered height, moving east to west.

Decades ago, Pacific Avenue was expected to develop into a Commercial thoroughfare. This never happened. In fact, historically, most of the commercial activity consisted of sweat shops and garages that are no longer present, except some small business garages continue to flourish. Parking has always been at an has always been at a premium as Pacific Ave narrows from east to West with the most narrow portion between Leavenworth and Polk Street.

Family Zoning Plan
The original Family Zoning Plan heights for 12 square blocks that make up the Pacific Avenue NCD, which include from the North and South - Broadway to Jackson Streets and from East and West - Taylor to Polk Street maintained the current 40 foot height. It is unclear whether the rear yard setbacks have been modified or eliminated. We asked that they remain to allow for maximum light and air.

Respectfully, the Pacific Avenue neighborhood Association asks that the Family Zoning Plan be modified to respect our current height limits in an eight block rectangle between Leavenworth and Polk Street along Pacific Avenue and between Broadway and Jackson Street and on our alley's adjacent to and within our Pacific Avenue community.

With many thanks for your consideration,

Robyn Tucker
Chair
Pacific Avenue Neighborhood Association
(PANA)
7 McCormick Street (7 ft wide alley)
San Francisco, CA 94109
415-609-5607

From:	Paul Wermer
To:	Melgar, Myrna (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Chen, Chyanne (BOS); ChenStaff; Carroll, John (BOS)
Cc:	SherrillStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS)
Subject:	File No. 250701 Family Zoning Plan - Ammendment needed to avoid gaming the system
Date:	Monday, November 3, 2025 11:59:07 AM

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

Dear Land Use and Transportation Committee:

At the last hearing, I spoke to a very specific problem: The upzoning bonuses under Sec 206.10, Housing Choice -San Francisco Program do not require any inclusionary or mixed income housing to serve the needs of San Franciscans. The concern has not been addressed.

The State programs all require significant affordability contributions to qualify. Apparently San Francisco does not, and based on Planning's Residential Nexus studies, the existing language may exacerbate the housing affordability problem we face.

Unfortunately, Sec 206.10 only requires that at least one unit be added, and the project must comprise at least 2 units, excluding ADUs, to qualify for the Local Program Bonus. No inclusionary requirements apply unless at least 10 units are built.

This creates a perverse incentive - especially in desirable areas, where views or amenities are attractive to the wealthier segment of San Francisco, small projects can qualify for the Local Program Bonus. This creates the opportunity for projects of between 2 and 9 units, each up to 4000 sq ft in size, catering to the very wealthy. There are hundreds of attractive sites - with views of the Bay, the ocean, Golden Gate Park, one lot adjacent to the Presidio. In aggregate there are potentially hundreds if not thousands of luxury apartments with desirable views. Furthermore, for RTO-C areas, commercial spaces are allowed - offering additional rentable space where perhaps the view is not so good.

at a minimum, the legislation should require Inclusionary contributions from ALL market rate projects qualifying for the Local Program.

Sincerely,

Paul Wermer

--
Paul Wermer
2309 California St
San Francisco,CA 94115

From:	James Lloyd
To:	Chen, Lisa (CPC); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Supervisors; ChanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); MahmoodStaff; MandelmanStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Cc:	Carroll, John (BOS); Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC); Cityattorney
Subject:	Re: public comment re items 6-11 for today"s Land Use Committee meeting
Date:	Monday, November 3, 2025 11:40:13 AM
Attachments:	San Francisco - Housing Choice SF Letter - BoS Land Use Committee 2025.11.03.pdf

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

Please disregard the previous message.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

The California Housing Defense Fund submits the attached public comment for today's Land Use and Transportation Committee meeting regarding the Family Zoning plan, agendized as items 6 through 11.

Sincerely,

James M. Lloyd
Director of Planning and Investigations
California Housing Defense Fund
james@calhdf.org
CalHDF is grant & donation funded
Donate today - https://calhdf.org/donate/

On Mon, Nov 3, 2025 at 11:35 AM James Lloyd <james@calhdf.org> wrote:

> Dear San Francisco City Council,
>
> The California Housing Defense Fund submits the attached public comment for today's City Council Land Use and Transportation Committee meeting regarding the Family Zoning plan, agendized as items 6 through 11.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> James M. Lloyd
> Director of Planning and Investigations
> California Housing Defense Fund
> james@calhdf.org
> CalHDF is grant & donation funded
> Donate today - https://calhdf.org/donate/

Nov 3, 2025

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
49 South Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94103

Re: Housing Element Implementation

By email: Lisa.chen@sfgov.org, Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org, bos@sfgov.org, bos-supervisors@sfgov.org, ChanStaff@sfgov.org, ChenStaff@sfgov.org, DorseyStaff@sfgov.org, Jackie.Fielder@sfgov.org, MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org, MandelmanStaff@sfgov.org, MelgarStaff@sfgov.org, SauterStaff@sfgov.org, SherrillStaff@sfgov.org, Shamann.Walton@sfgov.org

Cc: john.carroll@sfgov.org; sarah.dennis-phillips@sfgov.org; cityattorney@sfcityatty.org

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

The California Housing Defense Fund ("CalHDF") writes in advance of the Land Use and Transportation Committee meeting scheduled for November 3, 2025 at 1:30pm. CalHDF writes to warn the Committee, as well as the larger Board, that certain elements of the proposed Housing Choice-San Francisco ("HCSF") plan – which is, in turn, part of the overall Family Zoning Plan – violate state law. The HCSF program, in its current form, would explicitly forbid the application of state housing laws and/or require housing project applicants to waive protections they and their projects are entitled to under state law. The City, however, lacks authority to enact a program with these restrictions.

If the City does not obey the law, CalHDF will challenge the City in court. Such a lawsuit would expose the City to penalties for failure to comply with housing element law. The City would also be ordered to grant development applicants access to *both* the HCSF program *and* state laws, including the Statewide Density Bonus Law (the "SDBL"). CalHDF urges the City to avoid such needless litigation and instead comply with the law in the first instance. The City should drop the HCSF program's effort to carve itself out of the SDBL and other state laws.

//

2201 Broadway, PH1, Oakland, CA 94612
www.calhdf.org

State Law Limits Certain Aspects of the Proposed Housing Choice–San Francisco Bonus Program

The proposed HCSF bonus program provides additional residential zoning capacity for projects that meet certain criteria. Overall, this is good. However, one of the HCSF eligibility criteria poses a problem: the requirement, found in section 206.10(b)(5), that an HCSF project "not receive any density or development bonuses or relief from applicable Planning Code standards in any other State or local law or program." This requirement is unenforceable to the extent it pertains to state law, and, should it be enacted, developers will have the option to ignore it.

This is for four reasons. First, the City "cannot choose to forgo application of land use policies imposed by the Legislature." (*Ailanto Properties, Inc. v. City of Half Moon Bay* (2006) 142 Cal.App.4th 572, 595.) Second, just as the City cannot waive state law's application, project applicants cannot waive protections to which they are entitled under state law, since those protections are designed to serve the public interest. (See Civ. Code, § 3513 ["a law established for a public reason cannot be contravened by a private agreement"].) Third, the SDBL includes explicit rules for local density bonus programs: such programs must build on, rather than supplant, the SDBL. Finally, even if the first three points are ignored, the SDBL allows project applicants to waive the HCSF eligibility requirement forbidding the use of state bonuses. (Gov. Code, § 65915, subd. (e).) Legal interpretations from the California Department of Housing and Community Development ("HCD"), the state agency charged with interpreting and enforcing state housing law, support these conclusions.

Background

State law contains many provisions that grant rights and protections to proposed housing developments and applications for proposed housing developments. These include AB 2011, codified at Government Code section 65912.100 et seq., the SDBL, codified at Government Code section 65915 et seq., SB 35, codified at Government Code section 65913.4, and more besides. These laws accomplish a variety of pro-housing policies by, among other things, allowing proposed housing developments that meet certain criteria (such as the inclusion of affordable units) to reduce or avoid local zoning and other land use restrictions. In some cases, whether a project is eligible for state law protections and the extent to which it may reduce or avoid local rules depends on the generosity of the local zoning code. For example, the SDBL calculates density bonuses using a "base density," defined as "the greatest number of units allowed under the zoning ordinance, specific plan, or land use element of the general plan." (Gov. Code, § 65915, subd. (o)(6).)

The proposed HCSF program expands the San Francisco zoning code's accommodation for denser housing in much of the City. The aforementioned state laws then further expand the allowed range of housing projects, providing for even greater density and even more

forgiving standards for projects. But there is a catch: the HCSF program attempts to forestall these state laws, in section 206.10(b)(5). If not for proposed section 206.10(b)(5), housing project applicants would be able to propose projects under the HCSF rules and avail themselves of the full range of state law protections. Thus, the critical question is: does proposed section 206.10(b)(5) have any legal effect? As explained below, the answer is no. Developers may use both the HCSF rules and any state law bonuses or protections that apply.

The City Cannot Forgo the Application of State Law

State law preempts local law. (Cal. Const., art. XI, § 7.) This is a foundational constitutional principle, and it is no less true in the land use context than anywhere else. As a corollary to this principle, local governments "cannot choose to forgo application of land use policies imposed by the Legislature." (*Ailanto Properties*, *supra*, 142 Cal.App.4th at 595.) Proposed section 206.10(b)(5), however, attempts to do exactly that: it states, in effect, that state land use laws do not apply to projects proceeding under the HCSF program. The City is careful to word the section to dance around the point, perhaps in recognition of the legal consequences, but the section's intended purpose is unmistakably to "forgo application of land use policies imposed by the Legislature," as caselaw and the California constitution forbid. (*Ibid.*)

As explained above, numerous state laws – particularly the SDBL – grant certain housing projects legal protections. None of these state laws allows local governments to circumvent or opt out of these rules. The attempt to do so, in section 206.10(b)(5) of the proposed HCSF program, does not pass legal muster, and project applicants will be entitled to ignore it.

Project Applicants Cannot Waive State Law Protections to Which They Are Entitled

Just as the City cannot waive the application state land use and housing laws, neither can developers. "[A] law established for a public reason cannot be contravened by a private agreement." (Civ. Code, § 3513.) In other words, if a law is designed to accomplish a public benefit (possibly in addition to private benefits), the law's provisions cannot be waived. (See, e.g., *County of Riverside v. Superior Court* (2000) 86 Cal.App.4th 211, 220 [holding employment protections for public safety officers, although they benefitted individual officers, also served a broader public purpose and could not be waived].) The legislature has made clear that pro-housing laws serve the broader public interest.[1] (See, e.g., Gov. Code, §§ 65915, subd. (u); 65913.4, subd. (u); 65582.1; Stats. 2024, ch. 294, § 1; Stats. 2023, ch. 783, § 1.) The legislative history for these laws, moreover, confirms they are intended to serve the public by

[1] On one occasion, California courts found that a law establishing time limits for housing permit application processing primarily benefitted project applicants and not the general public, and hence project applicants could waive them. (*Bickel v. City of Piedmont* (1997) 16 Cal.4th 1040, 1049-1052.) The legislature immediately rebuked the Courts and overturned the *Bickel* holding through legislation. (See *Riverwatch v. County of San Diego* (1999) 76 Cal.App.4th 1428, 1439.)

expanding the supply of housing and affordable housing. (See *Doskocz v. ALS Lien Services* (2024) 102 Cal.App.5th 107, 115-116 [legislative history is relevant in deciding whether law serves a public purpose and hence cannot be waived].) Hence, project applicants have no authority to disclaim the application of these laws, as the City's proposed HCSF program would have them do.

Two additional reasons prevent project applicants from waiving their right to pursue state law protections.

First, as with all legal waivers, such a waiver must be voluntary. (*Harvey v. County of Kern* (1930) 107 Cal.App. 590, 597.) As currently framed, the HCSF program does not ask project applicants to voluntarily waive their state law rights. It instead makes waiver *mandatory* for any project applicant. No waiver can occur through such an ultimatum; to the extent that the issue is unclear, moreover, the ambiguity resolves against the existence of a waiver. (See *Perini v. Perini* (1964), 225 Cal.App.2d 399.)

Second, waiver requires "an abandonment of a right that could be enforced or a privilege that could be exercised." (*Estate of Goyette* (1971) 14 Cal.App.3d 224, 232 [internal citations omitted].) Thus, for an applicant to be able to waive the application of state law to an HCSF project, it must be the case that the applicant could, absent the waiver, enforce the application of the relevant state law. And it must be the case, from there, that the applicant could choose *not* to waive their rights and instead apply state law protections and bonuses to their project. In this way, the City faces a catch-22, and however it resolves the dilemma, developers will be able to use both the HCSF program and state law.

The State Density Bonus Law Creates Narrow Guidelines for Local Bonus Programs, Which the HCSF Program Does Not Obey

The SDBL does allow local governments to implement local bonus programs. It includes strict rules for such programs, however, which the proposed HCSF program does not meet. Local bonus programs must add to, rather than supplant, the SDBL. Government Code section 65915, subdivision (n), states: "nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit a city, county, or city and county from granting a density bonus *greater than* what is described in this section for a development that meets the requirements of this section" (emphasis added). By negative implication, local governments are forbidden from offering density bonuses that do not incorporate, at minimum, the bonuses allowed by the SDBL. Local bonus programs must add to the SDBL; they cannot displace it in favor of an entirely separate density bonus scheme. As described above, moreover, preemption principles prevent local governments from evading the SDBL, and this language in the SDBL confirms that outcome.

The SDBL includes stronger language too. Government Code section 65917 states:

> In enacting this chapter it is the intent of the Legislature that the density bonus or other incentives offered by the city, county, or city and county pursuant to this chapter shall contribute significantly to the economic feasibility of lower income housing in proposed housing developments. **In the absence of an agreement by a developer in accordance with Section 65915, a locality shall not offer a density bonus or any other incentive that would undermine the intent of this chapter.**

(Emphasis added.) In other words, if San Francisco wishes to offer a density bonus to developers, it must first allow them any protections they are entitled to under the SDBL. Only then can it offer a local bonus program. The law establishes a clear baseline: project applicants may avail themselves of any bonuses and benefits they are entitled to under the SDBL, and further local bonuses and benefits must come on top of the SDBL.

These rules are especially important in San Francisco. HCD has found that the SDBL is "critical" for developers navigating San Francisco's complex zoning rules and extensive procedural hurdles. (See "Examining Local Law, Policy, and Planning Practice on Development in San Francisco Using CALES," O'Neill et al., pp. 38-39 (available here).) In some cases, HCD has issued Notices of Violation to San Francisco for impeding housing development by refusing to grant bonuses, incentives, and waivers allowed by the SDBL. (See, e.g., California Department of Housing and Community Development, Letter to Kate Conner, December 29, 2022 (available here).) These HCD findings and Notices of Violation confirm the SDBL's importance in producing housing in San Francisco.

The proposed HCSF program, by attempting to displace the SDBL entirely, violates the SDBL's explicit rules for local bonus program. This violation carries particular significance for San Francisco, where project applicants often rely on the SDBL to navigate a complex zoning code and approval process. If San Francisco wishes to implement a local bonus program, it must stack that program on top of the SDBL. It cannot offer an "alternative" bonus program, such as the proposed HCSF program, that attempts to remove SDBL eligibility for projects that are eligible for SDBL protections.

In closing this section, CalHDF notes that HCD has weighed in on the question of whether local governments may enact zoning bonus programs that serve as alternatives to state law. In a letter to Menlo Park (available here), the Department wrote: "[T]he City's Affordable Housing Overlay states that the overlay will be an alternative to state density bonus law. **This is in conflict with state law and must be revised."** (Emphasis added.)[2] HCD's view warrants substantial deference as the interpretation of a "technical, obscure, [or] complex" statutory

[2] Separately, as explained later in this letter, HCD's Site Inventory Guidebook (available here) analyzes whether zoning overlays or other local zoning programs established by a city's housing element may supplant or displace the SDBL and firmly establishes that they cannot. (See pages 14-15 of the guidebook.) This analysis is more relevant to the question of how the HCSF program will affect the City's compliance with the Housing Element Law, but this analysis also underscores the specific point that the City may not wriggle out of state law.

scheme by the agency charged with enforcing it. (See *Boling v. Public Employment Relations Bd.* (2018) 5 Cal.5th 898, 911 [citing *Yamaha Corp. of America v. State Bd. of Equalization* (1998) 19 Cal.4th 1, 12]; *Hoffmaster v. City of San Diego* (1997) 55 Cal.App.4th 1098, 1113, fn. 13 ["We substantially rely on the Department of Housing and Community Development's interpretation [...] regarding compliance with the housing element law"].)

Even if the City Can Prohibit the Application of State Law, the Density Bonus Law Gives Project Applicants the Legal Right to Circumvent the City's Prohibition

Even if the above legal rules do not neutralize the City's attempt to avoid state law, any project eligible for the SDBL will be able to defeat the application of proposed section 206.10(b)(5). The SDBL states: "In no case may a city, county, or city and county apply any development standard that will have the effect of physically precluding the construction of a development meeting the criteria of subdivision (b) at the densities or with the concessions or incentives permitted by this section." (Gov. Code, § 65915, subd. (e)(1).) If a proposed project complies with the HCSF except for section 206.10(b)(5) – because it seeks benefits under the SDBL or another state law – and the application of section 206.10(b)(5) would physically preclude the project by eliminating its eligibility for the HCSF, then the City cannot apply that section to the project. To the extent the City doubts or intends to contest this, CalHDF reminds the City that the SDBL, by its terms, "shall be interpreted liberally in favor of producing the maximum number of total housing units." (*Id.* at subd. (r).) Flouting the law on this point also carries severe penalties, including mandatory payment of attorney's fees to a project applicant who challenges the City in court. (*Id.* at subd. (e)(1).)

The HCSF Program Violates the Housing Element Law

Furthermore, the HCSF violates the Housing Element Law (Gov. Code, § 65580 et seq.). Rezoning programs enacted pursuant to a housing element, such as the proposed Family Zoning Plan and its component HCSF program, may not exempt themselves from state law's application, as HCD has explained in its Site Inventory Guidebook (available here – see pages 14-15). Pursuing the HCSF program as it is currently designed would violate this rule and risk the City's housing element compliance. This would expose it to a range of penalties, including the "builder's remedy."

The City Should Take Care to Comply with New Caselaw Concerning Housing Element Rezonings

Lastly, the City should take care to ensure that the rezoning complies with housing element law requiring minimum residential density on low-income sites. The newly published Court of Appeal decision *New Commune DTLA LLC v. City of Redondo Beach* (Oct. 10, 2025, No. B336042) ___ Cal.App.5th ___ makes clear that in order to comply with minimum density requirements, local zoning must require that all new development include a minimum

density of residential use. Zoning "overlays" that allow for 100% non-residential development on a site fail to comply with housing element law. The proposed zoning includes many low-income sites that are given additional residential density on top of base commercial zoning. In order to comply with housing element law, the City should make clear that all new development of these sites must include the minimum density of residential use, and that 100% commercial development is prohibited.

‹ ›


As you are well aware, California remains in the throes of a statewide crisis-level housing shortage. New multifamily housing in San Francisco a public benefit: it will help satisfy demand for housing near jobs and transit, thereby reducing displacement pressure; and it will also cut down on transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions by providing housing in a major metro area, as opposed to farther-flung regions in the state (and out of state). CalHDF therefore urges the City to follow through on the commitments in its housing element, as the law requires, and obey state law in drafting and enforcing its land use regulations.

CalHDF is a 501(c)(3) non-profit corporation whose mission includes advocating for increased access to housing for Californians at all income levels, including low-income households. You may learn more about CalHDF at www.calhdf.org.

Sincerely,



Dylan Casey
CalHDF Executive Director



James M. Lloyd
CalHDF Director of Planning and Investigations

From:	Erica Zweig
To:	Connie Chan; ChanStaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Lurie, Daniel (MYR)
Cc:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject:	11/3 D4ward Position "Family" Housing plan
Date:	Monday, November 3, 2025 10:24:34 AM
Attachments:	D4ward letter on upzoning.pdf

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

Sent from AT&T Yahoo Mail on Android

D4ward is a grassroots network of Sunset District neighbors working to keep our community a place where regular people can afford to live, thrive, and have a real say in what happens here. We support affordable housing, stand up to big-money influence in San Francisco politics, protect workers, defend our coastline, and fight for community needs over corporate interests.

We are deeply concerned that, due to the delay in appointing a new District 4 Supervisor, our district is now being upzoned **without representation** on the current Board of Supervisors. Proceeding with this legislation under these circumstances amounts to **government without representation**. The Board should **postpone all hearings and votes on District 4 zoning changes until a new Supervisor is seated.**

D4ward's Key Positions and Priorities

In general, D4ward supports the **amendments proposed by Supervisors Connie Chan and Chyanne Chen** at the first Land Use and Transportation Committee hearing on the Mayor's upzoning plan. We urge the Board to incorporate these changes to protect affordability, safety, and neighborhood integrity.

Our specific priorities are:

1. Accelerate downtown office-to-housing conversions.
Before targeting stable, working-class neighborhoods like ours for massive rezoning, the City must aggressively pursue the conversion of empty downtown office buildings into housing.

2. Protect small businesses and tenants in District 4.
Under the Mayor's plan, our unique small businesses would become targets for demolition along all commercial corridors. We strongly support the **Race and Equity in All Planning Coalition (REP-SF)** and Supervisor Chan's **Tenant Protection Ordinance** to safeguard both tenants and neighborhood-serving businesses.

3. Eliminate in-lieu fees.
Developers must not be allowed to "fee out" of affordable housing requirements. In-lieu fees only produce delayed, off-site projects and create enclaves of market-rate luxury housing.

4. Dedicate all suitable public land for 100% affordable housing.
All appropriate public land—excluding parks and open space—should be reserved for **100% affordable housing** serving a full range of incomes, from middle-income working families to deeply affordable and supportive housing.

5. Preserve the Coastal Zone.
No land should be removed from the existing Coastal Zone boundaries. Coastal protections are essential for public safety, environmental resilience, and equity.

6. Prohibit upzoning in the Tsunami Zone.
It is reckless to increase building heights or density in areas at high risk of tsunami inundation. The City must also repair and reactivate the local tsunami warning system.

7. Ensure fire safety before allowing large-scale development.
No significant new upzoning should take effect until a secure **emergency firefighting water system** is installed in the Sunset and Parkside Districts, which are already vulnerable to wildfire and earthquake-related fires.

8. Protect historic and culturally significant buildings.
All **Category A and A-eligible historic buildings and districts** should be exempted from upzoning. District 4's mid-century homes and civic buildings reflect our community's unique cultural heritage and deserve preservation.

9. Prevent excessive height near parks and schools.
Properties bordering the southern edges of our parks and schools should not be upzoned for additional height. Casting shadows on open spaces and classrooms undermines the very "well-resourced" character the City claims to value.

Erica Zweig
Corresponding Secretary

From: L.D. Kirshenbaum
To: Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject: Please, Land Use Committee: Listen to Us!
Date: Monday, November 3, 2025 10:06:32 AM

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

Hello to all members of the Land Use Committee:

I am devastated by the trend in ignoring facts and stonewalling constituents.

We need affordability, and this ill-defined plan will only make housing problems worse.

I won't be attending today to say this in person; last time seemed like a disrespectful charade.

Sincerely,

– Daniela Kirshenbaum

From: Judy Irving
To: Melgar, Myrna (BOS); ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff
Cc: Carroll, John (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS)
Subject: Re: Upzoning and demolitions, etc.
Date: Monday, November 3, 2025 9:51:18 AM

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

I cannot attend today, but please address the point I made about demolition in my prior email (copied below). How do you rationalize the candy-coating this issue has received?

History will judge your acquiescence to state laws that will, if implemented, will destroy the fabric, culture, and livability of San Francisco.

> On Oct 19, 2025, at 6:00 PM, Judy Irving <films@pelicanmedia.org> wrote:
>
> One of the rationalizations I've heard over and over at meetings concerning the proposed upzoning is that
>
> "Since there have been very few demolitions in the past few years, there are bound to be few in the future."
>
> But in this case history will not repeat itself, because local zoning controls and other restrictions that have kept demolitions in check will be thrown out the window. De-regulation will *incentivize* demolitions because land values will rise so precipitously:
>
> "Buy that building! Tear it down! Build a highrise! Make a ton of money!" From a developer standpoint, it's irresistible.
>
> Don't be taken in by assurances that existing housing for middle-income San Francisco residents will be immune from developer greed.
>
> This is not a "family" plan — it's actually a "wealthy singles" plan, since 75% of new units will be studios and one-bedrooms. How can anyone believe that building highrise condos for well-off tech workers will somehow benefit families?
>
> You can turn this around by refusing to accept the YIMBY lobbyists' rhetoric. You can be proud of the fact that you stood up for small businesses, working-class tenants, and historic buildings by insisting on adaptive re-use of existing structures and 100% affordable development. The proposed amendments to this plan don't do nearly enough. Don't look back a few years from now and say to yourself, "I helped ruin a world-class city."
>
> Thank you.

From: Robyn Tucker
To: MelgarStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; ChanStaff (BOS)
Cc: Carroll, John (BOS); SauterStaff; kcourtney@xdm.com
Subject: Agenda Item 6, 250966 General Plan Amendments Family Zoning Plan
Date: Monday, November 3, 2025 9:45:23 AM

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

Sent via Email

November 2, 2025

From: The Pacific Avenue Neighborhood Association (PANA)

To: SF Board of Supervisors Land Use and Transportation Committee

I am writing on behalf of the Pacific Avenue Neighborhood Association and our 300+ supporters to request preservation of our 40 feet height limits and 45% rear yard setbacks for the Pacific Avenue Neighborhood Commercial District.

Pacific Avenue History
From 2004 through 2009, PANA leadership worked shoulder to shoulder with a designated member from the San Francisco Planning Department to plan and design our neighborhood to better serve our community then and in the future. The result of our collaboration was legislation establishing the Pacific Avenue Neighborhood Commercial District. The legislation's key elements set building heights at 40 feet, rear yard setbacks at 45% for specific lots to encourage contiguous green open space, and businesses that would best serve and protect our neighborhood.

In addition, in legislation notesthat taller buildings should be at located at corners to minimize impact on the entire surrounding residential blocks and under no circumstance should taller buildings be located mid block. Hence, the design would be one of staggered height, moving east to west.

Decades ago, Pacific Avenue was expected to develop into a Commercial thoroughfare. This never happened. In fact, historically, most of the commercial activity consisted of sweat shops and garages that are no longer present, except some small business garages continue to flourish. Parking has always been at an has always been at a premium as Pacific Ave narrows from east to West with the most narrow portion between Leavenworth and Polk Street.

Family Zoning Plan

The original Family Zoning Plan heights for 12 square blocks that make up the Pacific Avenue NCD, which include from the North and South - Broadway to Jackson Streets and from East and West - Taylor to Polk Street maintained the current 40 foot height. It is unclear whether the rear yard setbacks have been modified or eliminated. We asked that they remain to allow for maximum light and air.

Respectfully, the Pacific Avenue neighborhood Association asks that the Family Zoning Plan be modified to respect our current height limits in an eight block rectangle between Leavenworth and Polk Street along Pacific Avenue and between Broadway and Jackson Street and on our alley's adjacent to and within our Pacific Avenue community.

With many thanks for your consideration,

Robyn Tucker
Chair
Pacific Avenue Neighborhood Association
(PANA)
7 McCormick Street (7 ft wide alley)
San Francisco, CA 94109
415-609-5607

From: Nick Ferris
To: Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS)
Cc: Chan, Connie (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: COMMENTS ON PROPOSED FAMILY ZONING PLAN Amendments in File Nos. 251071, 251072, and 251073
Date: Monday, November 3, 2025 7:22:47 AM
Attachments: THD Land Use Transportation Upzoning Plan 11.3.pdf

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

Dear Chair Melgar and Members of the Committee,

Telegraph Hill Dwellers (THD) continues to oppose the Mayor's proposed Family Zoning Plan ("Upzoning Plan"). As set forth below, we urge the Committee and Board of Supervisors to reverse the last-minute inclusion of Telegraph Hill, North Beach, and the Northern Waterfront in the Upzoning Plan. Further, we implore you to amend the Upzoning Plan to prevent the displacement of tenants and small businesses, and to provide for a real plan for development of the affordable housing we so desperately need by approving amendments related legisnation offered by Supervisors Chan and Chen.

1. Remove North Beach, Telegraph Hill, and the Northern Waterfront from the Upzoning Plan.

THD continues to strongly oppose the late inclusion in the Upzoning Plan of major portions of Telegraph Hill, North Beach, and the Northern Waterfront, areas that were not included in the 2022 Adopted Housing Element ("2022 Housing Element") nor considered in the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR). These areas were not considered for inclusion in the Housing Element because they are one of the densest neighborhoods in San Francisco, with roughly 82% of our residents currently living in existing pre-1979 multi-family, rent-controlled buildings housing our City's workforce and seniors, including a large immigrant Asian population. Based on the City's profiles of neighborhoods in San Francisco, there are 37,156 people per square mile in North Beach as compared to 17,325 people per square mile in San Francisco. The Planning Department's own data shows that rent-controlled buildings in District 3 (built before 1979 with 2+ units, excluding condos) represent approximately 32,340 individual units, 13,983 of which are located in the current version of the Upzoning Plan. In other words, the tenants occupying 13,983 units will be subject to potential eviction and displacement.

And, although the Housing Element and FEIR assumed that the Northeast Planning District would provide net new housing units of only 800 units by 2050, the Upzoning Plan suddenly increased that figure to 5,900 units, a stunning 650% increase. The height and density increases represented by this increase will significantly impact existing tenants, small businesses, historic resources, parks and open spaces, and the diverse culture of District 3.

2. Support for Supervisors Chan's and Chen's Proposed Amendments:

Although we continue to oppose the Upzoning Plan, we appreciate Supervisor Chan and Chen's leadership in introducing critical amendments to strengthen tenant protections, prioritize affordable housing, support small businesses, and create real family-sized housing.

We urge this Committee to move these amendments forward, including those that follow:

(a) Exclude all historic resources, including local historic districts and those eligible for the California and National Registers. from the Upzoning Plan (File No. 251073).

(b) Exclude from the Upzoning Plan all development that would demolish, remove, or convert to another use any existing dwelling unit(s) or residential flat, including rent-controlled units.

(c) Remove areas within the Planning Equity Geography Special Use District ("PEG SUD") from the Upzoning Plan consistent with the 2022 Housing Element (File No. 251071)

(d) Remove areas in the Coastal Zone from the Upzoning Plan (File No. 251071)

(e) Adopt a Progress Requirement or "shot clock" for obtaining a building permit within a time certain of project approval (File No. 251073)

(f) Require inclusionary housing to be located nearby within ½ mile of the development (File No. 251073).

(g) Eliminate form-based density from Neighborhood Commercial Districts and ROTCs because we want family housing not dorm rooms (File No. 251073).

3. THD Urges Supervisor Melgar to Protect All Rent-Controlled Housing

We appreciate Supervisor Melgar's amendment removing rent controlled housing with three or more units but urge her to expand this amendment to exclude all rent-controlled housing with two or more units, not just three or more.

4. Support for Supervisor Chan's Legacy Business Controls

THD joins with Small Business Forward to support Supervisor Chan's legislation to extend the requirement for a Conditional Use Authorization for sites where a Legacy Business has been displaced. In absence of having any other tools available or financial resources to support the successful relocation of a Legacy Business within the community, the Conditional Use is an imperfect but necessary mechanism to discourage displacement of Legacy Businesses in the first place. That is why Small Business Forward supports that the extension of the CU legislation until other more effective protection measures are in place, such as commercial rent control, the right of return, and adequate relocation assistance.

5. Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District and Funding Strategy.

We join with REP-SF and the Council of Community Housing Organizations to demand that the SFMTA-SUD be revised to provide that these publicly owned parcels be developed for 100% affordable and social housing. Under San Francisco's state-approved Housing Element, as mandated by the state, 57% of the 36,200 new housing units proposed to be developed under the Upzoning Plan—more than 20,000 units—must be affordable to low- and very-low-income households. Yet the Upzoning Plan has no funding strategy or realistic plan to produce those affordable homes. It risks satisfying Sacramento's procedural checklist while abandoning the substance of the law: to build housing for the people who need it most.

* * * * * * * *

In conclusion, THD believes that the Upzoning Plan, as proposed, threatens tenants and small businesses, pits neighborhoods against each other, and disregards decades of community-based policymaking that has built San Francisco into a resilient, vibrant city through a network of strong neighborhoods.

The proposed amendments from Supervisors Chan and Chen address these concerns by focusing on protecting tenants and rent-controlled housing citywide, supporting small businesses, and prioritizing the development of affordable housing. We urge this Committee to move these critical elements forward.

Finally, we urge this Committee to recommend that Telegraph Hill, North Beach, and the Northern Waterfront be removed from the Upzoning Plan consistent with the 2022 Housing Element adopted by the Board of Supervisors and approved by HCD.

Sincerely,
Nick Ferris, *President*
Telegraph Hill Dwellers

November 3, 2025
Via Email

Myrna Melgar, Chair - *Myrna.Melgar@sfgov.org*

Chyanne Chen, Vice-Chair - *Chyanne.Chen@sfgov.org*

Bilal Mahmood, Member - *Bilal.Mahmood@sfgov.org*
Land Use and Transportation Committee
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

RE: COMMENTS ON PROPOSED FAMILY ZONING PLAN
Amendments in File Nos. 251071, 251072, and 251073

Dear Chair Melgar and Members of the Committee,

Telegraph Hill Dwellers (THD) continues to oppose the Mayor's proposed Family Zoning Plan ("Upzoning Plan"). As set forth below, we urge the Committee and Board of Supervisors to reverse the last-minute inclusion of Telegraph Hill, North Beach, and the Northern Waterfront in the Upzoning Plan. Further, we implore you to amend the Upzoning Plan to prevent the displacement of tenants and small businesses, and to provide for a real plan for development of the affordable housing we so desperately need by approving amendments related legisnation offered by Supervisors Chan and Chen.

1. **Remove North Beach, Telegraph Hill, and the Northern Waterfront from the Upzoning Plan.**

THD continues to strongly oppose the late inclusion in the Upzoning Plan of major portions of Telegraph Hill, North Beach, and the Northern Waterfront, areas that were not included in the 2022 Adopted Housing Element ("2022 Housing Element") nor considered in the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR). These areas were not considered for inclusion in the Housing Element because they are one of the densest neighborhoods in San Francisco, with roughly 82% of our residents currently living in existing pre-1979 multi-family, rent-controlled buildings housing our City's workforce and seniors, including a large immigrant Asian population. Based on the City's profiles of neighborhoods in San Francisco, there are **37,156** people per square mile in North Beach as compared to **17,325** people per square mile in San Francisco.[1] The Planning Department's own data shows that rent-controlled buildings in District 3 (built before 1979 with 2+ units, excluding condos) represent approximately 32,340 individual units, 13,983 of which are located in the current version of the Upzoning Plan. **In other words, the tenants occupying 13,983 units will be subject to potential eviction and displacement.**

[1] https://www.city-data.com/neighborhood/North-Beach-San-Francisco-CA.html

And, although the Housing Element and FEIR assumed that the Northeast Planning District would provide net new housing units of only *800 units* by 2050, the Upzoning Plan suddenly increased that figure to *5,900 units*, a stunning *650% increase*. The height and density increases represented by this increase will significantly impact existing tenants, small businesses, historic resources, parks and open spaces, and the diverse culture of District 3.

2. Support for Supervisors Chan's and Chen's Proposed Amendments:

Although we continue to oppose the Upzoning Plan, we appreciate Supervisor Chan and Chen's leadership in introducing critical amendments to strengthen tenant protections, prioritize affordable housing, support small businesses, and create real family-sized housing. We urge this Committee to move these amendments forward, including those that follow:

(a) Exclude all historic resources, including local historic districts and those eligible for the California and National Registers. from the Upzoning Plan (File No. 251073).

(b) Exclude from the Upzoning Plan all development that would demolish, remove, or convert to another use any existing dwelling unit(s) or residential flat, including rent-controlled units.

(c) Remove areas within the Planning Equity Geography Special Use District ("PEG SUD") from the Upzoning Plan consistent with the 2022 Housing Element (File No. 251071)

(d) Remove areas in the Coastal Zone from the Upzoning Plan (File No. 251071)

(e) Adopt a Progress Requirement or "shot clock" for obtaining a building permit within a time certain of project approval (File No. 251073)

(f) Require inclusionary housing to be located nearby within ½ mile of the development (File No. 251073).

(g) Eliminate form-based density from Neighborhood Commercial Districts and ROTCs because we want family housing not dorm rooms (File No. 251073).

3. THD Urges Supervisor Melgar to Protect All Rent-Controlled Housing

We appreciate Supervisor Melgar's amendment removing rent controlled housing with three or more units but urge her to expand this amendment to exclude ***all*** rent-controlled housing with two or more units, not just three or more.

4. **Support for Supervisor Chan's Legacy Business Controls**

THD joins with Small Business Forward to support Supervisor Chan's legislation to extend the requirement for a Conditional Use Authorization for sites where a Legacy Business has been displaced. In absence of having any other tools available or financial resources to support the successful relocation of a Legacy Business within the community, the Conditional Use is an imperfect but necessary mechanism to discourage displacement of Legacy Businesses in the first place. That is why Small Business Forward supports that the extension of the CU legislation until other more effective protection measures are in place, such as commercial rent control, the right of return, and adequate relocation assistance.

5. **Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District and Funding Strategy.**

We join with REP-SF and the Council of Community Housing Organizations to demand that the SFMTA-SUD be revised to provide that these publicly owned parcels be developed for 100% affordable and social housing. Under San Francisco's state-approved Housing Element, as mandated by the state, 57% of the 36,200 new housing units proposed to be developed under the Upzoning Plan—more than 20,000 units—must be affordable to low- and very-low-income households. Yet the Upzoning Plan has no funding strategy or realistic plan to produce those affordable homes. It risks satisfying Sacramento's procedural checklist while abandoning the substance of the law: to build housing for the people who need it most.

* * * * * * *

In conclusion, THD believes that the Upzoning Plan, as proposed, threatens tenants and small businesses, pits neighborhoods against each other, and disregards decades of community-based policymaking that has built San Francisco into a resilient, vibrant city through a network of strong neighborhoods.

The proposed amendments from Supervisors Chan and Chen address these concerns by focusing on protecting tenants and rent-controlled housing citywide, supporting small businesses, and prioritizing the development of affordable housing. We urge this Committee to move these critical elements forward.

Finally, we urge this Committee to recommend that Telegraph Hill, North Beach, and the Northern Waterfront be removed from the Upzoning Plan consistent with the 2022 Housing Element adopted by the Board of Supervisors and approved by HCD.

Sincerely,

Nick Ferris, President

ccs: Supervisor Connie Chan – *connie.chan@sfgov.org*
Clerk John Carroll - *John.Carroll@sfgov.org*
Members, San Francisco Board of Supervisors - *Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org*

From: Jean Barish
To: Carroll, John (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; ChenStaff
Cc: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); ChanStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; WaltonStaff (BOS)
Subject: LUTC Meeting - Nov. 3, 2025 - Agenda Items 6 - 11
Date: Monday, November 3, 2025 4:07:31 AM
Attachments: LUTC Letter 25_11_03.docx

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

Dear LUTC Committee Members:

Attached above and pasted below is a letter regarding Agenda Items 6 - 11 on the Monday November 3, 2025 Land Use and Transportation Committee meeting.

JEAN B BARISH
711 27th Avenue San Francisco, CA 94121
jeanbbarish@hotmail.com

November 3, 2025

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Land Use and Transportation Committee
City Hall 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Re: November 3, 2025 LUTC Meeting – Agenda Items 6 - 11

Dear Committee Members;

I am the President of Planning Association for the Richmond (sfpar.org) and the Vice-President of SaveMUNI (savemuni.org), two organizations that are very concerned about the impacts of Mayor Lurie's Family Zoning Plan. I am writing on my own behalf urging you not to pass this plan as currently written.

Below are just a few of the many reasons why you should not approve this plan as currently written.

- The State's RHNA Numbers are Flawed and the Amount of New Housing Mandated by the State is Overstated
- The Plan Does Not Meet the City's Need for Affordable Housing
- The Plan Will Destroy Many Small Businesses
- Density Decontrol Throughout the Residential Neighborhoods Must be Eliminated from the Plan
- Upzoning will Significantly Impact the Quality of Life and the Environment in the Richmond and Many Other Neighborhoods
- There are No Provisions in the Plan for Adding Vital Infrastructure
- The Plan Changes the Coastal Zone and Will Irreparably Damage our Priceless Coastal Environment
- There are Alternatives to Extensive Upzoning

This plan has no substantial affordable housing mandates, and will destroy neighborhoods to enable more gentrifying luxury housing. This will further increase skyrocketing rents, evictions and homelessness. There is a gentrification crisis that is destroying San Francisco, and this plan will simply advance that plan while destroying so much that is precious in San Francisco.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units - together more than enough to fulfill state mandates. Yet instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Mayor Lurie's plan simply rearranges zoning rules, which does almost nothing to increase affordable housing, and increases the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing over-supply while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods.

Further, a serious problem with this plan is that it removes necessary hard-won Coastal protections that are very important to the safety and wellbeing of many San Franciscans, especially those of us living on the west side of the City. Any changes to the existing Coastal zone regulations should be entirely removed from this plan.

Additionally, the City Economist just released a report showing that Mayor Lurie's Family Zoning plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing. Now that the City Economist has shown that Mayor Lurie's plan won't work you must replace his plan with one that will actually work. San Francisco needs a plan that would identify how to manage existing housing approvals, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing; protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review; and produce as much housing as possible out of existing vacancies and empty office space.

Supervisors Chan and Chen have proposed amendments that reduce the harm caused by this plan. While these amendments do not solve the fundamental flaws in this plan, they are a step in the right direction and should be considered.

And we mustn't lose sight of the fact that one of the attractions of San Francisco is its magnificent beauty and spectacular views. Recently, for example, an ad from SF Travel aired on the television broadcast of Game 7 of the World Series. (https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9jlZggOV1Fg___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzpkNzFiZDJjMjZjNTY2MmU4Y2E1ZjNhZTdjZTdlNzU1ZDo3OmQ5Yjl6NDBiNjk5OGQyNmQyODE2ZDc4YjU0NzYzNjM5YjFlZDQ5YzdmOTUxOTIzOTc2YjA0Mjg0OTU4ODM5N2NkMWMzYTp0OkY6Tg) This ad should remind you of how uniquely situated and built San Francisco is. Please do not desecrate our City with an upzoning plan that will turn San Francisco into a concrete, dehumanized megalopolis.

In closing, I urge you to delete and replace the current Family Zoning Plan with one that will actually solve our housing shortage, comply with the State's mandate, satisfy the needs and demands of countless San Franciscans and preserve and protect the splendor of Baghdad by the Bay.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Jean B Barish

cc: Mayor Daniel Lurie, Supervisors C. Chan, S. Sherrill, D. Sauter, M. Dorsey, R. Mandelman, J. Fielder, S. Walton

JEAN B BARISH
711 27th Avenue San Francisco, CA 94121
jeanbbarish@hotmail.com

November 3, 2025

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Land Use and Transportation Committee
City Hall 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Re: November 3, 2025 LUTC Meeting – Agenda Items 6 - 11

Dear Committee Members;

I am the President of Planning Association for the Richmond (sfpar.org) and the Vice-President of SaveMUNI (savemuni.org), two organizations that are very concerned about the impacts of Mayor Lurie's Family Zoning Plan. I am writing on my own behalf urging you not to pass this plan as currently written.

Below are just a few of the many reasons why you should not approve this plan as currently written.

- The State's RHNA Numbers are Flawed and the Amount of New Housing Mandated by the State is Overstated
- The Plan Does Not Meet the City's Need for Affordable Housing
- The Plan Will Destroy Many Small Businesses
- Density Decontrol Throughout the Residential Neighborhoods Must be Eliminated from the Plan
- Upzoning will Significantly Impact the Quality of Life and the Environment in the Richmond and Many Other Neighborhoods
- There are No Provisions in the Plan for Adding Vital Infrastructure
- The Plan Changes the Coastal Zone and Will Irreparably Damage our Priceless Coastal Environment
- There are Alternatives to Extensive Upzoning

This plan has no substantial affordable housing mandates, and will destroy neighborhoods to enable more gentrifying luxury housing. This will further increase skyrocketing rents, evictions and homelessness. There is a gentrification crisis that is destroying San Francisco, and this plan will simply advance that plan while destroying so much that is precious in San Francisco.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units - together more than enough to fulfill state mandates. Yet instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Mayor Lurie's plan simply rearranges zoning rules, which does almost nothing to increase affordable housing, and increases the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing over-supply while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods.

Further, a serious problem with this plan is that it removes necessary hard-won Coastal protections that are very important to the safety and wellbeing of many San Franciscans, especially those of us living on the west side of the City. Any changes to the existing Coastal zone regulations should be entirely removed from this plan.

Additionally, the City Economist just released a report showing that Mayor Lurie's Family Zoning plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing. Now that the City Economist has shown that Mayor Lurie's plan won't work you must replace his plan with one that will actually work. San Francisco needs a plan that would identify how to manage existing housing approvals, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing; protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review; and produce as much housing as possible out of existing vacancies and empty office space.

Supervisors Chan and Chen have proposed amendments that reduce the harm caused by this plan. While these amendments do not solve the fundamental flaws in this plan, they are a step in the right direction and should be considered.

And we mustn't lose sight of the fact that one of the attractions of San Francisco is its magnificent beauty and spectacular views. Recently, for example, an ad from SF Travel aired on the television broadcast of Game 7 of the World Series. (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9jIZggOV1Fg) This ad should remind you of how uniquely situated and built San Francisco is. Please do not desecrate our City with an upzoning plan that will turn San Francisco into a concrete, dehumanized megalopolis.

In closing, I urge you to delete and replace the current Family Zoning Plan with one that will actually solve our housing shortage, comply with the State's mandate, satisfy the needs and demands of countless San Franciscans and preserve and protect the splendor of Baghdad by the Bay.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Jean B Barish

cc: Mayor Daniel Lurie, Supervisors C. Chan, S. Sherrill, D. Sauter, M. Dorsey, R. Mandelman, J. Fielder, S. Walton

From:	Carroll, John (BOS)
To:	"George Wooding"; Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Sciammas, Charlie (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Cooper, Raynell (BOS)
Subject:	RE: 250966, 250700, 250701 written testimony for November 3, 2025 Land Use and Transportation Committee
Date:	Monday, November 3, 2025 10:28:00 AM
Attachments:	chan amendments.docx image001.png

Thank you for your comment letter.

I am forwarding your comments to the members of the Land Use and Transportation committee, and I will include your comments in the files for these ordinance matters.

I invite you to review the entire matter on our Legislative Research Center by following the links below:

- Board of Supervisors File No. 250966

  Board of Supervisors File No. 250700

- Board of Supervisors File No. 251071

  Board of Supervisors File No. 250701

- Board of Supervisors File No. 251072

- Board of Supervisors File No. 251073

John Carroll
Assistant Clerk
Board of Supervisors
San Francisco City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415)554-4445

 Click here to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The Legislative Research Center provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation and archived matters since August 1998.

Disclosures: *Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other*

public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.

From: George Wooding <gswooding@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 2, 2025 11:28 PM
To: Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>; George Wooding <gswooding@gmail.com>
Subject: 250966, 250700, 250701 written testimony for November 3, 2025 Land Use and Transportation Committee

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

Hi John,

Please consider me a person with special needs. I am requesting early speaking for speaker comments.

My written comments are attached for your review

Land Use and Transportation committee members. Melgar

November 2, 2025

Supervisor Connie Chans amendments are vital for the mayor's family plan to succeed.

What happened to the "affordable housing" mandates? They have disappeared.

Here is what the Planning Department's new report, "Rezoning Capacity Calculations," doesn't say: under San Francisco's state-approved Housing Element, **57% of those new homes—more than 20,000 units—must be affordable** to low- and very-low-income households. That's not a suggestion; it's part of the state mandate.

The Family Zoning Plan has no funding strategy, no framework for public land, and no realistic plan to produce those affordable homes. It risks satisfying Sacramento's procedural checklist while abandoning the substance of the law: to build housing for the people who need it most. The city is relying completely on developers, grants, GOBs and subsidized funding from the MOHCD.

-developers are not building due to high land costs and the scarcity of buildable land, high interest rates and high construction costs

-There are almost no grants. Despite best efforts, The Mayors Office Of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD) is currently underfunded and has little ability to subsidize low-income housing in San Francisco.

-The CPC is currently not trying to attain more housing funding: **Affordable Housing General Obligation Bond (Prop A)**: **Approval:** On March 5, 2024, San Francisco voters approved Proposition A, a $300 million bond to finance the construction, acquisition, and rehabilitation of affordable housing. The funding is on its first tranche--$147.2M

2019 Affordable Housing GOB ($600 million). Approximately $175.9 million remains outstanding, with a final issuance under consideration for late 2025. $55M is being held for the Mercy Housing build beside Laguna Honda Hospital for a senior center.

The balance between supply and demand

San Francisco Politicians and planners don't understand economics. They believe that if they build more units, the price of housing will decrease. This is not true in San Francisco due to market conditions.

Building more houses may not lower prices if there is a simultaneous increase in demand, or if sellers are unwilling to sell for less, a phenomenon known as " downside stickiness". Other factors like high mortgage rates, rising construction costs, and localized market dynamics can also offset the downward pressure on prices that new supply would typically create.

In a basic economic model, increased supply would lead to lower prices if demand remains constant. However, a parallel increase in demand can keep prices stable or even cause them to rise, despite the new houses.

Rising demand: Population growth, wage increases, favorable demographic trends, or an influx of institutional investors can drive up demand, absorbing new inventory as it enters the market.

Pent-up demand: In areas that have historically restricted development, a sudden increase in construction can be absorbed by years of pent-up demand, causing prices to plateau rather than fall.

The main cause of higher house prices in SF is the cost of land. Buildable Land is becoming so scarce that only Subsidized affordable housing will be built. The cost of affordable housing will continue to rise

Substitutions and proposed amendments On September 30, a new version of number 250700 was substituted by Mayor Lurie, which made relatively minor zoning changes on a number of parcels. The report analysis reflects those changes

On October 21, supervisor Melgar proposed an amendment that would prohibit the use of the local program on any parcel containing more than two existing housing units which would involve the demolition of a unit subject to rent control

Also, on October 21, supervisor Sauter introduced an amendment that creates incentives for developers to replace lost commercial space As the language of these two amendments was made public last week this report does not attempt to model there economic impact.

AMENDMENT LANGUAGE

-Furthering demolition controls to protect tenants. Absolutely. Please don't forget to protect the landlords.

-Implementing Nexus studies and impact fees to ensure adequate infrastructure investment, especially given the fact the city is facing existing funding challenges to build out the emergency water firefighting system for well -resourced neighborhoods, a deficit in public transit, an increased risk of tenant and small business displacement;

The West side EWSS project is already corrupted. The City no longer wants to build Kaboda piping for high water pressure. The fire department is now building large cisterns filled with water and they are also purchasing pump trucks that will connect to other pump tracks. This will allow the fire department to purchase more fire trucks. The cisterns will be attached to the pump trucks which have a limited range. The Kubota piping would have been a much better delivery system but the fire department wanted the trucks. The West side of San Francisco is more in danger of burning than ever before.

The requested reports would be a great idea

-The Mayor's Family Plan does not require developers to build or fix infrastructure. The City will bear the full cost of repairs. This is wrong. The developer should bare the costs of their own project.

-Placing a shot clock to require developers to build within 30 months to boost housing production in the near future to meet the state mandated timeline of 2031; The Planning Department already has 70,000 stored at planning

Factors that influence review time

- **Project complexity:** The scope and size of a project are major factors in the review timeline. Simple projects may be approved more quickly "over the counter," while complex projects may involve multiple reviews and public hearings.

- **Other reviewing agencies:** Building permits must be reviewed by multiple city departments for safety and code compliance. A permit can be sent back to Planning for another review if changes are made to the plans.

- **Permit type:** The type of permit being applied for, such as a building permit, coastal zone permit, or variance, all have different review processes and timeframes.
- **Application completeness:** Incomplete applications can significantly delay the review process. An application can go through multiple rounds of resubmissions before being accepted for review

LIMITING FORM BASED DENSITY:

Density decontrol is central to the Mayors' family zoning plan. This is the worst type of density planning. A developer can now add as many residential units as they want too. An eight story building can Have thirty units or only one unit. Density decontrol was added to the Mayor's family zoning plan so that San Francisco would have more units then SB 79. This will be uncontrolled density. The city will not stop this program as San Francisco planning is desperate not to be controlled by the state of California

"

Density decontrol" was a core component of the initial **Family Zoning Plan** legislation introduced by Mayor Daniel Lurie at the Board of Supervisors on **June 24, 2025**.
The concept of density decontrol, which removes unit limits while maintaining existing height and form restrictions, was part of the plan from its formal introduction as legislation, and was also included in earlier draft proposals developed by the Planning Department under former Mayor London Breed. The legislation is currently under consideration by the Board of Supervisors.

"

Form-based density" is not an inherently negative planning concept; rather, **specific implementations of form-based codes (FBCs) may face criticisms related to how density is managed, or some residents may object to the very idea of increased density** which FBCs often facilitate.
Common criticisms or perceived negative aspects related to form-based codes and density include:

- **Community Opposition to Increased Density:** A primary objection from some local residents is that FBCs "promote density and population increases to the detriment of locals" or conflict with an existing "small-town feel". The perception of form-based codes mandating high density can lead to community pushback during the adoption process.
- **Potential for Gentrification:** By creating highly desirable, walkable communities, FBCs can inadvertently result in new developments that sell or rent at a premium, potentially pricing out lower-income residents if affordable housing provisions are not included in the code.
- **Complexity and Administration Challenges:** Form-based codes can be more complex to write and administer than conventional Euclidean zoning, requiring specialized training for planners and staff to interpret design standards objectively. This complexity can lead to confusion, increased review times, or a greater need for variances if the code is not carefully written.
- **"Locking in" Undesirable Existing Forms:** If a form-based code is based strictly on the current urban fabric of an area, it might inadvertently "lock in" low-density, car-dependent patterns, making it harder to densify those areas later if needed to address housing shortages or promote sustainability.
- **Ignoring Market Realities:** Critics sometimes argue that FBCs are overly prescriptive or ignore market demands, although proponents argue that market studies are often a key component of a well-crafted FBC. In some cases, a local market may not be able to support the specific mixed-use or retail components called for in the code.
- **Loss of Perceived "Local Control":** FBCs often streamline the approval process by making projects that meet the code "by-right" (administrative review without public hearings), which some residents or community groups may see as a reduction in public participation and control over individual projects

There should be an amendment for form based density, but San Francisco well never pass this amendment.

Thank you for your consideration.

Best Regards,

George Wooding

415 695-1393

From: T Flandrich
To: Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS)
Cc: Carroll, John (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); ChenStaff; MelgarStaff (BOS)
Subject: FAMILY ZONING PLAN AMENDMENTS: SUPPORT CHAN, CHEN AMENDMENTS
Date: Sunday, November 2, 2025 11:49:20 AM

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

1 November 2025
Dear Chair Melgar, Supervisors Chen & Mahmood,
I am writing to ask you to support the amendments made by Supervisor Chan. Most importantly, the amendment which will preserve ALL rent-controlled housing thereby continuing to have real affordable housing choices for tenants today & in the future.

While I appreciate Supervisor Melgar's attempt to carve out some rent-controlled buildings, that amendment unfortunately does not go far enough.

I also ask you to support Supervisor Chen's amendments, especially as they address affordability, to serve our needs, our goal of creating, building 100% affordable housing. Public land must be used for public good.

In 2023, our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. Protecting tenants, our existing homes and using all available public land to build 100% affordable housing, must be our achievement.

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

From:	Dave Rhody
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff
Subject:	Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701
Date:	Sunday, November 2, 2025 1:20:00 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

The City Economist just released a report showing that Mayor Lurie's 'Family Zoning' plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing.

We still have 3 months to replace the Mayor's plan with one that will work. Here's a real strategy to solve the affordable housing crisis:

- San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units - together more than enough to fulfill state mandates.

- Instead of Lurie's plan which simply moves zoning rules around like deck chairs on the Titanic, we need to focus on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so.

You need to stop negotiating mere amendments to the 'Family Zoning' plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing housing approvals, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year in a way that will fully meet state mandates.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible, instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood, and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

The Mayor's plan would build more excess housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators. Please replace the text in this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural and community integrity, with text that will truly produce affordable housing and get State bureaucrats off of San Francisco's back.

- Thank you,
Dave Rhody

SF Policy Co-Chair
Climate Reality Project

From:	Carolyn Kenady
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff
Cc:	<board@doloresheights.org>
Subject:	Oppose Mayor"s Upzoning Plan - File #250701
Date:	Sunday, November 2, 2025 4:05:58 PM

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

To the members of the Board of Supervisors -

I am Carolyn Kenady, chair of the Dolores Heights Improvement Club (DHIC) in District 8. We oppose this Upzoning Plan and urge you to amend it to address the issues below.

DHIC opposes this strategy to upzone hundreds of thousands of SF properties because it's:

- Overkill: To meet its housing mandate, San Francisco only needs to approve 36,200 additional projects by 2032. Blanket upzoning allows demolition of existing housing - which is our most affordable housing

- Doesn't produce enough affordable units: 80% of the projects needed to reach this 36K goal must be affordable housing. The affordable requirements and subsidies provided by the proposed program won't produce the required 29k affordable units.

- Not increase market production or reduce housing costs: Per SF Planning's own feasibility study, only slightly improved economic assumptions, will developers undertake market-rate multi-unit projects (1-2 BR, avg $4600 monthly.) The City Economist's impact analysis shows very little impact on rents or prices for housing. (see pages 34 - 63 of SF Planning memo to SF Planning Commissioners, dated June 26, 2025 and the City Economist's Report, page 21, October 2025)

- Displacing tenant and small businesses: in my neighborhood shopping districts - Church & 24th Streets and the Castro NCDs are proposed for 65 foot heights. Most renters and small local businesses displaced by new construction won't be able to afford the new rents. Our small local businesses that attract shoppers and tourists to our neighborhoods will be driven out.

This plan caters to developers. It does not align with our City's housing needs: keeping existing housing – our most affordable resource, preserving the historic and cultural

resources enjoyed by visitors and residents alike, and being more strategic about where to add height vs. blanket zoning large areas of our City. Please revise this plan to protect our key resources, add sufficient affordability, and use height strategically. Thank you.

Carolyn

Carolyn Kenady
carolynkenady@gmail.com
408-218-3115
http://www.linkedin.com/in/ckenady

From:	Stardust Doherty
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff; Stardust
Subject:	Public Comment: VOTE NO On Lurie"s Recipe For Housing Failure & Replace It With A Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701
Date:	Saturday, November 1, 2025 1:42:02 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

The City Economist just released a report showing that Mayor Lurie's 'Family Zoning' plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing.

We still have 3 months to replace the Mayor's plan with one that will work. Here's a real strategy to solve the affordable housing crisis.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units - together more than enough to fulfill state mandates. (Yet instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Lurie's plan simply moves zoning rules around like deck chairs on the Titanic, does almost nothing to increase affordable housing, and increases the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing over-supply [now at 150%] while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods.)

Now that the City Economist has shown that Lurie's plan won't work, it is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the 'Family Zoning' plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing housing approvals, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year in a way that will fully meet state mandates.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible, instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood, and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

The Mayor's plan would build more excess housing for the wealthy, create more

homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators. **Please REPLACE the text in this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural and community integrity, with text that will truly produce affordable housing and get State bureaucrats off of San Francisco's back.**

Thank you,

Stardust Doherty
SF 94110

From: Stephen Gorski
To: Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Heath, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); WaltonStaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); EngardioStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Lee, Mailman (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Largaespada, Jen (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); SauterStaff
Subject: Public Comment: VOTE NO on Mayor Lurie's Family Housing Plan and Replace it with a Real Affordable Housing Plan – File #250701 – Land Use and Transportation Meeting, Monday, Nov. 3, 2025, 1:30 pm
Date: Saturday, November 1, 2025 12:02:46 PM

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

To:
John.Carroll@sfgov.org ; board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org ; Myrna.Melgar@sfgov.org ; Jen.Low@sfgov.org ; MelgarStaff@sfgov.org ; connie.chan@sfgov.org ; frances.Hsieh@sfgov.org ; ChanStaff@sfgov.org ; rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org ; mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org ; Calvin.Ho@sfgov.org ; jackie.Fielder@sfgov.org ; jennifer.Ferrigno@sfgov.org ; fielderstaff@sfgov.org ; shamann.walton@sfgov.org ; Percy.Burch@sfgov.org ; waltonstaff@sfgov.org ; Chyanne.Chen@sfgov.org ; jackie.Prager@sfgov.org ; ChenStaff@sfgov.org ; Stephen.Sherrill@sfgov.org ; joel.engardio@sfgov.org ; SherrillStaff@sfgov.org ; matt.dorsey@sfgov.org ; Mailman.X.Lee@sfgov.org ; dorseystaff@sfgov.org ; bilal.Mahmood@sfgov.org ; jen.Largaespada@sfgov.org ; MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org ; Danny.Sauter@sfgov.org ; Michelle.Anderson@sfgov.org ; SauterStaff@sfgov.org

From:
Stephen J. Gorski, District 4; zip code 94116

Date: November 1, 2025

Subject: Public Comment: VOTE NO on Mayor Lurie's Family Housing Plan and Replace it with a Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701 - Land Use and Transportation Meeting, Monday, Nov. 3, 2025, 1:30 pm

Dear Supervisors,

As a District 4 San Franciscan without representation on the Board of Supervisors, I am writing to ask you to strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's Family Upzoning Plan as it currently exists. As it is now written, the Plan incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

I speak for myself, my family, and many of my neighbors to respectfully ask you to:

- Require adequate infrastructure to be built PRIOR to building any additional housing
- Refuse to allow the use of *geo grouting to harden the earth and sand beneath proposed new housing building sites as it poisons our groundwater(See geo-grouting info at end of this email.)
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

As currently written, this Plan clears the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices and the safety of the very communities they are supposed to represent.

Our far western District 4 does not have existing infrastructure to support these new high-rises, and infrastructure needs to be designed, funded and built first. Circumventing CEQA requirements in a rush to build jeopardizes our safety.

We still have three months to replace the Mayor's Plan with one that will work.
The City Economist recently released a report that shows the Mayor's Plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because **zoning changes do not produce new housing**. Therefore, it is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the Family Zoning Plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing housing approvals, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year in a way that will fully meet state mandates.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units - together more than enough to fulfill state mandates. Instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Lurie's plan just moves the zoning rules around and does little to increase affordable housing. It increases instead the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing over-supply (now at 150%) while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods.

Let us not build more excess housing for the wealthy that will create more homelessness and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to corporate real estate speculators.

Please RELACE the text in this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco homeowners, tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural, and community integrity, with text that will truly produce housing and get State bureaucrats off of San Francisco's back.

Thank you,

Stephen J. Gorski, Esq.
SF District Resident 47 years , 94116

*CEQA requires that any project involving geo-grouting that requires a discretionary approval by a public agency undergo an environmental review process to identify and mitigate potential environmental impacts.

How geo-grouting can contaminate groundwater:

- Toxic additives: Many chemical and cement-based grouts contain additives that can be toxic or carcinogenic and may leach into the surrounding groundwater.
- Drilling and installation: The process of drilling holes for grouting can create pathways for surface contaminants to travel directly into aquifers, especially if the boreholes are not sealed properly.
- Contaminant pathways: Grouting operations can create or worsen fractures in the ground, creating direct routes for contaminants to flow into groundwater sources.
- Chemical reactions: The chemical reactions that occur during the hydration of cement-based grouts can alter the chemistry of the groundwater, potentially increasing dissolved solids and changing its overall characteristics.
- Improper disposal: Improper disposal of grout waste can also lead to secondary contamination of soil and water.

Sent from my iPad

From: Judi Gonski
To: Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Meilan, Marina (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Wong, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Busch, Percy (BOS); WaltonStaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Haney, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Roos, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Sauter, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Melgoza, Abril (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Bardis, Pascal (BOS); Kaplan, Michelle (BOS); EasterStaff
Subject: Public Comment: VOTE NO on Mayor Lurie's Family Housing Plan and Replace it with a Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701 - Land Use and Transportation Meeting, Monday, Nov. 3, 2025, 1:30 pm
Date: Saturday, November 1, 2025 10:01:32 AM

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

To:
John.Carroll@sfgov.org , board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org , Marina.Meilan@sfgov.org , Jen.Low@sfgov.org , MelgarStaff@sfgov.org , connie.chan@sfgov.org , Frances.Hsieh@sfgov.org , ChanStaff@sfgov.org , rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org , mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org , Calvin.Ho@sfgov.org , Jackie.Fielder@sfgov.org , Jennifer.Ferrigno@sfgov.org , fielderstaff@sfgov.org , shamann.walton@sfgov.org , Percy.Burch@sfgov.org , waltonstaff@sfgov.org , Chyanne.Chen@sfgov.org , Jackie.Haney@sfgov.org , ChenStaff@sfgov.org , Stephen.Sherrill@sfgov.org , Lorenzo.Rosas@sfgov.org , SherrillStaff@sfgov.org , matt.dorsey@sfgov.org , Madison.B.Tam@sfgov.org , dorseystaff@sfgov.org , Abril.Melgoza@sfgov.org , Sam.Logan@sfgov.org , MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org , Danny.Sauter@sfgov.org , Michelle.Andrews@sfgov.org , EasterStaff@sfgov.org

From:
Judi Gonski, District 4; zip code 94116

Date: November 1, 2025

Subject: Public Comment: VOTE NO on Mayor Lurie's Family Housing Plan and Replace it with a Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701 - Land Use and Transportation Meeting, Monday, Nov. 3, 2025, 1:30 pm

Dear Supervisors,

As a District 4 San Franciscan without representation on the Board of Supervisors, I am writing to ask you to strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's Family Upzoning Plan as it currently exists. As it is now written, the Plan incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

I speak for myself, my family, and many of my neighbors to respectfully ask you to:

- Require adequate infrastructure to be built PRIOR to building any additional housing
- Refuse to allow the use of *geo grouting to harden the earth and sand beneath proposed new housing building sites as it poisons our groundwater (See geo-grouting info at end of this email.)
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

As currently written, this Plan clears the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices and the safety of the very communities they are supposed to represent.

Our far western District 4 does not have existing infrastructure to support these new high-rises, and infrastructure needs to be designed, funded and built first. Circumventing CEQA requirements in a rush to build jeopardizes our safety.

We still have three months to replace the Mayor's Plan with one that will work.

The City Economist recently released a report that shows the Mayor's Plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because **zoning changes do not produce new housing**. Therefore, it is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the Family Zoning Plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing housing approvals, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year in a way that will fully meet state mandates.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units - together more than enough to fulfill state mandates. Instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Lurie's plan just moves the zoning rules around and does little to increase affordable housing. It increases instead the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing over-supply (now at 150%) while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods.

Let us not build more excess housing for the wealthy that will create more homelessness and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to corporate real estate speculators.

Please RELACE the text in this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco homeowners, tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural, and community integrity, with text that will truly produce housing and get State bureaucrats off of San Francisco's back.

Thank you,

Judi Gonski
SF District Resident 47 years , 94116

*CEQA requires that any project involving geo-grouting that requires a discretionary approval by a public agency undergo an environmental review process to identify and mitigate potential environmental impacts.

How geo-grouting can contaminate groundwater:

Toxic additives: Many chemical and cement-based grouts contain additives that can be toxic or carcinogenic and may leach into the surrounding groundwater.

Drilling and installation: The process of drilling holes for grouting can create pathways for surface contaminants to travel directly into aquifers, especially if the boreholes are not sealed properly.

Contaminant pathways: Grouting operations can create or worsen fractures in the ground, creating direct routes for contaminants to flow into groundwater sources.

Chemical reactions: The chemical reactions that occur during the hydration of cement-based grouts can alter the chemistry of the groundwater, potentially increasing dissolved solids and changing its overall characteristics.

Improper disposal: Improper disposal of grout waste can also lead to secondary contamination of soil and water.

From:	lgpetty
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides; Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject:	Re: The FZP - Stop Fighting Each Other Over Capacity. Fight the RHNA"s Illegality Instead. Adopt the Humane, Protective Chan, Chen, and Melgar Amendments
Date:	Saturday, November 1, 2025 2:04:07 AM

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

Dear Land Use Committee Members and all other Supervisors,

I urged in an October 17 email letter that the Board write its own zoning plan to include strong anti-displacement protections for tenants and small businesses, with a prioritized affordable housing funding & site plan.

Thank you, Supervisors Chan, Chen and Melgar, for attempting to inject decency into the FZP.

Thank you Supervisors Chan and Chen for recognizing that the concepts of compliance and capacity can only be met through a clear-eyed lens of San Francisco's actual needs. Not through the distorted view of those who would profit from unlimited removal and replacement of people and their homes with wealthy people and impossibly costly generic "units."

Capacity and compliance are currently based on a numerical fiction... the made-up structure of "State-Mandated RHNA numbers."

We must stop fighting each other in a futile race to rack up housing unit numbers we were never meant to achieve. RHNA's were designed to be impossibly high -- setting up the City to fail -- so that the State would have a rationale to remove all locally-determined regulations via a State-imposed "builders' remedy."

The RHNA's, even if created with good intentions, have been proven irrelevant by Covid impacts, tariff and construction cost inflation, and the loss of an investor-driven economy.

Let's stop chasing this non-existent RHNA capacity holy grail. Let's turn our efforts instead toward establishing the illegality of the RHNA numbers in court.

Let's stop being afraid.

Refine and strengthen tenant and small business protection Amendments for a revised FZP in the meantime. Create a better, uniquely San Francisco zoning plan that provides mostly affordable housing and does it without destroying ourselves and our City.

Thank you for your consideration.

Lorraine Petty

D2/5 senior, renter & voter
Affordable Housing Advocate

Seniors and Tenants Advocate
Member, SFTU & SDA

From: Magick Altman
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Family Housing
Date: Friday, October 31, 2025 8:28:24 PM

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

To whom in may concern, you can usually tell when something is against the people's interest when its called "Family planning". This is a scam to get quick approval of the destruction of our neighborhoods, affordable housing and protections for small businesses. North Beach is fine. LEAVE IT ALONE. There is purpose to the so=called red tape. To make sure the people win and not the developers, who could care less about our neighborhoods.
Stop this illegal and immoral action.
Be Leery of Lurie, Money doesn't talk it Swears.
Yours in Truth,
Magick Altman

From:	Francesca Pastine
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff; Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject:	SF Supervisors Support Mayor Lurie"s Affordable Housing and SF Neighborhoods Plan
Date:	Friday, October 31, 2025 7:35:08 PM

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

Hello All,

As you may know, Mayor Lurie's *Family Housing Plan* will go before the Land Use & Transportation Committee this Monday, November 3, sometime after 2 p.m. I fully support this plan. It's time for San Francisco to take real steps toward building enough housing—especially in the low-density neighborhoods on the west side of the city.

While the City Economist, Ted Egan, recently noted that the plan alone will not meet the city's full housing mandates, it represents an essential step toward building the infrastructure we need for future growth.

Let's create a San Francisco where working-class families and future generations can afford to live and thrive.

Best,

Francesca Pastine

1183 Shotwell Street

415 596 5543

--
https://www.francescapastine.com/
www.pastineprojects.com
IN THE MAKE
http://francescapastine.blogspot.com
http://www.innermissionneighborhood.com
www.hillaryronenmission.com

Life is short
Art is long
Opportunity fleeting
Experience treacherous
Judgment difficult

Hippocrates 400 b.c.

From:	Eric Brooks
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff
Subject:	Public Comment: VOTE NO On Lurie"s Recipe For Housing Failure & Replace It With A Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701
Date:	Friday, October 31, 2025 6:18:38 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

The City Economist just released a report showing that Mayor Lurie's 'Family Zoning' plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing.

We still have 3 months to replace the Mayor's plan with one that will work. Here's a real strategy to solve the affordable housing crisis.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units - together more than enough to fulfill state mandates. (Yet instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Lurie's plan simply moves zoning rules around like deck chairs on the Titanic, does almost nothing to increase affordable housing, and increases the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing over-supply [now at 150%] while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods.)

Now that the City Economist has shown that Lurie's plan won't work, it is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the 'Family Zoning' Ordinance and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing housing approvals, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year in a way that will fully meet state mandates.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible, instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood, and diesel construction equipment, releasing major greenhouse gas emissions.

The Mayor's plan would build more excess housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and

corporate real estate speculators. **Please REPLACE the text in this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural, and community integrity, with text that will truly produce affordable housing and get State bureaucrats off of San Francisco's back.**

Thank you,

Eric Brooks, Campaign Coordinator
Our City SF and San Francisco CEQA Defenders
415-756-8844

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); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations; BOS Legislation, (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject:	74 Letters regarding File Nos. 250700, 251071; 250701, 251072, 251073; 250966; and 251071
Date:	Thursday, October 30, 2025 3:00:33 PM
Attachments:	74 Letters regarding Zoning.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached for 74 Letters regarding File Nos. 250700, 251071; 250701, 251072, 251073; 250966; and 251071.

File No. 250700: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 251071: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 250701: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 251072: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 251073: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 250966: General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 251071: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan

Sincerely,

Joe Adkins
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From:	Nick Eckenwiler
To:	Tanner, Rachael (CPC); Chen, Lisa (CPC); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Supervisors; Bonde, Aly (MYR); Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC)
Cc:	McDougall, Paul@HCD; gustavo.velasquez@hcd.ca.gov; Megan.Kirkeby@hcd.ca.gov; Coy, Melinda@HCD; shannan.west@hcd.ca.gov; Zisser, David@HCD; Lisa.Frank@hcd.ca.gov; Fidel.Herrera@hcd.ca.gov; alex.fisch@doj.ca.gov; Matthew.Struhar@doj.ca.gov; David Pai
Subject:	CalHDF Letter Regarding San Francisco's Housing Element Implementation
Date:	Wednesday, October 29, 2025 4:21:46 PM
Attachments:	San Francisco - Housing Element Rezoning Letter - 2025.10.29 (Report Attached).pdf

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

Good afternoon,

Please see attached for a letter from the California Housing Defense Fund regarding San Francisco's proposed Family Zoning Plan and the City's obligations under the Housing Element Law.

Sincerely,

--
Nicholas Eckenwiler
Staff Attorney

Oct 29, 2025

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
49 South Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94103

Re: San Francisco's Housing Element Implementation

By email: rachael.tanner@sfgov.org, Lisa.chen@sfgov.org, Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org, bos@sfgov.org, bos-supervisors@sfgov.org, aly.bonde@sfgov.org, sarah.dennis-phillips@sfgov.org

Cc: Paul.McDougall@hcd.ca.gov, gustavo.velasquez@hcd.ca.gov, Megan.Kirkeby@hcd.ca.gov, Melinda.Coy@hcd.ca.gov, shannan.west@hcd.ca.gov, David.Zisser@hcd.ca.gov, Lisa.Frank@hcd.ca.gov, Fidel.Herrera@hcd.ca.gov, alex.fisch@doj.ca.gov, Matthew.Struhar@doj.ca.gov, David.Pai@doj.ca.gov

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

The California Housing Defense Fund ("CalHDF") submits this letter to outline the City of San Francisco's legal obligations surrounding its efforts to implement its housing element. Specifically, CalHDF writes to remind the City:

1. The City must rezone as promised in its housing element – it must upzone enough to produce (not merely attain capacity for) 36,282 units based on an analytical model that assesses the probability of development for rezoned parcels under current economic conditions.
2. The City's housing element and the housing element law oblige it to reduce constraints on housing production and refrain from adding new constraints, especially in the City's efforts to satisfy its other housing element obligations.

If the City does not obey the law on these points, CalHDF stands ready to challenge the City's intransigence in court. Such a lawsuit would expose the City to penalties, including the payment of CalHDF's attorney's fees. CalHDF urges the City to avoid such needless litigation and instead comply with state law, the contours of which are explained in detail below.

The City's Proposed Rezonings Are Inadequate

The Housing Element Law (Gov. Code, §§ 65580 et seq.) establishes a clear process for the evaluation, planning, and enactment of the City's housing policy. That process has a two-part structure. In the first part, the City must adopt a housing element on a specified timeline and that meets certain requirements. In the second part, the City must implement the programs promised in its housing element. Crucially, the second step relies on the first step: what, precisely, the City must do in the second step has already been established by the housing element. (See Gov. Code, § 65583, subd. (c).) The second step is *not* a freestanding exercise in policymaking or policy analysis. (See *id.*) The policymaking and policy analysis are conducted in the first step, and the Housing Element Law leaves essentially no room to alter the results at the second step.[1]

San Francisco has completed the first step. It adopted a housing element on January 31, 2023, adhering to the substantive and procedural rules in the Housing Element Law. The California Department of Housing and Community Development ("HCD") also certified the City's adopted housing element as legally compliant, pursuant to its statutory authority. (See, e.g., Gov. Code, § 65585.) That housing element made numerous detailed commitments. These commitments include promises to rezone large areas of the City to accommodate housing growth necessary to meet demand and ease upward pressures on housing costs. (See Gov. Code, §§ 65583 [establishing standards for required rezonings]; 65583.1 [same]; 65583.2 [same].) The housing element, moreover, promised not only to rezone, but to engage in detailed analysis that would help shape the rezoning. (See Program 7.1.1 in San Francisco's Housing Element, available here.)

San Francisco is now at the second step of the process: implementing the commitments in its housing element. This includes the aforementioned rezoning and associated policy analyses. The City's proposed rezoning, however, fails to fulfill crucial aspects of housing element commitments – commitments that the City, as explained above, cannot renege on without going through a full amendment process for its housing element.

Program 7.1.1 of the City's housing element commits the City to implementing a rezoning program that "reasonably account[s] for sites' likelihood of development during the planning period using an analytical model." The housing element uses mandatory language, stating that the City "shall" build its rezoning program around such a "probability-of-development" analysis. In sum: the City must rezone to an extent that the expected number of new units that will be built after the rezoning, calculated via a robust probability-of-development analysis, meets the City's projected housing need (i.e. the

[1] If the City wishes to alter the policy analysis or programs promised by its housing element, it has an avenue to do that: it may amend its housing element according to the procedures set forth in Government Code section 65585. But the process remains a two-step process: the City must first amend its housing element, and only then can it proceed to the second step of implementing the promised housing element programs.

Regional Housing Needs Assessment, or "RHNA," allocation, plus a buffer specified in the housing element).

The current rezoning proposal does not do this. The proposal's failure is twofold. First, none of the methods the Planning Department has relied on to assess whether the proposal will satisfy San Francisco's rezoning obligation constitutes a probability-of-development analysis using an analytical model in line with Program 7.1.1 in the housing element. Second, when the City has conducted an analysis that meets the requirements of Program 7.1.1, the analysis shows the current rezoning proposal will not satisfy San Francisco's rezoning obligation.

With respect to the rezoning proposal's first failure: the City proposes three methods to project the number of new units the proposed rezoning can be expected to produce. None of the three methods measures up to the standards in Program 7.1.1.

1. The first method is the "soft sites" method, which is described in appendix B of the City's housing element. This method assumes that a site currently hosting a residential use has a two percent probability of being redeveloped with the rezoning's planned residential capacity and a site currently hosting a non-residential use has a seventy percent probability of redevelopment. Such rigid calculations based on uniform, citywide assumptions about the odds of development on thousands of very different sites are not an "analytical model" and do not "reasonably account for sites' likelihood of development" as required by Program 7.1.1. These assumptions, furthermore, are not reasonable and do not rest on any evidence. They are highly motivated guesswork, and highly motivated guesswork will not cut the mustard.

2. The second method rests on an economic model developed by a consultant. This model does not assess the likelihood of a given site's being developed under the rezoning proposal. Instead, it calculates how many units of housing are "financially feasible" on parcels throughout the City. This is not an "analytical model" that "reasonably account[s] for sites' likelihood of development" as required by Program 7.1.1. As the City well knows, property owners across the City submit permit applications for only a small portion of economically feasible new housing units, and not all of those permit applications ultimately produce actual housing units. The City attempts to address this problem by assuming – similar to the soft sites method – that two percent of sites with economically feasible new housing developments currently occupied by residential uses and thirty-five percent of other sites with economically feasible new housing developments will be developed. This is inadequate for the same reasons the soft sites method is inadequate. Moreover, this method projects only 19,000 new units of housing over the planning period – far below the 36,282 units the City must accommodate.

3. The third method involves looking at "how much of the City's overall zoning capacity has gotten built out over the years." This – again – is not an "analytical model." Nor does it look at the sites slated for rezoning under the current rezoning proposal and assess the likelihood they will produce new housing. This method is further flawed because much of San Francisco's recent increase in zoned capacity, and much of the new housing that has been built, took place on vacant sites, whereas the proposed housing element rezoning covers a broad swath of the City and comprises mostly non-vacant sites. Other problems here include unrealistically low estimates of the City's residential zoning capacity in prior years (thus inflating the share of residential zoned capacity that has been built out) and the inclusion of residential projects built under development agreements, which do not correspond to rezonings, and which were separately counted towards the City's pre-existing residential zoned capacity in the housing element.

With respect to the rezoning proposal's second failure, analytical models that would satisfy Program 7.1.1 in the housing element demonstrate that the proposed rezoning will not produce anywhere close to the required number of new units. San Francisco's City Economist recently released an analysis of the City's proposed rezoning (available at the link and appended to this letter). This analysis relies on the exact approach that San Francisco's Housing Element pledged to use: an analytical model that assesses the probability of development. (Indeed, it is the exact approach HCD suggested the city use.) The results are damning. In the **best case scenario,** San Francisco's City Economist's analytical model found that the rezoning can only be reasonably expected to produce around **14,646 units by 2045**. Less optimistic assumptions produce a forecast of only 8,504 units by 2045. This indicates the rezoning plan falls far short of what is required: being shown by an analytical model to reasonably be expected to produce **36,282 units by 2031**.

These are not minor problems. Program 7.1.1 is central to San Francisco's compliance with the Housing Element Law. The City's housing element meets the requirements of the Housing Element Law *only because* it included Program 7.1.1's commitment to rezone based on a realistic probability-of-development analysis. To be crystal clear: without Program 7.1.1, the housing element does not comply with Government Code section 65583.2, subdivision (g)(2). This is because the housing element relies on non-vacant sites to accommodate more than half of its RHNA allocation at the lower-income level, and thus the Housing Element Law requires its housing element to "demonstrate that the existing use [on each non-vacant site] does not constitute an impediment to additional residential development." (Gov. Code, § 65583.2, subd. (g)(2).) "An existing use shall be presumed to impede additional residential development, absent findings based on substantial evidence that the use is likely to be discontinued." (*Ibid.*) San Francisco's housing element does not demonstrate with substantial evidence that specific existing uses on specific sites intended to accommodate low-income housing will not impede additional residential development. Instead, the housing element commits the City, in Program 7.1.1, to rezoning in a manner that "shall

reasonably account for sites' likelihood of development during the planning period using an analytical model." That commitment is the basis of the City's compliance with Government Code section 65583.2, subdivision (g)(2). Refusing to follow through on that commitment would leave the City without any basis for compliance with the Housing Element Law on this point.[2]

CalHDF urges the City to do as the law requires. The City must adopt a rezoning that an analytical model such as the City Economists' shows can reasonably be expected to produce 36,282 new units under current economic conditions, as required by Program 7.1.1. Alternatively, the City can increase the probability of sites' development (again, according to a realistic analytical model) by adjusting non-zoning policies that constrain housing production: the City could, for example, reduce transfer taxes for residential projects, impact fees for new residential construction, or inclusionary zoning requirements. The City should not – it cannot – rely on flawed and insufficient analyses to justify its planned rezonings. Doing so violates the law.

The City Must Reduce Constraints on Housing Production, Not Add New Ones

The City's planned rezoning, although on net it adds new capacity, includes constraints on housing development that do not exist under current zoning rules. Specifically, the proposal includes minimum office densities, caps on dwelling unit size, new limits on curb cuts, and lower parking maximums. Furthermore, the City's proposed local zoning bonus program, known as the "Housing Choice–San Francisco" ("HCSF") program, imposes new limitations on residential projects' eligibility for protections and benefits under state laws, including the Statewide Density Bonus Law. While some of these constraints may be good policy, they pose a problem for two reasons.

First, the new constraints were not analyzed by the City's housing element. The Housing Element Law requires local governments to analyze governmental constraints on housing production. (Gov. Code, § 65583, subd. (a)(5).) The results of this analysis then inform the policies and programs in the housing element. (See *id.*; *id.* at subd. (c)(3); *Californians for Homeownership, Inc. v. City of Beverly Hills* (2023) Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCP00143, at p. 6, [finding planned rezonings for housing element site inventory must consider constraints identified by the housing element's constraints analysis] [opinion attached to this letter].) Because the new constraints attached to the City's rezoning proposal were not analyzed in the City's housing element, the City cannot rely on the rezoning proposal to produce as many units as it is required to unless the City analyzes the effects of the new constraints and offsets their impact on housing production.

[2] The City could address this issue by producing site-specific evidence that existing uses on non-vacant sites will not impede additional residential development, adding that evidence to a new draft of its housing element, and adopting the amended housing element. But – again – the City would have to do this before rezoning. The process of developing and adopting housing element commitments and then, separately, implementing those commitments remains a two-step process.

Second, the City's housing element explicitly recognizes this and commits the City to refrain from adding new constraints. Program 7.1.1 states: "The rezoning program … shall not add government constraints that reduce project financial feasibility as determined by an analysis prior to the rezoning enactment." Program 8.1.6 states: "[A]ny City-adopted rezoning or development controls shall not impose any new governmental constraints to the development of housing unless those increased constraints are offset by the removal or reduction of other constraints." If San Francisco wishes to establish new governmental constraints to housing production (such as making new developments ineligible for the waivers and protections offered by State Density Bonus Law), it must concurrently reduce other constraints to a degree that maintains the overall viability of new residential construction, "as determined by an analysis prior to the rezoning enactment" that assess projects' "financial feasibility." Pursuing the new constraints without offsetting them by reducing existing constraints, however, would violate the commitments in housing element programs 7.1.1 and 8.1.6 and hence violate the Housing Element Law.


As you are well aware, California remains in the throes of a statewide crisis-level housing shortage. New multifamily housing in San Francisco a public benefit: it will help satisfy demand for housing near jobs and transit, thereby reducing displacement pressure; and it will also cut down on transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions by providing housing in a major metro area, as opposed to farther-flung regions in the state (and out of state). CalHDF therefore urges the City to follow through on the commitments in its housing element, as the law requires, and obey state law in drafting and enforcing its land use regulations.

CalHDF is a 501(c)(3) non-profit corporation whose mission includes advocating for increased access to housing for Californians at all income levels, including low-income households. You may learn more about CalHDF at www.calhdf.org.

Sincerely,



Dylan Casey
CalHDF Executive Director



James M. Lloyd
CalHDF Director of Planning and Investigations

Family Zoning Plan: Economic Impact Report

Office of the Controller
Office of Economic Analysis

Items 250700 & 250701
October 29, 2025

Introduction

- Two proposed ordinances would change zoning controls to permit more housing on a large segment of San Francisco, particularly on the western half of the city. They implement changes to the Housing Element of the City's General Plan, a planning document whose revisions were adopted in 2023.
- The Ordinance in file #250700, the Zoning Map Amendment, would generally raise allowable building heights along commercial corridors and transit lines, to permit mid-rise and some high-rise development.
- The Ordinance in file #250701 implements the Housing Choice-San Francisco program, which offers an alternative to the State Density Bonus program.
- The Office of Economic Analysis (OEA) has prepared this report because the proposed legislation may have a material impact on the city's economy. This report uses a model that estimates potential new development, in order to assess economic impact. That model is not a replacement for the City's estimates of realistic capacity under Government Code § 65583.2.


Zoning Map Amendment: Key Provisions

- The Zoning Map Amendment would make changes to allowable building heights and bulk, and/or zoning districts, in over 92,000 parcels in the city.
- The vast majority are residential parcels, whose allowable heights would either remain at 40 feet, or rise to 50 or 65 feet.
- On these and many other rezoned parcels, the Housing Choice San Francisco program (described on the next page) relaxes existing controls on the number of housing units allowed on a parcel.
- Allowable heights are generally increased to 65 to 85 feet along many commercial corridors, with development along wider streets near transit stations or major lines increased to 85 feet.
- Heights above 140 feet are allowed on certain streets that currently allow high-rise development or have larger parcels, at key intersections, and near certain major transit routes and stations. The map on page 5 provides additional details.

Housing Choice San Francisco – Key Provisions

- The Housing Choice San Francisco program, or "Local Program", gives developers an alternative to the State Density Bonus.
- Many of the rezoned residential parcels are too small to be eligible for the State Density Bonus, but may achieve greater density through the use of the Local Program.
- Local Program users also gain benefits associated with housing unit mix, methods of complying with inclusionary housing requirements, rear-yard and setback requirements, broad code flexibility, and certain process changes.
- The ordinance has several other provisions, including limiting the maximum size of new residential units, reducing allowable parking, and restricting new curb cuts. These policy changes are not considered in this report.
- Additionally, the proposed ordinance gives displaced businesses the right to relocate anywhere in the city where their activity is permitted by zoning, without a conditional use permit, and waives development impact fees associated with the relocation.

Details of the Rezoning



The map to the left, from the City Planning department, indicates which parcels in the city will be rezoned, and to which heights. It reflects the plan as of July.

Gray parcels will be zoned for low-rise, 40-50 feet housing developments. This includes single-family residential zones, within which greater density will be permitted via the Local Program.

Yellow and orange parcels will be upzoned to mid-rise development of 65-105 feet.

Pink and purple parcels will have height limits ranging from 120-180 feet, and the blue and green parcels will be upzoned for high-rise development, of 240 feet or greater.

The Rezoning and the Regional Housing Needs Assessment

- Each jurisdiction in California is required to have its Housing Element be certified by the State's Housing and Community Development Department.
- Certification involves, among other things, ensuring that the City has the zoning capacity to meet the city's obligations under the State's Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA).
- RHNA is a Statewide planning process, in which future needs are forecasted for metropolitan areas, and then allocated to the individual cities and counties that administer land use planning.
- In San Francisco's case, the RHNA obligation requires the City to have realistic capacity for approximately 82,000 new housing units, at different economic levels, within an 8-year planning period ending in 2031.
- Of this 82,000 unit requirement, the City must create capacity for approximately 36,000 units.

Substitutions and Proposed Amendments

- On September 30, a new version of #250700 was substituted by Mayor Lurie, which made relatively minor zoning changes on a number of parcels. This analysis reflects those changes.
- On October 21, Supervisor Melgar proposed an amendment that would prohibit the use of the Local Program on any parcel containing more then two existing housing units, which would involve the demolition of a unit subject to rent control.
- Also on October 21, Supervisor Sauter introduced an amendment that creates incentives for developers to replace lost commercial space.
- As the language of these two amendments was made public less than one week ago, this report does not attempt to model their economic impact.

Economic Impact Factors

- When the City relaxes zoning controls, by reducing density restrictions or increasing allowable heights, more development projects will become financially feasible, and the supply of housing in the city will rise.
- This increased supply will put downward pressure on housing prices in the city. Cheaper housing benefits city residents who move within the city, and also makes San Francisco more affordable for new arrivals.
- The development of new housing also stimulates investment and employment in construction and related industries.
- The population growth associated with new housing also stimulates the local economy, by expanding the numbers of workers and consumers.
- On the other hand, the limited amount of vacant lots in the city means that new housing generally involves the loss of existing buildings, including both residential and commercial properties. This can impose relocation and other costs on residential and commercial tenants.

Estimating the Likelihood of New Housing Development

- The amount of new housing that the rezoning will produce is an important contributor to its economic impact. To estimate this, OEA refined a statistical model that it has used since 2016 to estimate the impact of policy changes on housing production in the city[1].
- The model was the result of statistical analysis of housing production in San Francisco over the 2004-2024 period. Technical details on the model are provided in the Appendix.
- The first part of the model estimates the likelihood that multifamily housing will be developed on a given parcel, in a given year. The statistical analysis found that a parcel is more likely to develop when:
  - it has smaller existing buildings (or is vacant), and is located closer to downtown.
  - its zoning allows for a greater height, makes it eligible for the State Density Bonus, and does not restrict the number of units that may be constructed.
  - housing prices are relatively high, and construction costs are relatively low, compared to other years.

Estimating the Number of Units Produced

- The second part of the model estimates the number of units that will be produced when a parcel does develop housing. Based on past experience, the statistical analysis found that a parcel developing housing will produce more units when:
  - its land area and allowable maximum height are greater;
  - it is eligible for the State Density Bonus;
  - its zoning does not restrict the number of units that may be built.
- The OEA used the first part of the model to estimate the probability that housing will be built on a parcel over the next twenty years[2]. That probability was multiplied by the estimate of housing units from the second part, to create an expected number of housing units generated for each parcel over twenty years. When this is summed across all parcels, a citywide housing total is generated.
- This method was used to create estimates of housing production under the existing zoning, and the proposed rezoning. The difference is the estimate of housing that could be produced as a result of the proposed zoning changes.


Limitations of the Housing Development Model

- The housing development model can forecast future housing development based on the city's past experience, but important caveats must be made.
- Because of data availability, not every factor that affects housing production could be included. Missing data may include features of the parcel itself, or policies that may have changed over the 2004-24 period, or vary within the aggregated zoning designations used by the model.
- Limited data also prevents the analysis of fine-grained policy changes in the proposed rezoning, such as restrictions on unit size and mix.
- Several new City and State policies that were intended to encourage housing production have been enacted in recent years, such as, for example, the City's 2023 Housing Production Ordinance (0248-23). The model may be unable to properly assess the impact of these policies in the future.
- Despite these limitations, the OEA believes this approach is well-suited to estimating housing production, for the purposes of economic impact reporting.

Future Housing Market Scenarios

- As noted earlier, the amount of housing that will be produced as a result of the rezoning, and its economic impact, will depend on future housing market conditions. This creates an additional level of uncertainty in the forecasts.
- Gauging future market conditions is further complicated by changes in the city's housing market since the COVID-19 pandemic, as described on the next page.
- To understand the scope of what could potentially happen, the OEA created two future scenarios for housing prices and costs in San Francisco.
- In a high-growth scenario, San Francisco's housing prices, relative to the U.S., return to pre-COVID levels by 2030, and grow at the city's pre-COVID rate after that. Construction costs are assumed to grow at the same rate as inflation.
- In a low-growth scenario, San Francisco's post-COVID relative housing prices are assumed to represent a "new normal," and housing prices are assumed to grow only at a national average level over the next twenty years. Construction costs are also assumed to grow at the same rate as inflation.

San Francisco and U.S. Housing Price Trends Since 2000




While San Francisco's housing has always been expensive, during the 2010s, average San Francisco condo prices rose much faster than the rest of the U.S., to as much as 5 times the typical U.S. price.

Since 2020, however, San Francisco condo prices have declined, despite rising inflation and rising U.S. condo prices. Adjusted for inflation, typical San Francisco condo prices in 2025 are 25% lower than they were in 2019.

Among other factors, the increase in remote office work during COVID has reduced the value of a residence near large office employment centers like downtown San Francisco.

Source: Zillow. Data retrieved October 1, 2025.

Housing Price Trends Within the City




Source: Zillow. Data retrieved October 1, 2025.

The reduced value of a downtown location has also shifted multifamily price patterns within the city.

Condos in neighborhoods like Downtown and South of Market have experienced inflation-adjusted price drops of more than 40% since 2016, while the Richmond and Sunset have fallen by far less.

Because most multifamily housing in the city is near downtown, but most of the proposed rezoning is not, the use of a citywide average condo price index is inappropriate. This analysis uses an average price across the 10 Zillow neighborhoods most affected by the zoning, which is somewhat higher than the citywide average.

High and Low Growth Scenario Price Forecasts




Our high-growth scenario assumes that San Francisco's housing prices, relative to the U.S., return to pre-pandemic levels by 2030, and then grow at the city's long-term average rate until 2045. This implies a rapid growth in housing prices over the next five years, of over 10% per year.

In the low-growth scenario, the post-COVID housing market represents a new normal, and San Francisco housing prices are assumed to grow only at the U.S. long-term rate at 1.8% per year, in inflation-adjusted dollars. Under this assumption, San Franciso housing prices would not recover to their pre-COVID peak, in inflation-adjusted dollars, until 2041.

Source: Zillow. 10 Neighborhoods are Buena Vista, Polk Gulch, Inner Sunset, Marina, Mission, North Waterfront, Outer Sunset, Outer Richmond, Inner Richmond, and Western Addition.

Construction Cost Trends and Scenarios



Source: Bureau of Economic Analysis; U.S. Census Bureau, "Quarterly Workforce Indicators

The housing development model uses two measures of construction costs: materials cost and local construction industry wages. They are blended into a single index for modeling purposes. Details are in the Appendix.

The cost of construction materials and local wages have grown faster than overall inflation, particularly in the last few years. In 2024, real construction materials costs were 18% higher, and real local wages were 10% higher, than they were in 2016.

In both the high-growth and low-growth scenarios, the blended index is assumed to grow at 0% (after inflation) over the 2026-2045 period. This reflects an assumption that both labor and material costs inflation will revert to the broader rate of inflation in the long term.

Housing Production Forecasts Under Current Zoning

Planning District	Historic, 2000-24	Low-Growth Scenario Forecast, 2026-45	High-Growth Scenario Forecast, 2026-45
Buena Vista	975	43	90
Central	72	192	390
Downtown	289	112	230
Ingleside	0	58	120
Inner Sunset	123	28	59
Marina	131	126	263
Mission	187	197	406
Northeast	449	136	283
Outer Sunset	15	16	33
Richmond	0	23	47
South Central	0	6	11
Western Addition	997	658	1,265
Total	3,238	1,594	3,199

Source: For historic housing production, San Francisco Planning Department

Generally, the housing development model forecasts that the current zoning will produce fewer units in the next 20 years than the numbers of units that were produced in the last 20 years.

The table to the left only covers the portion of each planning district that is in the proposed rezoning area. In total, under the current zoning, the model forecasts 1,594 or 3,199 units under the low- and high-growth forecasts, respectively, while 3,238 units were built in the same areas over the 2000-2024 period.

On the next two pages, the model's forecasts of the additional housing created by the proposed zoning is discussed.

Forecast Net Effect of the Zoning

- As shown in the table below, under the low-growth and high-growth scenarios described earlier, the rezoning would lead to 8,504 and 14,646 additional housing units, beyond what would be produced under current zoning, over the next 20 years.

Low Growth Scenario	**Units**
20-Year Housing Production, Existing Zoning	1,594
20-Year Housing Production, Proposed Rezoning	10,098
Effect of Proposed Rezoning	8,504

High Growth Scenario	**Units**
20-Year Housing Production, Existing Zoning	3,199
20-Year Housing Production, Proposed Rezoning	17,845
Effect of Proposed Rezoning	14,646

Summary by Current Zoning District

		Low-Growth			High-Growth		
Current Zoning[3]	Number of Parcels	Average Housing Likelihood, Current	Average Housing Likelihood, Proposed	Change in Housing Units	Average Housing Likelihood, Current	Average Housing Likelihood, Proposed	Change in Housing Units
RH1	43,009	0.001%	0.205%	798	0.003%	0.446%	1,731
RH2	26,486	0.002%	0.259%	576	0.005%	0.565%	1,250
RH3_RM1	13,741	0.009%	0.347%	547	0.018%	0.756%	1,186
Office/Commercial	114	0.570%	0.780%	48	1.185%	1.639%	104
Public	239	0.060%	1.450%	3,483	0.122%	2.560%	4,814
Density-Restricted Multifamily	7,079	0.336%	0.490%	3,007	0.674%	1.026%	5,467
Form-Based Multifamily	2,053	0.725%	0.725%	46	1.502%	1.502%	94
Total	92,721			8,504			14,646

The table to the left breaks out the results by current zoning. It illustrates how many rezoned parcels are in the RH-1, RH-2, and RH-3 or RM-1 residential zones, primarily in the western side of the city. These areas will see a substantial increase in the likelihood of developing housing over the next 20 years, but the chances are still small, so those 83,000+ parcels are only forecast to produce about additional 4,200 housing units by 2045, in the high growth scenario.

Fewer Public parcels (generally owned by the City or SFUSD) are larger, and more likely to develop housing through the rezoning, though this depends on the owner's decisions.

Estimating the Loss of Existing Residential Units

- To evaluate the economic impact, OEA calculated the net increase in housing units.
- In the low-growth scenario, 463 more units would be lost under the proposed zoning than under current zoning, over the 20-year forecast period. In the high-growth scenario, 1,031 more housing units would be lost. These losses represent a 6-8% of the housing units gained as a result of the rezoning. Amendments proposed on October 20th may reduce these losses, along with overall housing production.
- The loss of existing housing slightly dampens the housing price reductions associated with the rezoning, and may impose financial harms on existing tenants. City and State law heavily restricts, but does not prohibit, the eviction of tenants for the purpose of demolition, or the demolition of rent-controlled housing. These events have been quite rare in recent decades. If this occurs, tenants are entitled to relocation payments.
- Without any way to meaningfully estimate the number of evictions or demolitions of rent-controlled units, or the financial impact on tenants, this report does not attempt to quantify these potential costs.

Impacts on Housing Prices

- The responsiveness of housing prices to increases in housing supply is a function of price elasticities of supply and demand, which the OEA has estimated in past research[4].
- The elasticities imply that the proposed rezoning would lead to a -2.5% to -4.2% change in housing prices in the city, depending on the scenario. For context, those percentages are also expressed in terms of current housing prices and apartment rents.

	Low Growth Scenario	**High Growth Scenario**
Net Change in Housing Supply (units produced less demolitions)	8,041	13,615
Percentage Change in Housing Supply[5]	2.0%	3.4%
Price Elasticity of Demand	-0.7	-0.7
Price Elasticity of Supply	0.1	0.1
Percent change in housing prices	-2.5%	-4.2%
Corresponding change in condo prices[6]	-$24,500	-$41,600
Corresponding change in annual apartment market rents[7]	-$903	-$1,529

Estimating Relocation and Disruption Costs

- To account for the impact on commercial businesses, OEA estimated potential displacement costs. Details are provided in the Appendix.
- Displaced businesses are estimated to occupy commercial space ranging from approximately 1.5 to 2.6 million square feet, depending on the scenario. This displacement would occur over twenty years, and it is highly likely that the rezoning would lead to an increase in the amount of commercial space in the city.
- Annual business disruption and relocation costs range from $16 to $28 million, in today's dollars.

	Low Growth	High Growth
Loss of occupied commercial space (million sf)	1.5	2.6
Disruption-relocation cost/sf	$190	$190
Annual disruption/relocation cost (2025 $ million)	$16	$28

REMI Economic Impact Simulation

- Based on the economic impact factors described earlier, the OEA used the REMI model to measure the net economic impact of the changes associated with the high and low growth scenarios to the city's economy over the 2026-2045 period:
  - An increase in the city's residential capital stock of $8.0 billion (low growth) to $13.5 billion (high growth) in today's dollars, representing the investment associated with the new units forecast under the two scenarios. These figures are calculated by multiplying the net increase in units by average prices.
  - A reduction in citywide housing prices, reaching 2.5% (low growth) and 4.2% (high growth) by 2045.
  - Annual business disruption and relocation costs for retail businesses of $16 million (low growth) and $28 million (high growth) in today's dollars, until 2045.

Economic Impact Assessment

- In the low-growth scenario, the city's GDP would be $560 million larger, in today's dollars, on average over the 2026-45 period. Total employment in the city would be approximately 3,000 more than under the current zoning, on average over the period.
- In the high-growth scenario, the city's GDP growth would be $940 million larger than under current zoning, in 2025 dollars. Employment would be about 5,000 higher.
- Employment gains are expected in every sector, but would be most heavily concentrated in the construction, health care, real estate, and accommodations and food services sectors.
- Despite the displacement of businesses, retail trade is forecast to grow as a result of the population and economic growth created by the proposed rezoning, adding about 210 jobs in the low-growth scenario and about 350 jobs in the high-growth scenario.
- Like most major policies, the proposed rezoning involves benefits and costs. Our analysis suggests the proposed rezoning's positive impact on the city's economy, from lower housing prices and construction, outweighs the negative impact from displaced businesses, by a factor of approximately 22:1.

Conclusions

- The context for housing development in San Francisco has changed profoundly in the past several years. Since 2019, after adjusting for inflation, condo prices in San Francisco have dropped by 25%, while our blended construction cost index has risen by 8%.
- Given this starting point, an expansive rezoning effort, like the proposed Family Zoning plan, will be challenged to match the 2010s levels of new housing development in the city, even under an optimistic high-growth scenario.
- Nevertheless, under both scenarios considered in this report, the proposed rezoning would lead to a significant increase in the city's housing supply, and have broadly positive effects on housing prices and the city's broader economy. The benefits of new residential investments and lower housing prices are projected to outweigh the costs of business interruption and displacement by a factor of roughly 22:1.
- If market conditions were such that the 36,000 unit target was achieved, as a result of the rezoning, the economic impact on the city would likely be significantly more positive than the estimates in this report.

Footnotes

1. See, for example, Inclusionary Housing Working Group: Preliminary Report September 2016.
2. Three large parcels were excluded from the analysis: Laguna Honda Hospital, and the USF Main and Lone Mountain campuses. While all three parcels receive height increases in the proposed rezoning, their size and unique uses makes them unsuitable for the model. If the model could accurately estimate the amount of housing likely to occur on those parcels, the total housing estimate reported in this report would be larger.
3. These are the aggregate zoning classifications used by the model. See the Appendix for details.
4. See Potential Effects of Limiting Market-Rate Housing in the Mission.
5. Assuming 406,000 housing units in the city.
6. Based on Zillow's 2025 average condo prices for San Francisco.
7. Based on 2025 average apartment asking rents, from ApartmentList.

Appendix

- Housing Development Model
  - Methodology
  - Data sources
  - Model coefficients and performance
  - Scenario Inputs
  - Zoning District Classification
  - Logic of Applying the Model to the Proposed Rezoning
- Estimates of Business Interruption and Relocation Costs

Appendix: Housing Development Model: Methodology

- The housing development model is a two-stage step model. The first stage is a logistic regression, covering every parcel in the city, except those subject to a development agreement, over the 2004-2024 period.
- The dependent variable of the logistic regression is 1 if the parcel produced housing in a given year, and 0 otherwise. Parcels that produce housing in a given year were removed from the dataset for subsequent years. Independent variables, reflecting existing land use, market conditions, and zoning, are listed on the next page.
- The second stage is a regression model including all parcels that produced multifamily housing with more than 10 units, over the 2004-24 period. The dependent variable is the number of units produced on the parcel, and the independent variables are the parcel's "building envelope" (its area multiplied by its allowable height), and two interaction variables: the building envelope times a dummy indicating if the parcel was eligible for the State Density Bonus in that year, and the building envelope times a dummy indicating if the parcel was subject to density-restricted zoning in that year. The intercept of the model was fixed at zero.

Appendix: Housing Development Model: Methodology

- The models' coefficients were used in a forecast that calculated the log-likelihood of development for each rezoned parcel, in each of the forecast years 2026-2045, using the site and zoning information, and the price and cost assumptions for each year (shown on the next page). The log-likelihoods were converted into annual probabilities, from which a 20-year probability of development was calculated.
- The model coefficients were also used to calculate a units estimate; the 20-year probability times the units estimate is the expected number of units produced on that parcel in the 20-year forecast period.
- The forecast model was run for both the current and the proposed zoning. See the section "Logic of Applying the Model to the Proposed Rezoning" for more details.
- Three parcels were excluded from the forecast: Laguna Honda Hospital, the University of San Francisco Main Campus, and the University of San Francisco Lone Mountain Campus. While some housing may be built on those parcels in the forecast period, the model is not well-suited for large parcels with unique uses like these.

Appendix: Housing Development Model: Data Sources

Variable Description	Variable	Data Source
Height limit for site in ft	Height_Ft	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Area for lot in 1000 sq ft	Area_1000	Planning Department, Land Use Database 4/16/25
Extisting building square footage in 1000 sq ft	Bldg_SqFt_1000	Planning Department, Land Use Database 4/16/25
Residential Existing Use using ResUnits (Dummy)	Res_Dummy	Planning Department, Land Use Database 4/16/25
Historic Status for Parcel (Dummy)	Historic	Planning Department, Land Use Database 4/16/25
Real Construction Cost Variable, 2 years prior	Construc_Cost_Real	a 60/40 average of Real Construction Materials PPI and Real San Francisco MSA Construction Wages, 2016=100
10-Neighborhood Housing Price Index (Zillow), Real, 2 years prior	Zillow_Price_Real	SF real condo prices per Zillow, 2016=100
Dummy indicating eligibility for State Density Bonus, 2016 forward	SDB_2016_5Plus	Calculated from Zoning Districts
Zoning dummy: Office/Commercial	zp_OfficeComm	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Zoning dummy: Density Restricted Multifamily, RTO = Form Based	zp_DRMulti_RTO	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Zoning dummy: Form Based Multifamily, RTO = form based	zp_FBDMulti_RTO	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Zoning dummy: Industrial / Production, Distribution & Repair	zp_PDRInd	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Zoning dummy: Public/Open Space	zp_Public	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Zoning dummy: Redevelopment Area	zp_Redev	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Zoning dummy: Residential 2-Family (2 Units per Lot)	zp_RH2	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Zoning = Residential 3-Family or Res Mixed (1/800 sqft)	zp_RH3_RM1	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Planning District dummy variables	DIST_<District Name>	Planning District from Assessor's Secured Roll DB

Appendix: Logistic Regression Coefficients

Variable Description	Variable	Coeff	StdErr	WaldChiSq	Prob>Chi Sq
Intercept	Intercept	(1.6226)	1.2829	1.5998	0.2059
Height limit for site in ft	Height_Ft	0.0017	0.0007	4.9693	0.0258
Area for lot in 1000 sq ft	Area_1000	0.0049	0.0009	30.6563	0.0000
Envelope Area in 1000 sq ft (area/1000*ht/10)	Env_1000_Area_Height	0.0002	0.0001	5.0369	0.0248
Extisting building square footage in 1000 sq ft	Bldg_SqFt_1000	(0.0023)	0.0007	10.7241	0.0011
Residential Existing Use using ResUnits (Dummy)	Res_Dummy	(0.8231)	0.1222	45.3669	0.0000
Historic Status for Parcel (Dummy)	Historic	(1.0378)	0.1271	66.6847	0.0000
Real Construction Cost Variable	Construc_Cost_Real	(0.0992)	0.0129	58.8929	0.0000
SF Housing Price Index (Zillow), Real	Zillow_Price_Real	0.0143	0.0053	7.1326	0.0076
Dummy for State Density Bonus, 5+ Unit Sites, 2016 forward	SDB_2016_5Plus	0.6303	0.1608	15.3724	0.0000
Zoning = Office/Commercial	zp_OfficeComm	4.2634	0.4873	76.5337	0.0000
Zoning = Density Restricted Multifamily, RTO = Form Based	zp_DRMulti_RTO	4.2450	0.4523	88.0989	0.0000
Zoning = Form Based Multifamily, RTO = form based	zp_FBDMulti_RTO	5.0508	0.4640	118.4768	0.0000
Zoning = Industrial / Production, Distribution & Repair	zp_PDRInd	3.4115	0.4790	50.7257	0.0000
Zoning = Public/Open Space	zp_Public	1.2491	0.8385	2.2190	0.1363
Zoning = Redevelopment Area	zp_Redev	4.5361	0.4999	82.3213	0.0000
Zoning = Residential 2-Family (2 Units per Lot)	zp_RH2	0.2674	0.6672	0.1607	0.6885
Zoning = Residential 3-Family or Res Mixed (1/800 sqft)	zp_RH3_RM1	1.3187	0.6064	4.7289	0.0297

Appendix: Logistic Regression Coefficients (Continued)

Variable Description	Variable	Coeff	StdErr	WaldChiSq	Prob>Chi Sq
District = South Bayshore	DIST_SBayshore	(1.4824)	0.3179	21.7380	0.0000
District = Bernal Heights	DIST_BernalHts	(1.7011)	0.6087	7.8100	0.0052
District = South Central	DIST_Scentral	(1.7307)	0.3867	20.0267	0.0000
District = Central	DIST_Central	(1.1523)	0.3353	11.8102	0.0006
District = Buena Vista	DIST_BuenaVista	(2.5369)	1.0188	6.2010	0.0128
District = Northeast	DIST_Northeast	(1.4171)	0.2539	31.1439	0.0000
District = Western Addition	DIST_WestAddition	(0.6831)	0.2362	8.3630	0.0038
District = South of Market	DIST_SOMA	(0.0756)	0.1903	0.1579	0.6911
District = Inner Sunset	DIST_InnerSunset	(1.6187)	0.4882	10.9939	0.0009
District = Richmond	DIST_Richmond	(2.8019)	0.5355	27.3716	0.0000
District = Ingleside	DIST_Ingleside	(1.8670)	0.4925	14.3711	0.0002
District = Outer Sunset	DIST_OuterSunset	(2.6147)	0.6098	18.3867	0.0000
District = Marina	DIST_Marina	(1.2492)	0.3253	14.7457	0.0001
District = Mission	DIST_Mission	(1.0938)	0.2380	21.1176	0.0000

Omitted Variables for Groups of Dummy Variables:

Omitted zoning = RH1

Omitted district = Downtown

Appendix: Units Regression Coefficients

Variable Description	Variable	Coeff	St Error	T-Stat
Simple building envelope (area/1000 * ht/10)	Env_1000_Area_Height	0.4252	0.0159	26.72
State Density Bonus * Simple Bldg Envelope (5+ Unit Sites, 2016 forward)	SDB_2016_5Plus_EnvFull	0.4385	0.0389	11.28
Simple Bldg Envelope only if density-restricted	Zoning_DR_EnvFull	(0.1601)	0.0174	(9.22)

Note: Model removes largest 5% (Positive and Negative) residual outliers

Appendix: Model Performance

Logistic Regression	
Number of Observations	3,369,573
Number with Dependent Variable = 1	422
Pseudo R-Square	0.000611
Max Rescaled R-Square	0.244596

Units Regression	
Number of Observations	383
R-Sq	0.867779
Adj R-Sq	0.866735
Dependent Mean Value	81.87206
Standard Error of Regression	48.40184

Appendix: Zoning Classifications

- The table below shows the correspondence between the City's zoning districts, and the aggregate zoning variables in the model.

Zoning Variable	Zoning Districts
zp_RH1	C-2/RH-1(D); RH-1(D)/C-2; C-M/RH-1; M-1/RH-1; NC-1/RH-1; NC-1/RH-1/RH-2; NC-2/RH-1; NC-2/RH-1(D); NC-3/RH-1; NCD/RH-1; NCD/RH-1(D); NC-S/RH-1; NCT-OCEAN/RH-1(D); NCT/RH-1(D); P/P-W/RH-1; P/RH-1; P/RH-1(D); P/RH-1/RH-1(D); P/RH-1/RH-2; RH-1; RH-1(D); RH-1(D)/NC-2; RH-1(D)/RH-1; RH-2/RH-1; RH-2/RH-1(D); RH-1(D)/RH-2; RH-1(D)/RM-1; RH-1(S); RH-1/C-M; RH-1/M-1; RH-1/NC-1; RH-1/NC-2; RH-1/NC-3; RH-1/NC-S; RH-1/RH-1(D); RH-1/RH-2; RH-1/RH-2/RM-1; RH-1/RM-1; RM-1/RH-1; RH-3/RH-1
zp_RH2	NC-1/RH-1/RH-2; P/RH-1/RH-2; RH-2/RH-1; RH-2/RH-1(D); RH-1(D)/RH-2; RH-1/RH-2; RH-1/RH-2/RM-1; M-1/RH-2/RM-1; MUR/RH-2; NC-1/RH-2; NC-2/RH-2; NC-3/RH-2; NCD/RH-2; NC-S/RH-2; NCT-GLEN PARK/RH-2; NCT-OCEAN/RH-2; NCT/RH-2; P/RH-2; P/RM-1/RH-2; RH-2; RH-2/NC-1; RH-2/NC-2; RH-2/NC-3; RH-2/RH-3; RH-2/RM-1; RM-1/RH-2; RH-2/RM-2; RM-2/RH-2; RH-2/RM-3; RM-3/RH-2; RH-3/RH-2
zp_RH3_RM1	RH-1/RH-2/RM-1; M-1/RH-2/RM-1; P/RM-1/RH-2; RH-2/RH-3; RH-2/RM-1; RM-1/RH-2; RH-3/RH-2; RH-1(D)/RM-1; RH-1/RM-1; RM-1/RH-1; RH-3/RH-1; C-2/RH-3; C-2/RM-1; C-2/RM-1/RM-4; C-M/RM-1; HP-RA/RM-1; M-1/RM-1; M-2/RH-3; NC-1/RM-1; RM-1/NC-1; NC-2/RH-3; NC-2/RM-1; NC-3/RH-3; NC-3/RM-1; NCD/RH-3; NCD/RH-3/UPR MARKET; NCD/RH-3/UPR MARK; NCD/RH-3/VALENCIA; NCD/RM-1; NCD/RM-1/SACRAMENTO; NCD/SACRAMENTO ST; NCD/SACRAMENTO/RM-1; NCD/RM-1/SACRAMEN; NCT-DIVISADERO/RH-3; NCT-DIVISADERO/RM-1; NCT/RH-3; NCT/RM-1; P/PM-R/RM-1; P/RH-3; P/RM-1; PM-MU2/PM-OS/PM-R/RM-1; PM-R/RM-1; RH-3; RH-3/C-2; RH-3/HAYES; RH-3/M-2; RH-3/NC-2; RH-3/RM-1; RM-1/RH-3; RH-3/RM-2; RM-2/RH-3; RH-3/RM-3; RM-3/RH-3; RH-3/RSD; RH-3/VALENCIA; RM-1; RM-1/C-M; RM-1/C-M/M-1; RM-1/NC-3; RM-1/RM-2; RM-1/RM-3; RM-1/RM-4; RM-1/SACRAMENTO
zp_OfficeComm	C-2/RH-3; C-2/RM-1; C-2/RM-1/RM-4; C-M/RM-1; RH-3/C-2; RM-1/C-M; RM-1/C-M/M-1; C-2/RH-1(D); RH-1(D)/C-2; C-M/RH-1; RH-1/C-M; C-2; C-2/M-1; C-2/M-1/P; C-2/P; C-3-G; C-3-G/C-3-R; C-3-G/C-M; C-3-G/RC-4; C-3-O; C-3-O(SD); C-3-O(SD)/P; C-3-O(SD)/TB DTR; C-3-O/C-3-O(SD); C-3-O/C-3-R; C-3-O/C-3-S; C-3-O/C-3-S/P; C-3-O/TB DTR; C-3-R; C-3-S; C-3-S/P; C-M; C-M/M-1; CMUO; CMUO/MUR; CMUO/P; MUO; NCD/C-2; P/C-3-R; RM-3/C-2; RM-4/C-2; WMUO

Appendix: Zoning Classifications (Continued)

Zoning Variable	Zoning Districts
zp_DRMulti_RTO	NC-2/P; NC-3/P/RM-3; NCD/P; NC-S/P; P/NC-S; P/NC-2; P/RC-4; P/RM-2; P/RM-3; C-2/RM-1/RM-4; C-3-G/RC-4; NCD/C-2; RM-3/C-2; RM-4/C-2; NC-1/RM-1; RM-1/NC-1; NC-2/RH-3; NC-2/RM-1; NC-3/RH-3; NC-3/RM-1; NCD/RH-3; NCD/RH-3/UPR MARKET; NCD/RH-3/UPR MARK; NCD/RH-3/VALENCIA; NCD/RM-1; NCD/RM-1/SACRAMENTO; NCD/SACRAMENTO ST; NCD/SACRAMENTO/RM-1; NCD/RM-1/SACRAMEN; RH-3/HAYES; RH-3/NC-2; RH-3/RM-2; RM-2/RH-3; RH-3/RM-3; RM-3/RH-3; RH-3/RSD; RH-3/VALENCIA; RM-1/NC-3; RM-1/RM-2; RM-1/RM-3; RM-1/RM-4; RM-1/SACRAMENTO; NC-1/RH-1/RH-2; NC-1/RH-2; NC-2/RH-2; NC-3/RH-2; NCD/RH-2; NC-S/RH-2; RH-2/NC-1; RH-2/NC-2; RH-2/NC-3; RH-2/RM-2; RM-2/RH-2; RH-2/RM-3; RM-3/RH-2; NC-1/RH-1; NC-2/RH-1; NC-2/RH-1(D); NC-3/RH-1; NCD/RH-1; NCD/RH-1(D); NC-S/RH-1; RH-1(D)/NC-2; RH-1/NC-1; RH-1/NC-2; RH-1/NC-3; RH-1/NC-S; 24TH-MISSION; 24TH STREET- NOE VALL; 24TH-NOE; BROADWAY; BROADWAY NEIGHBORHOOD; C-2/RM-4; CASTRO STREET NEIGHBO; CASTRO; CCB; CRNC; CR-NC; CRNC/CVR; CR-NC/CVR; CRNC/RM-4; CVR; DTR/RC-4; FILLMORE; HAIGHT; HAIGHT STREET NEIGHBO; HAYES; HAIGHT STREET NEIGHBO; INNER CLEMENT; INNER CLEMENT STREET; INNER SUNSET; INNER SUNSET NEIGHBOR; M-1/NC-2; M-1/RM-2; M-1/RSD; NC-1; NC-1/RM-2; NC-1/RM-3; NC-2; NC-2/M-1; NC-2/NC-3; NC-3/NC-2; NC-2/RM-3; NC-2/RM-4; NC-3; NC-3/RC-4; NC-3/RM-3; NC-3/RM-4; NCD; NCD/; NCD/24TH STREET- NOE VALL; NCD/24TH STREET-; NCD/24TH-MISSION; NCD/24TH-NOE; NCD/24TH-NOE-VALLE; NCD/24TH-NOE-VALLEY; NCD/BROADWAY; NCD/BROADWAY NEIG; NCD/BROADWAY NEIGHBORHOOD; NCD/CASTRO; NCD/CASTRO STREET; NCD/CASTRO STREET NEIGHBO; NCD/EXCELSIOR OUTER MISSI; NCD/EXCELSIOR OUT; EXCELSIOR OUTER MISSI; NCD/FILLMORE; NCD/HAIGHT; NCD/HAIGHT STREET; NCD/HAIGHT STREET NEIGHBO; NCD/HAYES; NCD/HAYES NCT; NCD/HAYES NCT/RTO; NCD/INNER CLEMENT; NCD/INNER CLEMENT STREET; NCD/INNER SUNSET; NCD/INNER SUNSET NEIGHBOR; NCD/IRVING STREET NEIGHBO; NCD/IRVING STREET; NCD/IRVING; IRVING STREET NEIGHBO; NCD/JAPANTOWN NEIGHBORHOO; NCD/JAPANTOWN NEI; JAPANTOWN NEIGHBORHOO; NCD/JUDAH STREET NEIGHBOR; NCD/JUDAH; NCD/JUDAH STREET; JUDAH STREET NEIGHBOR; NCD/NC-1; NCD/NC-2; NCD/NC-3; NCD/NCT; NCD/NO BEACH; NCD/NORIEGA STREET NEIGHB; NCD/NORIEGA STREE; NCD/NORIEGA; NCD/NORTH BEACH NEIGHBORH; NCD/NORTH BEACH N; NCD/NORTH BEACH; NCD/NORTHBEACH; NCD/NORTH BEACH/RM-1; NCD/NORTHBEACH/RM-1; NCD/OUTER CLEMENT; NCD/OUTER CLEMENT STREET; NCD/OUTER CLEMENT STREET; NCD/PACIFIC; NCD/PACIFIC AVENU; NCD/PACIFIC/RM-3; NCD/PACIFIC;RM-3; NCD/PACIFIC AVENUE NEIGHB; NCD/POLK; NCD/POLK STREET N; NCD/POLK STREET NEIGHBORH; NCD/POLK/RC-3; NCD/POLK/RC-4; NCD/RC-3; NCD/RESIDENTIAL- HOUSE, O; NCD/RESIDENTIAL-; NCD/RM-2; NCD/RM-3; NCD/RM-3/PACIFIC; NCD/RTO; NCD/SACRAMENTO; NCD/SACRAMENTO STREET NEI; NCD/TARAVAL STREET NEIGHB; NCD/TARAVAL STREE; NCD/TARAVAL; NCD/UNION; NCD/UNION STREET; NCD/UNION STREET NEIGHBOR; NCD/UPPER FILLMORE NEIGHB; NCD/UPPER FILLMOR; NCD/UPPER FILLMORE; NCD/UPPERFILLMORE; NCD/UPPER MARKET STREET N; NCD/UPPER MARKET; NCD/UPR MARKET NC; NCD/UPR MARKET; NCD/UPR MARKET NCT; NCD/UPR MARKET NCT/; NCD/VALENCIA; NCD/WEST PORTAL; NCD/WEST PORTAL A; NCD/WEST PORTAL AVENUE NE; NCD/BAYVIEW; NCD/COLE VALLEY; NCD/CORTLAND AVENUE; NCD/GEARY BOULEVARD; NCD/GEARY BOULEVA; NCD/GEARY BOULEVARD/RH-2; NCD/GEARY BOULEVARD/RM-1; NCD/INNER BALBOA STREET; NCD/INNER BALBOA S; NCD/OUTER BALBOA STREET; NCD/ OUTER BALBOA STREET; NCD/OUTER BALBOA S; NCD/LOWER HAIGHT STREET; NCD/LOWER HAIGHT S; NCD/LOWER HAIGHT STREET/RH-3; NCD/LOWER POLK STREET; NCD/MISSION BERNAL; NCD/INNER TARAVAL STREET; NCD/INNER TARAVAL; NCD/SAN BRUNO AVENUE; NCD/LAKESIDE VILLAGE; NCD/LAKESIDE VILLAG; NC-S; NC-S/PM-R; NC-S/RM-3; NCT-DIVISADERO/RM-3; NCT/RM-3; NCT/RM-4; NO BEACH; OUTER CLEMENT; POLK; RC-3; RC-3/POLK; RC-3/RM-3; RC-4; RC-4/NC-3; RC-4/RH DTR; RC-4/RM-4; RED/SLR; RM-2; RM-2/M-1; RM-2/NC-1; RM-2/NC-2; RM-2/NO BEACH; RM-2/RM-3; RM-2/RM-4; RM-3; RM-3/NC-1; RM-3/NC-2; RM-3/NC-3; RM-3/NC-S; RM-3/RC-3; RM-3/RM-4; RM-4; RM-4/CR-NC; RM-4/NC-2; RM-4/NC-3; RM-4/RC-4; RSD; RSD/SLR; SACRAMENTO; SLR; SSO; UNION; UPR MARKET; VALENCIA; WEST PORTAL

Appendix: Zoning Classifications (Continued)

Zoning Variable	Zoning Districts
zp_Public	C-2/M-1/P; C-2/P; C-3-O(SD)/P; C-3-O/C-3-S/P; C-3-S/P; CMUO/P; P/C-3-R; P/RM-1/RH-2; P/PM-R/RM-1; P/RH-3; P/RM-1; PM-MU2/PM-OS/PM-R/RM-1; P/RH-1/RH-2; P/RH-2; P/P-W/RH-1; P/RH-1; P/RH-1(D); P/RH-1/RH-1(D); Remove; HP-RA/M-1/M-2/P; HP-RA/M-2/P; M-1/M-2/P; M-1/P; M-2/MB-OS; M-2/MB-RA/P; M-2/P; MB-O; MB-O/MB-RA; MB-OS; MB-RA/P; MUG/P; NC-2/P; NC-3/P/RM-3; NCD/P; NC-S/P; NCT/P; NCT-3/P; NCT-3/RTO; P; P/C-3-O(SD); P/M-1; P/M-2; P/MISS BAY S PL; P/MISS BAY S PLN; P/MUR; P/NC-S; P/NC-2; P/PDR-2; P/PM-OS; P/PM-OS/PM-R; P/P-W; P/RC-4; P/RM-2; P/RM-3; P/TB DTR; P/RTO-C; P, RTO-C; PM-CF; PM-CF/PM-OS; PM-CF/PM-OS/PM-R; PM-MU1/PM-OS; PM-MU2/PM-OS/PM-R; PM-OS; PM-OS/PM-R; PM-OS/PM-R/PM-S; PM-OS/PM-S; Public
zp_FBDMulti_RTO	DTR/RC-4; NCD/HAYES NCT; NCD/HAYES NCT/RTO; NCD/NCT; NCD/RTO; NCD/UPR MARKET NCT; NCD/UPR MARKET NCT/; NC-S/PM-R; NCT-DIVISADERO/RM-3; NCT/RM-3; NCT/RM-4; RC-4/RH DTR; RED/SLR; P/PM-R/RM-1; PM-MU2/PM-OS/PM-R/RM-1; MUG/P; NCT/P; NCT-3/P; NCT-3/RTO; P/MUR; P/PM-OS/PM-R; P/TB DTR; P/RTO-C; P, RTO-C; PM-CF/PM-OS/PM-R; PM-MU1/PM-OS; PM-MU2/PM-OS/PM-R; PM-OS/PM-R; PM-OS/PM-R/PM-S; C-3-O(SD)/TB DTR; C-3-O/TB DTR; CMUO/MUR; NCT-DIVISADERO/RH-3; NCT-DIVISADERO/RM-1; NCT/RH-3; NCT/RM-1; PM-R/RM-1; MUR/RH-2; NCT-GLEN PARK/RH-2; NCT-OCEAN/RH-2; NCT/RH-2; NCT-OCEAN/RH-1(D); NCT/RH-1(D); DTR; DTR/M-1; M-1/RH DTR; M-2/MR-MU; M-2/P70-MU; MB-RA/MR-MU; MR-MU; MUG; MUG/RED; MUR; NCT; NCT-DIVISADERO; NCT-FOLSOM; NCT-GLEN PARK; NCT-HAYES; NCT-HAYES/RTO; NCT-HAYES/RTO-1; NCT-MISSION; NCT-UPPER MARKET; NCT-UPPER MARKET;; NCT-UPPER MARKET/RH-2; NCT-UPPER MARKET/RH-3; NCT-OCEAN; NCT-SOMA; NCT/NCT-3; NCT/RCD; NCT/RED-MX; NCT/RTO; NCT/RTO-M; NCT/UMU; NCT-1; NCT-2; NCT-3; NCT-3/NCT-HAYES; RTO-1/NCT-3; RTO/NCT-3; P70-MU; PDR-1-D/UMU; PDR-1-G/UMU; PM-MU1; PM-MU1/PM-R; PM-MU2/PM-R; PM-MU2; PM-R; RCD; RED; RED-MX; RED-MX/WMUG; RH DTR; RH DTR/SB-DTR; RH DTR/TB DTR; RTO; RTO-1; RTO/NCT; RTO-1/RTO-C; RTO-C; RTO-M; SB-DTR; SPD; TB DTR; UMU; WMUG
zp_PDRInd	DTR/M-1; M-1/RH DTR; M-2/MR-MU; M-2/P70-MU; PDR-1-D/UMU; PDR-1-G/UMU; M-1/NC-2; M-1/RM-2; M-1/RSD; NC-2/M-1; RM-2/M-1; C-2/M-1/P; HP-RA/M-1/M-2/P; HP-RA/M-2/P; M-1/M-2/P; M-1/P; M-2/MB-OS; M-2/MB-RA/P; M-2/P; P/M-1; P/M-2; P/PDR-2; C-2/M-1; C-M/M-1; RH-1/RH-2/RM-1; M-1/RH-2/RM-1; M-1/RM-1; M-2/RH-3; RH-3/M-2; M-1/RH-1; RH-1/M-1; HP-RA/M-1; HP-RA/M-2; M-1; M-1/M-1; M-1/M-2; M-1/PDR-1-B; M-1/PDR-2; M-2; M-2 (MB); M-2/MB-RA; M-2/PDR-2; M-2/SLI; MISS BAY S PLN/M-2; MISS BAY S PL; MISS BAY S PLN; MISS BAY S PLN/M-; PDR-1; PDR-1/PDR-2; PDR-1-B; PDR-1-B/PDR-2; PDR-1-D; PDR-1-G; PDR-2; SALI; SLI; SLI/M-2
zp_Redev	HP-RA/M-1/M-2/P; HP-RA/M-2/P; M-2/MB-RA/P; HP-RA/M-1; HP-RA/M-2; M-2/MB-RA; MISS BAY S PLN/M-2; MISS BAY S PL; MISS BAY S PLN; MISS BAY S PLN/M-; MB-RA/MR-MU; MB-O/MB-RA; MB-RA/P; P/MISS BAY S PL; P/MISS BAY S PLN; HP-RA/RM-1; HP-RA; MB-RA; MISS BAY N RED; MISS BAY N RED PLN; MISS BAY N RED PL; MISS BAY S RED; MISS BAY S RED PLN; MISS BAY S RED PL

Appendix: Logic of Applying the Model

- This section of the appendix describes in more detail how the model was used to produce estimates of future housing production.
- For the existing zoning (“baseline”), the application of the model is straightforward. Current zoning was encoded using the zoning classification on the previous page, and current allowable height was used as the height variable in the logistic regression, and to calculate building envelope in the units regression.
- For the proposed rezoning (“policy”), the logic used was as follows: based on the units regression, each 1000 square feet of building envelope results in 0.42 units. The State Density Bonus adds an additional 0.44 units. Parcels that elect to use the Local Program therefore need to accommodate at least 0.44 additional units per 1000 square feet of envelope if developers are to choose this option. For parcels where the Local Program was more desirable, and on parcels that are ineligible for the SDB, because their zoning and size prevents them from building more than 5 units, the Local Program was applied. For all other parcels the SDB was used.

Appendix: Logic of Applying the Model (Continued)

- Probabilities and units for any parcel using the State Density Bonus were calculated by:
  - In the logistic regression, using the first new height in the rezoning table for Height_Ft and in the Env_1000_Area_Height calculation.
  - In the units regression, using the first new height in the rezoning table to calculate Env_1000_Area_Height;
  - Incorporating the SDB_2016_5Plus_EnvFull effect;
  - Incorporating the Zoning_DR_EnvFull if applicable (i.e. the parcel is density-restricted.

Appendix: Logic of Applying the Model (Continued)

- Probabilities and units for any parcel using the Local Program were calculated by:
  - In the logistic regression, setting zp_FBDMulti_RTO = 1, to account for the relaxation of density controls in the Local Program;
  - In the logistic regression, using the second new height in the rezoning table for Height_Ft and in the Env_1000_Area_Height calculation.
  - In the units regression, using the second new height in the rezoning table to calculate Env_1000_Area_Height;
  - In the units regression, removing the SDB_2016_5Plus_EnvFull effect;
  - In the units regression, removing the Zoning_DR_EnvFull effect.

Appendix: Business Disruption / Relocation Costs

- The analysis makes the following assumptions about business disruption and relocation costs:
  - Lost space will be 10% vacant, so 90% of the loss represents the loss of occupied space.
  - Lost business net income (for 6 months of disruption): $5/occupied square foot.
  - Fixed labor costs (for 6 months): $10/occupied square foot.
  - Moving costs and build-out of space at new premises: $175/occupied square foot

Staff Contact

Ted Egan, Ph.D., Chief Economist ted.egan@sfgov.org

From:	Jane Natoli
To:	paul.mcdougall@hcd.ca.gov
Cc:	gustavo.velasquez@hcd.ca.gov; melinda.coy@hcd.ca.gov; Zisser, David@HCD; megan.kirkeby@hcd.ca.gov; shannan.west@hcd.ca.gov; Frank, Lisa@HCD; Herrera, Fidel@HCD; matthew.struhar@doj.ca.gov; david.pai@doj.ca.gov; alex.fisch@doj.ca.gov; Annie Fryman; Tanner, Rachael (CPC); Chen, Lisa (CPC); Sonja Trauss; matt@caforhomes.org; senator.wiener@senate.ca.gov; Severiano.Christian@sen.ca.gov; Mohtashemi, Raayan; David Broockman; Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Supervisors; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Bonde, Aly (MYR); Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC)
Subject:	SF YIMBY"s letter on the City Economist"s report
Date:	Wednesday, October 29, 2025 4:13:34 PM
Attachments:	SF YIMBY FZP Letter October 29 2025.pdf

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

Hello,

We are writing to urgently draw your attention to the just released report from the City Economist that shows San Francisco's rezoning will not meet our state housing requirements. Please see our attached letter, and let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you,

--
Jane Natoli (she/her)
San Francisco Organizing Director
415-335-9950



Check out everything we achieved in 2024!

Paul McDougall, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Mayor Daniel Lurie
San Francisco Board of Supervisors (re: file #250700)
October 29, 2025

We write to urgently draw your attention to **an analysis the City of San Francisco ("SF") released that finds that its own rezoning plan would violate state law.** The Family Zoning Plan ("FZP") is a significant step forward, but the city's analysis found that it will not meet the city's Housing Element's 36,282-unit requirement. **According to the city's own numbers, state law requires the city to conduct additional rezoning beyond the FZP.**

As a reminder, in 2022, the California Department of Housing and Community Development ("HCD") suggested that, instead of a traditional sites inventory, SF instead pledge to assess the capacity of its rezoning using the method from its underutilized sites analysis (a model called BlueSky, which estimates the likelihood of development). Housing Element Program 7.1.1 thus committed that SF's rezoning "shall reasonably account for sites' likelihood of development during the planning period using an analytical model."

SF's August submission to HCD revealed that SF still had not done so (see Appendix). HCD thus instructed SF that "As part of Program 7.1.1 and using analytical models to account for a site's likelihood of development in the planning period, the city should continue to explore additional and multiple methods and make adjustments as appropriate."

Today, SF did so: its City Economist reported that he used an updated version of the BlueSky analytical model—the same method HCD originally suggested SF use—to estimate the number of units the FZP will likely develop. **He reported that, in the best case scenario, the City's analytical model finds that the FZP is only likely to develop 14,646 units by 2045, far less than the 36,282 required by 2031** under 7.1.1. In other words, **using the exact method HCD suggested SF use, the City itself has found that its rezoning plan does not meet Program 7.1.1's requirements, and is around 10 times too small.**

Gov. Code § 65588(e)(4)(C)(iii) states, "If a jurisdiction…fails to complete the required rezoning within the time period required, the jurisdiction's adopted housing element shall be subject to" the housing element decertification process. Thus, **if SF fails to expand its plan, HCD will be legally obliged to begin the decertification process**.

We encourage HCD to offer SF guidance about how to bring its proposed rezoning into compliance, building on HCD's recent guidance to the city to "make adjustments as appropriate" when more analysis was made available. For example, using recent changes in state law (e.g., SB 131, SB 79), additional rezoning or policy changes that supplement the FZP (e.g., reduced fees and exactions) could be passed within months. Given the timeline required for decertification, HCD could reasonably offer SF up to six months before the builders' remedy would apply to fully complete its "required rezoning" through such a supplement.

Confirming that SF must rely on the City Economist's updated BlueSky analytical model to assess the rezoning's capacity, as well as the actions taken to satisfy Program 8.1.5 (the "circuit breaker"), would also be consistent with HCD's recent direction to the city to "us[e] conservative assumptions…that facilitate the highest housing outcomes."

SF's actions risk paving a path for other cities to evade state law. In particular, rather than "demonstrat[ing] that the existing use [on each non-vacant site] does not constitute an impediment to additional residential development" (Gov. Code, § 65583.2(g)), cities will be tempted to follow SF: promise in a Housing Element to provide this evidence later in the form of statistical analysis—but then ignore what this evidence shows when rezoning.

Best regards,

Salim Damerdji
Volunteer Lead, San Francisco YIMBY

Jane Natoli
San Francisco Organizing Director,
YIMBY Action

CC: Gustavo Velasquez, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Megan Kirkeby, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Melinda Coy, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Shannan West, California Department of Housing and Community Development
David Zisser, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Lisa Frank, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Fidel Herrera, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Alex Fisch, California Department of Justice
Matthew Struhar, California Department of Justice
David Pai, California Department of Justice
Annie Fryman, SPUR
Aly Bonde, Office of Mayor Daniel Lurie
Sarah Dennis-Phillips, Rachael Tanner, and Lisa Chen, San Francisco Planning
Sonja Trauss, YIMBY Law
Matt Gelfand, Californians for Homeownership
Senator Scott Wiener

Appendix: Why the Planning Department's methods do not satisfy the Housing Element's requirement to "reasonably account for sites' likelihood of development during the planning period using an analytical model"

The San Francisco Planning Department's August 1 submission to HCD contained three analyses of the capacity provided by its rezoning. None of these analyses satisfy Program 7.1.1's commitment to "reasonably account for sites' likelihood of development during the planning period using an analytical model." The below details why each of the Planning Department's methods do not satisfy this requirement. Indeed, a closer look at the Planning Department's analyses suggests conclusions that are in line with the City Economist's finding that the rezoning is insufficient.

"Soft Sites Method"

Under this method, the vast majority of the rezoning's capacity is from sites without existing residential uses (but that largely have other uses). The Planning Department assumes that 70% of these sites will be developed to their maximum capacity during the planning period. This 70% assumption is not "reasonabl[e]" (and certainly not "conservative" like the city claims):

1. In San Francisco, fewer than 70% of entitled projects are ultimately developed — making it implausible that 70% of all sites without residential use will be developed, even those where no interest has been expressed in development or discontinuing existing uses. As another comparison, the Terner Center found that only 8.6% of LA's very best sites are developed over 5 years (versus SF's 70% assumption across a huge number of sites).
2. These sites largely do have other non-residential uses which make their development especially improbable. For example, the first page of SF's parcel list includes 1201-05 Columbus Avenue, a 3-story Travelodge in Fisherman's Wharf. The city assumes there is a 70% chance that properties like this will be redeveloped during the planning period.
3. The city's related assertion that 2% of sites with existing residential uses will be redeveloped during the planning period is similarly made without evidence.

This approach also allows the city to evade complying with GC 65583.2(g)'s requirement that the city provide substantial evidence that existing uses on "lower income" sites are likely to be discontinued during the planning period. The city has not provided site-specific evidence supporting their assertion that most sites with existing non-residential uses will be developed during the planning period. The lack of site-specific evidence would not be a problem if the city had provided statistical evidence (i.e., had statistically estimated what percent of these sites will have their existing use discontinued during the planning period based on historical data, as action 7.1.1 promises). But the Planning Department simply provides no evidence whatsoever that 70% of sites with existing non-residential uses will be developed, either site-specific or

statistical. This 70% figure is simply fabricated — not from "an analytical model," and it is not at all "reasonable."

"Citywide Capacity Method"

This method calculates what share of the city's remaining zoned capacity was developed annually over the last 18 years (2005-2023). It then assumes the new capacity created by the rezoning will be developed at a similar annual rate.

While reasonable in theory, there are several errors and problems with how the Planning Department is implementing this approach that make it not "reasonabl[e]" in practice:

1. The city has two versions of this approach, each with errors:
    a. The primary version (with "exclusions") divides citywide development by the amount of capacity on only a subset of parcels. This overstates the rate at which capacity historically translates into development because less capacity is considered despite all development being considered. This is like computing the average grades of all students in a class by adding up all students' grades but then dividing this total by half the number of students there are in the class.
    b. The city describes another version of the method that measures capacity on all parcels but uses Planning entitlements to measure development; during this period there were 90K entitlements but only 53K building permits. Using entitlements to measure development overstates the historical development rate, as in San Francisco many entitlements are never developed (in part due to constraints the city places on development).
2. The city's statistic that 53K units were constructed citywide 2005-2023 includes development from development agreements (DAs). By counting historical DA development when computing the rate at which historical zoned capacity is developed, the city therefore assumes that the rezoning will produce new DA development during this planning period. This is unreasonable, as DAs do not result from (re)zoning. Furthermore, the city's housing element already counted expected development from DAs during the planning period in its claims of existing capacity.
3. Parcels where projects have been proposed but have not received permits are excluded from the city's calculation of its historical capacity; this leads the city to underestimate how much historical capacity it had, and therefore overstate the development rate of its capacity.
4. The new rezoned capacity is also less developable than the existing remaining capacity. Specifically, according to the city's Bluesky model (the model it used for its underutilized sites analysis), the new capacity is about 20% less likely to be developed. This is because, for example, rezoned capacity is 3x more likely to be on sites with an existing residential use than existing capacity. It's therefore not entirely reasonable to assume that the city's historical rate of development will manifest for the new capacity.

5. The Planning Department is relying on its UrbanSim tool to measure its remaining zoned capacity (313K). But the city's housing element (Sites Inventory Appendix B2 p. 4) gives a much larger number for this (572K), as do our own calculations. Insofar as the city is now understating how much capacity it has, it is therefore overstating the rate at which that capacity has been developed. We have asked for data that would help us understand this discrepancy, but the city has indicated that its UrbanSim tool is unable to provide the underlying data that supports this 313K calculation.

When addressing the first four errors and issues above, and when using the city's housing element's estimate that the city has 572K units of capacity remaining (see point 5), the historical development rate is 0.4% and the adjusted capacity of the rezoning is therefore 10K units.

"Financial Feasibility Method"

The Planning Department has contracted with UrbanSim to estimate whether development will be economically feasible on rezoned parcels. While this analysis is welcome, there are several problems with this approach:

1. Totaling the amount of economically feasible development does not "account for sites' likelihood of development." Historically, only a fraction of economically feasible units are actually developed, and some research practitioners have advised us that there is nearly an order of magnitude difference between the two.
2. The Planning Department's economic assumptions are not "reasonabl[e]": the Department assumes that construction costs, interest rates, and developer return expectations will drop without providing evidence. It also assumes rents will jump. The Department justifies these optimistic assumptions by asserting that it is only responsible for making housing feasible to develop under better economic conditions than are likely during this planning period — but action 7.1.1 commits to providing enough capacity to make 36K units likely developed during this planning period. Furthermore, the city's poor economic environment for development reflects the city's constraints on development that Housing Element Law is supposed to remediate. I.e., the fact that the city so heavily constrains development makes more rezoning (and changes to its other policies) necessary, and cannot be ignored when considering the appropriate scope of actions to accommodate development.
3. The Department's submission describes a flawed approach for using UrbanSim's output to account for the likelihood of development: asserting that 2% of economically feasible projects will occur on sites with existing residential uses and 35% of economically feasible projects will occur on sites with other non-residential uses. These assumptions are not based on any evidence and, for the same reasons we described in the context of the "soft sites" method, are not reasonable.
4. After applying this flawed approach for accounting for the likelihood of development, the Planning Department nevertheless finds that only 19K units will be developed during the planning period. This is short of the 36K required by action 7.1.1. The Planning

Department argues that this is acceptable because the method must only demonstrate sufficient capacity for meeting the city's 16K RHNA shortfall in the Moderate and Above-Moderate income categories. But action 7.1.1 makes no reference to separate by-category targets, it simply states that the rezoning must "accommodate… approximately 36,282 new units." Furthermore, the Department's argument is also belied by the Housing Element Law and the No Net Loss Law, both of which contemplate development of market-rate and mixed-income projects on "lower income" sites (GC 65583.2(c) & (h); GC 65863(c)(2)).

From:	BOS Legislation, (BOS)
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS)
Cc:	BOS Legislation, (BOS)
Subject:	FW: Public Comment – 875 Lombard St (Technical Map Correction, Files 250700 / 250701)
Date:	Monday, October 27, 2025 9:17:48 AM
Attachments:	Exhibit A – 875 Lombard St Height Correction Map.pdf

From: Kenneth Kim <ken.ei.kim@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 27, 2025 9:15 AM
To: CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>; BOS Legislation, (BOS) <bos.legislation@sfgov.org>
Cc: Andrews, Michelle (BOS) <michelle.andrews@sfgov.org>; SauterStaff <SauterStaff@sfgov.org>
Subject: Public Comment – 875 Lombard St (Technical Map Correction, Files 250700 / 250701)

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

Dear Commission Secretary and Supervisors,

I support the Expanding Housing Choice / Family Zoning proposal and request a technical map correction for 875 Lombard Street (Block 0073, Lot 017B, APN 0073017B).

My parcel is shown as 40//40-R-4, while the immediately adjacent parcel (APN 0073018) and all parcels directly across Lombard Street are 40//50-R-4, all within RM-1. The attached Exhibit A illustrates a single-parcel discontinuity.

Extending the 40//50-R-4 Local Program Height one parcel west to include 875 Lombard would not change the underlying use (it remains RM-1) but would:

• restore consistent streetwall and block-face form,

• support gentle-density objectives in RM-1 under the Local Program framework, and

• add incremental Housing Element capacity without altering neighborhood character.

Thank you for considering this technical correction for inclusion in the final map clean-ups for Files 250700 / 250701.


Sincerely,

Kenneth Kim

Owner – 875 Lombard Street, San Francisco, CA 94133

917-891-1805 | ken.ei.kim@gmail.com

Attachment: Exhibit A – 875 Lombard St Height Correction Map.pdf


San Francisco Planning
Expanding Housing Choice (Proposed Zoning Map)
Legend
Info
Layers
Imagery
PDF
Help
Legend
Rezoning September 2025
Ordinance (Board File 250700 - v3)
Proposed Local Program Height Limits (September 2025)
40'
50'
65'
85'
105'
120'
130'
140'
160'
180'
240'
250'
300'
350'
875 LOMBARD ST, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNI…
Search result
Proposed Height District (September 2025)
Zoom to
Parcel 0073017B
Block 0073
Lot 017B
Proposed Local Program Height 40//40-R-4
Proposed Base Height 40
Existing Height District 40-X
Supervisor District 3
Existing Zoning District RM-1
Proposed Zoning District No change
All opposite parcels:
40//50-R-4 Local Program Height
0073017B – 40//40-R-4
875 Lombard
0073018 -40//50-R-4
869 Lombard
875 Lombard St (0073017B) – Single-parcel discontinuity in proposed Local Program Height (40//40-R-4 vs. 40//50-R-4 adjacent)
Source: San Francisco Planning Department – Expanding Housing Choice (Proposed Zoning Map, Sept 2025).
Esri Community Maps Contributors, California State Parks, © OpenStreetMap, Microsoft, Esri, TomTom, Garmin, SafeGraph, GeoTechnologies, Inc, METI/NASA, USGS, Bureau of Land Management, EPA, NPS, US Census Bureau, USDA, USFWS
Powered by Esri

From: Tamila Wong
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 8:02:32 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Tamila Wong
tamilawong@yahoo.com
106 Byxbee St
San Francisco , California 94132

From: shelbyville500@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Shelby Campbell
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Saturday, October 25, 2025 1:32:37 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan resident, I oppose parts of Mayor Lurie's plan. Residents deserve the opportunity to have more input in the process.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees. Together, these plans prioritize the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent.

I provided my comments to the Planning Department's proposed upzoning of the Sunset. I was very much in support of the upzoning of transportation corridors that run perpendicular to the ocean, with two exceptions:
1. Consider not upzoning past Sunset Blvd or maybe as far as 44th Avenue on these corridors, to preserve the coastal environment of the outer Sunset.
2. Strongly oppose high rises at the beach. If you grant an exception for the investor on Sloat, you will set a precedent for a row of high rises at the beach, destroying the open space and coastal environment that defines the Outer Sunset.

We hope you will take the neighborhood's comments into consideration in making decisions about our community.

Sincerely,
Shelby Campbell
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: Vivienne Hay
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Saturday, October 25, 2025 12:56:06 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Vivienne Hay
vivienne.l.hay@gmail.com
1495 Golden Gate Avenue, Apt 207
San Francisco, California 94115

From: eugenemccarthy63@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Eugene McCarthy
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Saturday, October 25, 2025 8:44:26 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Eugene McCarthy

From: Sophia Hagy
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 24, 2025 4:32:17 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

To whom it may concern,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more

than ever!

Sincerely,
Sophia Hagy
San Francisco community member and Paraeducator for SFUSD

Sophia Hagy
sophiahagy@gmail.com
1302 York Street
San Francisco, California 94110

From: ROMALYN SCHMALTZ
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 3:05:32 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Romalyn Schmaltz

ROMALYN SCHMALTZ
romalynschmaltz@gmail.com
740 Union St
San Francisco, California 94133-2747

From: Kate Blumberg
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 2:10:33 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan. I live in a rent-controlled apartment in D10. Over the 24 years we have lived here, we have seen the incredible benefits that more housing can bring to support a thriving local business community and a more walkable and vibrant neighborhood. But only do the small business districts sprinkled throughout our neighborhoods need more homes to thrive, the citizens of San Francisco need more homes to provide the flexibility and affordability that can help us stay in this great city even if our circumstances change.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes in every corner of our city — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

I know there are several amendments proposed, some of which make sense and others which would weaken the plan. I especially support providing funds and resources to small businesses to help them weather change and incentives for larger family units to be built. While in theory I like the idea of any incentive to get builders building, I don't think a strict time clock would help in these turbulent times.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Kate Blumberg
kate@acmetron.com
2002 22nd. St
San Francisco, California 94107-3204

From: Ted.Hexter@proton.me
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 2:03:34 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Ted.Hexter@proton.me
1670 Market Street Apt 68
San Francisco, California 94102

From: elizbreilly@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Elizabeth Reilly
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 1:40:40 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Elizabeth Reilly
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: Cheryl Meeker
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 12:58:52 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Do not be manipulated into destroying rent controlled units and small businesses with this zoning change.

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the

private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Cheryl Meeker
cherylmeeker@gmail.com
1296 Haight St Apt 28
San Francisco, California 94117

From: rout.rishav@gmail.com
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 11:19:39 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Rishav Rout

rout.rishav@gmail.com
1075 Valencia St, Apt 1
San Francisco, California 94110

From: sayuri.anya@gmail.com
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 10:00:25 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

sayuri.anya@gmail.com
38 Tacoma St
SAN FRANCISCO, California 94118

From: alvatenebrae@gmail.com
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 9:53:16 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning plan will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis. It will accelerate displacement, enrich developers, and prioritize luxury units over homes for working people. Without significant amendments, this plan will make the housing crisis worse, not better.

There is a way forward that meets State density requirements while protecting renters, preserving small businesses, and delivering truly affordable housing. Any upzoning plan must include these transformative policies. Establish an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to guarantee a minimum of 50% genuinely affordable homes on large opportunity parcels. Protect all 100,000 rent-controlled homes – representing 200,000 people – from this plan. Our elected officials have already prioritized preserving people's homes.

Require more, not fewer, affordable units. Reject any scheme to swap BMR homes for market-rate units. Raise the BMR inclusionary requirement to 20% on-site so that new construction actually benefits working San Franciscans. Build for families. Require 50% of units to be 2-3 bedrooms with communal living spaces. Protect small businesses. Prohibit demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses. Require developers to cover relocation costs starting at $150k and provide turn-key "warm shell" improvements for displaced tenants.

Ensure workers who build our city receive a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements across all projects. Protect public space and our coast. Prevent the privatization or development of protected waterfront land. Go beyond the Mayor's plan. Push a real affordable housing financing strategy. Leverage state and federal support instead of relying on private developers or Downtown donors.

San Francisco's housing crisis is a product of systemic inequality. It is time for bold, people-first policies that confront developers' greed, protect working people, and ensure housing is a right, not a commodity. We need leadership that will fight for the city's residents, not developers' profits.

alvatenebrae@gmail.com
1177 Market St Apt 1432
San Francisco, California 94103

From: slpretti@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sharon Pretti
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 9:12:17 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

I've lived in the Richmond district for over 30 years. These changes would be devasting to renters like me, to seniors, and to families living and working in SF. This proposed plan is NOT a viable way to create affordable housing. It is reckless and harmful and will leave many people without housing. Also, I think it's reprehensible to put small businesses at risk. Neighborhood communities and small businesses are what define SF, NOT luxury high rises designed for the wealthy.

PLEASE work to scale back this very dangerous upzoning plan.

Sincerely,
Sharon Pretti
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: Charlie Musoff
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: All Eyes on the Mayor's RV Ban - No Tows Before Housing!
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 9:11:21 AM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to strongly protest the implementation of Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on oversize vehicle parking. RV residents, advocates, and media are all reporting exactly what we all feared: a rushed, inadequate rollout that clears the way for the Mayor to pursue his true goal of reducing visible poverty no matter the human cost.

Many longtime San Francisco RV residents were not included in the May 31st, 2025 count of vehicles that the City used to create the refuge permit eligibility list. Appeals are cumbersome and require large amounts of documentation and a five-day wait for a response - all done against an only month-long timeline before tows take place. The City has also arbitrarily tightened appeal requirements - going from requiring proof of residence at any time before May 31st, to an arbitrary window between March and May 2025.

Some permits are being issued, but outreach has been utterly inadequate, with RV residents just two blocks away from HOT team events unaware they're occurring. Into these gaps, a patchwork of groups, including RV residents, the Coalition on Homelessness and DSA SF members, are stepping up to try to ensure eligible residents get permits. We can't - and shouldn't - have to do this work against a manufactured deadline of November 1st.

To prevent irreparable harm to our neighbors living in RVs, this is what we're demanding:

1. Provide transparent reporting on the program before tows take place, including permits issued, appeal statistics, number of RV residents who attended outreach events, and number and type of housing offers made to RV residents.
2. Have outreach workers go door to door to issue permits to all RV residents currently on the permit eligibility list. RV residents already on the permit eligibility list should be automatically given permits. Until all permits have been issued, have SFMTA workers validate if an oversize vehicle is permit-eligible using license plate numbers before ticketing / towing.
3. Delay implementation of the November 1st towing deadline. If tows occur, ensure multiple warnings are given before towing vehicles. until permits can be issued.
4. Restore the original time window for appeals eligibility - documents showing an RV resident was present before May 31st, 2025 should be honored by the City. Expand the acceptable documents list to include Additional acceptable documents Acceptable documents must include enrollment at SFUSD or childcare, letters from employers, enrollment in benefits or Coordinated Entry, letters from medical or social service providers that residents you are receiving services in SF, or pictures/videos of vehicle with geolocation and time stamps (e.g. Google Maps streetview).

5. Issue short-term permits for RV residents currently appealing their permit status or with appeal hearings scheduled once the 2-hour parking limit goes into effect.
6. Provide direct, real-time support in troubleshooting appeals (not just a web portal), including establishing a permanent physical location, run by HSH or another department, for RV residents to ask questions.
7. For appeals, SFMTA must also cross reference anyone's ineligibility with already existing parking and tow records. Rather than putting the onus on RV residents to find a ticket record, the SFMTA should provide the record when someone is appealing.
8. Ensure housing offers that are given to permit recipients are provided in writing, and that residents have a transparent, well-documented system for refusing offers that don't work for them without losing their refuge permits.
9. Have family providers do mobile Coordinated Entry registration at city information sessions for RV residents.
10. For residents that accept an offer of temporary shelter, continue to provide a refuge permit or alternative parking for their vehicle until a permanent housing offer is made.

Our City owes RV residents more than a month of chaotic bureaucracy, inaccurate AI, and half-hearted outreach before towing their homes. Thank you for your attention and action.

Sincerely,

Charlie Musoff
charliemusoff@gmail.com
507 Bartlett St
San Francisco, California 94110

From: mary@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of MARY THOMAS
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 8:47:05 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS WE WILL NEVER HAVE ENOUGH AFFORDABLE HOUSING UNLESS YOU RAISE THE FEE DEVELOPERS HAVE TO PAY IF THEY OMIT THE 15% AFFORDABLE HOUSING... THE CURRENT FEES ARE NOT HIGH ENOUGH AND JUST BURRIED IN THE SALE PRICE OF UNITS AND GIVES SAN FRANCISCANS WHO NEEED LOW INCOME HOUSING NO HOPE... JUST MORE RISING COSTS OF HOUSING - DO THE MATH

Sincerely,
MARY THOMAS
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: Olivia Page
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 11:22:31 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Olivia Page

Olivia Page
oliviaindigopage@gmail.com
780 Shotwell St
San Francisco , California 94110

From: jeanettercool@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jeanette Cool
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 10:21:16 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Jeanette Cool
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: Nick DeRenzi
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: All Eyes on the Mayor's RV Ban - No Tows Before Housing!
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 9:33:04 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to strongly protest the implementation of Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on oversize vehicle parking. RV residents, advocates, and media are all reporting exactly what we all feared: a rushed, inadequate rollout that clears the way for the Mayor to pursue his true goal of reducing visible poverty no matter the human cost.

Many longtime San Francisco RV residents were not included in the May 31st, 2025 count of vehicles that the City used to create the refuge permit eligibility list. Appeals are cumbersome and require large amounts of documentation and a five-day wait for a response - all done against an only month-long timeline before tows take place. The City has also arbitrarily tightened appeal requirements - going from requiring proof of residence at any time before May 31st, to an arbitrary window between March and May 2025.

Some permits are being issued, but outreach has been utterly inadequate, with RV residents just two blocks away from HOT team events unaware they're occurring. Into these gaps, a patchwork of groups, including RV residents, the Coalition on Homelessness and DSA SF members, are stepping up to try to ensure eligible residents get permits. We can't - and shouldn't - have to do this work against a manufactured deadline of November 1st.

To prevent irreparable harm to our neighbors living in RVs, this is what we're demanding:

1. Provide transparent reporting on the program before tows take place, including permits issued, appeal statistics, number of RV residents who attended outreach events, and number and type of housing offers made to RV residents.
2. Have outreach workers go door to door to issue permits to all RV residents currently on the permit eligibility list. RV residents already on the permit eligibility list should be automatically given permits. Until all permits have been issued, have SFMTA workers validate if an oversize vehicle is permit-eligible using license plate numbers before ticketing / towing.
3. Delay implementation of the November 1st towing deadline. If tows occur, ensure multiple warnings are given before towing vehicles. until permits can be issued.
4. Restore the original time window for appeals eligibility - documents showing an RV resident was present before May 31st, 2025 should be honored by the City. Expand the acceptable documents list to include Additional acceptable documents Acceptable documents must include enrollment at SFUSD or childcare, letters from employers, enrollment in benefits or Coordinated Entry, letters from medical or social service providers that residents you are receiving services in SF, or pictures/videos of vehicle with geolocation and time stamps (e.g. Google Maps streetview).

5. Issue short-term permits for RV residents currently appealing their permit status or with appeal hearings scheduled once the 2-hour parking limit goes into effect.
6. Provide direct, real-time support in troubleshooting appeals (not just a web portal), including establishing a permanent physical location, run by HSH or another department, for RV residents to ask questions.
7. For appeals, SFMTA must also cross reference anyone's ineligibility with already existing parking and tow records. Rather than putting the onus on RV residents to find a ticket record, the SFMTA should provide the record when someone is appealing.
8. Ensure housing offers that are given to permit recipients are provided in writing, and that residents have a transparent, well-documented system for refusing offers that don't work for them without losing their refuge permits.
9. Have family providers do mobile Coordinated Entry registration at city information sessions for RV residents.
10. For residents that accept an offer of temporary shelter, continue to provide a refuge permit or alternative parking for their vehicle until a permanent housing offer is made.

Our City owes RV residents more than a month of chaotic bureaucracy, inaccurate AI, and half-hearted outreach before towing their homes. Thank you for your attention and action.

Sincerely,

Nick D

Nick DeRenzi
nickderenziphoto@gmail.com
2808 Golden Gate Ave
San Francisco, California 94118

From: Cecily Gardner
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 8:00:28 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Cecily Gardner
gardner.cecily@gmail.com
3627 21st St
San Francisco , California 94114