

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**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:** File No. 250887 - Driveways - 2 letters  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 3, 2026 12:11:06 PM  
**Attachments:** [2 Letters 250887 Driveways.pdf](#)

---

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the attached 2 letters, from members of the public and various organizations, regarding:

File No. 250887 - Ordinance amending the Planning Code to permit parking of up to two operable vehicles, not including boats, trailers, recreational vehicles, mobile homes, or buses, in driveways located in required front setbacks, side yards, or rear yards; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and making findings of public necessity, convenience, and welfare pursuant to Planning Code, Section 302.

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](mailto:richard.lagunte@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://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:** [Kieran Farr](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\): Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#)  
**Cc:** [alicia.johnbaptiste@sfgov.org](#); [daniel.adams@sfgov.org](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Opposition to Proposed Ordinance File #250887 (Driveway Parking)  
**Date:** Monday, February 2, 2026 2:39:52 PM  
**Attachments:** [Re\\_Opposition to Proposed Ordinance File #250887 \(Driveway Parking\).pdf](#)  
[Re\\_Opposition to Proposed Ordinance File #250887 \(Driveway Parking\).pdf](#)

---

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

Greetings,

Please find attached a letter from the Sierra Club opposing the proposed ordinance File #250887 (Driveway Parking)

Kieran Farr  
Sierra Club San Francisco Group  
Executive Committee Member, At Large



Serving Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin and San Francisco counties

February 2, 2026

To: Mayor **Daniel Lurie**, Board of Supervisors

CC:

**Alicia John-Baptiste**, Chief of Infrastructure, Climate, and Mobility

**Dan Adams**, Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

**Re: Opposition to Proposed Ordinance File #250887 (Driveway Parking)**

---

The Sierra Club San Francisco Group, representing 5,500 members city-wide, opposes the proposed ordinance (File #250887) that would allow parking in driveways located in front setbacks. We urge the Board of Supervisors to reject this ordinance or significantly amend it to address our concerns.

Currently, driveways in front setbacks may only be used to access a garage or other permitted parking. This ordinance would eliminate that restriction, allowing driveways to serve as standalone parking pads for up to two vehicles—even when they lead nowhere. The ordinance would also allow such parking pads to remain after garage-to-ADU conversions, when current law requires driveway removal.

We have the following concerns:

**Environmental Impact.** The existing law was enacted decades ago to prevent front yards from being paved over for parking - a practice that destroys trees, harms biodiversity, and increases impermeable surfaces that contribute to flooding. These problems have only grown more urgent. Transportation is the single largest source of CO2 emissions in California, with personal vehicles comprising the largest share. This ordinance would create potentially tens of thousands of new legal parking spaces, and research demonstrates that increased off-street residential parking [leads to higher car ownership](#) and vehicle miles traveled at the expense of sustainable transportation modes.

**No Environmental Review.** The city claims this is not a CEQA project because it results in no direct or indirect change to the physical environment. This is plainly incorrect given the ordinance's potential to dramatically increase paved surfaces and car storage capacity across the city. Proceeding without environmental review limits the ability of both the public and

decisionmakers to understand the magnitude of the environmental impact and make informed choices. It may also be illegal.

**Pedestrian and Bicycle Infrastructure.** When garages are converted to ADUs, current law requires driveway removal—creating opportunities to plant sidewalk trees, remove curb cuts, restore curbs to public use, repair sidewalks to accessible conditions without cross slopes, and make protected bike lanes more feasible. This ordinance would eliminate those benefits. Under current law residents often choose to illegally park on their driveways and store personal items in a garage instead of converting it to an ADU (as a way to preserve private parking). However, the answer is not to permit driveways to remain as car parking when converting garages to ADUs. It is to enforce current law that driveway parking is illegal, even if there is a garage present.

**Disability Access.** While parking that blocks sidewalks would technically remain illegal, this ordinance could muddy enforcement and make violations more common. Sidewalk obstruction is a serious access issue for disabled San Franciscans, and it reduces quality of life for all pedestrians.

If the Board is unwilling to reject the ordinance outright, we urge the following amendments:

- Limit the allowance to existing driveways only, prohibiting newly created parking pads
- Require that driveways still lead to permitted parking elsewhere, preserving the requirement that ADU conversions remove driveways
- Close the loophole that appears to allow parking pads of unlimited width
- Consider a time-limited enforcement deferral rather than permanent repeal, allowing homeowners who receive complaints to adjust their practices

We are facing a climate emergency that demands immediate action. Facilitating additional car storage runs counter to San Francisco's goals of reducing greenhouse gas emissions and promoting sustainable transportation. We urge you to oppose this ordinance.

Sincerely,

Charles Whitfield Chair, San Francisco Group Sierra Club

**From:** [Scott Feeney](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [Walton\\_Shannan \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Gluckstein, Lisa \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** Tuesday's Item 25, Permitting Parking in Driveways: Vote No  
**Date:** Monday, February 2, 2026 9:17:47 AM

---

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

Dear President Mandelman and Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to **not pass #250887, Permitting Parking in Driveways**, item 25 on your Tuesday, February 3rd agenda, but to hold it until legally required environmental review can be done, flaws in the language fixed, and alternatives considered.

### **Increase in Vehicle Miles Traveled Requires CEQA Review**

I understand this legislation intends to be a "common-sense" fix for a law — against parking in one's front setback — that is not widely known or enforced. But by creating tens of thousands of new legal parking spaces overnight, the legislation would increase the incentives for car ownership, and thereby increase vehicle miles traveled (VMT).

A Planning Commissioner had the same conclusion, saying at an October 23rd, 2025 hearing, "I think it's gonna incentivize people maybe getting a car and parking there 'cause there's even more spaces." That is a foreseeable physical change to the environment resulting from a discretionary action by public officials. It therefore requires an environmental review under CEQA, yet the Planning Commission erroneously determined this ordinance not to be a CEQA project. For this board to affirm that determination, in my opinion, would be legally indefensible.

This is not just an academic legal matter: Such an increase in car ownership and VMT, compared to not passing this legislation, would hurt progress toward our City's sustainability goals, increase congestion, and exacerbate air pollution that disproportionately impacts equity neighborhoods.

### **ADU Provision Hurts Tree Canopy, Sidewalk Quality, Bike Lane Feasibility, and Further Increases VMT**

Increased VMT is not the only foreseeable environmental impact that needs to be studied. The ordinance also allows garage to ADU (accessory dwelling unit) conversions to retain the former driveway as a parking pad, which would otherwise have to be removed. That prevents a tree from being planted, in our city which already lags behind most of its peers in urban tree canopy, especially in low-income neighborhoods of color. In addition, driveway curb cuts harm the pedestrian realm by reducing usable sidewalk space, and large numbers of driveway curb cuts along a corridor make protected bike lanes infeasible to build, such as along Alemany Boulevard where multiple cyclists have been hit by cars and killed.

Even without an ADU, homeowners who have converted their garage to non-car storage, and

who might otherwise give up their driveway curb cut if the current law stayed on the books and if there was a possibility of enforcement, may now keep it, also leading to the environmental impacts described in the previous paragraph. A survey by Mary Brown of one San Francisco neighborhood found that 49% of garages were not used for storing a motor vehicle: <https://marybrown.wordpress.com/thesis-pdfs/>

### **Likely Increases Parking on Sidewalks, an Obstacle to Accessibility**

Although this ordinance does not legalize parking that blocks the sidewalk, which is a violation of state law, it would almost certainly lead to more sidewalk parking in practice. Confusion over the exact property line will become a reason for parking control officers not to enforce. Parking on sidewalks is a serious hazard for elderly and disabled pedestrians, and further discourages people from walking or taking transit and makes them view driving as the only option, thus also increasing VMT. These impacts must also be studied.

Also, the ADU provision does not specify a minimum driveway length to apply. Most driveways in San Francisco are too short to allow a car to park without blocking the sidewalk. However, as written, ADUs built on those properties would allow the driveway curb cut to be retained anyway, creating a curb cut that exists *only* for illegal parking blocking the sidewalk. In addition to being a serious flaw that should be fixed, this possibility is an environmental impact that must be studied.

### **Harms Equity by Taking Away Street Parking**

I understand some of you may wish to pass this ordinance out of a desire to help low-income residents who rely on cars for everyday trips. But even here, there is as much harm as benefit. Lower-income households are more likely to lack driveways and rely on street parking. Preserving a driveway curb cut, when the driveway doesn't go to an actively used garage, takes away a street parking space and hurts these motorists. Even if you have a driveway, this ordinance does not have any benefit unless that driveway is long enough to fit a car without blocking the sidewalk. That's only true of a small minority of driveways in San Francisco.

Thus, even among motorists, this legislation will harm more people than it helps, and that's before accounting for the 30% of households that do not have vehicles.

### **Broad Opposition, But Alternatives Exist**

The Sierra Club (San Francisco group), the San Francisco Bicycle Coalition, and Livable City all oppose this legislation as written, as I am informed they have or will communicate to you. In contrast, according to the most recent board packet, not a single person or organization has written in support. But there are better ways to solve the problems this legislation seeks to address.

Instead of a permanent change, you could allow temporary forbearance to motorists parking in front setbacks, for a limited time while the City does outreach to learn how to improve parking management and transit routes in neighborhoods where this practice is common. And instead of letting ADUs keep driveways, you could incentivize ADU building by providing grants through the (already well-funded!) SFPUC green infrastructure fund for greening projects to be completed along with the building of an ADU.

However, whether the board accepts my suggestions or not, environmental law *requires* the City and County of San Francisco to first study and report on the environmental impacts I have described in this letter, and for good reason. I believe that passing this legislation without environmental review would violate CEQA, and I urge the board not to make that mistake.

Sincerely,  
Scott Feeney  
San Francisco resident

**From:** [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Claire Amable](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Low, Jen \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Sciammas, Charlie \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Letter of opposition to item 1: Parking in driveways ordinance - BOS File No. 250887  
**Date:** Friday, January 9, 2026 4:56:00 PM  
**Attachments:** [2026-01-09 Mayor's driveway ordinance \(2\).pdf](#)  
[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 file for this ordinance matter.

I invite you to review the entire matter on our [Legislative Research Center](#) by following the link below:

- [Board of Supervisors File No. 250887](#)

**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:** Claire Amable <[camable@sfbike.org](mailto:camable@sfbike.org)>  
**Sent:** Friday, January 9, 2026 10:35 AM  
**To:** Carroll, John (BOS) <[john.carroll@sfgov.org](mailto:john.carroll@sfgov.org)>  
**Subject:** Letter of opposition to item 1: Parking in driveways ordinance

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

sources.

Hi John,

Please find SFBike's letter of opposition to item 1 attached below. Thank you in advance.

- Claire

--

**Claire Amable**

*Director of Advocacy*

415-289-9349 | [claire@sfbike.org](mailto:claire@sfbike.org)

Pronouns: she/they

---

**San Francisco Bicycle Coalition**

*Promoting the Bicycle for Everyday Transportation*

1720 Market St.

San Francisco, CA 94102

**Join or renew as an SFBike member today!**

**Follow us on social media**

Instagram | Bluesky | Facebook



San Francisco Bicycle Coalition  
1720 Market Street  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
**T** 415.431.BIKE  
**F** 415.431.2468  
**sfbike.org**

PROMOTING THE BICYCLE FOR EVERYDAY TRANSPORTATION

January 9, 2026

Board of Supervisors  
Land Use and Transportation Committee  
Chair Melgar and Vice Chen  
1 Dr Carlton B Goodlett Place, Room 250  
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Chair Melgar and Vice Chair Chen,

For over 50 years, the San Francisco Bicycle Coalition has advocated to transform City streets to safe, just, and livable places by promoting the bicycle for everyday transportation for future generations. Our organization has strong concerns about the unintended impact this ordinance has on future bicycle projects that exist on corridors with active driveways and on our City's climate goals.

We understand the purpose of this ordinance is to legalize parking in driveways and that in many districts across San Francisco, people are already doing this in a way that doesn't impact the public right of way. While the goal this ordinance is hoping to achieve is clear, the impact of creating more parking has on the environment and our sustainable transportation goals is less clear.

At the October 23, 2025 Planning Commission hearing, Commissioner Campell expressed concerns about the ordinance encouraging more people to drive and incentivizing car ownership because more parking will be available. The impacts this ordinance will have on air pollution and our climate goals should be studied by an environmental impact report.

Most concerning to us are the potential impacts this ordinance will have on future bike projects. Active driveways and curb cuts are not only hazardous to pedestrians, seniors, and people with disabilities but they also make it difficult to upgrade unprotected bicycle facilities to protected facilities. Under this ordinance, garage to ADU conversions would keep curb cuts active and remove one of our few tools to remove driveways. For corridors like Alemany Boulevard in District 11 that have remained on the City's High-Injury Network for years and have a surplus of curb cuts, this ordinance potentially hinders our ability to improve safety for pedestrians and active transportation users.

The SF Bicycle Coalition strongly encourages committee members to ask these clarifying questions and request these concerns be studied to clearly understand what the environmental impacts are before adopting the ordinance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Claire Amable".

Claire Amable  
Director of Advocacy