

**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, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Writing on matter regarding 524-526 Vallejo Street  
**Date:** Monday, March 9, 2026 11:35:44 AM

---

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Ed Parillon regarding File No. 260021:

**File No. 260024:** Hearing of persons interested in or objecting to the de facto denial of a Conditional Use Authorization pursuant to Planning Code, Sections 303 and 317, for a proposed project at 524-526 Vallejo Street and 4-4A San Antonio Place (Assessor's Parcel Block No. 0132, Lot No. 009) identified in Planning Case No. 2024-011561CUA, to legalize the merger of three dwelling units on second and third floors into one dwelling unit and to reinstate one dwelling unit on the ground floor within an existing four-unit residential building located within RM-1 (Residential Mixed, Low Density) Zoning District, Telegraph Hill-North Beach Residential SUD (Special Use District), Priority Equity Geographies SUD, and 40-X Height and Bulk District. (District 3) (Appellants: Katelin Holloway and Ben Ramirez) (Filed January 5, 2026)

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](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)

---

**From:** Ed Parillon <eparillon@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, March 9, 2026 11:03 AM  
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Fielder, Jackie (BOS) <Jackie.Fielder@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** Writing on matter regarding 524-526 Vallejo Street

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

Hello,

I am a father and a resident of District 9, and I am writing to urge all members of the

Board of Supervisors to uphold the decision of the Planning Commission to de facto deny the Conditional Use Authorization for the property at 524-526 Vallejo Street. There is simply no grounds for appeal here, beyond "we are wealthy, and we should be able to follow our own rules". Furthermore, allowing this CUA would remove housing from the city in the midst of a housing crisis and establish the precedent that turning 4 (or more) homes into a single mansion is de facto legal for the wealthy. It's hard to imagine a more anti-housing action! Let's review the facts here:

1. The owners of the property endeavored to speak to the press for this article: <https://www.sfchronicle.com/sf/article/north-beach-housing-fight-21955921.php>, wherein it is made very clear that they had full knowledge of the property's non-compliance with code. They were not scammed or defrauded. The relevant information was disclosed, and they chose to ignore it.
2. This is not a situation where a family is trying to stay in San Francisco by adding an unwarranted in-law studio to a 2 bedroom. I think most San Franciscans have friends and colleagues who did this, and as a parent I am sympathetic. But that's not what we are talking about here. Here, attainable apartments for 4 families have been illegally turned into a mansion. The owner purchased this mansion for \$5 million -- at that price point, there are many, many legal options that do not drive displacement. The appellant rejected these options, choosing instead to lock in the illegal displacement.
3. The illegal mansion is in one of the densest parts of San Francisco - the kind of neighborhood where housing is desperately needed immediately adjacent to the city's primary job center. This is surely one of the worst places in San Francisco to remove housing.
4. As you all already know, San Francisco needs to add over 80,000 homes, a majority of them affordable to low income families, before the end of this RHNA cycle. As you are also aware, policy decisions and Board votes play a critical role in demonstrating to the state that the City is making progress towards this goal. How will the State HCD view a vote that would set a precedent that families can be illegally displaced to merge units and dramatically \*reduce\* housing? These are the kinds of votes that make it impossible for San Francisco to show housing element compliance, and thereby jeopardize critical housing and transportation funding.

It is unfortunate for the owners of 524 Vallejo that their "dream home" is a disappointment, but the recourse here is to their broker, or the seller, or ultimately to themselves. The solution is not to make it legal to turn apartment buildings housing

dozens of San Franciscans into mansions for a privileged few. I am urging all of you to reject this baseless appeal, and affirm the Planning Department's findings that the property must return to housing 4 families instead of just one.

Thank you for your consideration,  
Ed Parillon, D9 father and voter.