

**From:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#)  
**Cc:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Laxamana, Junko \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Comment on 210116 (Central Neighborhoods Large Residence SUD)  
**Date:** Thursday, February 24, 2022 10:09:19 AM

---

---

**From:** Andrew Metcalf <agmetcalf@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, February 12, 2022 9:05 AM  
**To:** Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** Comment on 210116 (Central Neighborhoods Large Residence SUD)

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

Hello,

I'm writing to express my objection to Supervisor Mandelman's proposed Central Neighborhoods Special Use District. I live in Noe Valley and have voted for Mandelman but I'm very disappointed by this legislation.

I believe that this legislation will do very little to promote multi-unit development on existing lots. Developers will continue to find ways to circumvent these provisions as they do with the residential merger provisions of Planning Code Section 317. I suspect that any legislation robust to circumvention will add untenable barriers to an already absurd permitting process.

If the Board truly wants these lots to be developed as multi-family, they should pass legislation that dramatically streamlines the process of doing so. For example, as Section 317 is currently written, replacing a single-family home with a multi-family complex usually requires Conditional Use Authorization by the Planning Commission, adding significant cost, time and risk to a project. The Board could pass legislation that removes these onerous requirements for projects that add units on a lot. I'm not familiar with all the impediments to developing these sorts of projects, but I suspect there are other areas where the Board could make it significantly more appealing for developers to pursue multi-family projects instead of massive single family projects.

Consider the case of 248 Valley St which recently sold near me for \$2.2m. This feels like a perfect candidate for a multi-family project -- extra-large lot, multi-family complex to one side and an existing property that may not warrant historic preservation. Assessor records show it sold to an LLC, so I assume a developer. I'd like the Board to consider what it would take to make it truly appealing for that developer to maximize the density on the lot (I think 2 units plus an ADU). Instead of raising even more barriers, can we lower barriers to building the sorts of multi-unit developments we're hoping for?

Separately, if the Board truly wants more multi-family housing, they should support projects like 469 Stevenson Street which would have added hundreds of units the city direly needs. Even the market-rate units in that complex would have been more affordable than a 3,000 square foot single-family home in Noe that would be untouched by the Special Use District proposal.

Housing has become such a critical problem in our city that I suspect my next vote for supervisor will go to whoever focuses the most on streamlining new development rather than scoring political points with ineffective new restrictions.

Thank you,  
Andrew Metcalf