

From: [Matt Munz](#)
To: [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#)
Subject: RE: Please vote for the Central Neighborhoods Large Residence SUD ordinance (File No. 210116)
Date: Monday, February 14, 2022 12:06:26 PM

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

To the members of the Land Use and Transportation Committee:

My neighbor forwarded to me this message from another District 8 neighbor, Gary Weiss. While I have not read the legislation in question I wholeheartedly agree with this statement and urge you to adopt the ordinance.

I am a District 8 resident who supports this proposed ordinance. Our neighborhoods are ground zero for construction projects building single-family homes that are 4000 square feet and much much larger. These “monster homes” are two to four times the size of the original structure and are sold for \$6 - 7 million. This creates a dynamic where those with capital outbid families who have saved enough to afford a modestly-sized home in San Francisco. Please vote for the Central Neighborhoods Large Residence SUD ordinance. Thank you.

Matt Munz
matt.m.munz@gmail.com

From: [David Pennebaker](#)
To: [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#)
Subject: RE: Please vote for the Central Neighborhoods Large Residence SUD ordinance (File No. 210116)
Date: Sunday, February 13, 2022 1:02:29 AM

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

To the members of the Land Use and Transportation Committee:
Thank you for your time regarding this matter.

I am a District 8 resident who supports this proposed ordinance. Our neighborhoods are ground zero for construction projects building single-family homes that are 4000 square feet and much much larger. These “monster homes” are two to four times the size of the original structure and are sold for \$6 - 7 million. This creates a dynamic where those with capital outbid families who have saved enough to afford a modestly-sized home in San Francisco. Please vote for the Central Neighborhoods Large Residence SUD ordinance.

Thank you,
David



From: [Bruce Bowen](#)
To: [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please vote for the Central Neighborhoods Large Residence SUD ordinance (File No. 210116)
Date: Monday, February 14, 2022 1:03:33 AM

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

Supervisors

Please vote for the Central Neighborhoods Large Residence SUD ordinance.

I'd like to start by thanking Supervisor Mandelman and his staff for listening to us in Dolores Heights and other neighborhoods in District 8 and developing this proposed ordinance. We need stronger controls to slow or stop the destructive waves of demolition, de facto demolition, and oversized additions that are reshaping our neighborhoods with larger and larger single family homes (with or without sham second units).

Forty years ago, the Dolores Heights SUD was created to "...preserve and provide for an established area...and to encourage development in context and scale with established character and landscape..." Unfortunately, the founders of the SUD could not anticipate the corrosive and destructive power of near-limitless wealth as it has poured into recent development projects. On streets where homes had averaged close to 2,000 square feet in size, we've been seeing more and more houses with square footage of 5,000, 6,000, 7,000, 8,000 and more.

The reality that Dolores Heights, in particular, has attracted this kind of development, has also brought to our neighborhood the other aberrations of out-of-balance capital investment, such as merger of lots and de facto multi-lot compounds. Giving essentially free reign to demolition of sound existing homes, and allowing monster homes to be built in their place, has only heightened the affordability crisis in our City. Worst of all, we've also seen that these new mansions are not even necessarily primary residences: for example, the owner of the largest new home constructed in recent years, who acquired four adjacent lots for his family, identifies his "locations" on his Twitter page as "Kauai, Montana" - not San Francisco.

Please send a signal that you do not believe that our neighborhoods should just be handed over to the wealthiest. The proposed ordinance appropriately provides for reasonably-sized family housing and additional density. Please support this ordinance.

Thank you

Bruce Bowen
Dolores Heights

From: [Christine Huhn](#)
To: [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Monster Home Ordinance for Noe Valley
Date: Friday, February 11, 2022 7:24:02 AM

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

Good morning Supervisors,

Please take my comments into consideration for the Land Use Committee hearing on Monday, February 14th.

Monster homes are menace to the environment. They encourage overconsumption of energy and scarce environmental resources to maintain humongous buildings used by small households that is the norm in Noe Valley. Average family size in Noe Valley is around 2 members who certainly don't need over 4000 square feet for a home.

These supersized structures deprive surrounding homes from natural light and pit neighbors against neighbors. They are speculative tools for developers who buy modest old homes only to supersize and flip them for massive profits.

Our housing crisis is about a lack of affordable housing and starter homes for families with modest income. In a city with scarce available land, it's a terrible waste to use over 4000 square feet for one home.

Monster homes encourage the demolition of modest homes that are relatively affordable to middle-class families who lose in bidding wars against developers with the money and resources to demolish and convert them to gargantuan homes not in line with the average family size in Noe Valley.

The topography of Noe Valley with steep hills makes it particularly attractive for developers to overdevelop lots not only for more square footage but also for grabbing views. This is not sustainable and doesn't benefit anyone other than developers who flip these homes for extraordinary profits.

Best regards,

Christine Huhn

From: [Thomas Schuttish](#)
To: [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Bintliff, Jacob \(BOS\)](#); [Hepner, Lee \(BOS\)](#); [Smeallie, Kyle \(BOS\)](#); [Low, Jen \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Central Neighborhoods Large Residence SUD Board File No. 210116 LUT on 2/14/2022
Date: Friday, February 11, 2022 6:37:54 AM

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

Dear Supervisor Melgar, Supervisor Peskin and Supervisor Preston:

The other day in the U.S. Mail, I received a post card from a real estate company touting the highest sale in Noe Valley for a single family home last year, 2021. The home sold in July 2021.

According to the post card the highest sale was \$7.60 Million for 752 Elizabeth Street.

However, what the card did not say is that 752 Elizabeth Street was approved by the City as an “extreme” Alteration. Originally selling for \$2.150 Million in back in 2015, this project was flipped *for an increase* of \$5.45 Million.

752 Elizabeth according to the plans published on the SFPIM was originally 1,837 square feet. It was expanded to 4,468 square feet. It also needed to revise the Horizontal value of the Demolition Calculations during the construction, but the project was still below the Threshold for Tantamount to Demolition per Section 317. But more of that later in this email.

If you look at the before, during and after photos of this project, it is hard to not logically conclude that this Elizabeth Street project should have been considered and reviewed as a Demolition. And that is true of so many other projects.

There are at least 39 other projects just like this within the Noe Valley Planning Department boundaries (south side of 21st Street, west side of Dolores Street, north side of 30th Street and a jagged line fundamentally running along the east side of Diamond Height Blvd, along the east side of Market Street, etc).

This total of at least 40 projects have been flipped for an average price increase of \$3.9 million in the past decade. They all had a dramatic increase in square footage to become “mega mansions” over 3,000 square feet.

There are many other homes outside of the Noe Valley boundaries, some just across the street into Dolores Heights, or Glen Park, or Eureka Valley/Castro, or the blocks just outside of the Mission District, that fall into this category of mega mansions. Throughout the proposed SUD some of these properties were originally two units prior to the Site Permit.

While there have been some homes that have had legitimate, legally approved Demolitions that then built to a “mega mansion” or Monster Home sized square footage *in Noe Valley you can probably count those on one hand*.

In fact in the first iteration of the proposed Ordinance which covered a smaller geographic

area, the Planning Staff analysis made the astounding admission that “Noe Valley is an epicenter for de facto demolition”.

This has been going on for years.

Even back in 2015 after reviewing a sample of five Noe Valley projects, the Staff concurred that 40% of the sample should have been reviewed as a Demolition *under the existing Demo Calcs!*

Since December 2017 when the RET was rescinded, the Planning Commission could have tempered this trend of extreme Alterations becoming high priced, super large single family homes by adjusting the Demolition Calculations as they are empowered to do do under Planning Code Section 317 (b) (2) (D). By putting forward the RET, the Planning Department acknowledged the problem which had been brewing since the Demo Calcs were set in the Section 317 Code Implementation Document in 2009. As former Staff told the Planning Commission in March 2009, they would likely return within the year to possibly adjust the Demo Calcs. *That has never happened.*

Please remember what the point was of including the Demolition Calculations in the Planning Code. It was to allow reasonable expansion of a structure without becoming a Demolition. As it says in the Section 317 (a), or the Findings: *“The General Plan recognizes that existing housing is the greatest stock of rental and financially accessible residential units, and is a resource in need of protection.”*

So what now?

I urge the LUT Committee to please put forward Supervisor Mandelman’s legislation for this SUD to the full Board.

ALSO, I urge the Committee to take Board File No. 200451 and somehow fold it into this proposed Ordinance. This File was passed unanimously and was Continued to the Call of the Chair on May 4, 2020. Please call it back.

Thank you.
Sincerely,
Georgia Schuttish