File No. 251073 **Committee Item No.** 10
Board Item No. _____

COMMITTEE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

Committee: Land Use and Transportation **Date:** November 3, 2025
Board of Supervisors Meeting: **Date:** _____

Cmte Board

☐	☐	**Motion**
☐	☐	**Resolution**
☒	☐	**Ordinance - VERSION 2**
☒	☐	**Legislative Digest - VERSION 2**
☐	☐	**Budget and Legislative Analyst Report**
☐	☐	**Youth Commission Report**
☐	☐	**Introduction Form**
☐	☐	**Department/Agency Cover Letter and/or Report**
☐	☐	**MOU**
☐	☐	**Grant Information Form**
☐	☐	**Grant Budget**
☐	☐	**Subcontract Budget**
☐	☐	**Contract / DRAFT Mills Act Agreement**
☐	☐	**Form 126 – Ethics Commission**
☐	☐	**Award Letter**
☐	☐	**Application**
☒	☐	**Public Correspondence**

OTHER

☒	☐	ECN Impact Report – October 29, 2025
☒	☐	Planning Presentation – October 20, 2025
☒	☐	3 LINKS – MAPS – September 30, July 29, June 24, 2025
☒	☐	LINK - PLN Affordable Housing Sites Analysis – October 16, 2025
☒	☐	LINK – PC Transmittal Package – September 18, 2025
☒	☐	LINK – FEIR Transmittal – October 16, 2025
☒	☐	LINK – CEQA Determination – September 11, 2025
☒	☐	LINK – CA HCD Letter – September 9, 2025
☒	☐	LINK – HPC Letter – September 9, 2025
☒	☐	LINK – SBC Response Memo – August 27, 2025
☒	☐	LINK – Index of PC Amends
☒	☐	LINK – 2022 Housing Element Reused Sites Chart
☒	☐	LINK – Rezoning Lower Income Sites Chart
☒	☐	D1 Supervisor's Memo – October 20, 2025
☒	☐	Hearing Notice – October 3, 2025
☒	☐	Notice of Availability – LCPA – September 3, 2025

Prepared by: John Carroll **Date:** October 31, 2025
Prepared by: _____ **Date:** _____

AMENDED IN COMMITTEE
10/20/2025

FILE NO. 251073 ORDINANCE NO.

[Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan]

Ordinance amending the Planning Code to: 1) create the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program to incent housing development through a local bonus program and by adopting a Housing Sustainability District, 2) modify height and bulk limits to provide for additional capacity in well-resourced neighborhoods, and to allow additional height and bulk for projects using the local bonus program, 3) require only buildings taller than 85 feet in certain Districts to reduce ground level wind currents, 4) make conforming changes to the RH (Residential, House), RM (Residential, Mixed), and RC (Residential-Commercial) District zoning tables to reflect the changes to density controls, and parking requirements made in this ordinance, 5) create the RTO-C (Residential Transit Oriented-Commercial) District, 6) implement the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's Transit-Oriented Communities Policy by making changes to parking requirements, minimum residential densities, and minimum office intensities, and requiring maximum dwelling unit sizes, 7) revise off-street parking and curb cut obligations citywide, 8) create the Non-contiguous San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Sites Special Use District, 9) permit businesses displaced by new construction to relocate without a conditional use authorization and waive development impact fees for those businesses, 10) make technical amendments to the Code to implement the above changes, 11) make conforming changes to zoning tables in various Districts, including the Neighborhood Commercial District and Mixed Use Districts, and 12) reduce usable open space and bicycle parking requirements for senior housing; amending the Business and Tax Regulations Code regarding the Board of Appeals' review of permits in the Housing Choice Program Housing

Sustainability District; also, amending the Local Coastal Program to implement the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program and other associated changes in the City's Coastal Zone, and directing the Planning Director to transmit the ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment; 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 public necessity, convenience, and welfare findings under Planning Code, Section 302.

NOTE: **Unchanged Code text and uncodified text** are in plain Arial font.
Additions to Codes are in *single-underline italics Times New Roman font*.
Deletions to Codes are in ~~*strikethrough italics Times New Roman font*~~.
Board amendment additions are in double-underlined Arial font.
Board amendment deletions are in ~~strikethrough Arial font~~.
Asterisks (* * * *) indicate the omission of unchanged Code subsections or parts of tables.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. Environmental and Land Use Findings

(a) On November 17, 2022, the Planning Commission, in Motion M-21206 certified the Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the 2022 Housing Element of the San Francisco General Plan (Housing Element EIR), as in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (California Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq), the CEQA Guidelines (14 Cal. Code Regs. Section 15000 et seq.), and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code. Copies of the Planning Commission Motion M-21206 and Housing Element EIR are on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. 230001.

(b) On December 15, 2022, at a duly noticed public hearing, the Planning Commission

adopted findings under CEQA regarding the 2022 Housing Element's environmental impacts, the disposition of mitigation measures, and project alternatives, as well as a statement of overriding considerations (CEQA Findings) and adopted a mitigation monitoring reporting program (MMRP), by Resolution 21220.

(c) The Planning Commission then adopted the proposed 2022 Housing Element in Resolution 21221, finding in accordance with Planning Code Section 340 that the public necessity, convenience, and general welfare required the proposed amendments to the General Plan.

(d) On January 31, 2023, in Ordinance 010-23, the Board of Supervisors, adopted the 2022 Housing Element. That ordinance confirmed the certification of the Housing Element EIR and made certain environmental findings, including adoption of the MMRP and a Statement of Overriding Considerations.

(e). On September 3, 2025, the Planning Department published an addendum to the Housing Element EIR, which concluded that no supplemental or subsequent environmental review is required for the Family Housing Rezoning Program, because the environmental impacts of these amendments were adequately identified and analyzed under CEQA in the Housing Element EIR, and the proposed amendments would not result in any new or more severe environmental impacts than were identified previously.

(f) The Board of Supervisors has reviewed and considered the Housing Element EIR and the Addendum, and concurs with the Planning Department's analysis and conclusions, finding that the addendum adequately identified and analyzed the environmental impacts of the Family Housing Rezoning Program, and that no additional environmental review is required under CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guideline Sections 15162-15164 for the following reasons:

(1) the Family Housing Rezoning Program would not involve new significant

environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of significant effects previously identified in the Housing Element EIR;

(2) no substantial changes have occurred that would require major revisions to the Final EIR due to the involvement of new environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of effects identified in the Housing Element EIR; and

(3) no new information of substantial importance has become available which would indicate that (i) the Family Housing Rezoning Program will have significant effects not discussed in the Final EIR; (ii) significant environmental effects will be substantially more severe; (iii) mitigation measure or alternatives found not feasible that would reduce one or more significant effects have become feasible, or (iv) mitigation measures or alternatives that are considerably different from those in the Housing Element EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment. The Addendum is on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. 251073.

(g) The Planning Department has determined that the amendments to the Local Coastal Program are exempt from CEQA review under Public Resources Code Sections 21080.5 and 21080.9, and CEQA Guidelines Section 15265. Said determination is on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. 251073. The Board affirms this determination and incorporates the determination by reference.

(h) On September 11, 2025, the Planning Commission, in Resolution No. 21810, adopted findings that the actions contemplated in this ordinance are consistent, on balance, with the City's General Plan and eight priority policies of Planning Code Section 101.1. The Board adopts these findings as its own. A copy of said Resolution is on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. 251073, and is incorporated herein by reference.

(i) Pursuant to Planning Code Section 302, this Board finds that these Planning Code amendments will serve the public necessity, convenience, and welfare for the reasons set

forth in Planning Commission Resolution No. 21810, and the Board adopts such reasons as its own. A copy of said resolution is on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. 251073 and is incorporated herein by reference.

Section 2. Additional Findings.

(a) This ordinance shall be known as the San Francisco Family Zoning Plan.

(b) California faces a severe crisis of housing affordability and availability, which has prompted the Legislature to declare, in Section 65589.5 of the Government Code, that "California has a housing supply and affordability crisis of historic proportions. The consequences of failing to effectively and aggressively confront this crisis are hurting millions of Californians, robbing future generations of a chance to call California home, stifling economic opportunities for workers and businesses, worsening poverty and homelessness, and undermining the state's environmental and climate objectives."

(c) Numerous factors have contributed to the high cost of housing in most of California's coastal cities and suburbs, including the dwindling supply and high cost of available land, and zoning regulations that restrict residential density, limit efficient land use, and create and reinforce inequitable patterns of discrimination and segregation.

(d) This crisis of housing affordability and availability is particularly severe in San Francisco. The City has seen dramatic increases in both rent prices and home sale prices over recent years.

(e) Limits on residential density can also contribute to the housing crisis by restricting the number of units per lot. The origins of density limits in San Francisco date back to the Cubic Air Ordinance, an 1870 anti-Chinese ordinance requiring 500 cubic feet of space for every person residing in a lodging. The City's first zoning law was passed in 1921 and largely reproduced the City's existing development pattern, limiting density in areas of the City that

were already low-density. In the 1960s, the City underwent a rezoning process, though the existing development patterns were largely maintained, with the exception of downtown and neighborhoods significantly impacted by City planning redevelopment plans.

(f) Starting in 1980, the Board of Supervisors, the Planning Commission, and the Planning Department responded to community concerns about neighborhood character by establishing and refining a set of new districts covering many of the City's neighborhood commercial streets. These districts imposed highly-detailed controls tailored to the specific character of each neighborhood. The 1987 Neighborhood Commercial Districts were based on the then-relatively new idea that the City should be more selective in its pursuit of economic growth. All of these Neighborhood Commercial District plans included numerical density limits for residential development.

(g) By removing these numerical density limits from Neighborhood Commercial Districts and replacing them with form-based density, which allows the density to be determined by the buildable area of a building, this ordinance aims to increase housing supply and reduce the factors that have contributed to the lack of housing in San Francisco.

(h) Under California Housing Element law, San Francisco must identify sites to accommodate its Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) goal of 82,069 new units in the next eight years. Because San Francisco does not currently have sufficient capacity to accommodate the RHNA goals, it must rezone sites to meet these goals, and must do so by January 31, 2026. Additional capacity will be created through amendments to the Planning Code and Zoning Maps. This ordinance implements commitments made in the City's 2022 Housing Element Update. The ordinance modifies zoning policies primarily in the well-resourced neighborhoods, which are sometimes referred to as Housing Opportunity Areas, are neighborhoods or areas with existing infrastructure, transit, businesses, well-performing public schools and lower levels of environmental pollution. The ordinance also aims to

increase capacity for multi-family housing. The ordinance satisfies the City's obligation to rezone and address the RHNA shortfall of 36,200 housing units.

(i) This ordinance, in Section 3, creates the Housing Choice-San Francisco (HC-SF) program which includes a local residential bonus program (Local Program), and a Housing Sustainability District (HSD). The bonus program is similar to state law programs (such as the State Density Bonus law), in that it allows additional residential development opportunities in certain circumstances. The HC-SF Program offers certain benefits compared to State Density Bonus law projects, however, by including more diverse affordable housing types and more predictable urban form.

(j) State law allows local jurisdictions to create HSDs to encourage housing production on infill sites near public transportation. Housing projects that are compliant with applicable general plan and zoning standards are eligible for streamlined approval by the City. There must be an approved Environmental Impact Report (EIR) in the area to establish an HSD, and HSD projects must adopt and implement any applicable mitigation measures. The City certified the 2022 Housing Element Update EIR on December 15, 2022. As of May 2025, the City has one HSD, the Central SoMa Housing Sustainability District, codified in Planning Code 343. This ordinance creates the Housing Choice-San Francisco (HC-SF) HSD that would work in conjunction with the HC-SF Program described above.

(k) This ordinance, in Section 4, makes changes to San Francisco's height and bulk requirements in the well-resourced neighborhoods, located primarily on the north and west sides of the City, which will create capacity to meet the City's RHNA obligation. The ordinance also creates a new R-4 Height and Bulk District, which will provide for form-based density, and increased height limits for projects using the HC-SF Program. The HC-SF HSD, mentioned above, would apply within the boundaries of the R-4 Height and Bulk District, except that it would not apply to any parcels zoned as Residential House (RH), or Residential

Mixed (RM).

(l) This ordinance, in Section 5, modifies the Planning Code's wind reduction obligations by creating a new objective standard for projects greater than 85 feet in the C-3, Van Ness SUD, Folsom and Main Residential/Commercial SUD, Downtown Residential, and Central SoMa SUD.

(m) This ordinance, in Section 6, makes conforming changes to the RH (Residential, House), RM (Residential, Mixed), and RC (Residential-Commercial) Districts and Zoning Tables. The changes implement the changes reflected in other parts of this ordinance.

(n) This ordinance, in Section 7, makes changes to the Residential Transit Oriented (RTO) zoning districts. RTO districts are composed of multi-family moderate-density areas, primarily areas that are well served within short walking distance of transit and neighborhood commercial areas. The Planning Code currently identifies two types of RTO zoning districts: RTO and RTO-M (Mission) districts. This ordinance creates a third type of RTO district: RTO-C (Commercial), which is an RTO district where a greater number of ground floor non-residential uses are permitted to provide goods and services to residents and visitors, especially adjacent to existing NC districts and along transit corridors, though ground floor commercial uses are not required. In addition, the ordinance refers to the three types of RTO zoning districts individually as RTO-1, RTO-M, and RTO-C, and collectively, as RTO zoning districts.

(o) This ordinance, in Section 8, makes changes to implement the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's (MTC) Transit-Oriented Communities (TOC) Policy, and Housing Element law. The MTC endorsed the TOC Policy in MTC Resolution 4530 in September 2022, to support the region's transit investments by creating communities around transit stations and along transit corridors that not only enable transit ridership, but also are places where Bay Area residents of all abilities, income levels, and racial and ethnic

backgrounds can live, work, and access services. The TOC Policy applies to the half-mile area around existing and planned fixed-guideway transit stops and stations (i.e., regional rail, commuter rail, light-rail transit, bus rapid transit, and ferries). MTC has indicated that subsequent One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) funding cycles will consider prioritizing investments in transit station areas that are subject to and compliant with the TOC Policy.

(p) The TOC Policy requirements consist of four elements: (1) minimum required and allowed residential and/or commercial office densities for new development; (2) policies focused on housing production, preservation and protection, and commercial anti-displacement and stabilization policies; (3) parking management; and (4) transit station access and circulation.

(q) Consistent with the TOC Policy, Planning Code Section 155.2 already requires one secure bike parking spot per Dwelling Unit, and one secure bike parking spot per 5,000 square feet of Occupied Floor Area for Office uses. This ordinance also creates minimum required and allowed residential densities and commercial development intensities for areas subject to the TOC Policy, and Housing Element law. Housing Element law (Government Code Section 65583.2(c) and (h)) requires cities to identify sites that were previously identified as appropriate for housing in prior Housing Element cycles, and sites that are appropriate to accommodate 100% of the City's allocation of lower-income housing. Lists of those sites are on file with the Clerk of the Board in File No. 250701. It also modifies the parking requirements be consistent with the TOC Policy.

(r) The ordinance also specifies that projects proposing the demolition, merger, or reduction in number of Dwelling Units are subject to a maximum Dwelling Unit size of 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area, but allows projects to seek a conditional use authorization to exceed this objective standard.

(s) This ordinance, in Section 9, makes changes to off-street parking and curb cut

requirements to clarify and simplify the requirements.

(t) This ordinance, in Section 10, creates the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) Non-Contiguous Sites Special Use District (SUD) consistent with the SFMTA's Joint Development Program, approved by the SFMTA's Board of Directors on February 4, 2025 in Resolution No. 250204-010. The SUD is comprised of parcels owned by the SFMTA, most of which are currently used as parking lots. The SUD allows development of market-rate and affordable housing consistent with each parcel's surrounding zoning district, as well as other zoning modifications specific to the SUD.

(u) Increased residential development could result in displacement of existing businesses. The City's Legacy Business program, in Administrative Code Section 2A.242, offers certain benefits for qualifying businesses. This ordinance, in Section 11, makes changes to the Planning Code that permit Displaced Businesses to relocate within the City without having to obtain a conditional use authorization or pay development impact fees.

(v) This ordinance, in Section 12, includes miscellaneous definitional and other changes that are appurtenant to the rezoning program.

(w) This ordinance, in Section 13, amends the Neighborhood Commercial District and Mixed-Use District tables to conform to the amendments in Sections 3-12. Section 13 also implements other changes contemplated in the Housing Element, such as eliminating numeric density controls in zoning districts that are located in well-resourced areas.

(x) This ordinance, In Section 14, amends the Business and Tax Regulations Code to include the new HC-HSD streamlining requirements.

(y) The Board of Supervisors finds that the Planning Code amendments in this ordinance constitute amendments to the City's Local Coastal Program ("LCP"). The Board of Supervisors finds that the LCP amendment conforms with the applicable provisions of the Coastal Act of 1976, and that the amendments are consistent with and adequate to carry out

the provisions of the City's certified LCP Land Use Plan—the Western Shoreline Area Plan. The Board further finds that the amendments will be implemented in full conformance with the Coastal Act's provisions, and acknowledges that the amendments in the Western Shoreline Area Plan are consistent with San Francisco's Housing Element's housing goals.

(z) The Board of Supervisors finds that promoting higher-density housing opportunities in the Coastal Zone is consistent with the Coastal Act's goal of providing "new affordable housing opportunities for persons of low and moderate income in the coastal zone." (Cal. Pub. Resources Code, § 30604(g).) Further, providing these opportunities in the Coastal Zone is consistent with the Housing Element's goal of creating new housing in well-resourced neighborhoods. To that end, this ordinance amends the Implementation Program of the City's certified LCP, including updating the use and development controls in the RH, RM, RTO-C, NC-1, and NC-2 use districts that comprise the Coastal Zone. These amendments are necessary to ensure housing opportunities in the Coastal Zone, and the City's approval of these amendments satisfies California Government Code Section 65583.

Section 3. Housing Choice – San Francisco Program. Articles 2 and 3 of the Planning Code are hereby amended by adding Sections 206.10, 334, and 344, to read, as follows:

SEC. 206.10 HOUSING CHOICE-SAN FRANCISCO PROGRAM.

*(a) **Purpose.** This Section 206.10 sets forth the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program (HC-SF Program). The HC-SF Program provides additional residential development capacity, additional options for complying with the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance, modifications to certain Planning Code and design standards, and an administrative or discretionary review process for eligible residential projects that comply with the program.* Except as provided in this Section 206.10, all HC-SF projects shall comply with Article 4 of the Planning Code.

*(b) **Applicability.** An HC-SF Project under this Section 206.10 shall be a project that*

complies with all of the following requirements:

(1) consists of new construction, an addition to an existing structure, or a conversion of an existing structure, and results in a net increase in the number of Dwelling Units or Group Housing bedrooms;

(2) contains two or more Dwelling Units or Group Housing bedrooms. Accessory Dwelling Units shall not count towards the minimum number of required Dwelling Units, but an HC-SF Project may contain ADUs;

(3) is located on a Lot in the R-4 Height and Bulk District;

(4) does not demolish or substantially alter *a* ~~building that is designated as a landmark under Article 10, is listed as a contributor to an historic district in Article 10, is listed as a Significant or Contributory Building under Article 11, is listed in the California Register of Historical Resources, or is listed on the National Register of Historic Places~~ 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*;*

(5) does not receive any density or development bonuses or relief from applicable Planning Code standards in any other State or local law or program, including but not limited to California Government Code Sections 65915 et seq., Government Code sections 65912.113(e), 65912.114(f)(1), 65912.123(b), (c), (d), (e), (i), (j)(1), and (j)(3) and 65912.124(f), and Sections 65852.28(b)(2), 65913.4.5, and 66499.41, as may be updated from time to time; and Planning Code

Section 124(f), Section 202.2(f), Sections 206.3 to 206.9, inclusive, Section 207(c), Section 304, and Section 328;

(6) complies with Objective Standards, except as otherwise modified by the HC-SF Program in this Section 206.10, or through the modification process in Section 334;

(7) is a project in which at least two-thirds of the new or converted square footage is designated for Residential Uses; or, a project with at least 50% new or converted square footage for Residential Uses if the project converts an existing Non-Residential Use and does not expand that use by more than 25%. Basements shall not count in the calculation of square footage. For additions to existing structures or conversions of existing buildings, only the net new or converted space shall be considered in the calculation of square footage; ~~and,~~

(8) is not located in a Special Use District that implements a Development Agreement adopted under California Government Code 65864 et seq and/or Administrative Code Chapter 56~~.~~;

(9) is not located on a site containing more than two residential units where the project would require the demolition of residential uses that are subject to the rent increase limitations set forth in Chapter 37 of the Administrative Code;

(10) does not demolish, remove, or convert to another use any existing Dwelling Unit(s), or Residential Flat; and

(11) does not demolish or convert any portion of a Tourist Hotel.

*(c) **Inclusionary Housing Ordinance Alternatives.** HC-SF Projects of 10 or more units shall comply with Section 415 et seq., and if applicable Section 419 et seq., except as allowed by this subsection (c). Projects that elect the off-site alternative in Section 415.5(g)(1)(B) or the Land Dedication Alternative in Section 419.5(a)(2) allowed in subsection (c)(2), shall provide the required units* ~~within the R-4 Height and Bulk District, or~~ *within one-half mile of the project. In addition to the alternatives set forth in Section 415.3(g), HC-SF Projects may satisfy the requirements of Section 415 et seq. by choosing one of the following options:*

(1) if the project is a Rental Project with 24 or fewer units, including any additional units allowed by this Section 206.10, a project sponsor shall subject all units in the project to the San Francisco Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance (Chapter 37 of the Administrative Code) for the Life of the Project; or

(2) applicants shall comply with the Land Dedication Alternative requirements of Section 419.5(a)(2), regardless of project location.

(d) ***Modified Development Standards.*** *Notwithstanding any contrary provisions found in the Planning Code, including any provision in a Special Use District not implementing a Development Agreement adopted under California Government Code 65864 et seq. and/or Administrative Code Chapter 56, or in any adopted Design Standard, the following development standards apply to eligible HC-SF Projects. Projects may also seek additional modifications under Section 334.*

(1) ***Standards Applicable to All Projects:*** *All HC-SF Projects shall receive the following zoning modifications:*

(A) ***Form-Based Residential Density.*** *An HC-SF Project shall be subject to Form-Based Density limits. Floor Area Ratio requirements or limitations shall not apply to the Residential Uses in an HC-SF Project.*

(B) ***Dwelling Unit Mix.*** *Section 207.6 and Section 207.7 shall* ~~not~~ *apply.* ~~HC-SF Projects of four units or more shall comply with the following:~~

~~(i) a project with four dwelling units shall contain at least one unit with two or more bedrooms;~~

~~(ii) for a project with between five and nine dwelling units, inclusive, at least 25% of its units shall contain two or more bedrooms, including at least one unit with three or more bedrooms; and~~

~~(iii) for a project with ten or more dwelling units, at least 25% of its units shall contain two or more bedrooms, including at least 5% of its units containing three or~~

~~more bedrooms.~~

~~(iv) The Dwelling Unit mix requirement in this subsection (d)(1)(B) shall not apply to 100% Affordable Housing projects or Residential Uses listed in Section 207.7(b)(2). The Dwelling Unit mix requirement may be modified pursuant to Section 334.~~

*(C) **Additional Height.** The applicable height limit for an HC-SF Project shall be the height pursuant to Section 263.19(b). Planning Code Section 261 shall not apply. Notwithstanding any lower height limit in this Code, including Section 263.19, the height limit of an HC-SF Project located on a Corner Lot or a Lot larger than 8,000 square feet shall be 65 feet, unless a higher height limit is provided elsewhere in the Code.*

*(D) **Ground Floor Setbacks on 19th Avenue.** Projects on a lot with frontage on 19th Avenue may reduce the setback required under Section 131 and 132 if the proposed project expands the publicly available sidewalk into the subject property and the resulting overall sidewalk width is not less than 15 feet. In such cases, the setback and sidewalk shall have a minimum vertical clearance of not less than 25 feet from grade, and the property owner shall record a Notice of Special Restrictions allowing for public access to the expanded sidewalk for the life of the project.*

*(E) **Rear Yard and Lot Coverage.** The rear yard requirements of Section 134 may be modified as follows:*

(i) Except for large lots subject to Section 134(d)(6), or lots in Residential Districts other than the Residential Transit Oriented-Commercial (RTO-C) district, the rear yard shall be equal to at least 18% of the total depth of the lot, or 15 feet, whichever is greater;

(ii) Except for large lots subject to the lot coverage limits of Section 134(d)(6), in Neighborhood Commercial, Named Neighborhood Commercial, Commercial Districts, Residential-Commercial (RC) and Residential Transit Oriented-Commercial (RTO-C) Districts, no rear yard is required at the ground floor;

(iii) On Corner Lots, or Lots at the intersection of a Street and an Alley

of at least 25 feet in width, where a rear yard can meet the requirements of Section 134(h), the area of the required open area shall be equal to 18% of the depth of the lot and a minimum of 15 feet in every horizontal direction.

(iv) In C districts, other than on large lots subject to Section 134(d)(6), lot coverage is limited to 82% at all levels containing Residential Uses. All other provisions of Section 134(d)(6) shall apply.

*(F) **Open Space.** The open space requirements of Section 135 shall not apply.*

*(G) **Dwelling Unit Exposure.** The dwelling unit exposure requirements of Section 140 shall not apply.*

*(H) **Non-Residential Use Size Limits.** Non-Residential Uses may exceed the non-residential use size limits in Section 121.2 without the need for a Conditional Use authorization.*

*(I) **Height Limits for Vertical Non-Habitable Architectural Elements.** Vertical Non-Habitable Architectural Elements may exceed height limits consistent with the requirements in Section 263.21(c).*

*(J) **Development of Large Lots in Residential Transit Oriented Commercial (RTO-C) Districts.** Sections 121.1 and 303(r) shall not apply to HC-SF Projects on large lots in the RTO-C Zoning District.*

*(K) **Ground Floor Ceiling Heights For Nine-Story Projects**. The ground floor ceiling height requirements in Section 145.1(c)(4) shall not apply to HC-SF Projects proposing nine stories in a district with a height limit of 85 feet.*

*(L) **Maximum Dwelling Unit Size.** Notwithstanding any other provision of this Code, Section 207.10 shall apply.*

*(M) **Reduction of Quantitative Objective Standards.** Any quantitative Objective Standard may be modified by up to 15% of the standard except for the following: standards set forth in subsection (d)(1)(A) through (d)(1)(L) inclusive, standards set forth in subsection (e), rear yard or lot*

coverage standards, standards ineligible for Major Modifications under Section 334(d)(3), and maximum average floor plate requirements in Section 270(i).

*(2) **Standards Applicable to 100% Affordable Projects.***

*(A) **Definitions.** A 100% Affordable HC-SF Housing Project shall be an eligible HC-SF Project where all Residential Uses, except a manager's unit, are comprised solely of Dwelling Units or Group Housing bedrooms that are restricted for the Life of the Project as "Affordable Units," as defined in Section 401, and meet the requirements in Section 406(b)(1)(A) and (C).*

*(B) **Additional Planning Code Modifications.** In addition to the modifications in subsection (d)(1), 100% Affordable HC-SF Housing Projects are entitled to the following Planning Code modifications:*

*(i) **Ground-floor ceiling height.** Ground floor ceiling height requirements in Section 145.1(c)(4) shall not apply.*

*(ii) **Active use requirement.** Active use requirements in Section 145.1(c)(3) shall be reduced by 20% of all the required dimensions.*

*(iii) **Curb cuts.** Curb cut restrictions in Section 155(r) shall not apply. However, where a site has two or more frontages, frontages with the fewest restrictions under Section 155(r) shall be prioritized for vehicular and loading access.*

*(iv) **Height Limit.** The height limit shall be 20 feet greater than the HC-SF height limit set forth in Section 263.19(b), and in subsection (d)(1)(C), and maybe be supplemented by any height bonus pursuant to subsection (e).*

*(3) **Authorization.** HC-SF Projects under this Section 206.10 shall be reviewed and approved under the provisions set forth in Section 334, and any other required entitlement except for Section 309 and Section 329. Approval procedures under Section 309 and Section 329 shall not apply.*

(4) **Exclusions.** In no event shall this Section 206.10 be interpreted as relieving a HC-SF project from complying with: Article 4 of the Planning Code other than as

specified in this subsection (d); Section 202.17; any tenant protections contained elsewhere in the Planning Code, including Section 317 et seq.; or Chapter 37 of the Administrative Code.

*(e) **Additional Height, Square Footage, and Other Bonuses.** HC-SF Projects that contain certain uses, amenities, or other building features are eligible for additional bonuses and code modifications, as described below.*

*(1) **Micro-Retail and/or Community Benefit Uses.** For projects that include, at or above grade, (A) one or more Micro-Retail spaces, which shall mean space for a Retail Use measuring no less than 100 gross square feet and no greater than 1,000 gross square feet; and/or (B) one or more Community Benefit Uses, shall receive additional square footage and height as set forth below. For the purposes of this subsection, Community Benefit Uses means: Child Care Facility, Community Facility, Job Training, Public Facilities, Social Service or Philanthropic Facility, Laundromat, Trade School, Grocery (General or Specialty), and/or any Displaced Business, as that term is defined in Section 202.17. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Code, all such Community Benefit Uses shall be principally permitted without limit on use size. The following provisions apply to projects providing Micro-Retail space(s) and/or on-site Community Benefit Use(s):*

(A) For every square foot of Community Benefit Use(s), or every 1.5 square feet of Micro-Retail, the Project shall be permitted to include an additional:

(i) up to two square feet for other project use(s); and

(ii) up to a maximum of 10 feet total above the permitted height limit to accommodate the additional square footage.

(B) On-site Community Benefits Use(s) and Micro-Retail space(s) must be included in the project for a minimum of 30 years, or the life of the project, whichever is shorter, and the use and space requirement shall be recorded in a Notice of Special Restrictions. If the Community Benefits Use(s) is discontinued, it must be replaced with another Community Benefits Use(s). If the Micro-Retail space(s) is reconfigured, the new resulting space(s) must meet the definition of a Micro-

Retail space and the cumulative square footage must not decrease in size.

(2) ***Warm Retail Shells****. For the purposes of this subsection (e)(2), "Warm Retail Shell" means a ground floor retail space* ~~in a "warm shell" condition suitable for food service use,~~ with the improvements described in this subsection (e)(2) as a Food Service Warm Shell or a General Warm Shell. ~~which space~~ A Food Service Warm Shell shall *contain*~~s~~ *all of the following: a concrete floor slab, exterior walls, roof, st*~~r~~*orefront, restroom(s)* ~~designed to~~ *meet*ing *ADA accessibility requirements, electrical panel with breakers* and outlets*, fire sprinklers* and alarm system *that* ~~meet shell~~ satisfy *building code, HVAC unit, Type 1 grease exhaust hood with appropriate ductwork, water meter(s), distribution piping for domestic water (hot/cold), and waste water plumbing, including floor drains.* A General Warm Shell shall contain all of the following: a finished concrete floor, exterior walls, sheet rock on walls, roof, restroom(s) satisfying ADA accessibility requirements, electrical panel with breakers and outlets, fire sprinklers and alarm system that satisfy building code, and basic lighting. *The following provisions apply to projects providing Warm Retail Shells.*

(A) For every square foot of Warm Retail Shell(s), the Project shall be permitted to include an additional:

(i) up to three square feet for other project use(s) for a Food Service Warm Shell*; and*

(ii) up to 2.5 square feet for other project use(s) for a General Warm Shell; and

*(ii*i*) up to a maximum of 10 feet total above the permitted height limit to accommodate the additional square footage.*

(B) The Warm Retail Shell shall be included in the project for a minimum of 30 years, or the life of the project, whichever is shorter, and the requirement shall be recorded in a Notice of Special Restrictions. If the space is modified within this period such that it no longer meets the

definition of a Warm Retail Shell, it must be replaced with a qualifying Community Benefit Use or a Micro-Retail use per subsection (e)(1) above. No Temporary or Final Certificate of Occupancy shall be issued unless the Planning Department, in consultation with the Department of Building Inspection, determines that the requirements of this subsection (e)(2) have been completed.

*(3) **Family-Friendly Amenities.** In Residential Districts, projects that provide certain Family Friendly Amenities, as defined below, shall be permitted to include an additional:*

(A) up to two square feet for project uses for each square foot of any one or more Family Friendly Amenity; and

(B) horizontal addition to the permitted building volume to accommodate this extra square footage through any combination of the following:

(i) reducing the required rear yard above the ground floor (Section 134) to 25% or 20 feet, whichever is greater;

(ii) reducing the required ground floor rear yard (Section 134) to 18% or 15 feet, whichever is greater;

(iii) reducing the required side yard (Section 133) to 0 feet, and/or

(iv) reducing the required upper-story setback to 10 feet for additions to Historic Buildings.

(C) Family Friendly Amenities shall be defined as the following:

(i) an indoor common recreational room of not less than 150 square feet that is directly accessible to an adjacent outdoor common open space of at least 150 square feet;

(ii) a common shared kitchen of not less than 150 square feet, equipped at minimum with a refrigerator, oven, stovetop, sink, dishwasher, and countertops for food preparation;

(iii) an overnight suite with a bedroom and bathroom, but that is not a Dwelling Unit and has no cooking facilities, that is a common building amenity and reservable

exclusively by residents for overnight guests;

(iv) secured storage space for residents, that is external to individual residential units, intended for large objects, and located on the ground floor or below or accessed from within a garage or loading area;

(v) bicycle parking space or storage area intended to accommodate cargo bicycles as shall be described in specifications published by the Zoning Administrator; and

(vi) an in-home childcare unit that meets the requirements of Section 414A.6(a)(2), (3), and (5). Projects that construct an in-home childcare unit shall receive a waiver of the requirements of Section 414A.

(D) Family-Friendly Amenities shall be included in the project for a minimum of 30 years, or the life of the project, whichever is shorter, and the use and space requirement shall be recorded in a Notice of Special Restrictions. If the Family-Friendly Amenity is discontinued, it must be replaced with another Family-Friendly Amenity.

*(4) **Units With** Two ~~Three~~ **or More Bedrooms.** Projects that contain units with* two ~~three~~ *or more bedrooms shall be permitted to include additional square footage, as set forth below:*

(A) 250 square feet for every two-bedroom unit provided in excess of the number of two-bedroom units required by subsection (d)(1)(B); and

(B) *250 square feet for every three-bedroom unit provided, including any three-bedroom units required pursuant to subsection (d)(1)(B); and*

(~~B~~C) 400 square feet for every unit provided that contains four or more bedrooms, including any such units required pursuant to subsection (d)(1)(B); and

(~~C~~D) horizontal additions to accommodate the extra square footage described in subsection (e)(4)(A)-(~~B~~C) through any combination of the following:

(i) reducing the required rear yard above the ground floor (Section 134) to 25% or 20 feet, whichever is greater; and

(ii) reducing the required ground floor rear yard (Section 134) to 18% or 15 feet, whichever is greater;

(iii) reducing the required side yard (Section 133) to zero feet, and/or

(iv) reducing the required upper-story setback to 10 feet for additions to Historic Buildings; and

(~~D~~E) in all districts except Residential districts, vertical additions not to exceed 10 feet total above the Housing Choice-SF height limit (Section 263.19) to accommodate the extra square footage described in subsections (e)(4)(A) ~~and~~ *-(~~B~~C).*

(~~E~~F) The units containing two ~~three~~ *or more bedrooms shall be included in the project for a minimum of 30 years, or the life of the project, whichever is shorter, and the use and space requirement shall be recorded in a Notice of Special Restrictions.*

(5) ***Replacement of Commercial Space.*** In districts other than Residential districts, projects proposing the alteration or demolition of a building with existing Commercial Uses shall be permitted to include additional square footage, as set forth below. For the purposes of this subsection (e)(5), a "Replacement Commercial Space" shall satisfy all of the following for each Commercial Use: (1) the space(s) contains between 90% to 110% of the gross floor area of the existing Commercial Use(s); (2) the storefront(s) occupies between 90 to 110% of the length of the street frontage occupied by the existing Commercial Use(s), except that if the street frontage for the existing Commercial Use is 50 feet or less, up to 10 feet of frontage can be used for a lobby; and if the street frontage for the existing Commercial Use is greater than 50 feet, up to 15 feet of the frontage can be used for a lobby; and (3) the space contains a Warm Retail Shell, as that term is defined in subsection (e)(2), provided that if the existing Commercial Use involves food service, the project must provide a Food Service Warm Shell.

.

(A) up to 1.5 square feet for project uses for each square foot of Replacement Commercial Space; and

(B) up to a maximum of 10 feet total above the permitted height limit to accommodate the additional square footage.

(C) A project providing Replacement Commercial Space is also eligible for the Warm Retail Shell bonuses in subsection (e)(2).

(D) The Replacement Commercial Space shall be included in the project for a minimum of 30 years, or the life of the project, whichever is shorter, and the use requirement shall be recorded in a Notice of Special Restrictions.

(6) ***Preservation of Historic Buildings.*** *In districts other than Residential districts, projects proposing an alteration to a Historic Building and/or constructing new buildings on sites that contain a Historic Building shall be permitted to include additional square footage, as provided below:*

(A) up to 1.5 times the gross floor area foregone by retaining the Historic Building and complying with Objective Standards pertaining to Historic Buildings, including through setting back building additions and/or new construction in relation to the Historic Building. For the purposes of this subsection (e)(~~5~~6)(A), the foregone gross floor area shall be equal to the gross floor area within the volume that would otherwise be permitted under the Planning Code and all applicable Objective Standards, inclusive of modifications allowed pursuant to this Section 206.10, but is not being constructed in order to accommodate a reduced building mass above or around a Historic Building and that complies with or exceeds the setbacks or mass reductions required by the Objective Standards pertaining to Historic Buildings. The Zoning Administrator may publish further guidance on the calculation of foregone gross floor area; and

(B) for Historic Buildings with storefronts that contain character-defining features, an additional 0.25 square feet for every square foot of space in the storefront, provided that the project preserves the storefront in compliance with Objective Standards

pertaining to Historic Buildings; and

(C) *horizontal or vertical additions to accommodate this extra square footage, except that any such additions shall not:*

(i) exceed 20 feet above the Housing Choice-SF height limit (Section 263.19); or

(ii) reduce the required rear yard above the ground floor to less than 15 feet where the site abuts the rear yard of adjacent parcels containing residential uses.

(~~C~~D*) The Historic Building* and/or historic storefront *shall be maintained in compliance with the Preservation Design Standards for the life of the project, and the requirement shall be recorded in a Notice of Special Restrictions.*

(~~6~~7*)* ***Limits on Bonuses.*** Except as provided below, A~~a~~*n HC-SF Project can combine the heights, square footage, and additional bonuses in subsections (e)(1) through (e)(*~~5~~6*),* ~~as provided below:~~.

(1) ***Height.*** *A project may combine the bonuses in subsections (e)(1) through (e)(*~~4~~5*) provided that any height bonus is limited to 10 feet above the Housing Choice-SF height limit. A project may combine the bonuses in subsections (e)(1) through (e)(*~~5~~6*) provided that any height bonus is limited to 30 feet above the Housing Choice-SF height limit.*

(2) ***Rear Yard.*** *A project cannot reduce the required rear yard beyond the lowest of the limits set forth in subsections (e)(3)-(e)(*~~5~~6*).*

SEC. 334. HOUSING CHOICE-SAN FRANCISCO PROJECT AUTHORIZATION.

(a) ***Purpose and Applicability.*** *The purpose of this Section 334 is to provide for the review and approval of a Housing Choice San Francisco (HC-SF) project, as defined in Section 206.10.*

(b) ***General Process.***

(1) ***Application.*** *An HC-SF Project shall apply through the Planning Department's*

procedures for Development Applications and review. An HC-SF project application shall be submitted with and processed concurrently with all other applications. The HC-SF project application shall be submitted on a form prescribed by the Department, and shall include all of the following information:

(i) A full plan set, including a site plan, elevations, sections, and floor plans, showing total number of units, and the number of and location of affordable units as applicable; and a draft Regulatory Agreement, if the project elects to subject units to the Rent Stabilization Ordinance under Section 206.10(c)(1);

(ii) Except as noted in subsection (iii), demonstration of compliance with the Planning Code and provisions of the HC-SF Program, including any permitted zoning modifications;

(iii) Requested Major Modifications under subsection (d).

*(2) **Procedures.** The review of an HC-SF Project shall be conducted as part of, and incorporated into, a Development Application. Where there is a conflict, the provisions of Section 206.10 shall govern. Unless modified by Section 206.10, if a project requires a conditional use authorization, or any other entitlement that requires a public hearing before the Planning Commission and/or the Historic Preservation Commission, the HC-SF Project shall be reviewed by the Planning Commission and/or the Historic Preservation Commission, as applicable.*

*(3) **Discretionary Review.** As long as the Planning Commission has delegated its authority to the Planning Department to review applications for an HC-SF Project, the Planning Commission shall not hold a public hearing for discretionary review of an HC-SF that is subject to this Section 334.*

*(4) **Regulatory Agreement for Projects Using Section 206.10(c)(1).***

(A) Sponsors of HC-SF Projects that elect to comply with the provisions of Section 206.10(c)(1) shall enter into a regulatory agreement with the City subjecting all units, except for any units required to be Affordable Units as defined in Planning Code Section 401, to the Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance (Chapter 37 of the Administrative Code), as a

condition of approval ("Regulatory Agreement").

(B) The property owner and the Planning Director, or the Director's designee, on behalf of the City, will execute the Regulatory Agreement, which is subject to review and approval by the City Attorney's Office. The Regulatory Agreement shall be executed prior to the City's issuance of the First Construction Document for the project, as defined in Section 107A.13.1 of the Building Code. Following execution of the Regulatory Agreement by all parties and approval by the City Attorney, the Regulatory Agreement or a memorandum thereof shall be recorded in the title records in the Office of the Assessor-Recorder against the property and shall be binding on all future owners and successors in interest.

(C) At a minimum, the Regulatory Agreement shall contain the following:

(i) A description of the total number of Dwelling Units approved, including the number of units subject to the Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance and other restricted units, if any, and the location, square footage of Dwelling Units, and number of bedrooms in each unit;

(ii) A statement that the Dwelling Units are not subject to the Costa-Hawkins Rental Housing Act (California Civil Code Section 1954.50 et seq.). Further, that under Section 1954.52(b), the property owner has entered into and agreed to the terms of the agreement with the City in consideration for an exception from residential density limits, or other direct financial contribution or other forms of assistance specified in California Government Code Section 65915 et seq.;

(iii) A description of the residential density exception or other direct financial contribution or forms of assistance provided to the property owner; and

(iv) A description of the remedies for breach of the agreement and other provisions to ensure implementation and compliance with the agreement; and,

(v) An agreement that any lease, sublease, or other agreement regarding

tenancy of units not subject to the Costa-Hawkins Rental Housing Act (California Civil Code Sections 1954.50 et seq.) shall include the following text: "This unit is a rental unit subject to the San Francisco Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance."

*(5) **Other Agreements.** HC-SF Projects that provide on-site affordable units under Section 415 et seq. or other state or local program that requires or allows the provision of on-site affordable units, shall comply with any applicable recording or regulatory agreement requirement of that state or local program.*

*(6) **Timeline of Review.** Unless the Environmental Review Officer determines that compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act would take more than 180 days, review of an HC-SF Project not seeking a Major Modification under this Section 334 shall be completed within 180 days of submittal of a complete Development Application. Unless the Environmental Review Officer determines that compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act would take more than 180 days, the Planning Commission shall hold a public hearing for projects seeking a Major Modification within 180 days of submittal of a complete project application.*

*(c) **Administrative Review.** The Planning Department shall administratively review an HC-SF Project, unless the Project seeks a Major Modification pursuant to subsection (d), or any HC-SF Project that is a 100% Affordable HC-SF Project. The Planning Department's determination regarding an HC-SF Project under this subsection (c) shall not be appealable.* Nothing in this Section 334 abrogates permit, license, or other requirements codified outside the Planning Code.

*(d) **Projects Seeking Major Modifications to Standards and Requirements.** An HC-SF Project may seek a Major Modification using the process in this subsection (d).*

*(1) **Definition.** A "Major Modification" means any deviation from any quantitative standard in the Planning Code or any applicable Objective Standard not otherwise provided in Section 206.10(d) through (e). A project seeking a Major Modification to an Objective Standard shall not be considered code compliant.*

*(2) **Additional Modifications.** HC-SF Projects seeking Major Modifications pursuant to this subsection (d) may also pursue additional modifications that are not Major Modifications under the provisions elsewhere in this Code.*

*(3) **Exclusions.** In no case may an HC-SF Project receive a Major Modification or other exception under any provision of this Code to the following requirements: maximum building height; maximum permitted accessory off-street parking amounts; wind standards; minimum density requirements; Floor Area Ratio limits; any standard set forth in Articles 1.7, 3, 3.5, 4, 10, and 11 of the Planning Code; definitions; permitted land uses; the Transportation Demand Management Program under Section 169;* dwelling unit mix; *and any standard or provision adopted by the voters.*

*(4) **Required Findings for Major Modifications.** To grant a Major Modification, the Planning Commission shall find: (a) that the proposed modification achieves equal or superior design quality, and (b) the project would provide a significant community benefit by producing housing near transit, or otherwise promote the general welfare.*

*(5) **Conditions of Approval.** The Planning Commission may adopt conditions of approval for granted modification(s). Such conditions shall be limited to addressing the potential impact of such granted modification(s).*

*(6) **Process for Applicants Seeking Major Modifications.***

*(A) **Decision.** The Planning Commission, at a noticed public hearing, shall review, and approve, disapprove, or approve with conditions, a request for a Major Modification. The Planning Commission shall find that the proposed Major Modification(s) meet the criteria in subsection (d)(4). As part of its review and decision, the Planning Commission may impose additional conditions, requirements, modifications, and limitations on a proposed project in order to mitigate the effect of the requested modification(s) and thereby achieve the objectives, policies, and intent of the General Plan and/or applicable Objective Standards.*

*(B) **Notification.** Notice of a hearing required by subsection (6)(A) shall be*

provided in accordance with Planning Code Section 333.

(e) ***Notification and Record of Decision.*** *Notification and record of decision of an HC-SF Project shall be provided as set forth in the Planning Department procedures for review and approval of Development Applications.*

(f) ***Change of Conditions.*** *Once a project is approved, a change in any condition previously imposed by the Planning Commission shall require approval by the Planning Commission subject to the procedures set forth in this Section 334.*

(g) **Progress Requirement.** Approval of a project pursuant to this Section 334 shall expire if the project sponsor has not procured a building permit or site permit for construction of the project within 30 months of the date of project approval. If the Planning Director or the Director's designee finds that the project sponsor has demonstrated good faith in its efforts to obtain the first site or building permit for the project, the Planning Director or designee may extend the approval for the project for a maximum of six additional months. Such deadline shall additionally be extended in the event of any appeal of such approval for the duration of the appeal, and in the event of litigation seeking to invalidate the approval for the duration of the litigation.

SEC. 344. HOUSING CHOICE HOUSING SUSTAINABILITY DISTRICT.

(a) ***Purpose.*** *This Section 344 establishes the Housing Choice - San Francisco Housing Sustainability District ("HSD") under California Government Code Sections 66200 et seq. The purpose of the HSD is to encourage the development of on-site affordable housing in new residential and mixed-use projects by providing a streamlined, ministerial approval process for such projects. This Section 344 sets forth eligibility criteria, design review standards, and entitlement and approval procedures for projects seeking approval pursuant to the HSD.*

(b) ***Geography.*** *The HSD shall be comprised of all parcels, other than those zoned as RH or*

RM, in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.

*(c) **Relationship to Other Planning Code Provisions.** Except as otherwise provided in this Section 344, the Planning Code shall apply to projects approved pursuant to this Section 344. In the event of a conflict between other provisions of the Planning Code and this Section 344, this Section shall control.*

*(d) **Eligibility.** Projects seeking approval pursuant to this Section 344 shall meet all of the following requirements:*

(1) The project is located in a zoning district where Residential uses are principally permitted.

(2) For Dwelling Unit projects, the project's residential density is no less than 50 Dwelling Units per acre, and no more than 1,000 Dwelling Units per acre.

(3) At least one-half of the project's Gross Floor Area is designated for Residential uses. All proposed Non-Residential uses must be principally permitted in the underlying zoning district and any applicable SUD(s). The project shall not include more than 24,999 square feet of Gross Floor Area of Office use that would be subject to the annual limit on office development set forth in Sections 321 et seq.

(4) The project does not demolish 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 ~~a building that is~~

~~designated as a landmark under Article 10, is listed as a contributor to an historic district in Article 10, is listed as a Significant or Contributory Building under Article 11, is listed in the California Register of Historical Resources, or is listed on the National Register of Historic Places~~.

(5) Consistent with California Government Code Section 66201(f), the project shall provide no less than 10% of dwelling units as units affordable to very low or low income households. A project subject to Section 415 may apply any such affordable units towards its compliance with Section 415. Projects not subject to Section 415 shall enter into a regulatory agreement with the City to restrict the affordability of any such units for no less than 55 years.

(6) The project does not demolish, remove, or convert to another use any existing Dwelling Unit(s), or Residential Flat.

(7) The project complies with all applicable Planning Code requirements and any adopted Objective Standards. Projects seeking approval pursuant to this Section 344 may not seek any exceptions to height and bulk limits pursuant to Section 309(a)(17).

(8) The project sponsor complies with all applicable mitigation measures in the Housing Element 2022 Update Environmental Impact Report ("Housing Element EIR").

(9) The project sponsor certifies that the project will comply with all applicable requirements of California Government Code Section 66201(f)(4).

(10) The project complies with the requirement of Government Code Section 66201(f)(5).

(11) The project provides relocation assistance to any displaced residential tenants.

(12) A project is not deemed to be for residential use if it is infeasible for actual use as a single or multifamily residence.

(13) The project does not demolish or convert any portion of a Tourist Hotel.

(e) ***Approving Authority.*** *The Planning Department is the approving authority designated to*

review permit applications for compliance with this Section 344.

(f) ***Application.*** *In addition to any requirements under other provisions of this Code for submittal of application materials, an application under this Section 344 shall be submitted to the Department on a form prescribed by the Department and shall not be considered complete until the project sponsor has provided all of the following:*

(1) A full plan set, including site plan, elevations, sections, and floor plans, showing total number of units, and number of and location of units affordable to very low or low income households;

(2) All documentation required by the Planning Department and sufficient to support determinations that:

(A) The project meets all applicable zoning and any Objective Standards.

(B) The project sponsor will implement any and all mitigation measures in the Housing Element EIR that the Environmental Review Officer determines are applicable. The project sponsor shall submit scope(s) of work for any studies required as part of any mitigation measure, and the application shall not be deemed complete until such studies are completed to the satisfaction of the Environmental Review Officer.

(C) The project will comply with subsections (d)(10) and (d)(11) of this Section 344.

(g) ***Decision and Hearing.*** *The Department shall ministerially approve projects that meet all the requirements in this Section 344, as follows:*

(1) ***Hearing.*** *The Planning Department shall conduct an informational public hearing for all projects that are subject to this Section 344 within 100 days of receipt of a complete application, as set forth in subsection (f).*

(2) ***Decision.*** *Within 120 days of receipt of a complete application, as set forth in subsection (f), the Planning Director or the Director's designee shall issue a written decision*

approving, disapproving, or approving subject to conditions, the project. The applicant and the Department may mutually agree to extend this 120-day period. If no written decision is issued within 120 days of the Department's receipt of a complete application, or within the period mutually agreed upon by the Department and applicant, the project shall be deemed approved. The Planning Director or the Director's designee shall include any certifications required by California Government Code Section 66205(e) in a copy of the written decision.

*(3) **Grounds for Permit Denial.** The Department may deny an HSD project application only for one or more of the following reasons:*

(A) The proposed project does not fully comply with this Section 344, including but not limited to meeting all adopted Objective Standards and/or implementing all mitigation measures in the Housing Element EIR that the Department determines are applicable.

(B) The project sponsor has not submitted all of the information or paid any application fee required by this Section 344 and necessary for an adequate and timely design review or assessment of potential impacts on nearby properties.

(C) The Department determines, based upon substantial evidence in light of the whole record of the public hearing on the project, that a physical condition on the site of development that was not known and could not have been discovered with reasonable investigation at the time the application was submitted would have a specific adverse impact upon the public health or safety and that there is no feasible method to satisfactorily mitigate or avoid the specific adverse impact. As used in this subsection (g)(3)(C), "specific adverse impact" means a significant, quantifiable, direct, and unavoidable impact based on identified objective written public health or safety standards, policies, or conditions, in existence at the time the application was deemed complete.

*(4) **Appeal.** The procedures for appeal to the Board of Appeals of a decision by the Department under this Section 344 shall be as set forth in Section 8 of the Business and Tax Regulations Code.*

*(5) **Discretionary Review.** No requests for discretionary review shall be accepted by the Planning Department for projects subject to this Section 344. As long as the Planning Commission has delegated its authority to the Planning Department to review applications for projects subject to this Section 344, the Planning Commission shall not hold a public hearing for discretionary review of projects subject to this Section 344.*

*(6) **Progress Requirement.** Approval of a project pursuant to this Section 344 shall expire if the project sponsor has not procured a building permit or site permit for construction of the project within 30 months of the date of the Department's issuance of a written decision pursuant to subsection (g)(2). If the Planning Director or the Director's designee finds that the project sponsor has demonstrated good faith in its efforts to obtain the first site or building permit for the project, the Planning Director or designee may extend the approval for the project for a maximum of six additional months. Such deadline shall additionally be extended in the event of any appeal of such approval for the duration of the appeal, and in the event of litigation seeking to invalidate the approval for the duration of the litigation.*

*(h) **Design Review Standards.** Projects subject to this Section 344 shall be reviewed for compliance with the design standards set forth in the Planning Code and any Objective Standards.*

*(i) **District Affordability Requirement.** At the request of the California Department of Housing and Community Development, the Planning Department shall demonstrate that at least 20% of the residential units constructed in the HSD during the life of the District and pursuant to this Section 344 will be affordable to very low, low, and moderate-income households and subject to a recorded affordability restriction for at least 55 years.*

*(j) **Monitoring and Enforcement.** The Planning Department shall include, as conditions of approval of all projects approved pursuant to this Section 344, monitoring and enforcement provisions to ensure that the project meets all applicable labor and wage requirements and complies with all identified applicable mitigation measures. Projects found to be in violation of any of these conditions*

shall be subject to the Administrative Enforcement Procedures in Section 176 of this Code, including initiation of abatement proceedings or referral to the City Attorney or District Attorney for prosecution, if not corrected within 90 days of service of any notice of violation issued under Section 176(b)(1). Conditions of approval shall include, but are not limited to:

(1) A project sponsor shall submit weekly reports to the Office of Labor Standards Enforcement, certifying that a project approved pursuant to this Section 344 is complying with subsections (d)(11) and (d)(12), if applicable to the project. Projects found to be in violation of subsections (d)(11) and (d)(12) shall be subject to penalties pursuant to Section 1741 of the Labor Code, in addition to any penalties assessed pursuant to Section 176 of this Code. All penalties shall be paid prior to issuance of the project's First Certificate of Occupancy, as defined in Section 401 of this Code.

(2) The Planning Department shall monitor compliance with the Housing Element EIR mitigation measures for projects approved under the HSD.

(3) The Planning Department shall monitor and report the construction of affordable housing units under the HSD in its annual Housing Inventory, which shall include the following information:

(A) Number of projects approved pursuant to this Section 344.

(B) Number of projects under construction pursuant to approvals obtained under this Section 344.

(C) Number of projects completed pursuant to approvals obtained under this Section 344.

(D) Number of Dwelling Units or Group Housing beds within projects completed pursuant to approvals obtained under this Section 344.

(E) Number of Dwelling Units affordable to very low, low, moderate, and middle income households within projects completed pursuant to approvals obtained under this Section 344.

*(k) **Operative and Sunset Dates.***

(1) This Section 344 shall become operative upon confirmation of approval by the California Department of Housing and Community Development under California Government Code Section 66202(c) ("Operative Date").

(2) This Section 344 shall expire by operation of law seven years from the Operative Date, unless this Section 344 is renewed by ordinance pursuant to Government Code Section 66201(g), in which case this Section 344 shall expire on the date specified in that ordinance ("Sunset Date"). Upon the expiration of this Section 344, the City Attorney shall cause this Section 344 to be removed from the Planning Code. Pursuant to Government Code Section 66205(b), this Section 344 shall govern the processing and review of any complete application submitted pursuant to this Section 344 prior to the Sunset Date.

Section 4. Height and Bulk Limits. Article 2.5 of the Planning Code is hereby amended by revising Sections 260, 263.19, 263.20, and 270, and adding Sections 270.3 to read as follows:

SEC. 260. HEIGHT LIMITS: MEASUREMENT.

(a) **Method of Measurement.** The limits upon the height of buildings and structures shall be as specified on the Zoning Map, except as permitted by Section 206. In the measurement of height, the following rules shall be applicable:

(1) The point above which such measurements shall be taken shall be as specified as follows.

(A) In the case of either *subsection (a)(1)*(B) or (C) below, such point shall be taken at the centerline of the building or, where the building steps laterally in relation to a street that is the basis for height measurement, separate points shall be taken at the centerline of each building step.

(B) Where the lot is level with or slopes downward from a street at the centerline of the building or building step, such point shall be taken at curb level on such a street. This point shall be used for height measurement only for a lot depth not extending beyond a line 100 feet from and parallel to such street, or beyond a line equidistant between such street and the street on the opposite side of the block, whichever depth is greater. Measurement of height for any portion of the lot extending beyond such line shall be considered in relation to the opposite (lower) end of the lot, and that portion shall be considered an upward sloping lot in accordance with ~~S~~subsection *(a)(1)*(C) below, whether or not the lot also has frontage on a lower street.

(C) Where the lot slopes upward from a street at the centerline of the building or building step, such point shall be taken at curb level for purposes of measuring the height of the closest part of the building within 10 feet of the property line of such street; at every other cross-section of the building, at right angles to the centerline of the building or building step, such point shall be taken as the average of the ground elevations at either side of the building or building step at that cross-section. The ground elevations used shall be either existing elevations or the elevations resulting from new grading operations encompassing an entire block. Elevations beneath the building shall be taken by projecting a straight line between ground elevations at the exterior walls at either side of the entire building in the same plane.

(D) Where the lot has frontage on two or more streets, the owner may choose the street or streets from which the measurement of height is to be taken, within the scope of the rules stated above.

Where the height limits for buildings and structures are established by this Code, the upper points to be taken for measurement of height shall be as prescribed in the provisions relating to such height limits.

(2) The upper point to which such measurement shall be taken shall be the highest point on the finished roof in the case of a flat roof, and the average height of the rise in the case of a pitched or stepped roof, or similarly sculptured roof form, or any higher point of a feature not exempted under ~~S~~s*ubsection* (b) below. For any building taller than 550 feet in height in the S-2 Bulk District, the height of the building shall be measured at the upper point of all features of the building and exempted features in such cases shall be limited to only those permitted in ~~S~~s*ubsection* (b)(1)(M) and which are permitted by the Planning Commission according to the procedures of Section 309.

(3) In cases where the height limit is 65 feet or less and a street from which height measurements are made slopes laterally along the lot, or the ground slopes laterally on a lot that also slopes upward from the street, there shall be a maximum width for the portion of the building or structure that may be measured from a single point at curb or ground level, according to the definition of "height," as specified in the following table. These requirements shall not apply to any property to which the bulk limitations in Section 270 of this Code are applicable.

(4) The following requirements shall apply to all parcels within the R-4 Height and Bulk District, at or below 85 feet. In cases where the height limit is 85 feet or less and a street from which height measurements are made slopes laterally along the lot, or the ground slopes laterally on a lot that also slopes upward from the street, there shall be a maximum width for the portion of the building or structure that may be measured from a single point at curb or ground level, according to the definition of "height" as specified in the following table. These requirements shall not apply to any property to which the bulk limitations in Sections 270 through 270.3 of this Code are applicable.

TABLE 260-*1*
HEIGHT MEASUREMENT
ON LATERAL SLOPES WHERE
HEIGHT LIMIT IS 65 FEET OR LESS

Average Slope of Curb or Ground From Which Height is Measured	**Maximum Width for Portion of Building that May Be Measured from a Single Point**
5% ~~*percent*~~ or less	No requirement
More than 5% ~~*percent*~~ but no more than 15% ~~*percent*~~	65 feet
More than 15% ~~*percent*~~ but not more than 20% ~~*percent*~~	55 feet
More than 20% ~~*percent*~~ but no more than 25% ~~*percent*~~	45 feet
More than 25% ~~*percent*~~	35 feet

[image]

TABLE 260-2
HEIGHT MEASUREMENT
ON LATERAL SLOPES WHERE
HEIGHT LIMIT IS BETWEEN 65 AND 85 FEET

Average Slope of Curb or Ground From Which Height is Measured	*Maximum Width for Portion of Building that May Be Measured from a Single Point*
5% or less	*No requirement*
More than 5% but no more than 15%	*85 feet*
More than 15% but no more than 20%	*75 feet*
More than 20% but no more than 25%	*65 feet*
More than 25%	*55 feet*

(b) **Exemptions.** In addition to other height exceptions permitted by this Code, the

features listed in this subsection (b) shall be exempt from the height limits established by this Code, in an amount up to but not exceeding that which is specified.

* * * *

SEC. 263.19. HEIGHT LIMITS: PERMITTED ~~*PODIUM AND*~~ TOWER HEIGHTS IN THE R BULK DISTRICTS.

(a) This Section 263.19(a) shall apply to R Bulk Districts, except for the R-4 Height and Bulk District.

~~*(a)*~~*(1)* **Intent.** The general development concept for R Bulk Districts is of podium buildings that vary from 65 to 170 feet in height depending on the district and location, with adequately spaced slender towers up to 650 feet in height rising above the podium buildings.

~~*(b)*~~*(2)* **Maximum Height Controls for Podiums and Towers.** In the ~~*R bulk districts, which include the*~~ R, R-2, and R-3 bulk districts as designated on Sectional Map No. HT01, HT02, and HT07 of the Zoning Map, maximum permitted building heights for both podiums and towers are expressed as two numbers separated by a slash. The number preceding the slash represents the height limit for podium buildings. The number following the slash represents the height limit for towers. No building may exceed the podium height limit except for towers meeting the bulk and tower spacing controls established in Section 270(e) and (f).

~~*(c)*~~*(3)* **Maximum Height Controls for Podiums and Towers in the R-2 Bulk District and the Van Ness & Market Residential Special Use District**. In the R-2 bulk district and within the Van Ness & Market Residential Special Use District, maximum permitted building heights for both podiums and towers are expressed as two sets of numbers separated by a double slash in the format described above, in subsection *(a)*(~~*b*~~*2)*. Each set of numbers represents the maximum heights for podium and tower applicable to the parcel and

as regulated per subsection *(a)*(2~~b~~) above as follows: The first set of numbers represents the principally permitted height limits for the parcel, both for the podium and for the tower. The second set of numbers after the double slash represents the maximum height limits for podium and tower that can be granted by the Planning Commission for that parcel through an exception pursuant to the procedures and findings of Section 309(a)(17).

(b) This Section 263.19(b) shall apply to the R-4 Height and Bulk District.

*(1) **Intent.** The general development concept for the R-4 Height and Bulk District is for buildings that vary in height depending on the location, and in some locations providing for adequately spaced slender towers rising above the podiums of lower height(s). In addition to establishing bulk controls for all buildings in the district as further described in Section 270(i), the R-4 district implements the Housing Choice-San Francisco (HC-SF) program by providing for a secondary height limit for projects using the HC-SF Program per Section 206.10.*

*(2) **Maximum Height Controls for the HC-SF Program.** In the R-4 Height and Bulk District, as designated on Sectional Maps Nos. HT01, 02, 03, 04, 05, 06, 07, 11, 12, and 13 of the Zoning Map, the permitted building heights are expressed as two sets of numbers separated by a double slash. Preceding the double slash is the permitted building height limit for projects not using the HC-SF Program. Following the double slash is the height limit for projects using the HC-SF Program per Section 206.10. Where there is a set of two numbers separated by a single slash, the number preceding the single slash is the maximum height for podium buildings and the number following the single slash is the maximum tower height subject to the bulk and tower spacing controls of Section 270(i).*

The following represents an example of height limits subject to both podium and tower controls, and high limits for projects not using the HC-SF Program and projects using the HC-SF Program.



SEC. 263.20. SPECIAL HEIGHT EXCEPTION: ADDITIONAL FIVE FEET HEIGHT FOR ACTIVE GROUND FLOOR USES IN CERTAIN DISTRICTS ***AND ALL GROUND FLOOR USES IN THE R-4 HEIGHT AND BULK DISTRICT*****.**

* * * *

(b) **Applicability.** The special height exception described in this ~~s~~Section *263.20* shall only apply to projects that meet ~~*all*~~ *both* of the following criteria:

(1) project is located in a 30-X, 40-X, or 50-X Height and Bulk District*, or in the R-4 Height and Bulk District with a height limit of 40, 50, or 80 feet,* as designated on the Zoning Map;

(2) ~~*project is located in one of the following districts:*~~

~~*(A) in an NCT district as designated on the Zoning Map;*~~

~~*(B) in the Castro Street, Inner Clement Street, Outer Clement Street, Excelsior Outer Mission Street, Irving Street, Japantown, Judah Street, Noriega Street, Taraval Street, and 24th Street – Noe Valley NCDs;*~~

~~*(C) on a NC-2 designated parcel on Balboa Street between 2nd Avenue and 8th Avenue, and between 32nd Avenue and 39th Avenue;*~~

~~*(D) on a NC-1 designated parcel within the boundaries of Sargent Street to Orizaba Avenue to Lobos Street to Plymouth Avenue to Farallones Street to San Jose Avenue to Alemany Boulevard to 19th Avenue to Randolph Street to Monticello Street and back to Sargent Street;*~~

~~*(E) on a NC-3 designated parcel fronting on Geary Boulevard from Masonic Avenue to 28th Avenue, except for parcels on the north side of Geary Boulevard between Palm Avenue and Parker Avenue; or*~~

~~*(F) on a parcel zoned NC-1 on Noriega, Irving, Taraval, or Judah Streets west of 19th Avenue.*~~

~~*(3)*~~ project features ground floor commercial space or other active use as defined by Section 145.1(b)(2) with clear ceiling heights in excess of ten feet from sidewalk grade, or in the case of residential uses, such walk-up residential units are raised up from sidewalk level.~~;~~

~~*(4) said ground floor commercial space, active use, or walk-up residential use is primarily oriented along a right-of-way wider than 40 feet;*~~

~~*(5) said ground floor commercial space or active use occupies at least 50% of the project's ground floor area; and*~~

~~*(6) except for projects located in NCT districts, the project sponsor has conclusively demonstrated that the additional 5' increment allowed through Section 263.20 would not add new shadow to any public open spaces.*~~

* * * *

SEC. 270. BULK LIMITS: MEASUREMENT.

(a) The limits upon the bulk of buildings and structures shall be as stated in this Section 270 *(including Sections 270.1, 270.2, and 270.3)* and in Sections 271 and 272. The terms Diagonal Dimension, Height, Length, and Plan Dimensions shall be as defined in this Code. In

each height and bulk district, the maximum plan dimensions shall be as specified in the following table, at all horizontal cross-sections above the height indicated.

TABLE 270 **BULK LIMITS**			
District Symbol on Zoning Map	***Height Above Which Maximum Dimensions Apply (in feet)***	***Maximum Plan Dimensions (in feet)***	
		Length	***Diagonal Dimension***
* * * *			
R	This table not applicable. But see Section 270(e)		
R-2	This table not applicable. But see Section 270(f)		
R-3	*This table not applicable. But see Section 270(g)*		
R-4	*This table not applicable. But see Section 270(i)*		
V		110	140
* * * *			

* * * *

*(i) **R-4 Height and Bulk District.** In the R-4 Height and Bulk District, the bulk limitation are as follows:*

*(1) **Tower Bulk and Spacing.** In the R-4 Height and Bulk District, the otherwise applicable bulk controls for structures below a height of 85 feet or below a different height threshold where explicitly specified elsewhere in the Code ("Podium Height") shall govern, including, but not limited to, those found in the Citywide Design Standards. Portions of structures above the podium height shall comply with the bulk limitations described in subsection (i)(1)(A) and (B) below.*

(A) Buildings between the Podium Height and 140 feet in height (exclusive of

permitted height exceptions) shall:

(i) Provide 15-foot setback(s) from any interior property line(s) for portion(s) of the building above the Podium Height.

(ii) For portions of structures above the Podium Height, the average floor plate shall not exceed 12,000 square feet.

(iii) For portions of structures above the Podium Height, a maximum length of 130 feet and a maximum diagonal of 160 feet are permitted.

(iv) Building portions above the Podium Height and up to 140 feet must maintain a 30-foot distance from other buildings above the Podium Height on any lot.

(B) Buildings above 140 feet in height (exclusive of permitted height exceptions) shall:

(i) Provide 15-foot setback(s) from any interior property line(s) for portion(s) of the building above the Podium Height.

(ii) For portions of structures above the Podium Height, the average floor plate shall not exceed 12,000 square feet.

(iii) For portions of structures above the Podium Height, a maximum length of 130 feet and a maximum diagonal of 160 feet are permitted.

(iv) Building portions above the Podium Height shall be separated by no less than 115 feet from other buildings above 85 feet on any lot.

(v) For portions of buildings above the Podium Height, a maximum unbroken wall width of 100 feet is permitted. For building masses above 85 feet in height and with a plan length in excess of 100 feet, relief shall be provided through:

a. a notch, defined as a building recess or volumetric reduction that is provided at the indicated height and extending the full vertical height of the subject facade above 85-feet, of at least 10 feet by 10 feet; or

b. a change in plane of at least 10 feet.

(vi) The top one-third of a building above 85 feet shall be reduced in both floor plate and the allowed maximum plan and diagonal dimensions set forth in subsection (i)(1)(B) by 10% each.

SEC. 270.3. SPECIAL BULK REQUIREMENTS: MID-BLOCK ALLEYS IN LARGE LOT DEVELOPMENT OUTSIDE OF THE EASTERN NEIGHBORHOODS MIXED USE DISTRICTS, SOUTH OF MARKET COMMERCIAL TRANSIT DISTRICT, FOLSOM STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL TRANSIT DISTRICT, REGIONAL COMMERCIAL DISTRICT, C-3 AND DTR DISTRICTS.

*(a) **Findings.** This Section 270.3 incorporates the findings in Section 270.2(a), and determines that the conditions in Section 270.2 are applicable outside of the geographic area specified in Section 270.2..*

*(b) **Purpose.** The mid-block alley requirements of this Section 270.3 are intended to ameliorate the conditions and impacts described in the findings in Section 270.2(a) and make the subject areas appropriate for a higher density of activity and population in areas being targeted for more intense development. The horizontal mass reductions and mid-block alleys will ensure that block sizes for new housing support walkable neighborhoods. To encourage pedestrian movement, walking to nearby destinations including to and from transit, and neighborhood blocks with shortened distances to facilitate this activity, the bulk limitations noted below will apply.*

*(c) **Applicability.** This Section 270.3 applies to all development lots not subject to the requirements of Section 270.2, except development lots in PDR districts or that contain exclusively government or Public Facilities, that:*

(1) Are two acres or larger; and/or

(2) Have a frontage of 200 feet or greater on a single block face that is 400 feet or

greater.

*(d) **Requirements.** New construction on development lots that meet the criteria in subsection (c) above must be divided into smaller resultant lots and blocks in either one of the two following ways:*

*(1) **Option 1.** Lots shall be divided into resultant blocks such that:*

(A) no block frontage exceeds a length of 300 feet between intersections;

(B) no block perimeter exceeds a total of 1,200 feet; and

(C) the resultant blocks shall be separated from each other by newly created public street(s), alley(s), or publicly-accessible privately-owned street(s) or alley(s). Such street(s) shall meet San Francisco street standards including the Better Streets Plan as codified in Section 138.1 and pursuant to Public Works Code requirements. If privately-owned street(s) or alley(s) are created, they shall be maintained and must provide public access pursuant to the standards provided in Planning Code Section 270.2(e).

*(2) **Option 2**. Lots shall be divided into resultant blocks of not more than 400 feet in length between intersections of streets or alleys per subsection (d)(1)(C) above, that are bisected by alleys or passageways, and that do not exceed a total block perimeter of 1,400 feet. Such mid-block alleys or passageways shall meet the following conditions:*

*(A) **Location.** Be located as close to the middle portion of the subject block face, defined as within 50 lateral feet from the block centerline, perpendicular to the subject frontage and connecting to any existing adjacent streets and alleys. If the subject lot is not within the central portion of the block, the passageway shall cross the subject lot at its centerline or within 50 lateral feet from the lot centerline. For Development projects that include a Public Facility or are immediately abutting a parcel containing a Public Facility, this locational requirement shall not apply.*

*(B) **Hours of Operation.** The passageway(s) must be open to the public 24 hours a day, seven days a week. Fences and/or gates that would prevent public access at any point within the passageway(s) are prohibited.*

*(C) **Width.** The passageway(s) must maintain minimum width(s) of 20 feet measured from building-to-building at any point.*

*(D) **Walking Width.** Have a minimum clear walking width of 10 feet free of any obstructions in the case of a pedestrian-only right-of-way, and dual sidewalks each of not less than six feet in width with not less than four feet minimum clear width in the case of an alley with vehicular access.*

*(E) **Open to the Sky.** At least 60% of the passageway area must be open to the sky. Obstructions permitted within setbacks pursuant to Planning Code Section 136, that do not conflict with or obstruct the required walking width, may be located within the portion of the alley or passageway that is required to be open to the sky. All portions of the alley or pathway not open to the sky shall have a minimum clearance height from grade of 15 feet at all points. For Development Projects that include a Public Facility or are immediately abutting a parcel containing to a Public Facility, the required percent of the passageway area that must be open to the sky may be reduced to 50%.*

*(F) **Topography.** Changes in grade or steps are not permitted in an alley or passageway unless required by the natural topography and average grade.*

*(G) **Frontage.** Alleys or passageways must be fronted by active ground-floor uses, as defined in Section 145.1, for no less than 60% of their fronting length and in no case feature more than 50 continuous feet of inactive use(s) in any segment. For development projects that include a Public Facility or are immediately abutting a parcel containing a Public Facility, the required percent for active ground-floor uses may be reduced to 40% and may be unevenly distributed between the alley's or passageway's two sides.*

*(H) **Visual access.** Alleys or passageways must be configured to allow clear visual access from one end of the passageway through the development lot to its opposite end.*

(e) Additional Requirements for Private Passageways and Alleys.

*(1) **Maintenance.** Mid-block passageways and alleys required under this Section 270.3 shall be maintained at no public expense unless a publicly-accepted street or alley is created pursuant to subsection (d)(1) above. The owner of the property on which the alley or passageway is located shall maintain it by keeping the area clean and free of litter and by keeping it in an acceptable state of repair. Conditions intended to assure continued maintenance of the right-of-way for the actual lifetime of the building giving rise to the open space requirement may be imposed.*

*(2) **Informational Plaque.** Prior to issuance of a permit of occupancy, a plaque shall be placed in a publicly conspicuous location for pedestrian viewing. The plaque shall state the right of the public to pass through the alley and stating the name and address of the owner or owner's agent responsible for maintenance. The plaque shall be of no less than 24 inches by 36 inches in size.*

(3) Property owners providing a pathway or alley under this Section 270.3 shall hold harmless the City and County of San Francisco, its officers, agents, and employees, from any damage or injury caused by the design, construction, or maintenance of the right-of-way, and are solely liable for any damage or loss occasioned by any act or neglect in respect to the design, construction, or maintenance of the right-of-way.

(f) Any non-vehicular portions of such a passageway or alley, including sidewalks or other walking areas, seating areas, or landscaping, may count toward any open space requirements of this Code which permit publicly-accessible open space, provided that such space meets the standards of Section 135.

Section 5. Wind Controls. Articles 1, and 2 of the Planning Code are hereby amended by revising Sections 148, 243, 249.1, and 249.78, to read as follows:

SEC. 148. REDUCTION OF GROUND-LEVEL WIND CURRENTS *FOR BUILDINGS TALLER THAN 85 FEET* IN ~~*C-3*~~ *CERTAIN* DISTRICTS.

*(a) **Applicability.** In the C-3 Districts, Van Ness Special Use District, Folsom and Main*

Residential/Commercial Special Use District, Downtown Residential (DTR) Districts, and Central SoMa Special Use District, this Section 148 shall apply to new buildings taller than 85 feet in Height, vertical additions of more than 30 feet resulting in a total building height greater than 85 feet, or vertical additions of more than 30 feet to an existing building that is taller than 85 feet. Building height for the purpose of applicability of this Section shall be calculated pursuant to the provisions of Sections 260 and 263.21.

(b) ***Definitions.***

"Equivalent Wind Speed" means an hourly average wind speed adjusted to incorporate the effects of gustiness or turbulence on pedestrians, pursuant to the methodology adopted by the Planning Commission, as amended from time to time.

"Nine-Hour Hazard Criterion" means a ground-level equivalent wind speed of 26 miles per hour for nine or more hours per year.

(c) ***Controls for Hazardous Winds.*** *Projects shall not result in any net new locations that exceed the Nine-Hour Hazard Criterion.*

(d) ***Wind-reducing Features.*** *All wind-reducing features necessary to meet the requirements of this Section 148 shall be identified on the approved project plan set.*

(e) ***Maintenance of Wind-reducing Features.*** *All wind-reducing features necessary to meet the requirements of this Section 148 must be maintained for the life of the project. The Zoning Administrator may approve, including after installation, substitution of alternate wind-reducing features that would have an equal or superior effect on reducing ground-level winds at the subject location, provided that such features do not conflict with or increase noncompliance with other provisions of the Planning Code or other adopted Citywide Design Standards.*

~~*(a)* ***Requirement and Exception.*** *In C-3 Districts, buildings and additions to existing buildings shall be shaped, or other wind-baffling measures shall be adopted, so that the developments will not cause ground-level wind currents to exceed, more than 10 percent of the time year round, between 7:00*~~

~~*a.m. and 6:00 p.m., the comfort level of 11 m.p.h. equivalent wind speed in areas of substantial pedestrian use and seven m.p.h. equivalent wind speed in public seating areas.*~~

~~*When preexisting ambient wind speeds exceed the comfort level, or when a proposed building or addition may cause ambient wind speeds to exceed the comfort level, the building shall be designed to reduce the ambient wind speeds to meet the requirements. An exception may be granted, in accordance with the provisions of Section 309, allowing the building or addition to add to the amount of time that the comfort level is exceeded by the least practical amount if (1) it can be shown that a building or addition cannot be shaped and other wind-baffling measures cannot be adopted to meet the foregoing requirements without creating an unattractive and ungainly building form and without unduly restricting the development potential of the building site in question, and (2) it is concluded that, because of the limited amount by which the comfort level is exceeded, the limited location in which the comfort level is exceeded, or the limited time during which the comfort level is exceeded, the addition is insubstantial.*~~

~~*No exception shall be granted and no building or addition shall be permitted that causes equivalent wind speeds to reach or exceed the hazard level of 26 miles per hour for a single hour of the year.*~~

~~*(b) **Definition.** The term "equivalent wind speed" shall mean an hourly mean wind speed adjusted to incorporate the effects of gustiness or turbulence on pedestrians.*~~

~~*(c) **Guidelines.** Procedures and Methodologies for implementing this Section shall be specified by the Office of Environmental Review of the Planning Department.*~~

SEC. 243. VAN NESS SPECIAL USE DISTRICT.

* * * *

(c) **Controls.** All provisions of the Planning Code applicable to an RC-4 District shall apply except as otherwise provided in this Section *243*.

* * * *

(15) ***Wind Standards.*** *Wind standards shall apply pursuant to Section 148.* ~~***Reduction of Ground Level Wind Currents.***~~

~~*(A) New buildings and additions to existing buildings shall be shaped, or other wind baffling measures shall be adopted, so that the development will not cause year-round ground level wind currents to exceed, more than 10 percent of the time, between 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m., the comfort level of 11 m.p.h. equivalent wind speed in areas of pedestrian use and seven m.p.h. equivalent wind speed in public seating areas. When pre-existing ambient wind speeds exceed the comfort levels specified above, the building shall be designed to reduce the ambient wind speeds in efforts to meet the goals of this requirement.*~~

~~*(B) An exception to this requirement may be permitted but only if and to the extent that the project sponsor demonstrates that the building or addition cannot be shaped or wind baffling measures cannot be adopted without unduly restricting the development potential of the building site in question.*~~

~~*(i) The exception may permit the building or addition to increase the time that the comfort level is exceeded, but only to the extent necessary to avoid undue restriction of the development potential of the site.*~~

~~*(ii) Notwithstanding the above, no exception shall be allowed and no building or addition shall be permitted that causes equivalent wind speeds to reach or exceed the hazard level of 26 m.p.h. for a single hour of the year. For the purposes of this Section, the term "equivalent wind speed" shall mean an hourly wind speed adjusted to incorporate the effects of gustiness or turbulence on pedestrians.*~~

* * * *

SEC. 249.1. FOLSOM AND MAIN RESIDENTIAL/COMMERCIAL SPECIAL USE

DISTRICT.

* * * *

(b) **Controls.** The following zoning controls are applicable in the Residential/Commercial Special Use District.

(1) ***Wind Standards.*** *Wind standards shall apply pursuant to Section 148.* ~~***Reduction of Ground-Level Wind Currents.***~~

~~*(A) **Requirement.** New buildings and additions to existing buildings shall be shaped, or other wind-baffling measures shall be adopted, so that the developments will not cause ground-level wind currents to exceed, more than 10 percent of the time year-round, between 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m., the comfort level of 11 m.p.h. equivalent wind speed in areas of substantial pedestrian use and seven m.p.h. equivalent wind speed in public seating areas. The term "equivalent wind speed" shall mean an hourly mean wind speed adjusted to incorporate the effects of gustiness or turbulence on pedestrians.*~~

~~*When preexisting ambient wind speeds exceed the comfort level, or when a proposed building or addition may cause ambient wind speeds to exceed the comfort level, the building shall be designed to reduce the ambient wind speeds to meet the requirements. The provisions of this Section 249.1(b)(3) shall not apply to any buildings or additions to existing buildings for which a draft EIR has been published prior to January 1, 1985.*~~

~~*(B) **Exception.** The Zoning Administrator may allow the building or addition to add to the amount of time the comfort level is exceeded by the least practical amount if (1) it can be shown that a building or addition cannot be shaped and other wind-baffling measures cannot be adopted to meet the foregoing requirements without creating an unattractive and ungainly building form and without unduly restricting the development potential of the building site in question, and (2) it is concluded that, because of the limited amount by which the comfort level is exceeded, the limited location in which the comfort level is exceeded, or the limited time during which the comfort level is*~~

~~*exceeded, the addition is insubstantial.*~~

~~*The Zoning Administrator shall not grant an exception and no building or addition shall be permitted that causes equivalent wind speeds to reach or exceed the hazard level of 26 miles per hour for a single hour of the year.*~~

~~*(C) **Procedures.** Procedures and methodologies for implementing this Section shall be specified by the Office of Environmental Review of the Planning Department.*~~

* * * *

SEC. 249.78. CENTRAL SOMA SPECIAL USE DISTRICT.

* * * *

(d) **Urban Design and Density Controls.**

* * * *

(9) **Wind** ***Standards.*** *Wind standards shall apply pursuant to Section 148.*

~~*(A) **Applicability.** This subsection shall apply to new buildings above 85 feet in Height and additions to existing buildings that result in a building above 85 feet in Height.*~~

~~*(B) **Definitions.***~~

~~*"Comfort Level" means ground-level equivalent wind speeds of 11 miles per hour in areas of substantial pedestrian use and seven miles per hour in public seating areas between 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. when occurring for more than 15 percent of the time year round.*~~

~~*"Equivalent Wind Speed" means an hourly mean wind speed adjusted to incorporate the effects of gustiness or turbulence on pedestrians.*~~

~~*"Nine-Hour Hazard Criterion" means a ground-level equivalent wind speed of 26 miles per hour for more than nine hours per year per test location.*~~

~~*"One-Hour Hazard Criterion" means a ground-level equivalent wind speed of 26 miles per hour for more than one hour per year per test location.*~~

~~*"Substantial Increase" means an increase in wind speeds of more than six miles per hour for more than 15 percent of the time year round.*~~

~~*(C) **Controls for Wind Comfort.***~~

~~*(i) Projects may not result in wind speeds that exceed the Comfort Level at any location.*~~

~~*(ii) Projects may not cause a Substantial Increase in wind speed at any location where the existing or resulting wind speed exceeds the Comfort Level.*~~

~~*(iii) Pursuant to Section 329, the Planning Commission may grant an exception to the standards of subsections (i) and (ii) above as applied to a project if it finds that the project meets the following criteria:*~~

~~*(aa) It has undertaken all feasible measures to reduce wind speeds through such means as building sculpting and appurtenances, permanent wind baffling measures, and landscaping; and*~~

~~*(bb) Reducing wind speeds further would substantially detract from the building design or unduly restrict the square footage of the project.*~~

~~*(D) **Controls for Hazardous Winds.***~~

~~*(i) Projects shall not result in net new locations with an exceedance of the One-Hour Hazard Criterion, except as allowed by the Planning Commission based on criteria described in subsection (ii) below.*~~

~~*(ii) Pursuant to Section 329, the Planning Commission may grant an exception to the standard of subsection (i) above as applied to a proposed project if it finds that the proposed project meets all of the following criteria:*~~

~~*(aa) The project with wind reduction measures does not result in net new locations with an exceedance of the Nine-Hour Hazard Criterion;*~~

~~*(bb) The project has undertaken all feasible measures to reduce*~~

~~*hazardous wind speeds, such as building sculpting and appurtenances, permanent wind baffling measures, and landscaping; and*~~

~~*(cc) Meeting the requirements of subsection (i) would detract from the building design or unduly restrict the square footage of the project.*~~

~~*(iii) No exception shall be granted and no building or addition shall be permitted for any project that causes net new locations with an exceedance in the Nine-Hour Hazard Criterion.*~~

~~*(E) **Guidelines.** Procedures and methodologies for implementing this subsection shall be issued by the Department.*~~

* * * *

Section 6. Residential Districts. Article 2 of the Planning Code is hereby amended by revising Sections 209, 209.1, 209.2, and 209.3, to read as follows:

SEC. 209. DESCRIPTION AND PURPOSE OF RESIDENTIAL AND RESIDENTIAL-COMMERCIAL DISTRICTS.

The following statements of description and purpose outline the main functions of the Residential and Residential-Commercial (Residential) Districts in the zoning plan for San Francisco, supplementing the statements of purpose contained in Section 101 of this Code.

(a) **Purpose.** These Districts are established for purposes of implementing the Residence element and other elements of the General Plan, according to the objectives, principles and policies stated therein. Among these purposes are the following:

(1) Preservation, improvement and maintenance of the existing housing stock through protection of neighborhood environments and encouragement of sound ownership practices and rehabilitation efforts;

(2) Recognition and protection of the architectural characteristics and *urban*

patterns densities of existing residential areas;

(3) Maximizing of housing choice by assuring the availability of quality owner and rental housing of various kinds, suitable for a whole range of household types, lifestyles and economic levels;

(4) Encouragement of residential development that will meet outstanding community needs, provide adequate indoor and outdoor spaces for its occupants, and relate well to the character and scale of existing neighborhoods and structures; and

(5) Promotion of balanced and convenient neighborhoods having appropriate public improvements and services, suitable nonresidential activities that are compatible with housing and meet the needs of residents, and other amenities that contribute to the livability of residential areas.

(b) **Uses and Features Permitted in Residential and Residential-Commercial Districts.** The uses and features permitted in Residential and Residential-Commercial Districts are listed in the Zoning Control Tables in Sections 209.1 through 209.4.

SEC. 209.1. RH (RESIDENTIAL, HOUSE) DISTRICTS.

These Districts are intended to recognize*, protect, conserve,* and enhance areas characterized by dwellings in the form of houses and small multi-family buildings, usually with one, two, or three units with separate entrances, and limited scale in terms of building width and height, and characterized by rear yards and a pattern of mid-block open spaces. Such areas tend to have similarity of building styles and predominantly contain large units suitable for family occupancy, considerable open space, and limited nonresidential uses. *In all RH Districts, multi-family buildings with four or more units are permitted under various provisions of this Code.* The RH Districts are composed of five separate classes of districts, as follows:

RH-1(D) Districts: One-Family (Detached Dwellings). These Districts are

characterized by lots of greater width and area than in other parts of the City, and by single-family houses with side yards. The structures are relatively large, but rarely exceed 35 feet in height. Ground level open space and landscaping at the front and rear are usually abundant. Much of the development has been in sizable tracts with similarities of building style and narrow streets following the contours of hills. ~~*In some cases private covenants have controlled the nature of development and helped to maintain the street areas.*~~

RH-1 Districts: One-Family. These Districts ~~*are*~~*have been* occupied almost entirely by single-family houses on lots 25 feet in width, without side yards. Floor sizes and building styles vary, but tend to be uniform within tracts developed in distinct time periods. Though built on separate lots, the structures have the appearance of small-scale row housing, rarely exceeding 35 feet in height. Front setbacks are common, and ground level open space is generous. ~~*In most cases the single-family character of these Districts has been maintained for a considerable time.*~~

RH-1(S) Districts: One-Family with Minor Second Unit. These Districts are similar in character to RH-1 Districts, except that a small second dwelling unit has been installed in many structures, usually by conversion of a ground-story space formerly part of the main unit or devoted to storage. The second unit remains subordinate to the owner's unit, and may house one or two persons related to the owner or be rented to others. Despite these conversions, the structures retain the appearance of single-family dwellings.

RH-2 Districts: Two-Family. These Districts ~~*are devoted to*~~*have been historically developed with* one-family and two-family houses, with the latter commonly consisting of two large flats, one occupied by the owner and the other available for rental. Structures are finely scaled and usually do not exceed 25 feet in width or 40 feet in height. Building styles are often more varied than in historically single-family areas, but certain streets and tracts are quite uniform. Considerable ground-level open space is available, and it frequently is private for

each unit. The Districts may have easy access to shopping facilities and transit lines. In some cases, Group Housing and institutions are found in these areas, although nonresidential uses tend to be quite limited.

RH-3 Districts: Three-Family. These Districts have many similarities to RH-2 Districts, but structures with three units are common in addition to one-family and two-family houses. The predominant form ~~is~~*has historically been* large flats rather than apartments, with lots 25 feet wide, a fine or moderate scale, and separate entrances for each unit. Building styles tend to be varied but complementary to one another. Outdoor space is available at ground level, and also on decks and balconies for individual units. Nonresidential uses are more common in these areas than in RH-2 Districts.

Table 209.1

ZONING CONTROL TABLE FOR RH DISTRICTS

Zoning Category	***§ References***	***RH-1(D)***	***RH-1***	***RH-1(S)***	***RH-2***	***RH-3***
BUILDING STANDARDS						
Massing and Setbacks						
Height and Bulk Limits	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250-252, 253, 260, 261, 261.1, *263.19,* 270, *270.3,* 271. See	No portion of a Dwelling may be taller than 35 feet. Structures with uses	~~*No portion of a Dwelling may be taller than*~~ *Varies, but generally* 40 feet. Structures with uses other than Dwellings may be constructed to the prescribed height limit. Per § 261 the height limit may be decreased based on the			Varies, but generally 40 feet. Height sculpting on Alleys per §

		also Height and Bulk District Maps.	other than Dwellings may be constructed to the prescribed height limit, which is generally 40 feet. Per § 261 the height limit may be decreased or increased based on the slope of the lot.	slope of the lot.	261.1.
	Front Setback	§§ 130, 131, 132	Required. Based on the front setback of the adjacent property with the shortest front setback or if subject property has a Legislated Setback. When front setback is based on adjacent properties, in no case shall the required setback be greater than 10 feet.		

Rear Yard	§§ 130, 134	30% of lot depth, but in no case less than 15 feet.		
Side Yard	§§ 130, 133	Required for Lots 28 feet and wider. Width of side setback depends on width of lot.	Not Required	
~~*Residential*~~ Design Guidelines *and Standards*	§ 311	Subject to the Residential Design Guidelines *and Citywide Design Standards and any o~~.~~ ~~O~~ther applicable* design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission ~~*may also apply*~~.		
Street Frontage and Public Realm				
Front Setback Landscaping and Permeability Requirements	§ 132	Required. At least 50% of Front Setback shall be permeable so as to increase storm water infiltration and 20% of Front Setback shall be unpaved and devoted to plant material.		
Streetscape and Pedestrian Improvements (Street Trees)	§ 138.1	Required.		

Street Frontage Requirements	§ 144	§ 144 applies generally. Additional requirements apply to Limited Commercial Uses, as specified in § 186.				
Street Frontage, Parking and Loading Access Restrictions	§ 155(r)	As specified in § 155(r)				
Miscellaneous						
Planned Unit Development	§ 304	C	C	C	C	C
Awning	§ 136.1	*N*P(1)	*N*P(1)	*N*P(1)	*N*P(1)	*N*P(1)
Canopy or Marquee	§ 136.1	NP*(2)*	*NP(2)*	NP*(2)*	NP*(2)*	NP*(2)*
Signs	§ 606	As permitted by ~~*Section*~~ § 606.				
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*				
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES						
Development Standards						
Usable Open Space [Per Dwelling Unit]	§§ 135, 136	At least 300 square feet if private, and 400 square	At least 300 square feet if private, and 400 square	At least 300 square feet for the first unit and 100 for the	At least 125 square feet if private, and 166 square	At least 100 square feet if private, and 133 square

		feet if common.	feet if common.	minor second unit if private, and 400 square feet for the first unit and 133 square feet for the second unit if common.	feet if common.	feet if common.
Parking Requirements	§§ 151, 161	None required. Maximum permitted per § 151.				
Residential Conversion, Demolition, or Merger *of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	§ 317	C ~~*for Removal of one or more Residential Units or Unauthorized Units.*~~				
Use Characteristics						
Intermediate Length Occupancy	§§ 102, 202.10	P(9)	P(9)	P(9)	P(9)	P(9)

Single Room Occupancy	§ 102	P	P	P	P	P
Student Housing	§ 102	P	P	P	P	P
Residential Uses							
~~*Residential Density,*~~ Dwelling Unit~~s~~ *Density, General* (6)(11)	§§ 102, 207	P up to one ~~*One*~~ unit per lot, or one unit per 3,000 square feet of lot area, with no more than three units per lot.	P up to one unit per lot, or up to one unit per 3,000 square feet of lot area.	P up to two units per lot, if the second unit is 600 sq. ft. or less, or up to one unit per 3,000 square feet of lot area, with	P up to two units per lot, or up to one unit per 1,500 square feet of lot area.	P up to three units per lot, or up to one unit per 1,000 square feet of lot area.

					no more than three units per lot.		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*					
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*					
Senior Housing *Density*	§§102, 202.2(f), *207*	P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a principal use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a principal use in the district and meeting all requirements of ~~*Section*~~ § 202.2(f)(1) except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.					
~~*Residential Density,*~~ Group Housing *Density*	§208	NP(10)	NP (10)	NP (10)	P, up to one bedroom for every	P, up to one bedroom for every	

					415 square feet of lot area.	275 square feet of lot area.
Homeless Shelter	§§ 102, 208	P	P	P	P	P
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES						
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124	1.8 to 1	1.8 to 1	1.8 to 1	1.8 to 1	1.8 to 1
Off-Street Parking	§§ 150, 151, 161	None required. Maximum permitted per § 151.				
Limited Commercial Uses	§§ 186, 186.3	Continuing nonconforming uses are permitted, subject to the requirements of § 186. Limited Commercial Uses may be conditionally permitted in historic buildings subject to § 186.3.				
Limited Corner Commercial Uses	§ 231	P on a Corner Lot, with no part of the use extending more than 50 feet in depth from said corner; NP if the LCCU would require the Residential Conversion of a Residential Unit or Unauthorized Unit under Planning Code Section 317, unless the space proposed for conversion is occupied by a garage or storage space located in the Basement or First Story.				
Commercial Use Characteristics						
Drive-up Facility	§ 102	NP				
Formula Retail	§ 102,	NP				

	303.1					
Hours of Operation	§§ 102, 186, 231	For Limited Corner Commercial Uses under § 231 and Limited Commercial Uses under § 186: P 6:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.; NP 10:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m.				
Maritime Use	§ 102	NP				
Open Air Sales	§ 102	NP				
Outdoor Activity Area	§§ 102, 145.2, 186, 202.2, 231	P if located in front of building; NP if elsewhere.				
Walk-up Facility	§ 102	NP				
Agricultural Use Category						
Agricultural Uses*	§§ 102, 202.2(c)	C	C	C	C	C
Agriculture, Industrial	§§ 102, 202.2(c)	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP
Agriculture, Neighborhood	§§ 102, 202.2(c)	P	P	P	P	P
Automotive Use Category						
Automotive Uses*	§ 102	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP
Parking Garage, Private	§ 102	C	C	C	C	C
Parking Lot, Private	§ 102	C	C	C	C	C
Parking Lot, Public	§§ 102,	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP

	142, 156					
Entertainment, Arts and Recreation Use Category						
Entertainment, Arts and Recreation Uses*	§ 102	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP
Open Recreation Area	§ 102	C	C	C	C	C
Passive Outdoor Recreation	§ 102	P	P	P	P	P
Industrial Use Category						
Industrial Uses*	§ 102	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP
Institutional Use Category						
Institutional Uses*	§ 102	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP
Child Care Facility	§ 102	P	P	P	P	P
Community Facility	§ 102	C	C	C	C	C
Hospital	§ 102	C	C	C	C	C
Post-Secondary Ed. Institution	§ 102	C	C	C	C	C
Public Facilities	§ 102	P	P	P	P	P
Religious Institution	§ 102	C	C	C	C	C
Residential Care Facility	§ 102	P	P	P	P	P
School	§ 102	C	C	C	C	C

Sales and Service Category						
Retail Sales and Service Uses*	§ 102	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP
Hotel	§ 102	NP	NP	NP	C(4)	C(4)
Mortuary	§ 102	C(5)	C(5)	C(5)	C(5)	C(5)
Non-Retail Sales and Service Uses	§ 102	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP
Utility and Infrastructure Use Category						
Utility and Infrastructure*	§ 102	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP
Internet Service Exchange	§ 102	C	C	C	C	C
Utility Installation	§ 102	C	C	C	C	C
Wireless Telecommunications Services Facility	§ 102	C or P (7)	C or P (7)	C or P (7)	C or P (7)	C or P (7)

* Not listed below.

(1) *P if required as a wind mitigation feature. Additionally,* P for Limited Commercial Uses and Limited Corner Commercial Uses per *§Section* 136.1 ~~*only, otherwise NP*~~.

(2) ~~*[Note Deleted]*~~ *Canopy is P if required as a wind mitigation feature.*

(4) C for five or fewer guest rooms or suites of rooms; NP for six or more guest rooms.

(5) Must be located on a landmark site, and where the site is within a Height and Bulk District of 40 feet or less, and where a columbarium use has lawfully and continuously operated since the time of designation.

(6) Construction of Accessory Dwelling Units may be permitted pursuant to Sections

207.1 and 207.2.

(7) C if a Macro WTS Facility; P if a Micro WTS Facility.

(8) [Note expired.]

(9) NP for buildings with three or fewer Dwelling Units; C for buildings with 10 or more Dwelling Units.

(10) Group Housing permitted at one room per 415 sq. ft. of lot area according to the provisions in Planning Code Section 207(c)(8).

(11) P for up to four dwelling units per lot, excluding Corner Lots, and P for up to six dwelling units in Corner Lots, pursuant to Section 207(c)(8).

SEC. 209.2. RM (RESIDENTIAL, MIXED) DISTRICTS.

* * * *

Table 209.2

ZONING CONTROL TABLE FOR RM DISTRICTS

Zoning Category	***§ References***	***RM-1***	***RM-2***	***RM-3***	***RM-4***
BUILDING STANDARDS					
Massing and Setbacks					
Height and Bulk Limits	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250-252, 253, 260, 261.1-, *263.19,* 270, *270.3,* 271	Varies~~,~~. See Height and Bulk Map and referenced sections. Height sculpting on Alleys per § 261.1.			
Front Setback	§§ 130, 131,	Based on the front setback of the adjacent property			

	132	with the shortest front setback or if subject property has a Legislated Setback. When front setback is based on adjacent properties, in no case shall the required setback be greater than 10 feet.	
Rear Yard	§§ 130, 134	30% of lot depth but in no case less than 15 feet.	25% of lot depth, but in no case less than 15 feet.
Side Yard	§§ 130, 133	Not Required.	
~~*Residential*~~ Design Guidelines *and Standards*	§ 311	Subject to the Residential Design Guidelines *and Citywide Design Standards and any* ~~. *O*~~*o*ther design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission ~~*may also apply*~~.	
Street Frontage and Public Realm			
Front Setback Landscaping and Permeability Requirements	§ 132	At least 50% of Front Setback shall be permeable so as to increase stormwater infiltration and 20% of Front Setback shall be unpaved and devoted to plant material.	
Streetscape and Pedestrian Improvements (Street Trees)	§ 138.1	Required.	
Street Frontage Requirements	§ 144	§ 144 applies generally. Additional requirements apply to Limited Commercial Uses, as specified in § 186.	
Moderation of	§ 144.1	Stepping of the front of the buildings required when	

Building Frontage		lot width is greater than 35 feet.				
Street Frontage, Parking and Loading Access Restrictions	§ 155(r)	As specified in § 155(r).				
Miscellaneous						
Planned Unit Development	§ 304	C	C	C	C	
Awning	§ 136.1	*N*P(1)	*N*P(1)	*N*P(1)	*N*P(1)	
Canopy or Marquee	§ 136.1	NP*(2)*	NP*(2)*	NP*(2)*	NP*(2)*	
Signs	§ 606	As permitted by ~~*Section*~~ § 606.				
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*				
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES						
Development Standards						
* * * *						
Usable Open Space [Per Dwelling Unit]	§§ 135, 136	At least 100 square feet if private, and 133 square feet per Dwelling Unit if	At least 80 square feet if private, and 106 square feet per Dwelling Unit if common.	At least 60 square feet if private and 80 square feet per Dwelling Unit if common.	At least 36 square feet if private, and 48 square feet per Dwelling Unit if common.	

		common.				
Parking Requirements	§§ 151, §155, 161	None required. Maximum permitted per § 151.				
Residential Conversion, Demolition, or Merger *of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	§ 317	C ~~*for Removal of one or more Residential Units or Unauthorized Units.*~~				
* * * *						
Use Characteristics						
Intermediate Length Occupancy	§§ 102, 202.10	P(10)	P(10)	P(10)	P(10)	P(10)
Single Room Occupancy	§ 102	P	P	P	P	P
Student Housing	§ 102	P	P	P	P	P
Residential Uses						
~~*Residential Density,*~~ Dwelling Unit~~s~~ *Density, General* (7)	§ 207	~~*P if 3 units per lot or at least one unit per 1067 square feet of lot area, whichever is greater.*~~	~~*P if 3 units per lot or at least one unit per 800 square feet of lot area, whichever is greater.*~~	~~*P if 3 units per lot or at least one unit per 533 square feet of lot area, whichever is greater.*~~	~~*P if 3 units per lot or at least one unit per 267 square feet of lot area, whichever is greater.*~~	

		Total maximum permitted density is one unit per 800 square feet of lot area. ~~*(11)*~~	Total maximum permitted density is one unit per 600 square feet of lot area. ~~*(11)*~~	Total maximum permitted density is one unit per 400 square feet of lot area ~~*(11)*~~	Total maximum permitted density is one unit per 200 square feet of lot area. (8)~~, *(11)*~~
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*			
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*			
Senior Housing *Density*	§§102, 202.2(f)*, 207*	P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of ~~*Section*~~ § 202.2(f)(1) except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.			
~~*Residential Density,*~~	§208	P (6), Up to	P (6), Up to	P (6), Up to	P (6), Up

Group Housing *Density*		one bedroom for every 275 square feet of lot area.	one bedroom for every 210 square feet of lot area.	one bedroom for every 140 square feet of lot area.	to one bedroom for every 70 square feet of lot area.
Homeless Shelter	§§ 102, 208	P	P	P	P
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES					
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124	1.8 to 1	1.8 to 1	3.6 to 1	4.8 to 1
Off-Street Parking	§§ 150, 151, 155, 161	None required. Maximum permitted per § 151.			
Limited Corner Commercial Uses	§ 231	P on a Corner Lot, with no part of the use extending more than 50 feet in depth from said corner; NP if the LCCU would require the Residential Conversion of a Residential Unit or Unauthorized Unit under Planning Code Section 317, unless the space proposed for conversion is	P on a Corner Lot, with no part of the use extending more than 100 feet in depth from said corner; NP if the LCCU would require the Residential Conversion of a Residential Unit or Unauthorized Unit under Planning Code Section 317, unless the space		

		occupied by a garage or storage space located in the Basement or First Story.		proposed for conversion is occupied by a garage or storage space located in the Basement or First Story. ~~*Limited Commercial*~~	
Limited Commercial Uses	§§ 186, 186.3	Continuing nonconforming uses are permitted, subject to the requirements of § 186. Limited Commercial Uses may be conditionally permitted in historic buildings subject to § 186.3.			
Commercial Use Characteristics					
Drive-up Facility	§ 102	NP			
Formula Retail	§ 102, 303.1	NP			
Hours of Operation	§§ 102, 186, 231	For Limited Corner Commercial Uses under § 231 and Limited Commercial Uses under § 186: P 6:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.; NP 10:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m.			
Maritime Use	§ 102	NP			
Open Air Sales	§ 102	NP			
Outdoor Activity Area	§§ 102, 145.2, 186, 202.2, 231	P if located in front of building; NP if elsewhere.			
Walk-up Facility	§ 102	NP		P	
Agricultural Use Category					
Agricultural Uses*	§§ 102, 202.2(c)	C	C	C	C

Agriculture, Industrial	§§ 102, 202.2(c)	NP	NP	NP	NP
Agriculture, Neighborhood	§§ 102, 202.2(c)	P	P	P	P
Automotive Use Category					
Automotive Uses*	§ 102	NP	NP	NP	NP
Parking Garage, Private	§ 102	C	C	C	C
Parking Lot, Private	§ 102	C	C	C	C
Entertainment, Arts and Recreation Use Category					
Entertainment, Arts and Recreation Uses*	§ 102	NP	NP	NP	NP
Open Recreation Area	§ 102	C	C	C	C
Passive Outdoor Recreation	§ 102	P	P	P	P
Industrial Use Category					
Industrial Uses*	§ 102	NP	NP	NP	NP
Institutional Use Category					
Institutional Uses*	§ 102	NP	NP	NP	NP
Child Care Facility	§ 102	P	P	P	P
Community Facility	§ 102	C	C	C	C
Hospital	§ 102	C	C	C	C

Post-Secondary Ed. Institution	§ 102	C	C	C	C
Public Facilities	§ 102	P	P	P	P
Religious Institution	§ 102	C	C	C	C
Residential Care Facility	§ 102	P	P	P	P
School	§ 102	C	C	C	C
Sales and Service Category					
Retail Sales and Service Uses*	§ 102	NP	NP	NP	NP
Hotel	§ 102	C(4)	C(4)	C(4)	C(4)
Mortuary	§ 102	C(5)	C(5)	C(5)	C(5)
Non-Retail Sales and Service Uses	§ 102	NP	NP	NP	NP
Utility and Infrastructure Use Category					
Utility and Infrastructure*	§ 102	NP	NP	NP	NP
Internet Service Exchange	§ 102	C	C	C	C
Utility Installation	§ 102	C	C	C	C
Wireless Telecommunications Services Facility	§ 102	C or P (9)	C or P (9)	C or P (9)	C or P (9)

* Not listed below.

(1) *P if required as a wind mitigation feature. Additionally,* P for Limited Commercial Uses and Limited Corner Commercial Uses per § 136.1 ~~*only, otherwise NP*~~.

(2) ~~*[Note Deleted]*~~ *Canopy is P if required as a wind mitigation feature.*

(3) [Note Deleted]

(4) C for 5 or fewer guest rooms or suites of rooms; NP for 6 or more guest rooms; provided, however, that a total of up to 47 Tourist Hotel rooms are Principally Permitted on Block 0976, Lot 001, subject to the provisions of Ordinance No. 251-22.

(5) Must be located on a landmark site, and where the site is within a Height and Bulk District of 40 feet or less, and where a columbarium use has lawfully and continuously operated since the time of designation.

(6) C required if the Group Housing is affiliated with and operated by a Hospital or an Institutional Educational Use as defined in Section 102.

(7) Construction of Accessory Dwelling Units may be permitted pursuant to Sections 207.1 and 207.2.

(8) For purposes of this calculation, a Dwelling Unit in this ~~d~~*D*istrict containing no more than 500 square feet of net floor area and consisting of not more than one habitable room in addition to a kitchen and a bathroom may be counted as equal to three-quarters of a Dwelling Unit.

(9) C if a Macro WTS Facility; P if a Micro WTS Facility.

(10) NP for buildings with three or fewer Dwelling Units; C for buildings with 10 or more Dwelling Units.

(11) *[Note Deleted]*~~*NP if less than minimum density as set forth in the table. Expansions of existing single-family residential buildings may not exceed more than 25% of Gross Floor Area over 10 years, or result in a building over 3,000 square feet. In new construction, no unit may be smaller than one-third the Gross Floor Area of the largest unit in the building.*~~

SEC. 209.3. RC (RESIDENTIAL-COMMERCIAL) DISTRICTS.

These Districts are intended to recognize, protect, conserve, and enhance areas characterized by structures combining Residential uses with neighborhood-serving Commercial uses. The predominant Residential uses are preserved, while provision is made for supporting Commercial uses, usually in or below the ground story, that meet the frequent needs of nearby residents without generating excessive vehicular traffic. The compact, walkable, transit-oriented and mixed-use nature of these Districts is recognized by no off-street parking requirements. The RC Districts are composed of two separate districts, as follows:

RC-3 Districts*~~: Medium Density~~*. These Districts provide for *Residential Uses*~~*a mixture of medium-density Dwellings similar to those in RM-3 Districts*~~, with supporting Commercial ~~u~~*U*ses. Open spaces are required for Dwellings in the same manner as in RM-3 Districts, except that rear yards need not be at ground level and front setback areas are not required.

RC-4 Districts*~~: High Density~~*. These Districts provide for *Residential Uses,*~~*a mixture of high-density Dwellings similar to those in RM-4 Districts*~~ with supporting Commercial uses. Open spaces are required for Dwellings in the same manner as in RM-4 Districts, except that rear yards need not be at ground level and front setback areas are not required.

* * * *

Table 209.3

ZONING CONTROL TABLE FOR RESIDENTIAL-COMMERCIAL DISTRICTS

Zoning Category	***§ References***	***RC-3***	***RC-4***
BUILDING STANDARDS			
Massing and Setbacks			
Height and Bulk	§§ 102, 105,	Varies~~,~~. See Height and Bulk Maps. Height sculpting	

Limits	106, 250-252, 260-, 261.1-, *263.19,* 270, *270.3,* 271	on Alleys per § 261.1.	
* * * *			
~~*Residential*~~Design Guidelines *and Standards*	§ 311	Subject to the Residential Design Guidelines *and Citywide Design Standards and any*~~*.*~~ ~~*O*~~*o*ther design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission may also apply.	
Street Frontage and Public Realm			
* * * *			
Street Frontage, Parking and Loading Access Restrictions	§ 155(r)	As specified in § 155(r).	As specified in § 155(r). ~~*Curb cuts are NP on The Embarcadero between King and Jefferson Streets, and on Broadway between Mason and The Embarcadero.*~~
Miscellaneous			
* * * *			
Signs	§ 607.1	Per § 607.1.	Per § 607.1.
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*	

RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES			
Development Standards			
* * * *			
Residential Conversion, Demolition, or Merger *of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	§ 317	C *for Removal of one or more Residential Units or Unauthorized Units.*	
* * * *			
Residential Uses			
Residential Density, Dwelling Unit*s* *Density, General* (7) (13)	§ 207	*Form-Based Density applies within the R-4 Height and Bulk District (§ 263.19). Outside the R-4 Height and Bulk District, P if 3 units per lot, or at least one unit per 533 square feet of lot area, whichever is greater. T*total maximum permitted density is one unit per 400 square feet of lot area. *(13)*	*Form-Based Density applies within the R-4 Height and Bulk District (§ 263.19). Outside the R-4 Height and Bulk District, P if 3 units per lot or at least one unit per 267 square feet of lot area, whichever is greater. T*total maximum permitted density is one unit per 200 square feet of lot area. No density limits in the Van Ness SUD (§

			243). (8)~~, (13)~~
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*	
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*	
Senior Housing *Density*	§§102, 202.2(f)*, 207*	*Form-Based Density applies within the R-4 Height and Bulk District (§ 263.19). Outside the R-4 Height and Bulk District,* P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a principal use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a principal use in the district and meeting all requirements of ~~*Section*~~ § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location. C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of ~~*Section*~~ § 202.2(f)(1) except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.	
~~*Residential Density,*~~ Group Housing *Density*	§208	*Form-Based Density applies within the R-4 Height and Bulk District (§*	*Form-Based Density applies within the R-4 Height and Bulk District (§*

		263.19). Outside the R-4 Height and Bulk District, P up to one bedroom for every 140 square feet of lot area. (9)	*263.19). Outside the R-4 Height and Bulk District,* P up to one bedroom for every 70 square feet of lot area. (9)
* * * *			
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES			
Development Standards			
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124*, 207.9*	3.6 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*	4.8 to 1. Other FAR controls apply in the Van Ness SUD; § 243(c)(1). *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*
* * * *			

* * * *

(7) Construction of Accessory Dwelling Units may be ~~*permitted*~~ *P* pursuant to Sections 207.1 and 207.2.

(8) For purposes of this calculation, a Dwelling Unit in this ~~*d*~~*D*istrict containing no more than 500 square feet of net floor area and consisting of not more than one habitable room in addition to a kitchen and a bathroom may be counted as equal to three-quarters of a Dwelling Unit.

(9) *Within the Priority Equity Geographies SUD,* C required if the Group Housing is affiliated with and operated by a Hospital or an Institutional Educational Use as defined in Section 102.

* * * *

(13) *[Note Deleted]* ~~*NP if less than minimum density as set forth in the table. Expansions of existing single-family residential buildings may not exceed more than 25% of Gross Floor Area over 10 years, or result in a building over 3,000 square feet. In new construction, no unit may be smaller than one-third the Gross Floor Area of the largest unit in the building.*~~

Section 7. Residential, Transit Oriented (RTO) Districts. Articles 1.2, 1.7, 2, 3, and 6 of the Planning Code are hereby amended by revising Sections 124, 132, 134, 135, 144, 186, 186.3, 201, 207.6, 207.7, 208, 209.4, 231, 303, 304, 603, 606, and 607.1, to read as follows:

SEC. 124. BASIC FLOOR AREA RATIO.

(a) Except as provided in subsections (b), (c), (d), (e), *(k),* and (l) of this Section 124, the basic Floor Area Ratio limits specified in the Zoning Control Table for the district in which the lot is located, or in Table 124 below, shall apply to each building or development in the districts indicated.

TABLE 124
BASIC FLOOR AREA RATIO LIMITS

District	***Basic Floor Area Ratio Limit***
RED, RED-MX	1.0 to 1
Pacific	1.5 to 1
* * * *	1.8 to 1
RTO~~*, RTO-M*~~	
* * * *	
* * * *	

(b) In R, RC, NC, and Mixed Use Districts, *F*~~f~~loor *A*~~a~~rea *R*~~r~~atio limits shall not apply to ~~*dwellings or to other*~~ ~~r~~*R*esidential ~~u~~*U*ses. *However, projects proposing new construction of a Dwelling Unit that would exceed the maximum dwelling unit size described in Section 207.10 may require Conditional Use authorization by the Planning Commission as set forth in Section 207.10.* In Chinatown Mixed Use Districts, the above floor area ratio limits shall not apply to institutions, and mezzanine commercial space shall not be calculated as part of the floor area ratio.

* * * *

SEC. 132. FRONT SETBACK AREAS IN RTO, RH, AND RM DISTRICTS AND FOR REQUIRED SETBACKS FOR *PROJECTS IN NC AND RTO-C DISTRICTS, AND* PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENTS.

The following requirements for minimum front setback areas shall apply to every building in all RH, RTO, and RM Districts, in order to relate the setbacks provided to the existing front setbacks of adjacent buildings. ~~*Buildings in RTO Districts which have more than 75 feet of street frontage are additionally subject to the Ground Floor Residential Design Guidelines, as adopted and periodically amended by the Planning Commission.*~~ Planned Unit Developments or PUDs, as defined in Section 304, shall also provide landscaping in required setbacks in accord with Section 132(g).

* * * *

(c) **Applicability to Special Lot Situations.**

* * * *

(3) **Lots Abutting RC, C, M, and P Districts.** In the case of any lot that abuts property in an RC, C, M, or P District, any property in such district shall be disregarded, and the required setback for the subject lot shall be equal to the front setback of the adjacent building in the RH, RTO, or RM District.

* * * *

*(e) **Required Front Setbacks and Sidewalk Widths in RTO-C and NC Districts.***

*(1) **Applicability.** This subsection (e) applies to projects located in RTO-C and Neighborhood Commercial (NC) Districts that meet any of the following criteria:*

(A) Have a street frontage of 50 feet or more;

(B) Are located on a Corner Lot; or

(C) Are adjacent to a building with a front setback consistent with the requirements of this subsection.

*(2) **Setback Requirement.** Where the sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided to widen the publicly accessible sidewalk. The setback must be wide enough so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. If a greater front setback is required under Section 132 or any other provision of this Code, the greater requirement shall apply. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade.*

* * * *

(h) **Permeable Surfaces.** The front setback area shall be at least 50% permeable so as to increase stormwater infiltration. The Permeable Surface may be inclusive of the area counted towards the landscaping requirement; provided, however, that turf pavers or similar planted hardscapes shall be counted only toward the Permeable Surface requirement and not the landscape requirement.

(1) The Zoning Administrator, after consultation with the Director of Public Works, may waive the Permeable Surface requirement if the site does not qualify as a suitable location pursuant to Department of Public Works rules and regulations.

(2) If the site receives stormwater run-off from outside the lot boundaries, the

Zoning Administrator, after consultation with the General Manager of the Public Utilities Commission, may modify the Permeable Surface requirement to include alternative management strategies, such as bio-retention or other strategies, pursuant to Public Utilities Commission rules and regulations.

(3) If a portion of the front setback is designed as a publicly-accessible sidewalk extension to satisfy the Better Streets Standard width standards under subsection (e), then the provisions of this subsection (h) do not apply.

* * * *

SEC. 134. REAR YARDS IN R, RC, *RTO,* NC, M, CMUO, MUG, MUO, MUR, RED, RED-MX, SPD, UMU, AND WMUG DISTRICTS; AND LOT COVERAGE REQUIREMENTS IN C DISTRICTS.

* * * *

(b) **Applicability.** The rear yard requirements established by this Section 134 shall apply to every building in the districts listed below~~, except NC-S Districts, where no rear yard is required~~. To the extent that these provisions are inconsistent with any Special Use District or Residential Character District, the provisions of the Special Use District or Residential Character District shall apply.

(c) **Basic Requirements.** The basic rear yard requirements shall be as follows for the districts indicated:

(1) In RH, RM-1, RM-2, RTO*-1*, *and* RTO-M Zoning Districts, the basic rear yard shall be equal to 30% of the total depth of the lot on which the building is situated, but in no case less than 15 feet.

* * * *

(d) **Rear Yard Location Requirements.**

(1) **RH, RM, RTO*-1, RTO-M*, NC-1, NCT-1, Inner Sunset, Outer Clement Street, Cole Valley, Haight Street, Lakeside Village, Sacramento Street, 24th Street-Noe Valley, Pacific Avenue, and West Portal Avenue *NC* Districts.** Rear yards shall be provided at grade level and at each succeeding level or story of the building.

(2) ***RTO-C, NC-S,* NC-2, NCT-2, Ocean Avenue, Inner Balboa Street, Outer Balboa Street, Castro Street, Cortland Avenue, Divisadero Street NCT, Excelsior-Outer Mission Street, Inner Clement Street, Upper Fillmore Street, Lower Haight Street, Judah Street, Noriega Street, North Beach, San Bruno Avenue, Taraval Street, Inner Taraval Street, Irving Street, Union Street, Valencia Street, 24th Street-Mission, Glen Park**, ***and Folsom Street NC Districts, and the* Regional Commercial District** ~~*and Folsom Street Districts*~~**.** Rear yards shall be provided at the second story, and at each succeeding story of the building, and at the First Story if it contains a Dwelling Unit.

* * * *

(*6*~~*H*~~) **Lot Coverage in C Districts.** Lot coverage is limited to 80% at all levels containing residential uses, except that on levels that include only lobbies and circulation areas and on levels in which all residential uses, including circulation areas, are within 40 horizontal feet from a property line fronting a street or alley, up to 100% lot coverage may occur. The unbuilt portion of the lot shall be open to the sky except for those obstructions permitted in yards pursuant to subsections (1) through (23) of Section 136(c). Where the adjacent properties have an existing rear yard, the unbuilt area of the new project shall be designed to adjoin that rear yard. In accordance with Section 210.5, lot coverage requirements shall not be applicable for Commercial to Residential Adaptive Reuse projects.

* * * *

(f) **Second Building on Corner Lots and Through Lots in RH, RTO~~*, RTO-M*~~, RM-1, and RM-2 Districts.** Where a lot is a Corner Lot, or is a through lot having both its front and

its rear lot line along Streets, Alleys, or a Street and an Alley, the subject lot may have two buildings, each fronting at one end of the lot, provided that all the other requirements of this Code are met. In such cases, the rear yard required by this Section 134 for the subject lot shall be located in the central portion of the lot, between the two buildings on such lot. In no case shall the total minimum rear yard for the subject lot be thus reduced to less than a depth equal to 30% of the total depth of the subject lot or to less than 15 feet, whichever is greater; provided, however, that the Zoning Administrator may reduce the total depth to 20% pursuant to Section 307(l) of this Code if the reduction is for the sole purpose of constructing an Accessory Dwelling Unit under Section 207.1, and provided further that the reduction/waiver is in consideration of the property owner entering into a Regulatory Agreement pursuant to Section 207.1 subjecting the ADU to the San Francisco Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance. For buildings fronting on a Narrow Street as defined in Section 261.1 of this Code, the additional height limits of Section 261.1 shall apply. Furthermore, in all cases in which this subsection (f) is applied, the requirements of Section 132 of this Code for front setback areas shall be applicable along both Street or Alley frontages of the subject through lot.

* * * *

*(l) **Lot Coverage for Large Lots.** This subsection (l) shall apply to all districts except C-3 districts. In lieu of rear yard and lot coverage controls described in this Section 134, where a development lot is two acres or greater, the allowed lot coverage for any project containing residential uses shall be limited to 60% of lot area at street grade and above with a corresponding requirement of 40% unbuilt area in Residential Districts other than RTO-C, and in all other districts 65% lot coverage from the second story and above with 35% lot area unbuilt. Obstructions permitted in setbacks and yards per Section 136 are permitted in the unbuilt area. New rights-of-way, pedestrian passageways or any portion of the site provided for publicly-accessible circulation or open space, including but not limited to any such space provided pursuant to Planning Code Sections 270.2, 270.3, or elsewhere in*

this Code, may count toward the required unbuilt area.

SEC. 135. USABLE OPEN SPACE FOR DWELLING UNITS AND GROUP HOUSING, R, NC, MIXED USE, C, AND M DISTRICTS.

* * * *

(a) **Character of Space Provided.** Usable open space shall *generally* be composed of an outdoor area or areas designed for outdoor living, recreation or landscaping, including such areas on the ground and on decks, balconies, porches and roofs, which are safe and suitably surfaced and screened, and which conform to the other requirements of this Section. Such area or areas shall be on the same lot as the dwelling units (or bedrooms in group housing) they serve, and shall be designed and oriented in a manner that will make the best practical use of available sun and other climatic advantages. "Private usable open space" shall mean an area or areas private to and designed for use by only one dwelling unit (or bedroom in group housing). "Common usable open space" shall mean an area or areas designed for use jointly by two or more dwelling units (or bedrooms in group housing). "Privately-owned public open space," only allowed in DTR and Eastern Neighborhood Mixed Use under this Section, shall mean an area of areas designed for use of the general public while owned and maintained by private owners as described in Section 138*. For senior housing, usable open space requirements are set forth in subsection (d)(3) below.*

* * * *

(d) **Amount Required.** Usable open space shall be provided for each building in the amounts specified herein and in Tables 135A and B for the district in which the building is located; provided, however, that (i) in the Downtown Residential (DTR) Districts, open space shall be provided in the amounts specified in Section 825, and (ii) in accordance with Section 210.5, usable open space shall not be required for Commercial to Residential Adaptive Reuse

projects.

* * * *

(3) *In all districts, ~~F~~f*or dwellings specifically designed for and occupied by senior citizens, as defined and regulated by Section 102.6.1 of this Code, the minimum amount of usable open space to be provided for use by each dwelling unit shall be one-half the amount required for each dwelling unit as specified in Paragraph (d)(1) above *or 36 square feet, whichever is less. Notwithstanding 135(a), for these dwellings, "common usable open space" shall also include indoor community space, defined as indoor space that is not less than 10 feet wide in all directions at all points, is accessible to all residents of the building or site equally at no additional cost, is specifically configured and designed for leisure and/or recreational use, and shall not include any building circulation spaces, lobbies, or other building or resident support facilities not specifically intended for leisure and/or recreational use*.

* * * *

(6) ***~~Efficiency Dwelling Units With Reduced Square Footage.~~*** *~~Common usable open space shall be the preferred method of meeting the open space requirement for Efficiency Dwelling Units with reduced square footage, as defined in Section 318 of this Code. Private open space shall not be credited toward satisfaction of the open space requirement for such units unless the Zoning Administrator determines that the provision of common open space is infeasible or undesirable, in whole or in part, due to~~*

~~(A) site constraints;~~

~~(B) the special needs of anticipated residents, or~~

~~(C) conflicts with other applicable policies and regulations, including but not limited to standards for the treatment of historic properties, the Americans with Disabilities Act, or the Building Code.~~

~~(7)~~ **Homeless Shelters.** Homeless Shelters, as defined in Section 102 of this

Code, are exempt from the open space requirements described in this Section 135.

TABLE 135A MINIMUM USABLE OPEN SPACE FOR DWELLING UNITS AND GROUP HOUSING OUTSIDE THE EASTERN NEIGHBORHOODS MIXED USE DISTRICT		
District	**Square Feet of Usable Open Space Required for Each Dwelling Unit If All Private**	**Ratio of Common Usable Open Space That May Be Substituted for Private**
* * * *		
RM-1, RC-1, ~~*RTO,*~~ RTO-M	100	1.33
RM-2, RC-2, SPD, *RTO-1*	80	1.33
RM-3, RC-3, RED, *RTO-C*	60	1.33
* * * *		

* * * *

(e) **Slope.** The slope of any area credited as either private or common usable open space shall not exceed *15%* ~~*five percent*~~.

* * * *

SEC. 144. STREET FRONTAGES IN RH, RTO, ~~*RTO-M,*~~ AND RM DISTRICTS.

(a) **Purpose.** This Section *144* is enacted to assure that in RH, RM, *and* RTO ~~*and RTO-M*~~ Districts the ground story of dwellings as viewed from the street is compatible with the scale and character of the existing street frontage, visually interesting and attractive in relation to the pattern of the neighborhood, and so designed that adequate areas are provided for front landscaping, street trees and on-street parking between driveways. The design of ground story frontages subject to this Section *144* shall also be reviewed for consistency with applicable design guidelines, including the Ground Floor Residential Design Guidelines.

(b) **Controls.**

(1) **Entrances to Off-Street Parking.** Except as otherwise provided herein, in the case of every dwelling in such districts no more than one-third of the width of the ground story along the front lot line, or along a street side lot line, or along a building wall that is set back from any such lot line, shall be devoted to entrances to off-street parking, except that in no event shall a lot be limited by this requirement to a single such entrance of less than *10* ~~*ten*~~ feet in width, or to a single such entrance of less than ~~*8*~~ *eight* feet in RTO ~~*and RTO-M d*~~*D*istricts. In addition, no entrance to off-street parking on any lot shall be wider than 20 feet, and where two or more separate entrances are provided there shall be a minimum separation between such entrances of six feet. Lots ~~*in RTO and RTO-M districts*~~ are limited to a total of 20 feet per block frontage devoted to entrances to off-street parking. Street-facing garage structures and garage doors may not extend closer to the street than a primary building facade unless the garage structure and garage door are consistent with the features listed in Section 136 of this Code. Entrances to off-street parking shall be located at least six feet from a lot corner located at the intersection of two public rights-of-way.

* * * *

SEC. 186. EXEMPTION OF LIMITED COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL NONCONFORMING USES IN RH, RM, RTO*-1, RTO-M*, AND RED DISTRICTS.

* * * *

(a) **Exemption from Termination Provisions.** The following nonconforming uses in R Districts shall be exempt from the termination provisions of Section 185, provided such uses comply with all the conditions specified in subsection (b) below:

* * * *

(4) In the RED Districts, any nonconforming use that is Arts Activities, Business

Service, Catering, Design Professional, Light Manufacturing, Personal Service, Trade Office, Trade Shop, Wholesale Sales,~~,~~ or Wholesale Storage~~,~~ use.

(b) **Conditions on Limited Nonconforming Uses.** The limited nonconforming uses described above shall meet the following conditions:

* * * *

(3) The hours during which the use is open to the public shall be limited to the period between 6:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m., however, in RED, RTO-*1*, and RTO-M Districts only, the Planning Commission may extend the hours of operation to 12:00 a.m. through Conditional Use authorization, as outlined in Section 303 of this Code;

* * * *

SEC. 186.3. NON-RESIDENTIAL USES IN LANDMARK BUILDINGS IN RH, RM, RTO-*1*, AND RTO-M DISTRICTS.

Any use listed as a Principal or Conditional Use permitted on the ground floor in an NC-1 District, when located in a structure on a landmark site designated pursuant to Article 10 of this Code, is permitted with Conditional Use authorization pursuant to Section 303 of this Code, provided that no Conditional Use shall be authorized under this ~~*provision*~~ *Section 186.3* unless (1) such authorization conforms to the applicable provisions of Section 303 of this Code, and (2) the specific use so authorized is essential to the feasibility of retaining and preserving the landmark.

SEC. 201. CLASSES OF USE DISTRICTS.

Residential Districts (Defined in Sec. 209.1-209.4)	
* * * *	
RTO-*1*	Residential, Transit-Oriented Neighborhood Districts (Defined in

	Sec. 209.4)
RTO-C	*Residential, Transit-Oriented, Commercial Districts (Defined in Sec. 209.4)*
RTO-M	Residential, Transit-Oriented, – Mission Neighborhood Districts (Defined in Sec. 209.4)

* * * *

In addition to the classes of use districts in the above table, the following terms shall apply:

* * * *

"RTO District" shall mean any RTO-*1, RTO-C,* or RTO-M District;

* * * *

SEC. 207.6. REQUIRED MINIMUM DWELLING UNIT MIX IN RTO-*1, RTO-M*, RCD, NCT, DTR, EASTERN NEIGHBORHOODS MIXED USE DISTRICTS, THE VAN NESS & MARKET RESIDENTIAL SPECIAL USE DISTRICT, AND THE POLK STREET AND PACIFIC AVENUE NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICTS.

(a) **Purpose.** In order to foster flexible and creative infill development while maintaining the character of the district, dwelling unit density is not controlled by lot area in RTO-*1, RTO-M*, NCT, and Eastern Neighborhoods Mixed Use Districts but rather by the physical constraints of this Code (such as height, bulk, setbacks, open space, and dwelling unit exposure). However, to ensure an adequate supply of family-sized units in existing and new housing stock, new residential construction must include a minimum percentage of units of at least two bedrooms. In the Pacific Avenue and Polk Street Neighborhood Commercial Districts, and the Van Ness & Market Residential Special Use District, a dwelling unit mix

requirement addresses the need for family-sized housing production in these districts.

(b) **Applicability.**

(1) This Section *207.6* shall apply in the RTO-*1, RTO-M*, RCD, NCT, DTR, Eastern Neighborhoods Mixed Use Districts, the Van Ness & Market Residential Special Use District, and the Pacific Avenue and Polk Street NCDs.

* * * *

(c) **Controls.** For all RTO-*1, RTO-M*, RCD and NCT districts, as well as DTR, Eastern Neighborhoods Mixed Use Districts, the Van Ness & Market Residential Special Use District, and the Pacific Avenue and Polk Street NCDs, one of the following three must apply:

(1) no less than 40% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least two bedrooms. Any fraction resulting from this calculation shall be rounded to the nearest whole number of Dwelling Units, or

(2) no less than 30% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least three bedrooms. Any fraction resulting from this calculation shall be rounded to the nearest whole number of Dwelling Units, or

(3) no less than 35% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least two or three bedrooms with at least 10% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units containing three bedrooms. Any fraction resulting from this calculation shall be rounded to the nearest whole number of Dwelling Units.

(d) **Modifications.**

(1) In NCT, RCD, RTO-*1, RTO-M* and the Pacific Avenue and Polk Street NC Districts, these requirements may be waived or modified with Conditional Use ~~*A*~~*a*uthorization. In addition to those conditions set forth in Section 303, the Planning Commission shall consider the following criteria:

(A) The project demonstrates a need or mission to serve unique

populations, or

(B) The project site or existing building(s), if any, feature physical constraints that make it unreasonable to fulfill these requirements.

(2) In Eastern Neighborhoods Mixed Use Districts, these requirements may be waived in return for provision of family-sized affordable units, pursuant to Section 419 et seq. To receive this waiver, 100*%* ~~*percent*~~ of the total number of inclusionary units required under Section 415 et seq. or Section 419 et seq. shall contain at least two bedrooms. Also in Eastern Neighborhoods Mixed Use Districts, these requirements may be waived or modified through the Variance process set forth in Section 305, or in the case of projects subject to Section 329, through the procedures of that section.

(3) In DTR Districts, these requirements may be modified per the procedures of Section 309.1.

(4) In the Van Ness & Market Residential Special Use District, these requirements may only be modified pursuant to the procedures of Section 309, regardless of the underlying zoning district.

* * * *

SEC. 207.7. REQUIRED MINIMUM DWELLING UNIT MIX.

(a) **Purpose.** To ensure an adequate supply of family-sized units in new housing stock, new residential construction must include a minimum percentage of units of at least two and three bedrooms.

(b) **Applicability.**

(1) This Section 207.7 shall apply to all applications for building permits and/or Planning Commission entitlements that propose the creation of 10 or more Dwelling Units in all districts that allow residential uses, unless that project is located in the RTO-*1, RTO-M*,

RCD, NCT, DTR, and Eastern Neighborhoods Mixed Use Districts, or in an area or Special Use District with higher specific bedroom mix requirements, or is a HOME SF project subject to the requirements of Planning Code Section 206.3.

* * * *

SEC. 208. DENSITY LIMITATIONS FOR GROUP HOUSING OR HOMELESS SHELTERS.

The density limitations for Group Housing or Homeless Shelters, as described in Sections 102 and 890.88(b) and (c) of this Code, shall be as follows:

(a) For Group Housing, the maximum number of Bedrooms on each Lot shall be as specified in the Zoning Control Table for the District in which the Lot is located, except that in RTO, ~~*RTO-M,*~~ RCD, UMU, MUG, WMUG, MUR, MUO, CMUO, WMUO, RED, RED-MX, SPD, DTR, and all NCT Districts the density of Group Housing shall not be limited by lot area, and except that for Lots in NC Districts, the group housing density shall not exceed the number of Bedrooms permitted in the nearest R District provided that the maximum density not be less than the amount permitted by the ratio specified for the NC District in which the lot is located. For Homeless Shelters, the maximum number of beds on each lot shall be regulated pursuant to the requirements of the Standards of Care for City Shelters contained in Administrative Code, Chapter 20, Article XIII, in addition to the applicable requirements of the Building Code and Fire Code.

* * * *

SEC. 209.4. RTO (RESIDENTIAL TRANSIT ORIENTED) DISTRICTS.

~~*These*~~*RTO (Residential Transit Oriented)* Districts*, inclusive of RTO-1, RTO-M, and RTO-C Districts,* are intended to recognize~~*, protect, conserve,*~~ and enhance areas characterized by a

mixture of houses and apartment buildings, covering a range of densities and building forms. RTO-*1* *(Residential, Transit -Oriented Neighborhood)* and RTO-M (Residential Transit Oriented, Mission) Districts are composed of multi-family moderate-density areas, primarily areas formerly designated RM and RH-3~~,~~. *RTO-C (Residential Transit Oriented, Commercial) permits neighborhood-serving uses at limited sizes along with housing. RTO Districts~~and~~* are well served within short walking distance, generally less than one-quarter mile, of transit and neighborhood commercial areas. Transit available on nearby streets is frequent and/or provides multiple lines serving different parts of the City or region. *In RTO-1 and RTO-M Districts, ~~L~~l*imited small-scale neighborhood-oriented retail and services ~~*is*~~*are* common and permitted throughout the neighborhood on Corner Lots only to provide goods and services to residents within walking distance, but the ~~*d*~~*D*istricts are otherwise residential. *In RTO-1 and RTO-M Districts, ~~O~~o*nly retail compatible with housing, generally those permitted in NC-1 Districts, is permitted and auto-oriented uses are not permitted~~.~~*;* ~~*H*~~*h*ours of operation are restricted and off-street parking is not permitted for these very locally-oriented uses. *In the RTO-C District, a greater amount and wider range of non-residential uses are permitted and not limited to corners, to provide goods and services to residents and visitors, especially adjacent to existing NC Districts and along transit corridors, though ground floor commercial uses are not required.*

Areas of these districts off of major commercial or transit streets are largely characterized by a~~A~~ fine-grain pattern of 25-foot to 35-foot building widths*, with some larger and wider structures on major streets ~~is prevalent, and structures typically range from two to five stories in height~~*. While some one- and two-family structures are present, the character of the District is primarily of structures with three or more units of a range of sizes and types suitable for a variety of households. Buildings are moderately scaled and segmented, and units or groups of units have separate entrances directly from the street. ~~*The overall residential density is regulated by the*~~

~~*permitted and required height, bulk, setbacks, and open space of each parcel, along with residential design guidelines.*~~ *Except in the RTO-1 District, housing density is generally limited not by lot area, but by the regulations on the built envelope of buildings, including height, bulk, setbacks, and lot coverage, and standards for Residential Uses, including open space and exposure, and urban design standards.* Because of the high availability of transit service and the proximity of retail and services within walking distance, many households do not own cars; it is common that not every Dwelling Unit has a parking space and overall off-street residential parking is limited. Open space is provided on site, in the form of rear yards, decks, balconies, roof-decks, and courtyards, and is augmented by nearby public parks, plazas, and enhanced streetscapes.

Table 209.4

ZONING CONTROL TABLE FOR RTO DISTRICTS

Zoning Category	***§ References***	***RTO-1***	***RTO-M***	***RTO-C***
BUILDING STANDARDS				
Massing and Setbacks				
Height and Bulk Limits	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250-252, 260, 261.1, *263.19,* 270, *270.3,* 271	Varies. See Height and Bulk Map and referenced sections.		
Front Building Setback	§ 132	~~*Required. Based on average of adjacent properties or if subject property has a Legislated Setback. When front setback is based on adjacent properties, in no case shall the required setback be greater than 15 feet.*~~		

		Required. Based on the front setback of the adjacent property with the shortest front setback or if subject property has a Legislated Setback. When front setback is based on adjacent properties, in no case shall the required setback be greater than 10 feet. *For RTO-C Districts, regardless of the depth of setback required by § 132, where the sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade.*	
Rear Yard	§§ 130, 134	30% of lot depth but in no case less than 15 feet.	*25% of the total depth of the lot on which the building is situated, but in no case less than 15 feet.*
Side Yard	§ 133	Not Required.	
~~*Residential*~~Design Guidelines *and*	§ 311	Subject to the Residential Design Guidelines, *Citywide Design Standards, and any* ~~*O*~~*o*ther design	

Standards		guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission ~~*may also apply*~~.
Street Frontage and Public Realm		
Front Setback Landscaping and Permeability Requirements	§ 132	*Generally* ~~*R*~~*r*equired. At least 50% of Front Setback shall be permeable so as to increase storm water infiltration and 20% of Front Setback shall be unpaved and devoted to plant material. *Not required where front setback is used to expand adjacent sidewalk to meet Better Streets Plan recommended dimensions.*
Streetscape and Pedestrian Improvements (Street Trees)	§ 138.1	Required.
Street Frontage Requirements	§§ 144, 186, 231	Controls of § 144 apply to residential frontages. Additional controls apply to Limited Commercial Uses per §§ 186 and 231.
Street Frontage, Parking and Loading Access Restrictions	§ 155(r)	As specified in § 155(r) ~~*curb cuts are restricted on certain specified streets and on Transit Preferential, Neighborhood Commercial Streets or official City bicycle routes or bicycle lanes*~~.
Miscellaneous		
Large Project Review	§ 303(r)	New buildings or significant enlargement of existing buildings on lots of 10,000 sq. ft. or larger requires C. New public rights-of-way may be required for sites larger than 1/2 acre.

Planned Unit Development	§ 304	C	C	*C*
Awning	§§ 136, 136.1	*N*P(1)	*N*P(1)	*P*
Canopy or Marquee	§§ 136, 136.1	NP*(2)*	NP*(2)*	*NP(2)*
Signs	§*§* 606*, 607.1*	As permitted by ~~*Section*~~ § 606.		*As permitted by controls of the nearest NC District described in § 607.1.*
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*		
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Usable Open Space [Per Dwelling Unit]	§§ 135, 136	At least ~~*100*~~*80* square feet if private, and ~~*133*~~ *106* square feet per Dwelling Unit if common.	*At least 100 square feet if private, and 133 square feet per Dwelling Unit if common.*	*At least 60 square feet if private, and 80 square feet per Dwelling Unit if common.*
Parking Requirements	§§ 150, 151.1	None required. Maximum permitted per § 151.1.		
Residential Conversion,	§ 317	C ~~*for Removal of one or more Residential Units or Unauthorized Units.*~~		

Demolition, or Merger *of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*				
Dwelling Unit Division	§ 207.8	P	P	*P*
~~*Required Dwelling Unit Mix*~~	~~*§ 207.6*~~	~~*No less than 40 percent of the total number of proposed dwelling units shall contain at least two bedrooms; or no less than 30 percent of the total number of proposed dwelling units shall contain at least three bedrooms.*~~		~~*No less than 40 percent of the total number of proposed dwelling units shall contain at least two bedrooms; or no less than 30 percent of the total number of proposed dwelling units shall contain at least three bedrooms.*~~
Dwelling Unit Mix	*§§ 207.6, 207.7*	*Generally required for creation of five or more Dwelling Units per § 207.6. No less than 40% of the total number*		*Generally required for creation of 10 or*

		of proposed dwelling units shall contain at least two bedrooms; or no less than 30% of the total number of proposed dwelling units shall contain at least three bedrooms.		*more Dwelling Units. No less than 25% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least two Bedrooms, and no less than 10% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least three Bedrooms.*
Use Characteristics				
Intermediate Length Occupancy	§§ 102, 202.10	P(10)	P(10)	*P(10)*
Single Room Occupancy	§ 102	P	P	*P*
Student Housing	§ 102	P	P	*P*
Residential Uses				
~~*Residential Density,*~~	§ 207	~~*P if at least one*~~	~~*No density limit.*~~	~~Form-Based~~

Dwelling Unit~~s~~ *Density, General* (7)		~~*unit per 800 square feet of lot area (8).*~~ Maximum density as of right is one unit per 600 square feet of lot area. C above, per criteria of § 207(a). ~~*(11)*~~*(8)*	~~*Density is regulated by the permitted height and bulk, and required setbacks, exposure, and open space of each parcel, along with Residential Design Guidelines.*~~ *Form-Based Density.*	~~Density.~~ Maximum density shall be as set forth in the nearest Neighborhood Commercial District.
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, If Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		
Senior Housing	§§102,	*Form-Based*	~~*No density limit.*~~	*Form-Based*

Density	202.2(f)*,* *207.9*	*Density applies within the R-4 Height and Bulk District (§ 263.19). Outside the R-4 Height and Bulk District,* P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a principal use in the district; C*,* *required to exceed that density limit.* ~~*density not limited by lot area, but by the applicable requirements and limitations elsewhere in this Code, including but not limited to*~~	~~*Density is regulated by the permitted height and bulk, and required setbacks, exposure, and open space of each parcel, along with Residential Design Guidelines.*~~*Form-Based Density.*	*Density.*

		~~height, bulk, setbacks, open space, exposure, unit mix, and relevant design guidelines.~~		
~~Residential Density,~~ Group Housing *Density*	§ 208	*~~No density limit. Density is regulated by the permitted height and bulk, and required setbacks, exposure, and open space of each parcel, along with Residential Design Guidelines.~~Form-Based Density.*		
Homeless Shelter	§§ 102, 208	P	P	*P*
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124, *207.9*	1.8 to 1	1.8 to 1	*1.8 to 1. For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*
Use Size	*§ 102*	*N/A*	*N/A*	*N/A: Non-Residential Uses of any size are either P or C, depending on*

				specified lot or use features. (11)
Off-Street Parking	§§ 150, 151.1	None required. Maximum permitted per § 151.1.		
Limited Corner Commercial Uses	§ 231	P on a Corner Lot, with no part of the use extending more than 50 feet in depth from said corner	P on a Corner Lot, with no part of the use extending more than 100 feet in depth from said corner	*N/A*
Limited Commercial Uses	§§ 186, 209	Continuing nonconforming uses are permitted, subject to the requirements of § 186.		*N/A*
Commercial Use Characteristics				
Hours of Operation	§§ 102, 186, 231	For Limited Corner Commercial Uses under § 231 and limited commercial uses under § 186: P 6:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.; C 10:00 p.m. to 12:00 a.m.; NP 12:00 a.m. to 6:00 a.m.		*P 6:00 a.m. to 2:00 a.m.; C 2:00 a.m. to 6:00 a.m.*
Formula Retail	*§§ 102, 303.1*	*NP(3)*	*NP(3)*	*C*
Outdoor Activity Area	§§ 102, 145.2, 186, 202.2, 231	P if located in front of building; P if elsewhere and compliant with § 202.2(a)(7); NP otherwise.		

Agricultural Use Category				
Agricultural Uses*	§§ 102, 202.2(c)	C	C	*C*
Agriculture, Neighborhood	§§ 102, 202.2(c)	P	P	*P*
Automotive Use Category				
Automotive Uses*	§ 102	NP	NP	*NP*
Electric Vehicle Charging Location	*§ 102*	*NP*	*NP*	*NP*
Parking Garage, Private	§ 102	C	C	*C*
Parking Garage, Public	*§ 102*	*C*	*C*	*C*
Parking Lot, Private	§§ 102, 144, 155(r), 158.1	C	C	*C*
Parking Lot, Public	*§§ 102, 144, 155(r), 158.1*	*C*	*C*	*C*
Entertainment, Arts and Recreation Use Category				
Entertainment, Arts and Recreation Uses*	§ 102	NP	NP	*P*
Entertainment, Nighttime	*§ 102*	*NP*	*NP*	*C*
Movie Theater	*§ 102*	*NP*	*NP*	*C*

Open Recreation Area	§ 102	C	C	*C*
Passive Outdoor Recreation	§ 102	P	P	*P*
Industrial Use Category				
Industrial Uses*	§ 102	NP	NP	*NP*
Institutional Use Category				
Institutional Uses*	§ 102	NP	NP	*P*
Childcare ~~*Child Care*~~ Facility	§ 102	P	P	*P*
Community Facility	§ 102	P	P	*P*
Hospital	§ 102	C	C	*C*
Post-Secondary Ed. Institution	§ 102	C	C	*P*
Public Facilities	§ 102	P	P	*P*
Religious Institution	§ 102	C	C	*P*
Residential Care Facility	§ 102	P	P	*P*
School	§ 102	C	C	*P*
Sales and Service Category				
Retail Sales and Service Uses*	§ 102	NP	NP	*P*
Flexible Retail	*§ 102*	*NP*	*NP*	*P*
Hotel	§ 102	C(4)	C(4)	*C*

Mobile Food Facility	§ 102	P(5)	P(5)	*P*
Services, Retail Professional	*§ 102*	*NP*	*NP*	*P*
Mortuary	§ 102	C(6)	C(6)	*P*
Non-Retail Sales and Service*	§ 102	NP	NP	*C*
Service, Non-Retail Professional	*§ 102*	*NP*	*NP*	*C*
Utility and Infrastructure Use Category				
Utility and Infrastructure*	§ 102	NP	NP	*C*
Internet Service Exchange	§ 102	C	C	*C*
Power Plant	*§ 102*	*NP*	*NP*	*NP*
Public Utilities Yard	*§ 102*	*NP*	*NP*	*NP*
Utility Installation	§ 102	C	C	*C*
Wireless Telecommunications Services Facility	§ 102	C or P (9)	C or P (9)	*C or P (9)*

* Not listed below.

(1) *P if required as a wind mitigation feature. Additionally,* P for Limited Commercial Uses and Limited Corner Commercial Uses per § 136.1 ~~*only, otherwise NP*~~.

(2) ~~*[Note Deleted]*~~ *Canopy is P if required as a wind mitigation feature.*

(3) ~~*[Note Deleted]*~~ *C for Limited Commercial Uses per § 303.1.*

* * * *

(7) Construction of Accessory Dwelling Units may be ~~*permitted*~~*P* pursuant to Sections 207.1 and 207.2.

(8) ~~*With Conditional Use authorization, f*~~*F*or purposes of this calculation, a Dwelling Unit in this ~~*d*~~*D*istrict containing no more than 500 square feet of net floor area and consisting of not more than one habitable room in addition to a kitchen and a bathroom may be counted as equal to three-quarters of a Dwelling Unit.

(9) C if a Macro WTS Facility; P if a Micro WTS Facility.

(10) NP for buildings with three or fewer Dwelling Units; C for buildings with 10 or more Dwelling Units.

(11) ~~*NP if less than minimum density as set forth in the table. Expansions of existing single-family residential buildings may not exceed more than 25% of Gross Floor Area over 10 years, or result in a building over 3,000 square feet. In new construction, no unit may be smaller than one-third the Gross Floor Area of the largest unit in the building.*~~ *No use size limit applies for Non-residential uses located on a lot where at least 2/3 of the total gross floor area contains Residential uses. No use size limit applies to a Non-residential use that is principally permitted in a RM-1 District. Conditional Use authorization is required for all use sizes if the Use does not meet one of those conditions. The controls applicable to each Use as provided in this Table 209.4 continue to apply. Nothing in the foregoing principally permits or conditionally authorizes a Use that is not permitted in this Table 209.4.*

SEC. 231. LIMITED CORNER COMMERCIAL USES IN RH, RTO*-1, RTO-M*, AND RM DISTRICTS.

(a) **Purpose.** Corner stores enhance and support the character and traditional pattern of development in San Francisco. These small neighborhood-oriented establishments provide convenience goods and services on a retail basis to meet the frequent and recurring needs of

neighborhood residents within a short walking distance of their homes. These uses tend to be small in scale, to serve primarily walk-in trade, and cause minimum interference with nearby streets and properties. These uses are permitted only on the ground floor of corner buildings, and their intensity and operating hours are limited to ensure compatibility with the predominantly residential character of the district. Accessory off-street parking is prohibited for these uses to maintain the local neighborhood walk-in character of the uses.

(b) **Location.** Uses permitted under this *Section 231* must be located:

(1) completely within an RH, RTO*-1*, RTO-M, or RM District;

(2) on or below the ground floor;

(3) in RH, RM-1, RM-2, ~~*and*~~ RTO*-1, and RTO-M* Districts, on a Corner Lot, with no part of the use extending more than 50 feet in depth from said corner, as illustrated in Figure 231~~.~~*; and*

(4) in a space that would not require the Residential Conversion of a Residential Unit or Unauthorized Unit under Planning Code Section 317, unless the space proposed for conversion is occupied by a garage or storage space located in the Basement or First Story~~.~~*; and*

[Figure 231 remains]

(5) in RM-3, RM-4, and RTO-M Districts, on a Corner Lot, with no part of the use extending more than 100 feet in depth from said corner.

* * * *

(d) **Use Size.** In any RH, RM-1, or RM-2 District, the use size shall comply with the use size limitations of a Neighborhood Commercial District or Special Use District located within one-quarter mile of the use, up to a maximum of 1,200 square feet of Occupied Floor Area of commercial area. In any RM-3 or RM-4 District, the use size shall comply with the use size limitations of a Neighborhood Commercial District or Special Use District located within

one-quarter mile of the use, up to a maximum of 2,500 square feet of Commercial Use. No more than 1,200 square feet of Occupied Floor Area of commercial area in a RTO-*1* District or in a RH, RM-1, or RM-2 District if the use is more than one-quarter mile from a Neighborhood Commercial District or Special Use District, and no more than 2,500 occupied square feet of Commercial Use in a RTO-M District or in a RM-3 or RM-4 District if the use is more than one-quarter mile from a Neighborhood Commercial District or Special Use District shall be allowed per Corner Lot, subject to the following exception. On lots which occupy more than one corner on a given block, an additional 1,200 square feet of Occupied Floor Area of Commercial Use shall be allowed per additional corner, so long as the commercial space is distributed equitably throughout appropriate parts of the parcel or project.

(e) **Formula Retail Uses.** All uses meeting the definition of "formula retail" use per Section 303.1 shall not be permitted except by Conditional Use through the procedures of Section 303 for RTO and RTO-M Districts and shall not be permitted in RH and RM Districts.

* * * *

(k) **Outdoor Activity Area.** An Outdoor Activity Area is principally permitted if it is located at the front of the building. An Outdoor Activity Area that is not at the front of the building is principally permitted in RTO-*1* and RTO-M Districts only if it complies with the operating restrictions in Section 202.2(a)(7) and shall not be permitted in RH or RM Districts.

SEC. 303. CONDITIONAL USES.

* * * *

(r) **Development of Large Lots in RTO-*1* and RTO-M Districts.** In order to promote, protect, and maintain a scale of development that is appropriate to each district and compatible with adjacent buildings, new construction or significant enlargement of existing buildings on lots of the same size or larger than the square footage stated in Table 209.4 under Large Project Review shall be permitted only as Conditional Uses subject to the

provisions set forth in this Section *303* of this Code.

* * * *

SEC. 303.1. FORMULA RETAIL USES.

* * * *

(e) **Conditional Use Authorization Required.** A Conditional Use Authorization shall be required for a Formula Retail use in the following zoning districts unless explicitly exempted:

* * * *

(8) Limited Commercial Uses in RTO-*1, RTO-M,* and RED Districts, as permitted by Sections 186, 186.3, and 231;

* * * *

(9) Third Street Formula Retail Restricted Use District, as defined in Section 786; ~~*and*~~

(10) Central SoMa Special Use District as defined in Section 848, except for those uses not permitted pursuant to subsection (f) below~~.~~*; and*

(11) RTO-C District, as defined in Section 209.4.

* * * *

SEC. 304. PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENTS.

* * * *

(d) **Criteria and Limitations.** The proposed development must meet the criteria applicable to conditional uses as stated in Section 303(c) and elsewhere in this Code. In addition, it shall:

* * * *

(5) In R Districts, include Commercial Uses only to the extent that such uses are necessary to serve residents of the immediate vicinity, subject to the limitations for NC-1 Districts under this Code, and in RTO*-1 and RTO-M* Districts include Commercial Uses only according to the provisions of Section 231 of this Code;

* * * *

SEC. 603. EXEMPTED SIGNS.

* * * *

(c) Two General Advertising Signs each not exceeding 24 square feet in area on either a transit shelter or associated advertising kiosk furnished by contract with the Municipal Transportation Agency or predecessor agency for the Municipal Railway in RTO~~*, RTO-M*~~, RM-2, RM-3, RM-4, RC, NC, C, M, PDR, Eastern Neighborhoods Mixed Use Districts, and in those P Districts where such Signs would not adversely affect the character, harmony, or visual integrity of the district as determined by the Planning Commission; eight General Advertising Signs each not exceeding 24 square feet in area on transit shelters located on publicly owned property on a high level Municipal Railway boarding platform in an RH-1D District adjacent to a C-2 District, provided that such advertising signs solely face the C-2 District; up to three double-sided General Advertising Signs each not exceeding 24 square feet in area on or adjacent to transit shelters on publicly owned high level Municipal Railway boarding platforms along The Embarcadero south of the Ferry Building, up to six double-sided panels at 2nd and King Streets, and up to four double-sided panels at 4th and King Streets; up to two double-sided panels not exceeding 24 square feet in area on each low-level boarding platform at the following E-Line stops: Folsom Street and The Embarcadero, Brannan Street and The Embarcadero, 2nd and King Streets, and 4th and King Streets; and a total of 71 double-sided General Advertising Signs each not exceeding 24 square feet in area on or adjacent to transit shelters on 28 publicly owned high level Municipal Railway boarding

platforms serving the Third Street Light Rail Line. Each advertising sign on a low-level or high-level boarding platform shall be designed and sited in such a manner as to minimize obstruction of public views from pedestrian walkways and/or public open space.

Notwithstanding the above, no Sign shall be placed on any transit shelter or associated advertising kiosk located on any sidewalk which shares a common boundary with any property under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Commission, with the exception of Justin Herman Plaza; on any sidewalk on Zoo Road; on Skyline Boulevard between Sloat Boulevard and John Muir Drive; on John Muir Drive between Skyline Boulevard and Lake Merced Boulevard; or on Lake Merced Boulevard on the side of Harding Park Municipal Golf Course, or on any sidewalk on Sunset Boulevard between Lincoln Way and Lake Merced Boulevard; on any sidewalk on Legion of Honor Drive; or in the Civic Center Special Sign Districts as established in Section 608.3 of this Code.

The provisions of this subsection (c) shall be subject to the authority of the Port Commission under Sections 4.114 and B3.581 of the City Charter and under State law.

* * * *

SEC. 606. RESIDENTIAL AND RESIDENTIAL ENCLAVE DISTRICTS.

Signs in Residential and Residential Enclave Districts, *excluding the Residential Transit Oriented-Commercial (RTO-C) District, and* other than those signs exempted by Section 603 of this Code, shall conform to the following provisions:

* * * *

SEC. 607.1. NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL AND RESIDENTIAL-COMMERCIAL DISTRICTS, *AND RESIDENTIAL TRANSIT ORIENTED-COMMERCIAL DISTRICTS*.

* * * *

(a) **Purposes and Findings.** In addition to the purposes stated in Sections 101 and 601 of this Code, the following purposes apply to Neighborhood Commercial and Residential-Commercial Districts. These purposes constitute findings that form a basis for regulations and provide guidance for their application.

(1) As Neighborhood Commercial, ~~and~~ Residential-Commercial, *and Residential Transit Oriented-Commercial* Districts change, they need to maintain their attractiveness to residents, customers and potential new businesses alike. Physical amenities and a pleasant appearance will profit both existing and new enterprises.

(2) The character of signs and other features projecting from buildings is an important part of the visual appeal of a street and the general quality and economic stability of the area. Opportunities exist to relate these signs and projections more effectively to street design and building design. These regulations establish a framework that will contribute toward a coherent appearance of Neighborhood Commercial and Residential-Commercial Districts.

(3) Neighborhood Commercial, ~~and~~ Residential-Commercial, *and Residential Transit Oriented-Commercial* Districts are typically mixed use areas with commercial units on the ground or lower stories and residential uses on upper stories. Although signs are essential to a vital commercial district, they should not be allowed to interfere with or diminish the livability of residential units within a Neighborhood Commercial District or in adjacent residential districts.

(4) The scale of most Neighborhood Commercial and Residential-Commercial Districts as characterized by building height, bulk, and appearance, and the width of streets and sidewalks differs from that of other commercial and industrial districts. Sign sizes should relate and be compatible with the surrounding district scale.

(5) Signs controls in Residential Transit Oriented-Commercial Districts are determined

by the sign controls of the nearest Neighborhood Commercial District described in this Section 607.1.

* * * *

Section 8. Transit Oriented Communities and Parking. Articles 1.5 and 2 of the Planning Code are hereby amended by deleting Section 151 in its entirety, revising Sections 151.1, 153, 154, 155, 155.2, and 161, and adding Sections 207.9 and 207.10, to read as follows:

~~SEC. 151. SCHEDULE OF REQUIRED OFF-STREET PARKING SPACES.~~

*~~(a) **Applicability.** Off-street parking spaces shall be provided in the minimum quantities specified in Table 151, except as otherwise provided in Section 151.1 and Section 161 of this Code. Where the building or lot contains uses in more than one of the categories listed, parking requirements shall be calculated in the manner provided in Section 153 of this Code. Where off-street parking is provided which exceeds certain amounts in relation to the quantities specified in Table 151, as set forth in subsection (c), such parking shall be classified not as accessory parking but as either a Principal or a Conditional Use, depending upon the use provisions applicable to the district in which the parking is located. In considering an application for a Conditional Use for any such parking, due to the amount being provided, the Planning Commission shall consider the criteria set forth in Section 303(t) or 303(u) of this Code. Minimum off-street parking requirements shall be reduced, to the extent needed, when such reduction is part of a Development Project's compliance with the Transportation Demand Management Program set forth in Section 169 of this Code.~~*

*~~(b) **Minimum Parking Required**.~~*

~~Table 151~~

~~OFF-STREET PARKING SPACES REQUIRED~~

~~Use or Activity~~	***~~Number of Off-Street Parking Spaces Required~~***

~~***RESIDENTIAL USES***~~	
~~*Dwelling*~~	~~*None required. P up to 1.5 parking spaces for each Dwelling Unit.*~~
~~*Dwelling, in the Telegraph Hill – North Beach Residential Special Use District*~~	~~*None required. P up to 0.5 parking spaces for each Dwelling Unit, subject to the controls and procedures of Section 249.49(c) and Section 155(t); NP above preceding ratio.*~~
~~*Dwelling, in the Polk Street Neighborhood Commercial District*~~	~~*None required. P up to 0.5 parking spaces for each Dwelling Unit; NP above preceding ratio.*~~
~~*Dwelling, in the Pacific Avenue Neighborhood Commercial District*~~	~~*None required. P up to 0.5 parking spaces for each Dwelling Unit; C up to one car for each Dwelling Unit; NP above preceding ratios.*~~
~~*Group Housing of any kind*~~	~~*None required.*~~
~~***NON-RESIDENTIAL USES***~~	
~~***Agricultural Use Category***~~	
~~*Agricultural Uses**~~	~~*None required*~~
~~*Greenhouse*~~	~~*None required. Maximum 1.5 parking spaces for each 4,000 square feet of Occupied Floor Area, where the Occupied Floor Area exceeds 5,000 square feet.*~~
~~***Automotive Use Category***~~	
~~*Automotive Uses*~~	~~*None required.*~~
~~***Entertainment, Arts and Recreation Use Category***~~	
~~*Entertainment, Arts and Recreation Uses**~~	~~*None required. Maximum 1.5 parking spaces for each 200 square feet of Occupied Floor Area, where the Occupied Floor Area exceeds 5,000 square feet.*~~
~~*Arts Activities, except theater or auditorium spaces*~~	~~*None required. Maximum 1.5 parking spaces for each 2,000 square feet of Occupied Floor Area, where the Occupied Floor Area exceeds 7,500 square feet.*~~
~~*Sports Stadium*~~	~~*None required. Maximum 1.5 parking spaces for each 15 seats.*~~
~~*Theater or auditorium*~~	~~*None required. Maximum 1.5 parking spaces for each 8 seats up to 1,000 seats where the number of seats exceeds 50 seats, plus 1.5 parking spaces for each 10 seats in excess of 1,000.*~~
~~***Industrial Use Category***~~	
~~*Industrial Uses**~~	~~*None required. Maximum 1.5 parking spaces for each 2,000 square feet of Occupied Floor Area, where the Occupied Floor Area exceeds 10,000 square feet.*~~
~~*Live/Work Units*~~	~~*None required. Maximum 1.5 parking spaces for each 2,000 square*~~

	~~*feet of Occupied Floor Area, where the Occupied Floor Area exceeds 7,500 square feet, except in RH or RM Districts, within which the requirement shall be one space for each Live/Work Unit.*~~
~~***Institutional Uses Category***~~	
~~*Institutional Uses**~~	~~*None required.*~~
~~*Child Care Facility*~~	~~*None required. Maximum 1.5 parking spaces for each 25 children to be accommodated at any one time, where the number of such children exceeds 24.*~~
~~*Hospital*~~	~~*None required. Maximum 1.5 parking spaces for each 8 beds excluding bassinets or for each 2,400 square feet of Occupied Floor Area devoted to sleeping rooms, whichever results in the greater requirement, provided that these requirements shall not apply if the calculated number of spaces is no more than two.*~~
~~*Post-Secondary Educational Institution*~~	~~*None required. Maximum 1.5 parking spaces for each two classrooms.*~~
~~*Religious Institution*~~	~~*None required. Maximum 1.5 parking spaces for each 20 seats by which the number of seats in the main auditorium exceeds 200.*~~
~~*Residential Care Facility*~~	~~*None required. Maximum in RH-1 and RH-2 Districts, 1.5 parking spaces for each 10 beds where the number of beds exceeds nine.*~~
~~*School*~~	~~*None required. Maximum 1.5 parking spaces for each six classrooms.*~~
~~*Trade School*~~	~~*None required. Maximum 1.5 parking spaces for each two classrooms.*~~
~~***Sales and Service Category***~~	
~~***Retail Sales and Services****~~	~~*None required. Maximum 1.5 parking spaces for each 500 square feet of Occupied Floor Area up to 20,000 where the Occupied Floor Area exceeds 5,000 square feet, plus 1.5 spaces for each 250 square feet of Occupied Floor Area in excess of 20,000.*~~
~~*Eating and Drinking Uses*~~	~~*None required. Maximum 1.5 parking spaces for each 200 square feet of Occupied Floor Area, where the Occupied Floor Area exceeds 5,000 square feet.*~~
~~*Health Services*~~	~~*None required. Maximum 1.5 parking spaces for each 300 square feet of Occupied Floor Area, where the Occupied Floor Area exceeds 5,000 square feet.*~~
~~*Hotel in NC Districts*~~	~~*None required. Maximum 1.2 parking spaces for each guest bedroom.*~~
~~*Hotel in districts other than NC*~~	~~*None required. Maximum 1.5 parking spaces for each 16 guest bedrooms where the number of guest bedrooms exceeds 23, plus one for the manager's Dwelling Unit, if any.*~~
~~*Mortuary*~~	~~*Eight*~~

~~*Motel*~~	~~*None required. Maximum 1.5 parking spaces for each guest unit, plus one for the manager's Dwelling Unit, if any.*~~
~~*Retail space devoted to the handling of bulky merchandise such as motor vehicles, machinery or furniture*~~	~~*None required. Maximum 1.5 parking spaces for each 1,000 square feet of Occupied Floor Area, where the Occupied Floor Area exceeds 5,000 square feet.*~~
~~*Retail Greenhouse or plant nursery*~~	~~*None required. Maximum 1.5 parking spaces for each 4,000 square feet of Occupied Floor Area, where the Occupied Floor Area exceeds 5,000 square feet.*~~
~~*Self-Storage*~~	~~*None required. Maximum 1.5 parking spaces for every three self-storage units.*~~
~~***Non-Retail Sales and Services****~~	~~*None required. Maximum 1.5 parking spaces for each 1,000 square feet of Occupied Floor Area, where the Occupied Floor Area exceeds 5,000 square feet.*~~
~~*Commercial Storage or Wholesale Storage*~~	~~*None required. Maximum 1.5 parking spaces for each 2,000 square feet of Occupied Floor Area, where the Occupied Floor Area exceeds 10,000 square feet.*~~
~~*Office*~~	~~*None required. Maximum 1.5 parking spaces for each 500 square feet of Occupied Floor Area, where the Occupied Floor Area exceeds 5,000 square feet.*~~
~~***Utility and Infrastructure Category***~~	
~~*Utility and infrastructure uses*~~	~~*None required.*~~

~~** Not listed below*~~

~~*(c) Where no parking is required for a use by this Section 151, the maximum permitted shall be one space per 2,000 square feet of Occupied Floor Area of use, three spaces where the use or activity has zero Occupied Floor Area or the maximum specified elsewhere in this Section.*~~

SEC. 151.1. SCHEDULE OF PERMITTED *ACCESSORY* OFF-STREET PARKING SPACES ~~*IN SPECIFIED DISTRICTS*~~.

(a) **Applicability.** *Unless otherwise specified in a Special Use District, this Section 151.1 shall apply.* ~~*This Section 151.1 shall apply only to NCT, RC, RCD, RTO, Mixed Use, M-1, PDR-1-D, PDR-1-G, and C-3 Districts, and to the Broadway, Excelsior Outer Mission Street, Japantown, North*~~

~~*Beach, Polk, and Pacific Avenue Neighborhood Commercial Districts.*~~

(b) ***Off-street Accessory Parking.*** *Off-street accessory parking shall not be required for any use, and the quantities of off-street parking specified in Tables 151.1-1 and 151.1-2 shall serve as the maximum amount of off-street parking that may be provided as accessory to the uses specified. In addition:*

(1) Accessory off-street parking spaces shall be permitted up to quantities specified in Tables 151.1-1 and 151.1-2, except where provision of such parking would conflict with other provisions of this Code, including but not limited to Sections 144, 145.1, 145.4, and 155(r), in which case the Code Sections other than this Section 151.1 shall apply.

(2) Where a building or lot contains more than one use, the applicable accessory parking limit shall be calculated in the manner provided in Section 153 of this Code.

(3) Where the amount of off-street parking exceeds the quantities specified in Tables 151.1-1 and 151.1-2, such parking shall be considered a separate use requiring a separate entitlement and not considered an accessory use, unless it is existing non-conforming accessory parking that may only be expanded or intensified pursuant to Section 150(e).

(4) Off-street parking shall be reduced, if required for a Development Project to comply with the Transportation Demand Management Program set forth in Section 169 of this Code.

~~*(b)* ***Controls.*** *Off-street accessory parking shall not be required for any use, and the quantities of off-street parking specified in Table 151.1 shall serve as the maximum amount of off-street parking that may be provided as accessory to the uses specified. Variances from accessory off-street parking limits, as described in this Section 151.1, may not be granted. Where off-street parking is provided that exceeds the quantities specified in Table 151.1 or as explicitly permitted by this Section, such parking shall be classified not as accessory parking but as either a principally permitted or Conditional Use, depending upon the use provisions applicable to the district in which the parking is located. In considering an application for a Conditional Use for any such parking due to the amount being*~~

~~*provided, the Planning Commission shall consider the criteria set forth in Sections 303(t) or 303(u) of this Code.*~~

(c) **Definition.** Where a number or ratio of spaces are described in Table*s* 151.1*-1 or 151.1-2*, such number or ratio shall refer to the total number of parked ~~*cars*~~ *vehicles* accommodated in the project ~~*proposal*~~, regardless of the arrangement of parking, and shall include all spaces accessed by mechanical means, valet, or non-independently accessible means. For the purposes of determining the total number of ~~*cars*~~ *vehicles* parked, the area of an individual parking space, except for those spaces specifically designated for persons with physical disabilities, may not exceed 185 square feet, including spaces in tandem, or in parking lifts, elevators, or other means of vertical stacking. Any off-street surface area accessible to motor vehicles with a width of 7.5 feet and a length of 17 feet (127.5 square feet) not otherwise designated on plans as a parking space may be considered and counted as an off-street parking space at the discretion of the Zoning Administrator if the Zoning Administrator, in considering the possibility for tandem and valet arrangements, determines that such area is likely to be used for parking a vehicle on a regular basis and that such area is not necessary for the exclusive purpose of vehicular circulation to the parking or loading facilities otherwise permitted.

(d) **Car-Share Parking.** Any off-street parking space dedicated for use as a car-share parking space, as defined in Section 166, shall not ~~*be credited*~~ *count* toward the total parking permitted as accessory in this Section *151.1*.

Table 151.1*-1*

OFF-STREET PARKING PERMITTED AS ACCESSORY

Use or Activity	Number of Off-Street ~~*Car*~~ *Vehicle* Parking Spaces or Space Devoted to Off-Street ~~*Car*~~

	Vehicle Parking Permitted
RESIDENTIAL USES	
Dwelling (in all Districts unless specified otherwise below)	*P up to 2.0 parking spaces on Lots with one Dwelling Unit; P up to 3.0 parking spaces on Lots with two Dwelling Units; P up to 1.0 parking space for each Dwelling Unit for Lots with three or more Dwelling Units; NP above preceding ratio.*
Dwelling, in the Telegraph Hill - North Beach Residential Special Use District	*P up to 0.5 parking space for each Dwelling Unit, subject to the controls and procedures of Section 249.49(c) and Section 155(t); NP above preceding ratio.*
Dwelling, in the Polk Street Neighborhood Commercial District	*P up to 0.5 parking space for each Dwelling Unit; NP above preceding ratio.*
Dwelling, in the Pacific Avenue Neighborhood Commercial District	*P up to 0.5 parking space for each Dwelling Unit; C above 0.5 and up to 1.0 parking space for each Dwelling Unit; NP above preceding ratios.*
~~*Dwelling Units in RH-DTR Districts*~~	~~*P up to one car for each two Dwelling Units; C up to one car for each Dwelling Unit, subject to the criteria and procedures of Section 151.1(e); NP above one space per unit.*~~
Dwelling Units in SB-DTR Districts, except as specified below	P up to *0.375 parking space for each Dwelling Unit* ~~*one car for each four Dwelling Units*~~; C *above 0.375 and* up to 0.75 ~~*cars*~~ *parking space* for each Dwelling Unit, subject to the criteria and procedures of Section 151.1(e); NP above 0.75 ~~*cars*~~ *parking space* for each Dwelling Unit.
Dwelling Units in SB-DTR Districts with at least 2 bedrooms and at least 1,000 square feet of Occupied Floor Area	P up to *0.375 parking space* ~~*one car*~~ for each ~~*four*~~ Dwelling Unit~~s~~; C *above 0.375 and* up to *1.0* ~~*one car*~~ *parking space* for each Dwelling Unit, subject to the criteria and procedures of Section 151.1(e); NP above *1.0* ~~*one car*~~ *parking space* for each Dwelling Unit.
Dwelling Units in C-3 *and RH-DTR* Districts	P up to *0.375 parking space* ~~*one car*~~ for each ~~*two*~~ Dwelling Unit~~s~~; C *above 0.375 and* up to 0.75 ~~*cars*~~ *parking space* for each Dwelling Unit, subject to the criteria and procedures of Section 151.1(e); NP above ~~*three cars for each four*~~ *0.75 parking space for each* Dwelling Unit~~s~~.
Dwelling Units in the Van Ness & Market Residential Special Use District	P up to ~~*one car*~~ *0.25 parking space* for each ~~*four*~~ Dwelling Unit~~s~~; NP above *0*.25 ~~*cars*~~ *parking space* for each Dwelling Unit.

Dwelling Units ~~*and SRO Units*~~ in SALI, MUG outside of the Central SoMa SUD, WMUG, MUR, MUO, WMUO, SPD Districts, except as specified below	P up to ~~*one car*~~ *0.25 parking space* for each ~~*four*~~ Dwelling ~~*or SRO*~~ Unit~~s~~; C *above 0.25 and* up to 0.75 ~~*cars*~~ *parking space* for each Dwelling Unit, subject to the criteria~~, *and*~~ conditions, and procedures of Section 151.1(e) or (f); NP above 0.75 ~~*cars*~~ *parking spaces* for each Dwelling ~~*or SRO*~~ Unit.
Dwelling Units in SALI, MUG outside of the Central SoMa SUD, WMUG, MUR, MUO, WMUO, and SPD Districts with at least two bedrooms and at least 1,000 square feet of Occupied Floor Area	P up to ~~*one car*~~ *0.25 parking space* for each ~~*four*~~ Dwelling Unit~~s~~; C *above 0.25 and* up to *1.0* ~~*one car*~~ *parking space* for each Dwelling Unit, subject to the criteria and conditions and procedures of Section 151.1(e) or (f); NP above *1.0* ~~*one car*~~ *parking space* for each Dwelling Unit.
Dwelling Units ~~*and SRO Units*~~ in NCT, RC, RCD, RSD, Chinatown Mixed Use Districts, except as specified below	P up to ~~*one car*~~ *0.5 parking space* for each ~~*two*~~ Dwelling ~~*or SRO*~~ Unit~~s~~; C *above 0.5 and* up to 0.75 ~~*cars*~~ *parking space* for each Dwelling Unit, subject to the criteria and procedures of Section 151.1(e); NP above 0.75 ~~*cars*~~ *parking space* for each Dwelling Unit.
Dwelling Units ~~*and SRO Units*~~ in the Telegraph Hill - North Beach Residential Special Use District	P up to 0.5 parking spaces for each Dwelling Unit, subject to the controls and procedures of Section 249.49(c) and Sections 155(r) and 155(t); NP above *preceding ratio*.
Dwelling Units ~~*and SRO Units*~~ in the Broadway and North Beach Neighborhood Commercial Districts outside of the boundaries of the Telegraph Hill - North Beach Residential Special Use District	P up to 0.5 parking space for each Dwelling Unit~~,~~*;* C *above 0.5 and* up to 0.75 ~~*cars*~~ *parking spaces* for each Dwelling Unit; NP above 0.75 ~~*cars*~~ *parking space* for each Dwelling Unit, subject to the controls and procedures of Sections 155(r), 155(t), and Section 151.1(e). *NP above preceding ratio.*
Dwelling Units in the Glen Park NCT District	*P up to 0.5 parking space for each Dwelling Unit; C above 0.5 and up to 1.0 parking space for each Dwelling Unit, subject to the criteria and procedures of Section 151.1(e); NP above 1.0 parking space for each Dwelling Unit.*
Dwelling Units in the ~~*Glen Park and*~~ Ocean Avenue NCT District~~s~~ and the Excelsior Outer Mission Street Neighborhood Commercial District	P up to ~~*one car*~~ *1.0 parking space* for each *Dwelling U*~~*u*~~nit; NP above *1.0 parking space for each Dwelling Unit*.
Dwelling Units in the Japantown NC District	P up to 0.75 ~~*cars*~~ *parking space* for each Dwelling Unit~~,~~*;* C *above 0.75 and* up to 1.0 ~~*cars*~~

	parking space for each Dwelling Unit, subject to the criteria and procedures of Section 151.1(e); NP above *1.0 parking space for each Dwelling Unit*.
Dwelling Units ~~*with*~~in the Central SoMa SUD	P up to ~~*one car*~~ *0.25 parking space* for each ~~*four*~~ Dwelling Unit~~*s*~~; C above 0.25 and up to 0.5 ~~*cars*~~ *parking space* for each Dwelling Unit. *NP above 0.5 parking space for each Dwelling Unit.*
Dwelling Units in RTO Districts.	*P up to 1.0 parking space for each Dwelling Unit; NP above 1.0 parking space for each Dwelling Unit. For Lots east of Divisadero and Castro Streets in RTO Districts, P up to 0.75 parking spaces for each Dwelling Unit; C above 0.75 and up to 1.0 parking space for each Dwelling Unit, subject to the criteria and procedures of Section 151.1(e) or (f). NP above 1.0 parking space for each Dwelling Unit.*
Dwelling Units in ~~*RTO,*~~ RED and RED-MX Districts, except as specified below	P up to ~~*three cars*~~ *0.75 parking spaces* for each ~~*four*~~ Dwelling Unit~~*s*~~; C *above 0.75 and* up to *1.0* ~~*one car*~~ *parking space* for each Dwelling Unit, subject to the criteria and procedures of Section 151.1(e) or (f); NP above *1.0* ~~*one car*~~ *parking space* for each Dwelling Unit.
Dwelling Units in UMU Districts, except as specified below	P up to 0.75 ~~*cars*~~ *parking spaces* for each Dwelling Unit; NP above *0.75 parking spaces for each Dwelling Unit*.
Dwelling Units in UMU District with at least 2 bedrooms and at least 1,000 square feet of occupied floor area	P up to 1*.0* ~~*car*~~ *parking space* for each Dwelling Unit and subject to the conditions of *Section* 151.1(e); NP above *1.0 parking space for each Dwelling Unit*.
Group Housing of any kind	P up to *1.0* ~~*one car*~~ *parking space* for each three bedrooms or for each six beds, whichever results in the greater *number of parking spaces* ~~*requirement*~~, plus *1.0* ~~*one*~~ *parking space* for the manager's Dwelling Unit if any; NP above *preceding ratios*.
NON-RESIDENTIAL USES IN C-3 DISTRICTS	
All non-residential uses in C-3 Districts	Not to exceed 7% of Occupied Floor Area of such uses, except not to exceed 3.5% of Occupied Floor Area in the C-3-O(SD) District, and subject to the pricing conditions of

	Section 155(g).
NON-RESIDENTIAL USES IN DISTRICTS OTHER THAN C-3	
Non-residential, non-office uses in PDR-1-D, PDR-1-G, and UMU Districts	P up to 50% greater than indicated for the uses specified below. *NP above preceding ratio.*
Agricultural Use Category	
Greenhouse	*P up to 1.5 parking spaces for each 4,000 square feet of Occupied Floor Area. NP above preceding ratio.*
Entertainment, Arts, and Recreation Uses Category	
Entertainment, Arts, and Recreation Uses*	*P up to 1.5 parking spaces for each 200 square feet of Occupied Floor Area. NP above preceding ratio.*
Arts Activities, except theaters and auditoriums	~~*P up to one car for each 200 square feet of Occupied Floor Area.*~~ *P up to 1.5 parking spaces for each 2,000 square feet of Occupied Floor Area. NP above preceding ratio.*
Sports Stadium	P up to *1.0 parking space* ~~*one car*~~ for each 15 seats. *NP above preceding ratio.*
Theater or auditorium	P up to *1.0* ~~*one car*~~ *parking space* for each ~~*eight*~~ *8* seats up to 1,000 seats, plus ~~*one*~~ *1.0 parking space* for each 10 seats in excess of 1,000. *NP above preceding ratio.*
Industrial Uses Category	
Industrial Uses*	P up to ~~*one car*~~ *1.0 parking space* for each 1,500 square feet of Occupied Floor Area. *NP above preceding ratio.*
Small Enterprise Workspace	P up to ~~*one car*~~ *1.0 parking space* for each 1,500 square feet of Occupied Floor Area. *NP above preceding ratio.*
Live/Work Units	*P up to 1.5 parking spaces for each 2,000 square feet of Occupied Floor Area, except in RH or RM Districts, within which the requirement shall be 1.0 parking space for each Live/Work Unit. NP above*

	preceding ratio.
Institutional Uses Category	
Institutional Uses*	P up to ~~*one car*~~ *1.0 parking space* per 1,500 square feet of Occupied Floor Area. NP above *preceding ratio*.
Child Care Facility	P up to ~~*one car*~~ *1.0 parking space* for each 25 children ~~*to be accommodated at any one time*~~. *NP above preceding ratio.*
Hospital	P up to ~~*one car*~~ *1.0 parking space* for each 8 guest beds excluding bassinets or for each 2,400 square feet of Occupied Floor Area devoted to sleeping rooms, whichever results in the lesser requirement. *NP above preceding ratio.*
Post-Secondary Educational Institution	P up to ~~*one car*~~ *1.0 parking space* for each ~~*two*~~ *2* classrooms. *NP above preceding ratio.*
Religious Institution	P up to ~~*one car*~~ *1.0 parking space* for each 20 seats. *NP above preceding ratio.*
Residential Care Facility	P up to ~~*one car*~~ *1.0 parking space* for each 10 beds. *NP above preceding ratio.*
School	P up to ~~*one car*~~ *1.0 parking space* for each ~~*six*~~ *6* classrooms. *NP above preceding ratio.*
Trade School	P up to ~~*one car*~~ *1.0 parking space* for each ~~*two*~~ *2* classrooms. *NP above preceding ratio.*
Sales and Services Category	
Retail Sales and Services*	P up to ~~*one car*~~ *1.0 parking space* for each 500 square feet of Occupied Floor Area. ~~*up to 20,000 square feet, plus one car for each 250 square feet of Occupied Floor Area in excess of 20,000.*~~ *NP above preceding ratio.*
Eating and Drinking Uses	P up to *1.25 parking spaces* ~~*one car*~~ for each *500* ~~*200*~~ square feet of Occupied Floor Area. *NP above preceding ratio.*

All retail in the Eastern Neighborhoods Mixed Use Districts where any portion of the parcel is within the Central SoMa Special Use District or is less than *one-quarter* ~~*1/4*~~ mile from Market, Mission, 3rd Streets and 4th Street north of Berry Street, except grocery stores of over 20,000 gross square feet.	P up to ~~*one*~~ *1.0 parking space* for each 1,500 square feet of Gross Floor Area. *NP above preceding ratio.*
General Grocery uses with over 20,000 square feet of Occupied Floor Area	P up to ~~*one car*~~ *1.0 parking space* per 500 square feet of Occupied Floor Area, and subject to the conditions of Section 303(u)(2). C up to ~~*one car*~~ *1.0 parking space* per 250 square feet of Occupied Floor Area ~~*for that area in excess of 20,000 square feet*~~, subject to the conditions and criteria of Section 303(t)(2). NP above *preceding ratio*.
Health Service	P up to *1.0* ~~*one*~~ *parking space* for each 300 square feet of Occupied Floor Area. *NP above preceding ratio.*
Hotel*s in Districts other than NC*	P up to ~~*one car*~~ *1.0 parking space* for each 16 guest bedrooms, plus ~~*one*~~ *1.0 parking space* for the manager's Dwelling Unit, if any. *NP above preceding ratio.*
Hotels in NC Districts	*P up to 1.2 parking spaces for each guest bedroom. NP above preceding ratio.*
Limited Corner Commercial Uses in *RH, RTO-1,* RTO-*M* and RM districts authorized under Section 231.	None permitted.
Mortuary	P up to *5.0 parking spaces.* ~~*five cars.*~~ *NP above preceding ratio.*
Motel	P up to *1.0 parking space* ~~*one car*~~ for each guest unit, plus ~~*one*~~ *1.0 parking space* for the manager's Dwelling Unit, if any. *NP above preceding ratio.*
Retail *Greenhouse or* plant nursery	P up to ~~*one car*~~ *1.0 parking space* for each 4,000 square feet of Occupied Floor Area. Such uses exceeding 20,000 square feet shall be

	subject to the conditions of Section 303(u)(2). *NP above preceding ratio.*
Retail space devoted to the handling of bulky merchandise such as motor vehicles, machinery, or furniture	P up to ~~*one car*~~ *1.0 parking space* for each 1,000 square feet of Occupied Floor Area. Such uses exceeding 20,000 square feet shall be subject to the conditions of Section 303(u)(2). *NP above preceding ratio.*
Self-Storage	P up to ~~*one car*~~ *1.0 parking space* for each ~~*three*~~ *3* self-storage units. *NP above preceding ratio.*
Non-Retail Sales and Services*	P up to ~~*one car*~~ *1.0 parking space* per 1,500 square feet of Occupied Floor Area. *NP above preceding ratio.*
Commercial Storage or Wholesale Storage	P up to ~~*one car*~~ *1.0 parking space* for each 2,000 square feet of Occupied Floor Area. *NP above preceding ratio.*
Office (unless otherwise specified below)	*P up to 1.25 parking spaces for each 500 square feet of Occupied Floor Area. NP above preceding ratio.*
Office uses in DTR, SPD, MUG, WMUG, MUR, WMUO, and MUO Districts	P up to 7% of the Occupied Floor Area of such uses and subject to the pricing conditions of Section 155(g); NP above *preceding ratio.*.
Office uses in the Central SoMa Special Use District	P up to ~~*one car*~~ *1.0 parking space* per 3,500 square feet of Occupied Floor Area. *NP above preceding ratio.*
Office uses in Chinatown Mixed Use Districts	P up to 7% of the Occupied Floor Area of such uses; NP above *preceding ratio*.
Office uses in M-1, UMU, SALI, PDR-1-D, and PDR-1-G Districts, except as specified below	P up to ~~*one car*~~ *1.0 parking space* per 1,000 square feet of Occupied Floor Area and subject to the pricing conditions of Section 155(g); NP above *preceding ratio*.
Office uses in M-1, UMU, SALI, PDR-1-D, and PDR-1-G Districts where the entire parcel is greater than *one-quarter* ~~¼~~ mile from Market, Mission, 3rd Streets and 4th Street north of Berry Street	P up to ~~*one car*~~ *1.0 parking space* per 500 square feet of Occupied Floor Area; NP above *preceding ratio*.

Utility and Infrastructure Uses Category	
Utility and Infrastructure Uses	P up to ~~*one car*~~ *1.0 parking space* per 1,500 square feet of Occupied Floor Area. NP above *preceding ratio*.

* Not listed below

*(e) **Non-Residential Uses.** Unless otherwise specified in Tables 151.1-1 or 151.1-2, or elsewhere in this Section 151.1, the maximum accessory parking permitted for non-residential uses shall be one of the following:*

(1) One parking space per 2,000 square feet of Occupied Floor Area of use; or

(2) Three parking spaces where the use or activity has no Occupied Floor Area.

(*f*~~e~~) **Excess Residential Parking.** Any request for accessory residential parking, in excess of what is principally permitted in Table*s* 151.1-*1 and 151.1-2*, shall be reviewed by the Planning Commission as a Conditional Use*, provided that the request does not exceed the maximum amount stated in Tables 151.1-1 and 151.1-2*. In MUG, WMUG, MUR, MUO, RED, RED-MX, and SPD Districts, any project subject to Section 329 and that requests residential accessory parking in excess of that which is principally permitted in Table*s* 151.1-*1 and 151.1-2*, but which does not exceed the maximum amount stated in Table*s* 151.1-*1 and 151.1-2*, shall be reviewed by the Planning Commission according to the procedures of Section 329. Projects that are not subject to Section 329 shall be reviewed under the procedures detailed in subsection (*g*) below.

(*f*~~g~~) **Small Residential Projects in MUG, WMUG, MUR, MUO, CMUO, WMUO, RED, RED-MX, and SPD Districts**. Any project that is not subject to the requirements of Section 329 and that requests residential accessory parking in excess of what is principally permitted in Table*s* 151.1-*1 and 151.1-2* shall be reviewed by the Zoning Administrator subject to Section 307(i). The Zoning Administrator may grant parking in excess of what is principally permitted in Table*s* 151.1-*1 and 151.1-2*, not to exceed the maximum amount stated in Table*s* 151.1-*1*

and 151.1-2, only if the Zoning Administrator determines that:

(1) all the following conditions have been met:

(A) Vehicle movement on or around the project does not unduly impact pedestrian spaces or movement, transit service, bicycle movement, or the overall traffic movement in the district;

(B) Accommodating excess accessory parking does not degrade the overall urban design quality of the project proposal;

(C) All above-grade parking is architecturally screened and lined with active uses according to the standards of Section 145.1, and the project sponsor is not requesting any exceptions or variances requiring such treatments elsewhere in this Code; and

(D) Excess accessory parking does not diminish the quality and viability of existing or planned streetscape enhancements;

(2) parking is not accessed from any protected Transit or Pedestrian Street described in Section 155(r), and

(3) where more than 10 spaces are proposed at least half of them, rounded down to the nearest whole number, are stored and accessed by mechanical stackers or lifts, valet, or other space-efficient means that reduces space used for parking and maneuvering, and maximizes other uses.

~~*(g) **Excess Parking for Non-Residential Uses greater than 20,000 square feet.** Where permitted by Table 151.1 for a Non-Residential Use greater than 20,000 square feet, any request for accessory parking in excess of what is principally permitted in Table 151.1, but which does not exceed the maximum amount stated in Table 151.1, shall be reviewed by the Planning Commission as a Conditional Use.*~~

*(h) **Transit-Oriented Communities Parking Limits.** Consistent with the Transit-Oriented Communities Policies of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, this Section 151.1 implements*

the maximum parking limits based on the presence of certain transit services within one-half mile of the development. Notwithstanding the provisions of Table 151.1-2, if any portion of the subject development falls within the geographic areas listed in Table 151.1-2, the lower of the maximum limits in either Table 151.1-1 or Table 151.1-2 shall apply as the maximum amount of parking.

Table 151.1-2

MAXIMUM PARKING LIMITS FOR TRANSIT STATION AREAS

Geographic Area	*Maximum Residential Parking per Dwelling Unit **	*Maximum Parking for Non-Retail Sales and Service Uses (including all Office and Laboratory uses) and Retail Sales and Service Uses, except for any use also classified as a Production, Distribution, and Repair Use.*
*Transit-Oriented Communities Tier 1: Sites within a half-mile of Embarcadero, Montgomery, Powell, or Civic Center BART stations; and Salesforce Transbay Transit Center.***	*0.375 parking space for each Dwelling Unit.*	*0.25 parking spaces per 1,000 square feet of Occupied Floor Area.*
Transit-Oriented Communities Tier 2: Sites within a half-mile of 16th Street, 24th Street, Glen Park, or Balboa Park BART	*0.5 parking spaces for each Dwelling Unit.*	*1.6 parking spaces per 1,000 square feet of Occupied Floor Area.*

*stations.***		
*Transit-Oriented Communities Tier 3: Sites within a half-mile of all Muni rail stops on the F, J, K, L, M, N, or T lines; Caltrain Stations; and Van Ness Bus Rapid Transit Stops (i.e., stops on Van Ness Avenue between and including Market Street and Union Street).***	*1.0 parking space for each Dwelling Unit.*	*2.5 parking spaces per 1,000 square feet of Occupied Floor Area.*
*Transit-Oriented Communities Tier 4: Sites within a half-mile of all ferry terminals, including the Ferry Building, 16th Street/Mission Bay, and Treasure Island.***	*1.0 parking space for each Dwelling Unit.*	*2.5 parking spaces per 1,000 square feet of Occupied Floor Area.*

** Refer to Table 151.1-1 for maximum parking limits applicable to Group Housing, including Group Housing projects in Transit Station Areas.*

*** As used in Table 151.1-2, the distance of one-half mile shall be measured in accordance with the methodology established by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission.*

SEC. 153. RULES FOR CALCULATION OF ~~*REQUIRED*~~ *PARKING* SPACES.

(a) In the calculation of off-street parking, freight loading spaces, and bicycle parking spaces *permitted or* required under Sections 151*.1*, 152, 152.1, 155.2, 155.3, and 155.4 of this

Code, *or pursuant to any Special Use District,* the following rules shall apply:

(1) In the case of mixed uses in the same structure, on the same lot, or in the same development, or more than one type of activity involved in the same use, the total ~~*requirements for*~~ *permitted* off-street parking and *requirements for* loading spaces shall be the sum of the requirements for the various uses or activities computed separately, including fractional values.

(2) Where an initial quantity of floor area, rooms, seats, or other form of measurement is exempted from ~~*off-street parking or*~~ loading requirements, such exemption shall apply only once to the aggregate of that form of measurement. If the initial exempted quantity is exceeded, for either a structure or a lot or a development, the requirement shall apply to the entire such structure, lot, or development, unless the contrary is specifically stated in this Code. In combining the requirements for use categories in mixed use buildings, all exemptions for initial quantities of square footage for the uses in question shall be disregarded, excepting the exemption for the initial quantity which is the least among all the uses in question.

(3) Where a structure or use is divided by a zoning district boundary line, the requirements as to quantity of ~~*off-street parking and*~~ loading spaces *and permitted off-street parking* shall be calculated in proportion to the amount of such structure or use located in each zoning district.

(4) Where seats are used as the form of measurement, each 22 inches of space on benches, pews and similar seating facilities shall be considered one seat.

(5) When the calculation of the ~~*required*~~ number of ~~*off-street parking or*~~ *required* freight loading *or permitted off-street parking* spaces results in a fractional number, a fraction of ~~*½*~~ *one-half* or more shall be adjusted to the next higher whole number of spaces, and a fraction of less than *one-half* ~~*½ may*~~ *shall* be disregarded, *except where the number of permitted spaces is*

less than one, in which case one parking space shall be permitted.

(6) In C-3, MUG, MUR, MUO, CMUO, and UMU *Districts*, substitution of two service vehicle spaces for each required off-street freight loading space may be made, provided that a minimum of 50*%* ~~*percent*~~ of the required number of spaces are provided for freight loading. Where the 50*%* ~~*percent*~~ allowable substitution results in a fraction, the fraction shall be disregarded.

(b) The requirements for off-street ~~*parking and*~~ loading *and permitted off-street parking* for any use not specifically mentioned in Sections 151*.1* and 152 shall be the same as for a use specified which is similar, as determined by the Zoning Administrator.

(c) For all uses and all districts covered by Section 151.1, the rules of calculation established by subsection (a) *of this Section 153* shall apply to the determination of maximum permitted spaces ~~*al*~~ allowed by Section 151.1.

SEC. 154. DIMENSIONS FOR OFF-STREET PARKING, FREIGHT LOADING, AND SERVICE VEHICLE SPACES.

(a) **Parking Spaces.** ~~*Required parking*~~ *Parking* spaces may be either independently accessible or space-efficient as described in *Section* 154(a)(4) and 154(a)(5), except as required elsewhere in the Building Code for spaces specifically designated for persons with physical disabilities. Space-efficient parking is encouraged.

(1) Each independently accessible off-street parking space ~~*shall have a minimum*~~ *measuring an* area of 144 square feet (8 feet by 18 feet) *shall count as* ~~*for*~~ a standard space and *measuring* 112.5 square feet ~~*for*~~ *shall count as* a compact space (7.5 feet by 15 feet), except for the types of parking spaces authorized by *subsection* ~~*Paragraph*~~ (a)(4) below and spaces specifically designated for persons with physical disabilities, the requirements for which are set forth in the Building Code. Every ~~*required*~~ *parking* space shall be of usable shape. The area

of any such space shall be exclusive of driveways, aisles, and maneuvering areas. ~~*The parking space requirements for the Bernal Heights Special Use District are set forth in Section 242.*~~

(2) Any ratio of standard spaces to compact spaces may be permitted, so long as compact car spaces are specifically marked and identified as a compact space. ~~*Special provisions relating to the Bernal Heights Special Use District are set forth in Section 242.*~~

(3) Off-street parking spaces in DTR, C-3, RTO, NCT, Eastern Neighborhoods Mixed Use, PDR-1-D, and PDR-1-G Districts shall have no ~~*minimum*~~ *defined* area or dimension requirements, except as required elsewhere in the Building Code for spaces specifically designated for persons with physical disabilities. For all uses in all Districts, ~~*for which there is no minimum off-street parking requirement, per Section 151.1,*~~ refer to *Sections 153 and* 151.1(c) for rules regarding calculation of parking spaces.

(4) *Permitted off-street parking* ~~*Parking*~~ spaces in mechanical parking structures that allow a vehicle to be accessed without having to move another vehicle under its own power shall be deemed to be independently accessible. Parking spaces that are accessed by a valet attendant and are subject to such conditions as may be imposed by the Zoning Administrator to insure the availability of attendant service at the time the vehicle may reasonably be needed or desired by the user ~~*for whom the space is required*~~, shall be deemed to be independently accessible. Any conditions imposed by the Zoning Administrator pursuant to this Section *154* shall be recorded as a Notice of Special Restriction.

(5) Space-efficient parking is parking in which vehicles are stored and accessed by valet, mechanical stackers or lifts, certain tandem spaces, or other space-efficient means. Tandem spaces shall ~~*only*~~ count ~~*towards satisfying the parking requirement*~~ *toward permitted off-street parking spaces* if no more than one car needs to be moved to access the desired parking space. ~~*Space-efficient parking is encouraged, and may be used to satisfy minimum parking requirements so long as the project sponsor can demonstrate that all required parking can be*~~

~~*accommodated by the means chosen.*~~

* * * *

SEC. 155. GENERAL STANDARDS AS TO LOCATION AND ARRANGEMENT OF OFF-STREET PARKING, FREIGHT LOADING, AND SERVICE VEHICLE FACILITIES.

Required off-street parking and freight loading facilities shall meet the following standards as to location and arrangement. Facilities which are not required but are actually provided shall also meet the following standards unless such standards are stated to be applicable solely to required facilities. In application of the standards of this Code for off-street parking and loading, reference may be made to provisions of other portions of the Municipal Code concerning off-street parking and loading facilities, and to standards of the Better Streets Plan and the Bureau of Engineering of the Department of Public Works. Final authority for the application of such standards under this Code, and for adoption of regulations and interpretations in furtherance of the stated provisions of this Code shall, however, rest with the Planning Department.

* * * *

(u) **Driveway and Loading Operations Plan (DLOP)** ~~***in the Central SoMa Special Use District and Van Ness & Market Residential Special Use District***~~**.**

(1) **Purpose.** The purpose of a Driveway and Loading Operations Plan (DLOP) is to reduce potential conflicts between driveway and loading operations, including passenger and freight loading activities, and pedestrians, bicycles, and vehicles, to maximize reliance of on-site loading spaces to accommodate new loading demand, and to ensure that off-site loading activity is considered in the design of new buildings.

(2) **Applicability.** Development projects of more than 100,000 net new *Gg*ross ~~*square feet*~~ *Floor Area* ~~*in the Central SoMa Special Use District and Van Ness & Market Residential*~~

~~*Special Use District*~~.

(3) **Requirement.** Applicable projects shall prepare a DLOP for review and approval by the Planning Department, in consultation with the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency. The DLOP shall be written in accordance with any guidelines issued by the Planning Department.

SEC. 155.2. BICYCLE PARKING: APPLICABILITY AND REQUIREMENTS FOR SPECIFIC USES.

* * * *

Table 155.2

BICYCLE PARKING SPACES REQUIRED

Use	**Minimum Number of Class 1 Spaces Required**	**Minimum Number of Class 2 Spaces Required**
RESIDENTIAL USES		
* * * *		
~~*Senior Housing or*~~ Dwelling Units dedicated to persons with physical disabilities	One Class 1 space for every 10 units or beds, whichever is applicable.	Minimum two spaces. Two Class 2 spaces for every 50 units or beds, whichever is applicable.
Senior Housing (Dwelling Units or Group Housing)	*One Class 1 space for every 20 units or beds, whichever is applicable. No Class 1 spaces are required for projects where the ratio would result in a requirement of less than 5*	*Two Class 2 spaces for every 100 units or beds, whichever is applicable.*

	spaces.	
* * * *		

* * * *

SEC. 161. EXEMPTIONS AND EXCEPTIONS FROM OFF-STREET PARKING, FREIGHT LOADING, AND SERVICE VEHICLE REQUIREMENTS.

The following exemptions shall apply to the requirements for off-street parking and loading spaces set forth in Sections 151*.1* through 155 of this Code. These provisions, as exemptions, shall be narrowly construed. Reductions or waivers by the Zoning Administrator permitted by this Section 161 shall be conducted pursuant to the procedures of Section 307(h)(2). Where exceptions in this Section *161* require approval by the Zoning Administrator, the Zoning Administrator shall consider the criteria of Section 307(i).

~~*(a) **Topography**. No off-street parking shall be required for a one-family or two-family dwelling where the lot on which such dwelling is located is entirely inaccessible by automobile because of topographic conditions.*~~

(~~b~~a) ~~***Parking or***~~ **Loading Across Very Wide Sidewalks.** No off-street ~~*parking or*~~ loading shall be required where access to the lot cannot be provided other than by means of a driveway across a sidewalk 25 feet or more in width from the curb to the front lot line which would cause serious disruption to pedestrian traffic.

(~~c~~b) **Joint Use of Off-Street Parking.** Joint use of the same off-street parking spaces ~~*to meet the requirements of this Code*~~ for two or more structures or uses *is* ~~*may be*~~ permitted~~*, where the normal hours of operation of such structures or uses are such as to assure the feasibility of such joint use of parking and where the total quantity of spaces provided is at least equal to the total of the required spaces for the structures or uses in operation at any given time*~~.

~~*(d) **Exceptions to Improve Conformity with Setbacks, Yards, Open Space, and Other***~~

~~***Requirements of the Code**. The Zoning Administrator may reduce or waive the off-street parking requirement for existing buildings if removal of parking and associated structures increases conformity with required front setbacks, side yards, and rear yards, increases conformity with open space or street frontage requirements, reduces or eliminates any nonconforming encroachment onto public rights-of-way or other public property or easement, and/or reduces or eliminates any other code nonconformity.~~

(~~e~~c) **Freight Loading and Service Vehicle Spaces.** In recognition of the fact that site constraints may make provision of required freight loading and service vehicle spaces impractical or undesirable, a reduction in or waiver of the provision of freight loading and service vehicle spaces for uses may be permitted, by the Zoning Administrator in all ~~d~~D districts, or in accordance with the provisions of Section 309 of this Code in C-3 Districts. In considering any such reduction or waiver, the following criteria shall be considered:

(1) Provision of freight loading and service vehicle spaces cannot be accomplished underground because site constraints will not permit ramps, elevators, turntables and maneuvering areas with reasonable safety;

(2) Provision of the required number of freight loading and service vehicle spaces on-site would result in the use of an unreasonable percentage of ground-floor area, and thereby preclude more desirable use of the ground floor for retail, pedestrian circulation or open space uses;

(3) A jointly used underground facility with access to a number of separate buildings and meeting the collective needs for freight loading and service vehicles for all uses in the buildings involved, cannot be provided; and

(4) Spaces for delivery functions can be provided at the adjacent curb without adverse effect on pedestrian circulation, transit operations or general traffic circulation, and off-street space permanently reserved for service vehicles is provided either on-site or in the immediate vicinity of the building.

(~~g~~d) **Historic Buildings.** There shall be no minimum off-street ~~*parking or*~~ loading requirements for any principal or Conditional Use located in (1) a landmark building designated per Article 10 of this Code, (2) a contributing building located within a designated historic district per Article 10, (3) any building designated Category I-IV per Article 11 of this Code, or (4) buildings listed on the National Register and/or California Register.

(~~h~~e) **Landmark and Significant Trees.** The required off-street ~~*parking and*~~ loading may be reduced or waived if the Zoning Administrator determines that provision of required ~~*off-street parking or*~~ loading would result in the loss of or damage to a designated Landmark Tree or Significant Tree, as defined in the Public Works Code. The Zoning Administrator's decision shall be governed by Section 307~~*(i)*~~ and shall require either (1) the recommendation of the Department of Public Works Bureau of Urban Forestry, or its successor agency, or (2) the recommendation of a certified arborist as documented in the subject tree's required tree protection plan.

(~~i~~f) **Geologic Hazards.** No off-street ~~*parking or*~~ loading shall be required where the Planning Department finds that required ~~*parking or*~~ loading cannot practically be provided without compromising the earthquake safety or geologic stability of a building and/or neighboring structures and properties.

(~~j~~g) **Protected Street Frontages and Transit Stops.** No off-street ~~*parking or*~~ loading is required on any lot whose sole feasible automobile access is across a protected street frontage identified in Section 155(r).

(~~k~~h) **Curbside Transit Lanes and Bikeways.** No off-street parking or loading is required on any lot whose sole feasible automobile access is across a curbside transit lane or bikeway.

SEC. 207.9. MINIMUM DWELLING UNIT DENSITIES AND MINIMUM OFFICE

INTENSITIES, USES "BY-RIGHT."

(a) ***Purpose.*** *This Section 207.9 establishes minimum residential and commercial density standards in Transit-Oriented Communities, as identified by the Metropolitan Transit Commission, and implements the City's Housing Element obligations pursuant to Government Code 65583, including requirements for both minimum densities and approval of certain projects on Housing Element Sites. Consistent with the Transit-Oriented Communities Policies of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, this Section establishes the minimum Dwelling Unit densities for residential development and minimum intensities for Office use. Consistent with Government Code Sections 65583.2(c), and (h), this Section permits certain types of housing projects as a "use by right," as that term is defined in Government Code Section 65583.2(i).*

(b) ***Minimum Dwelling Unit Density.***

(1) ***Applicability.***

(A) ***Transit-Oriented Community Tiers.*** *This Section 207.9 applies to all projects proposing new construction of one or more Residential Buildings on sites that do not already contain Residential uses unless such uses are demolished, and that are located in the geographic areas or satisfy the applicability criteria described in Table 207.9. These minimum residential densities shall apply only in zoning Districts where Residential uses are permitted. Changes of use of existing building space to Residential use, additions of Residential use to existing structures, and additions of Residential or Office uses to lots where such uses are already existing, and that are not proposed for demolition, are not subject to the requirements of this Section.*

(B) ***Housing Element Sites.*** *Residential projects on sites identified pursuant to Government Code Section 65583.2(c) and (h) in which at least 20% of the units are set aside to households with incomes at 80% of Area Median Income or lower shall be approved "by-right" as that term is defined in Government Code Section 65583.2(i).*

(2) ***Minimum Densities.*** *New construction proposing Dwelling Units on sites within*

the geographic areas described in Table 207.9 must provide at least the number of Dwelling Units specified in Table 207.9. Sites that meet more than one applicable Tier requirement in Table 207.9 shall comply with the higher minimum density. Fractions of units shall be rounded per Section 207(b)(1). For purposes of this Section 207.9, Accessory Dwelling Units shall count toward any minimum density requirement.

*(c) **Minimum Office Intensity.***

*(1) **Applicability.** This subsection (c) applies to all projects proposing new construction of Office use on sites that do not already contain Office uses, and that are located in the geographic areas or satisfy the applicability criteria described in Table 207.9; provided that the minimum Office intensities in this subsection (c) shall not exceed the amount of permissible Office use allowed in the District. These minimum densities shall only apply in Districts where Office uses are permitted. Changes of use of existing building space to Office use, additions of Office use to existing structures, and additions of Office uses to Lots where such uses are already existing, and that are not proposed for demolition are not subject to the requirements of this Section 207.9.*

*(2) **Minimum Intensity.** New construction proposing Office use on sites within the geographic areas described in Table 207.9 must comply with the FAR requirements in Table 207.9.*

Table 207.9

MINIMUM DENSITIES REQUIRED FOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT AND MINIMUM INTENSITIES FOR OFFICE USE

Applicability	***Minimum Dwelling Unit Density***	***Minimum Intensity for Office Use***
Transit-Oriented Communities Tier 1: Sites within a half-mile	*100 units per acre*	*Floor Area Ratio 4:1*

*of Embarcadero, Montgomery, Powell, or Civic Center BART stations; and Salesforce Transbay Transit Center.**		
*Transit-Oriented Communities Tier 2: Sites within a half-mile of 16th Street, 24th Street, Glen Park, or Balboa Park BART stations.**	*75 units per acre*	*Floor Area Ratio 3:1*
*Transit-Oriented Communities Tier 3: Sites within a half-mile of all Muni rail stops on the F, J, K, L, M, N, or T lines; Caltrain Stations; and Van Ness Bus Rapid Transit Stops (i.e. stops on Van Ness Avenue between and including Market Street and Union Street).**	*50 units per acre*	*Floor Area Ratio 2:1*
Transit-Oriented Communities Tier 4: Sites within a half-mile of all ferry terminals, including the Ferry Building, 16th Street/Mission Bay, and Treasure Island; and all other locations subject to the	*50 units per acre*	*Floor Area Ratio 1:1*

*applicability of Section 207.9.**		
*Sites identified as Reused Sites in the 2022 Housing Element Update.***	*50 units per acre*	*N/A*
*Sites identified as Appropriate for Very Low Income or Low Income Households in the 2022 Housing Element Update.****	*50 units per acre*	*N/A*

** As used in Table 207.9, the distance of one-half mile shall be measured in accordance with the methodology established by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission.*

*** Housing Projects in which at least 20% of the units are set aside to households with incomes at 80% of Area Median Income or lower on sites in this category shall be approved consistent with California Government Code Section 65583.2(c) and (i).*

**** Housing Projects in which at least 20% of the units are set aside to households with incomes at 80% of Area Median Income or lower on sites in this category shall be approved consistent with California Government Code Section 65583.2(h) and (i).*

*(d) **Gross Floor Area.** For purposes of determining the Gross Floor Area of a development Lot subject to this Section 207.9, the calculation shall exclude Gross Floor Area to be dedicated for publicly accessible streets. In instances where portions of a Lot are unbuildable due to topographic or geologic conditions, a development is proposed on only a portion of the Lot, or the Lot is otherwise constrained, the Zoning Administrator is authorized to determine that a smaller portion of a Lot shall serve as the development Lot.*

*(e) **Mixed-uses.** For purposes of determining minimum Residential Density and Office Intensity, as long as one of the land uses satisfies the minimum Residential Density and/or Office Intensity the*

respective land uses are prorated to comply individually.

(f) Conditional Use Authorizations for Projects that Fail to Comply with this Section. *Projects that fail to comply with the objective standards in this Section 207.9 shall be considered non-code-compliant. If not otherwise prohibited by the Code, a project may not comply with the minimum Residential Density and Office Intensity, if the Planning Commission approves a Conditional Use Authorization.*

SEC. 207.10. MAXIMUM DWELLING UNIT SIZE.

(a) ***Purpose.*** *To encourage new infill multi-family housing, limit the proliferation and expansion of large houses that do not increase the housing stock of moderately-priced units, support the preservation of existing housing that serves lower- and middle-income households, and encourage maximizing residential density, this Section 207.10 sets forth citywide maximum Dwelling Unit sizes.*

(b) ***Applicability.*** *This Section 207.10 applies to projects proposing to construct one or more Dwelling Units for which a Development Application is filed after January 31, 2026, and the project proposes any of the following:*

(1) construction of new Dwelling Unit(s), including the construction of a Dwelling Unit where an existing unit is proposed for demolition as defined in Section 317(b)(2);

(2) merger of two or more Dwelling Units as defined in Section 317(b)(7); or

(3) reduction in the number of existing Dwelling Units.

(c) ***Requirements.*** *Any project that meets one or more of the criteria in subsection (b) shall be restricted to a maximum Dwelling Unit size of 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1, whichever is greater, except in the following conditions:*

(1) any new construction project of four to nine Dwelling Units, where not more than one Dwelling Unit exceeds 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area; or

(2) any new construction project of 10 or more Dwelling Units, where not more than 10% of such units exceed 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area.

(d) ***Conditional Use Authorizations for Projects that Fail to Comply with this Section.*** *Projects that fail to comply with the objective standards in this Section 207.10 shall be considered non-code-compliant. If not otherwise prohibited by the Code, a project may exceed the maximum Dwelling Unit size, without satisfying the conditions in subsection (c), if the Planning Commission approves a Conditional Use Authorization for the larger Dwelling Unit(s).*

(e) ***Conditional Use Criteria.*** *In addition to the criteria outlined in Planning Code Section 303(c), in acting upon an application for Conditional Use Authorization, the Planning Commission shall consider whether facts are presented to establish based on the record before the Commission, that all of the following criteria are met:*

(1) the proposed project meets applicable Residential Design Guidelines, Citywide Design Standards, and other applicable adopted guidelines or standards;

(2) the proposed project does not propose to reduce the size of any other existing Dwelling Unit or negatively impact the characteristics of a Residential Flat, as set forth in Section 317(g);

(3) the proposed project increases the number of Dwelling Units on the Lot and, if applicable, meets the applicable minimum density requirement under Section 207.9; and

(4) the proposed project will not have specific adverse impacts on a Historic Building as defined in Planning Code Section 102 or would render the property ineligible for historic designation as an individual or contributing resource.

(f) ***Calculation of Gross Floor Area.*** *For the purposes of this Section 207.10, the following shall apply in the calculation of a Dwelling Unit's total Gross Floor Area:*

(1) Gross Floor Area shall have the meaning set forth in Planning Code Section 401;

(2) Shared spaces and common areas in multi-unit buildings shall not be included;

(3) Storage areas, sheds, or other enclosed areas on the property that are accessory to and assigned to a specific Dwelling Unit but not contiguous with and directly accessible from the unit shall not be included; and

(4) Gross Floor Area shall include (A) all expansions of the Residential Building for which a building permit was issued within the previous 10 years, and (B) any Gross Floor Area resulting from construction performed without a validly issued permit regardless of the date of construction.

Section 9. Off-Street Parking and Curb Cuts. Article 1 and Article 2 of the Planning Code are hereby amended by revising Sections 155, 249.49, and 249.71, to read as follows

SEC. 155. GENERAL STANDARDS AS TO LOCATION AND ARRANGEMENT OF OFF-STREET PARKING, FREIGHT LOADING, AND SERVICE VEHICLE FACILITIES.

* * * *

(r) **Protected Pedestrian-, Cycling-, and Transit-Oriented Street Frontages.** In order to *protect and improve* ~~*preserve the*~~ pedestrian *and bicycle safety and transit service,* ~~*character of certain districts and to minimize delays to transit, service, garage entries, driveways, or other*~~ vehicular access to off-street parking or loading via curb cuts ~~*on development lots*~~ shall be regulated as set forth in this subsection (r). *However,* ~~*T*~~*t*hese limitations ~~*do*~~ *shall* not apply to the creation of new publicly-accessible Streets and Alleys. Any lot *where the only* ~~*whose sole feasible*~~ vehicular access is via a protected street frontage described in this subsection (r) shall be exempt~~*ed*~~ from any off-street ~~*parking or*~~ loading requirement found elsewhere in this Code*, unless a curb cut is otherwise authorized*.

*(1) **Curb Cuts Not Permitted.** No new or expanded curb cuts shall be permitted on the frontages listed in Table 155(r)(1) below:*

TABLE 155(r)(1). PROHIBITED STREET FRONTAGES
2nd Street from Market to Townsend Streets
3rd Street in the UMU District for 100 feet north and south of Mariposa Street and 100 feet north and south of 20th Street
3rd Street from Folsom Street to Townsend Street
4th Street from Folsom Street to Townsend Street
6th Street from Folsom Street to Brannan Street
6th Street for its entirety within the SoMa NCT District
9th Avenue from Lincoln Way to Judah Street in the Inner Sunset NC District
16th Street between Kansas and Mississippi Streets in the UMU and PDR-1-D Districts
16th Street between Guerrero and Capp Streets within the Valencia Street NCT and Mission Street NCT Districts
17th Street in the Castro Street NC District
18th Street in the Castro Street NC District
22nd Street between 3rd Street and Minnesota Streets within the NCT-2 District
24th Street in the 24th Street - Noe Valley NC District east of Castro Street
24th Street for the entirety of the 24th Street-Mission NCT District
All Alleys within the North Beach NCD and the Telegraph Hill-North Beach Residential SUD
All Alleys in the Chinatown Mixed Use Districts
Balboa Street from 35th Avenue to 38th Avenue
Brannan Street from 2nd Street to 6th Street
Broadway between Van Ness Avenue and Larkin Street
Broadway from the Embarcadero on the east to Polk Street on the west

Buchanan Street from Post Street to Sutter Street
Bush Street between Van Ness Avenue and Larkin Street
California Street between Van Ness Avenue and Hyde Street
Carl Street in the Cole Valley NC District
Castro Street in the Castro Street NC District
Chenery Street within the Glen Park NCT District
Chestnut Street from Divisadero Street to Fillmore Street
Church Street in the Upper Market Street NCT and NCT-3 Districts
Clement Street from Arguello Boulevard to Park Presidio Boulevard
Cole Street in the Cole Valley NC District
Columbus Avenue between Washington and North Point Streets
Destination Alleyways, as designated in the Downtown Streetscape Plan
Diamond Street within the Glen Park NCT District
Divisadero from Page to Oak Streets, from Fell to Grove Streets, and from Geary to Pine Streets
Ecker Alley in its entirety
Fillmore Street in the Upper Fillmore NC District
Folsom Street from 2nd Street to 13th Street
Folsom Street, from Second Street to The Embarcadero, except as permitted pursuant to Section 827
Geneva Avenue from I-280 to San Jose Avenue within the NCT-2 District
Grant Avenue between Columbus Avenue and Filbert Street
Green Street between Grant Avenue and Columbus/Stockton
Haight Street in the Lower Haight NC District and Haight Street NC District
Hayes Street from Franklin Street to Laguna Street
Howard Street from 5th Street to 13th Street

Hyde Street between California Street and Pine Street
Irving Street from 19th Avenue to 25th Avenue
Irving Street from 6th Avenue to 10th Avenue in the Inner Sunset NC District
Market Street for its entirety from The Embarcadero to Castro Street
Mission Street for the entirety of the Mission Street NCT District
Mission Street from The Embarcadero to Annie Street and from 10th Street to Division Street
Natoma Street from 300 feet westerly of 1st Street to 2nd Street
Ocean Avenue from Junipero Serra Boulevard to Lagunitas Drive in the Lakeside Village NC District
Ocean Avenue within the Ocean Avenue NCT District
Octavia Street from Hayes Street to Fell Street
Parnassus Avenue in the Cole Valley NC District
Pine Street between Van Ness Avenue and Larkin Street
Polk Street between Filbert Street and Golden Gate Avenue
Post Street, on the north side from Webster Street to Laguna Street and on the south side from Fillmore Street to Webster Street
Shaw Alley in its entirety
Taraval Street from 19th Avenue to 22nd Avenue
The Embarcadero (the western/inland side) between King and Jefferson Streets
The Embarcadero in the DTR Districts
Townsend Street from 2nd Street to 6th Street, except as permitted pursuant to Section 329(e)(3)(B)
Union Street from Fillmore Street to Octavia Street
Valencia Street between 15th and 23rd Streets in the Valencia Street NCT District
Van Ness Avenue from Hayes Street to Mission Street

*(2) **Protected Street Features.** No new or expanded curb cuts shall be permitted within the following street features:*

(A) An adjacent on-street curbside striped bus stop (e.g., curbside bus stop zones with striping or red curb) that has been approved by the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) Board of Directors;

(B) A transit bulb-out, as defined in the Better Streets Plan; or

(C) A transit boarding island, as defined in the Better Streets Plan, if vehicles accessing the curb cut would be required to cross over the boarding island.

*(3) **Corner Lots in the SALI District.** For corner lots in the SALI District, no new curb cut shall be permitted, nor any existing curb cut expanded, on any Street or Alley identified as an Alley in the Western SoMa Area Plan of the General Plan if any property on the same block with frontage along that Street or Alley is designated as a RED or RED-MX District.*

*(4) **Curb Cuts Requiring Planning Commission Approval.** In all zoning districts except RH, M, NC-S, P, PDR, and SALI, no new or expanded curb cuts shall be permitted on the frontages listed in Table 155(r)(4), unless approved by the Planning Commission through a Conditional Use Authorization pursuant to Planning Code Section 303. However, if the new or expanded curb cut is part of a project that requires Planning Commission approval under a separate section, such as Section 309 or 329, then the Planning Commission shall consider the curb cut as part of that approval. Regardless of the type of approval, in order to approve such a curb cut, the Planning Commission must make the findings required by Section 303(y). For projects within the C-3-0(SD) and the Central SoMa Special Use District, in no case shall such curb cut approval be granted where the proposed accessory parking would be greater than the amount principally permitted.*

*(A) **Protected Streets.** Planning Commission approval is required for any new or expanded curb cut that directly fronts any of the streets listed in Table 155(r)(4) below.*

Table 155(r)(4). PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVAL OF CURB CUTS
1st Street from Market to Folsom Street
5th Street from Howard Street to Townsend Street
16th Street in the RTO Districts
Beale Street from Market Street to Folsom Street
Bryant Street from 2nd Street to 6th Street
California Street in its entirety
Church Street in the RTO Districts
Dolores Street from Market Street to 16th Street
Duboce Street from Noe Street to Market Street
Fillmore Street from Hermann Street to Duboce Avenue
Folsom Street in the C-3 Districts
Fremont Street from Market Street to Folsom Street
Geary Street in the C-3 Districts
Grant Avenue from Market Street to Sacramento Street
Harrison Street from 2nd Street to 6th Street
Mission Street in the C-3 Districts
Montgomery Street from Market Street to Columbus Avenue
Noe Street from Duboce Avenue to Market Street
Octavia Street from Fell Street to Market Street
Powell Street in the C-3 Districts
Stockton Street in the C-3 Districts
The Embarcadero (eastern/water side) between Townsend and Taylor Streets
West Portal Avenue in the West Portal NC District

*(B) **Protected Street Types with Alternative Frontage.** Planning Commission approval is required for any new or expanded curb cut that directly fronts any of the following when an alternative street frontage is available:*

(i) Transit Preferential Streets designated in the Transportation Element;

(ii) Neighborhood Commercial Streets or Commercial Throughways defined by the Better Streets Plan; or

(iii) Bicycle routes or lanes as adopted by SFMTA Board of Directors.

On such bicycle routes or lanes where the bicycle facility is only on one side of the street, the curb cut restriction shall apply to the side of the street with the bicycle facility, and shall not apply to the opposite side of the street.

*(C) **Protected Street Types with No Alternative Frontage.** A new or expanded curb cut on street types listed in subsection (r)(4)(B) where no alternative frontage exists shall still require Planning Commission approval. However, in such cases the Planning Commission shall not make the findings of Section 303(y) and instead must find that the final design minimizes negative impacts to transit movement and to the safety of pedestrians and bicyclists to the fullest extent feasible.*

*(5) **Existing Curb Cuts.** Existing curb cuts on frontages listed in subsections (r)(1)-(r)(4) shall not be retained as part of a project that involves new construction, a building alteration that increases the Gross Floor Area of a structure by 20% or more, or a change of use affecting more than 50% of the structure's Gross Floor Area. However, the Planning Commission may allow retention or relocation of up to one existing curb cut along any of the site's frontages, through Conditional Use authorization or other applicable discretionary Planning Commission approval, provided that no existing curb cut shall be maintained if it is located in or affects a protected transit stop feature pursuant to subsection (r)(2), and no existing curb cut may be relocated to newly affect such features. In granting such approval, the Planning Commission must make the additional findings required under Planning Code Section 303(y) and must also find that (1) the project represents an increase in*

residential density and/or non-residential intensity that is appropriate to the site, such as its proximity to transit or its location within a mixed-use area; and (2) the proposed curb cut is necessary to support the project's scale and function, while being sited and designed to minimize to the fullest extent feasible negative impacts on pedestrian activity, street-level commercial activity, the movement of transit vehicles and passengers, and bicycle facilities.

(6) Sites owned by the City and County of San Francisco under the jurisdiction of the SFMTA are not subject to the provisions of this Section 155(r).

~~*(1) Folsom Street, from Second Street to The Embarcadero, not permitted except as set forth in Section 827.*~~

~~*(2) Not permitted:*~~

~~*(A) The entire portion of Market Street from The Embarcadero to Castro Street,*~~

~~*(B) Hayes Street from Franklin Street to Laguna Street, and Church Street in the NCT-3 and Upper Market NCT Districts,*~~

~~*(C) Van Ness Avenue from Hayes Street to Mission Street,*~~

~~*(D) Mission Street from The Embarcadero to Annie Street and from 10th Street to Division Street,*~~

~~*(E) Octavia Street from Hayes Street to Fell Street,*~~

~~*(F) Embarcadero in the DTR Districts,*~~

~~*(G) 22nd Street between 3rd Street and Minnesota Streets within the NCT-2 District,*~~

~~*(H) Valencia Street between 15th and 23rd Streets in the Valencia Street NCT District,*~~

~~*(I) Mission Street for the entirety of the Mission Street NCT District,*~~

~~*(J) 24th Street for the entirety of the 24th Street-Mission NCT,*~~

~~*(K) 16th Street between Guerrero and Capp Streets within the Valencia Street NCT and Mission Street NCT Districts,*~~

~~*(L) 16th Street between Kansas and Mississippi Streets in the UMU and PDR-1-D*~~

~~*Districts,*~~

~~*(M) 6th Street for its entirety within the SoMa NCT District,*~~

~~*(N) 3rd Street, in the UMU districts for 100 feet north and south of Mariposa and 100 feet north and south of 20th Streets,*~~

~~*(O) Ocean Avenue within the Ocean Avenue NCT District,*~~

~~*(P) Geneva Avenue from I-280 to San Jose Avenue within the NCT-2 District,*~~

~~*(Q) Columbus Avenue between Washington and North Point Streets,*~~

~~*(R) Broadway from the Embarcadero on the east to Polk Street on the west,*~~

~~*(S) All alleyways in the Chinatown Mixed Use Districts,*~~

~~*(T) Diamond Street within the Glen Park NCT District,*~~

~~*(U) Chenery Street within the Glen Park NCT District,*~~

~~*(V) Natoma Street from 300 feet westerly of 1st Street to 2nd Street,*~~

~~*(W) Ecker Alley in its entirety,*~~

~~*(X) Shaw Alley in its entirety,*~~

~~*(Y) 2nd Street from Market to Townsend Streets,*~~

~~*(Z) Destination Alleyways, as designated in the Downtown Streetscape Plan,*~~

~~*(AA) The western (inland) side of the Embarcadero between Townsend and Jefferson Streets,*~~

~~*(BB) Post Street, on the north side from Webster Street to Laguna Street and on the south side from Fillmore Street to Webster Street,*~~

~~*(CC) Buchanan Street from Post Street to Sutter Street,*~~

~~*(DD) Grant Avenue between Columbus Avenue and Filbert Street,*~~

~~*(EE) Green Street between Grant Avenue and Columbus/Stockton,*~~

~~*(FF) All Alleys within the North Beach NCD and the Telegraph Hill-North Beach Residential SUD,*~~

~~*(GG)1 Polk Street between Filbert Street and Golden Gate Avenue,*~~

~~*(HH) California Street between Van Ness Avenue and Hyde Street,*~~

~~*(II) Hyde Street between California Street and Pine Street,*~~

~~*(JJ) Broadway between Van Ness Avenue and Larkin Street,*~~

~~*(KK) Bush Street between Van Ness Avenue and Larkin Street,*~~

~~*(LL) Pine Street between Van Ness Avenue and Larkin Street, and*~~

~~*(MM) Howard Street from 5th Street to 13th Street,*~~

~~*(NN) Folsom Street from 2nd Street to 13th Street,*~~

~~*(OO) Brannan Street from 2nd Street to 6th Street,*~~

~~*(PP) Townsend Street from 2nd Street to 6th Street, except as permitted pursuant to Section 329(e)(3)(B),*~~

~~*(QQ) 3rd Street from Folsom Street to Townsend Street,*~~

~~*(RR) 4th Street from Folsom Street to Townsend Street, and*~~

~~*(SS) 6th Street from Folsom Street to Brannan Street.*~~

~~*(TT) No curb cut shall be permitted that directly fronts an adjacent on-street striped bus stop (e.g., bus stop zones with striping or red curb) that has been approved by the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) Board of Directors, transit bulb-out as defined in the Better Streets Plan, or on street frontage directly adjacent to a transit boarding island as defined in the Better Streets Plan if vehicles accessing the curb cut would be required to cross over the boarding island.*~~

~~*(3) Not permitted without Conditional Use authorization or Sections 309 or 329 exception. In the C-3-O(SD) and the Central SoMa Special Use Districts, the Planning Commission may grant permission for a new curb cut or an expansion of an existing one as an exception pursuant to Sections 309 or 329 in lieu of a Conditional Use authorization as long as the Commission makes the findings required under Section 303(y) and where the amount of parking proposed does not exceed the*~~

~~*amounts permitted as accessory according to Section 151.1. In addition, in the MUG, WMUG, MUR, MUO, RED, RED-MX, and SPD Districts, the Planning Commission may grant permission for a new curb cut or an expansion of an existing one as an exception pursuant to Section 329 in lieu of a Conditional Use authorization as long as the Commission makes the findings required under Section 303(y). A Planning Commission Conditional Use authorization subject to the additional findings under Section 303(y) is required to allow a new curb cut or expansion of an existing one on any other restricted street identified in this subsection 155(r)(3).*~~

~~*(A) Except as provided in Section 155(r), in all zoning districts except RH, M, NC-S, P, PDR, and SALI, no curb cuts accessing off-street parking or loading shall be created or expanded on street frontages identified along any Transit Preferential Street as designated in the Transportation Element of the General Plan, or Neighborhood Commercial Street and Commercial Throughways as defined in the Better Streets Plan, or any SFMTA Board of Directors adopted bicycle routes or lanes, where an alternative frontage is available. On such bicycles routes or lanes where the bicycle facility is only on one side of the street, the curb cut restriction shall apply to the side of the street with the bicycle facility, and shall not apply to the opposite side of the street.*~~

~~*(B) The entire portion of California Street,*~~

~~*(C) Folsom Street, Geary Street, Mission Street, Powell Street and Stockton Street in the C-3 Districts,*~~

~~*(D) Grant Avenue from Market Street to Sacramento Street,*~~

~~*(E) Montgomery Street from Market Street to Columbus Avenue,*~~

~~*(F) Church Street and 16th Street in the RTO District,*~~

~~*(G) Duboce Street from Noe Street to Market Street,*~~

~~*(H) Octavia Street from Fell Street to Market Street,*~~

~~*(I) 1st, Fremont and Beale Streets from Market to Folsom Street,*~~

~~*(J) The eastern (water) side of The Embarcadero between Townsend and Taylor Streets,*~~

~~(K) Fillmore Street from Hermann Street to Duboce Avenue,~~

~~(L) Noe Street from Duboce Avenue to Market Street, and~~

~~(M) Dolores Street from Market Street to 16th Street.~~

~~(N) Harrison Street from 2nd Street to 6th Street,~~

~~(O) Bryant Street from 2nd Street to 6th Street, and~~

~~(P) 5th Street from Howard Street to Townsend Street.~~

~~(4) In all zoning districts except RH, M, NC-S, P, PDR, and SALI, where an alternative frontage is not available, parking or loading access along any Transit Preferential Street as designated in the Transportation Element of the General Plan, or Neighborhood Commercial Street or Commercial Throughways defined in the Better Streets Plan, or any SFMTA Board of Directors adopted bicycle routes or lanes, may be allowed on streets not listed in subsection (r)(2) above as an exception in the manner provided in Section 309 for C-3-O(SD) Districts, Section 329 for Mixed-Use Districts, and in Section 303 for all other Districts in cases where the Planning Commission can determine that the final design of the parking access minimizes negative impacts to transit movement and to the safety of pedestrians and bicyclists to the fullest extent feasible.~~

~~(5) Corner lots in the SALI District. For corner lots in the SALI District, no new curb cut shall be permitted, nor any existing curb cut expanded, on any Street or Alley identified as an alley in the Western SoMa Area Plan of the General Plan if any property on the same block with frontage along that Street or Alley is designated as a RED or RED-MX District.~~

~~(6) A "development lot" shall mean any lot containing a proposal for new construction, building alterations which would increase the gross square footage of a structure by 20 percent or more, or change of use of more than 50 percent of the gross floor area of a structure containing parking. Pre-existing access to off-street parking and loading on development lots that violates the restrictions of this Section 155(r) may not be maintained.~~

* * * *

(t) **Garage Additions in the North Beach Neighborhood Commercial District, North Beach-Telegraph Hill Residential Special Use District, and Chinatown Mixed Use Districts.** Notwithstanding any other provision of this Code to the contrary, a mandatory discretionary review hearing by the Planning Commission is required in order to install a garage in an existing or proposed structure of two units or more in the North Beach NCD, the North Beach-Telegraph Hill Residential SUD, and the Chinatown Mixed Use Districts.

In order to approve the installation of any garage in these districts, the City shall find that: (1) the proposed garage opening/addition of off-street parking will not cause the elimination or reduction of ground-story retail or commercial space; (2) the proposed garage opening/addition of off-street parking will not eliminate or decrease the square footage of any ~~d~~*Dwelling* ~~u~~*Unit*, (3) the building has not had two or more evictions with each eviction associated with a separate ~~u~~*Dwelling Unit*(s) within the past *10* ~~ten~~ years, and (4) the garage would not front on an Alley pursuant to Section 155(r)~~(2)~~*(1)* of this Code or on a public right-of-way narrower than 41 feet, and (5) the proposed garage/addition of off-street parking is consistent with the Priority Policies of Section 101.1 of this Code. Prior to the issuance of notification under Section 311 or 312 of this Code, the Department shall require a signed affidavit by the project sponsor attesting to (1), (2), and (3) above, which the Department shall independently verify, and the Department shall determine whether the project complies with subsection (4) above. If the project sponsor does not provide such signed affidavit, or the garage would front on an Alley or on a public right-of-way narrower than 41 feet, the Department shall disapprove the application and no Planning Commission hearing shall be required.

* * * *

SEC. 249.49. TELEGRAPH HILL – NORTH BEACH RESIDENTIAL SPECIAL USE

DISTRICT.

* * * *

(c) **Controls.**

* * * *

(2) **Installation of a Parking Garage.** Installation of a garage in an existing or proposed residential building of two or more units requires a mandatory discretionary review hearing by the Planning Commission. In order to approve the installation of any garage in these districts, the Commission shall find that: (1) the proposed garage opening/addition of off-street parking will not cause the elimination or reduction of ground-story retail or commercial space; (2) the proposed garage opening/addition of off-street parking will not eliminate or decrease the square footage of any dwelling unit; (3) the building has not had two or more evictions within the past 10 years, with each eviction associated with a separate unit(s), (4) the garage would not front on an Alley pursuant to Section 155(r)~~*(2)*~~*(1)* of this Code or on a public right-of-way narrower than 41 feet, and (5) the proposed garage opening/ addition of off-street parking is consistent with the Priority Policies of Section 101.1 of this Code.

* * * *

SEC. 249.71. YERBA BUENA CENTER MIXED-USE SPECIAL USE DISTRICT.

* * * *

(c) **Use Controls.** The following provisions shall apply to the special use district:

* * * *

(8) **Protected Street Frontages.**

(A) Section 155(r)~~*(3)*~~*(4)(A)-(B)* shall not apply within the special use district.

(B) For the purposes of Section 155(r)(4)*(C)*, the project does not have alternative frontage to Third Street and Mission Street, and therefore curb cuts accessing off-street parking or loading off Third Street and Mission Street may be permitted as an exception pursuant to Section 309 and Section 155(r)(4)*(C)*.

* * * *

Section 10. San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Special Use District. Article 2 of the Planning Code is hereby amended by adding Section 249.11, to read as follows:

SEC. 249.11 NON-CONTIGUOUS SAN FRANCISCO MUNICIPAL TRANSPORTATION AGENCY SITES SPECIAL USE DISTRICT.

*(a) **Purpose*** and Findings.

(1) *There shall be a non-contiguous Special Use District ("SUD") for sites owned by the City and County of San Francisco and under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) to enable SFMTA to use the sites for transportation and other Public uses as well as uses permitted by the underlying zoning district. This SUD also enables mixed-use residential development with characteristics not accommodated by underlying zoning.*

(2) The SUD facilitates the SFMTA's Joint Development Program Goals and Policy ("Program Policy"), approved by the SFMTA's Board of Directors on February 4, 2025 in Resolution No. 250204-010. The Program Policy guides SFMTA decision making, and, consistent with state and local law, requires the provision of affordable housing and open, competitive solicitation processes for the residential development of large sites in the SFMTA portfolio. The Program Policy guides SFMTA's approach to development of the sites within the SUD to maximize community development, housing affordability, and green sustainable development goals, as urged by the Board of Supervisors in Resolution No. 87-25. The development of 100% affordable housing within the SUD, particularly on sites located within

the Priority Equity Geographies (Section 249.97), should be prioritized where transit uses or other on-site development that supports neighborhood needs—such as improved access to services, infrastructure, or economic opportunity—are not feasible. The SUD facilitates these housing, equity, and sustainability goals by providing for a diversity of land use types and building characteristics.

(b) ***Applicability.*** *The provisions in this Section 249.11 shall apply to the following Assessor's Block/Lots: 0019/001; 0490/009, 010, 011, 012, 013; 0635/009, 009A; 0669/012; 1072/001; 1439/035, 036, 045, 048, 049; 1440/028, 029, 030; 1453/020; 1526/002, 028, 028A;* ~~1596/044, 045~~*; 1730/050; 1763/044; 2647/034, 017; 2864/050; 2979A/002, 034; 2988A/007; 3582/087; 6507/023; 6972/036; 7225/013; 7226/016. Notwithstanding Planning Code Section 206.10, which prohibits projects within SUDs that implement Development Agreements from using the HC-SF Program, residential development projects within this SUD may use the HC-SF Program even when such development is associated with a Development Agreement, Project Agreement or other similar agreement.*

(c) ***General Controls.***

(1) ***Permitted Uses.*** *In addition to any uses permitted by the zoning district in which the lot is located, uses permitted under Section 211.1 shall be principally permitted and uses conditionally permitted under 211.2 shall be conditionally permitted. Where there is a conflict between land use controls in the underlying zoning district and those in Sections 211.1 or 211.2, the more permissive control shall apply.*

(2) ***Residential Density.*** *Maximum residential density limits or Floor Area Ratio limits shall not apply to Residential Uses in the SUD. Form Based density shall apply to Residential Uses in the SUD.*

(3) ***Measurement of Height.*** *Notwithstanding Planning Code Section 260(a) regarding Method of Measurement, the height of a structure containing a Public Facility may be measured from the centerline of such structure along any frontage for that structure's entire depth.*

*(4) **Bulk and Lot Coverage.** For Development projects that are in height districts that allow heights of 400 feet or greater, and are using the HC-SF Program in Section 206.10, the following bulk controls and lot coverage provisions shall apply:*

(A) Notwithstanding Sections 270(i)(1)(A)(i) and 270(i)(1)(B)(i) no setbacks are required for interior property lines abutting lots with a Public Facility.

(B) Below a height of 85 feet, no rear yard or lot coverage limits shall apply. For portions of a building between 85 feet in height and 120 feet in height, the bulk controls of Section 270(i) shall not apply; rather, for a lot that does not include a Public Facility, the lot coverage shall be limited to 60% of the lot area.

(C) For portions of a building above 120 feet in height (herein "above the podium"), building mass may be provided in up to two towers that meet the bulk limits of Section 270(i)(1). However, the following exceptions to Section 270(i)(1) shall apply:

(i) Tower separation may be reduced to not less than 50 feet if the height of the shorter tower above the podium is no taller than one-half the height of the taller tower above the podium.

(ii) A tower's average floorplate above the podium shall be no larger than 14,000 square feet.

(iii) If there are two towers, one of the towers shall not be taller than 360 feet.

(iv) The combined maximum gross floor area of two towers, measured for floors between 120 feet and 360 feet in height shall be limited to 576,000 square feet.

(v) The average floorplate for the top 1/3 portion of a tower above the podium shall be reduced in square footage by 10% from the average floorplate of the lower 2/3 portion of the tower, and the allowed maximum dimensions in Section 270(i)(B) for such top 1/3 portion of the tower shall be reduced by 5% from the lower 2/3 portion of the tower.

(vi) The standards in this subsection (c)(4)(C) are not eligible for the reduction or modification of standards in Section 206.10(d)(1)(M).

*(5) **Open Space.** Section 135 shall apply, except as follows:*

*(A) **On-Site Publicly Accessible Usable Open Space.** The usable open space requirement may be met for projects subject to the SUD with on-site publicly accessible usable open space, including open space otherwise required by Planning Code Section 270.3. When on-site publicly accessible usable open space is provided, the maintenance, information plaque, and liability provisions of Section 270.3(e) shall apply.*

*(B) **Off-Site Publicly Accessible Usable Open Space.** When additional off-site improvements are made to meet the usable open space requirement, including improvements on adjacent sidewalks and public rights-of-way, such open space improvements shall comply with all applicable regulations of the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency, San Francisco Art Commission, the Department of Public Works, the Bureau of Light, Heat and Power of the Public Utility Commission, or any other public agency, as applicable. The property owner shall maintain all such improvements and meet the liability provisions of Section 270.3(e) for the life of the project.*

*(6) **Development Impact Fees.** For a development project on land subject to the SUD:*

(A) With the recommendation of the SFMTA Board of Directors, the Board of Supervisors may waive all or a portion of any applicable Transportation Sustainability Fee under Section 411A, and all or a portion of any applicable Jobs-Housing Linkage Program requirements under Section 413.

(B) The provisions of Section 415 et seq., as amended or replaced from time to time, shall apply. Notwithstanding Section 415.6(h)(1), a development project may receive development subsidies if the development provides the same number of on-site affordable units as required by the applicable on-site affordable housing requirement in Section 415 et seq., or any temporary reduction as set forth in Sections 415A et seq. or 415B et seq., plus an additional number of on-site affordable

units equal to 25% of the applicable on-site affordable units. Additional units shall be provided as affordable to households at or below 80% of Area Median Income. Any units required to be affordable to middle- or moderate-income households under Sections 415.6(a), 415A, or 415B, as applicable, or this subsection 249.11(c)(6)(B), may instead be affordable to moderate- or low-income households. Notwithstanding Section 415.6(f)(1), the moderate and low income units may be located anywhere in the project.

(d) Pre-Application Requirements. When a Development Application is submitted pursuant to this Section 249.11, the project sponsor, in conjunction with SFMTA, shall provide:

(1) A feasibility study that models the development of the project site as 100% affordable housing, as that term is defined in Section 406(b)(1)(A) and (C);

(2) Documentation that the project sponsor, in conjunction with SFMTA, has conducted at least one pre-application meeting. Mailed notice of the meeting shall be provided to the individuals and neighborhood organizations specified in Planning Code Section 333(e)(2)(A) and (C), as well as posted notice as set forth in Planning Code Section 333(e)(1). The Planning Department may establish procedures and requirements to administer this subsection; and

(3) Documentation of how the project advances the City's goals for affordable housing on public lands, as identified in Housing Element Policy Actions 1.2.6 and 1.2.7.

Section 11. Displaced Businesses. Article 2 of the Planning Code is hereby amended by adding Section 202.17, to read as follows:

SEC. 202.17. PERMITTED USES AND USE SIZE LIMITS FOR DISPLACED BUSINESSES; NOTICE REQUIREMENT.

*(a) **Purpose.** It is to the general benefit of the people of San Francisco and the unique*

character of the City and its neighborhoods to retain commercially viable businesses that are forced to close and relocate for a variety of reasons, including but not limited to new development, escalating commercial rent, or other economic hardship. The provisions of this Section 202.17 are intended to streamline and increase opportunities for Displaced Businesses to relocate within the City, but do not override any controls enacted by voter initiative.

(b) ***Definitions.*** *The following definitions shall apply to this Section 202.17.*

New Location *means the site or location where a Displaced Business seeks to be permitted.*

Prior Location *means the place of operation where a Displaced Business was lawfully permitted and operated for at least five years prior to relocating to the New Location.*

Displaced Business *means a commercial or institutional use with less than 50,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area, whose lease expired and was not renewed, or was otherwise terminated by the property owner, and submits a complete Development Application to relocate to a New Location within five years of the property owner submitting a complete Development Application for development at the site of the Prior Location. Any Displaced Business shall not be considered a Displaced Business upon the Department's approval of the first Development Application to relocate to the New Location.*

(c) ***Controls.***

(1) ***Conditional Use Authorization Not Required.*** *Notwithstanding any other provision of this Code, if the use and use size associated with a Displaced Business is either principally or conditionally permitted in the zoning district of the New Location, the use and use size of the Displaced Business shall be principally permitted. In no event shall this subsection be construed to permit a use or use size that is not permitted in the zoning district of a proposed New Location, or to allow Formula Retail uses in the Neighborhood Commercial Districts without Conditional Use authorization.*

(2) ***No Development Impact Fees.*** *A relocating Displaced Business shall not be subject*

to fees pursuant to Article 4.

*(d) **Notice of Development Applications to Existing Businesses.** Within 15 days of determining that a Development Application is complete or deemed complete, if the Development Application is proposed at a property where there is an existing commercial or industrial use with less than 50,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area, the Department shall provide mailed and electronic notice of the Development Application to the existing non-residential tenant and the Office of Small Business. This provision does not increase or decrease the rights or obligations of the property owner or non-residential tenant pursuant to a private agreement, such as a lease.*

Section 12. Miscellaneous Amendments. These amendments are related to the Housing Element rezoning, and include other code changes to streamline the consideration of housing projects. Articles 1, 1.2, 2, and 3 of the Planning Code are hereby amended by revising Sections 102, 202.2, 306.1, 311 and 317, and deleting Sections 140.1, 206.5, and 318, to read as follows.

SEC. 102. DEFINITIONS.

* * * *

DBI. The San Francisco Department of Building Inspection or its successor.

Density, Form-Based. *A type of residential density where the maximum number of residential units is not numerically limited by lot or lot area but by the number of units that could be built within the volume of a proposed development that complies with all applicable Planning Code requirements and Objective Standards. Such requirements and standards include, but are not limited to, Height, Bulk, Rear Yard, Lot Coverage, Setbacks, Open Space, Dwelling Unit Exposure, and Dwelling Unit Mix.*

Density, Numeric. *A type of residential density where the permitted maximum number of residential units is calculated based on a specified number of units per lot, or number of units per lot*

area.

* * * *

Objective Standard. *A standard that does not involve personal or subjective judgment and is publicly available and uniformly verifiable by reference to a benchmark or criterion and knowable, including but not limited to those in the Planning Code or any applicable standards adopted by the Planning Commission, Zoning Administrator, or Board of Supervisors (by ordinance), which are under the purview of the Planning Commission, Planning Department, or Zoning Administrator, including any Citywide Design Standards.*

Occupied Floor Area. See Floor Area, Occupied.

* * * *

Residential Care Facility. An Institutional Healthcare Use providing lodging, board, and care for a period of 24 hours or more to persons in need of specialized aid by personnel licensed by the State of California. Such facility shall display nothing on or near the facility that gives an outward indication of the nature of the occupancy except for a sign as permitted by Article 6 of this Code, shall not provide outpatient services, and shall be located in a structure which remains residential in character. Such facilities shall include, but not necessarily be limited to, a board and care home, family care home, long-term nursery, orphanage, rest home or home for the treatment of addictive, contagious or other diseases, or psychological disorders.

Residential Flat. *A Residential Unit in a building containing two or more Dwelling Units, that has contiguous habitable space that extends the full depth of the building on the same story from the front street-facing façade to the rear of the building, and has windows or doorways on both front and rear facades from at least one habitable room that is not a hallway.*

* * * *

~~***SEC. 140.1. COMMON AREA REQUIREMENT FOR EFFICIENCY DWELLING UNITS WITH REDUCED SQUARE FOOTAGE.***~~

~~*Buildings with 20 or more Efficiency Dwelling Units with reduced square footage, as defined in Section 318 of this Code, shall include at least one common room for use by the residents. Such common room(s) may be used as study or reading rooms, shared kitchen or dining facilities, media rooms, game rooms, fitness facilities, or similar uses appropriate to the needs of residents. Interior common areas shall be of sufficient size to reasonably accommodate residents' needs, but in no event shall the area required be less than ten square feet per unit.*~~

SEC. 202.2. LOCATION AND OPERATING CONDITIONS.

* * * *

(f) **Residential Uses.** The Residential Uses listed below shall be subject to the corresponding conditions:

(1) **Senior Housing.** To qualify as Senior Housing, as defined in Section 102 of this Code, the following definitions shall apply and shall have the same meaning as the definitions in California Civil Code Sections 51.2, 51.3, and 51.4, as amended from time to time. These definitions shall apply as shall all of the other provisions of Civil Code Sections 51.2, 51.3, and 51.4. Any Senior Housing must also be consistent with the Fair Housing Act, 42 U.S.C. §§ 3601-3631 and the Fair Employment and Housing Act, California Government Code Sections 12900-12996.

* * * *

(C) **Definition**. "Senior Citizen Housing Development" means a residential development developed, substantially rehabilitated, or substantially renovated for senior citizens ~~*that has at least 35 Dwelling Units*~~. Any Senior Citizen Housing Development that is required to obtain a public report under Section 11010 of the Business and Professions

Code and that submits its application for a public report after July 1, 2001, shall be required to have been issued a public report as a Senior Citizen Housing Development under Section 11010.05 of the Business and Professions Code. No housing development constructed prior to January 1, 1985, shall fail to qualify as a Senior Citizen Housing Development because it was not originally developed or put to use or occupancy by senior citizens.

* * * *

~~***SEC. 206.5. STATE RESIDENTIAL DENSITY BONUS PROGRAM: ANALYZED.***~~

~~*(a) **Purpose.** Sections 206.5, 206.6, and 206.7 shall be referred to as the San Francisco State Residential Density Bonus Program or the State Density Bonus Program. First, the Analyzed State Density Bonus Program in Section 206.5 offers an expedited process for projects that seek a density bonus that is consistent with the pre-vetted menu of incentives, concessions and waivers that the Planning Department and its consultants have already determined are feasible, result in actual cost reductions, and do not have specific adverse impacts upon public health and safety of the physical environment. Second the Individually Requested State Density Bonus Program in Section 206.6 details the review, analysis and approval process for any project seeking a density bonus that is consistent with State Law, but is not consistent with the requirements for the Analyzed State Density Bonus Program established in Section 206.5. Third, Section 206.7 describes density bonuses available under the State code for the provision of childcare facilities.*~~

~~*This Section 206.5 implements the Analyzed State Density Bonus Program or "Analyzed State Program." The Analyzed State Program offers an expedited process for projects that seek a density bonus that is consistent with, among other requirements set forth below, the pre-vetted menu of incentives, waiver and concessions.*~~

~~*(b) **Applicability.***~~

~~*(1) A Housing Project that meets all of the requirements of this subsection (b)(1) or is a*~~

~~*Senior Housing Project meeting the criteria of (b)(2) shall be an Analyzed State Density Bonus Project or an "Analyzed Project" for purposes of Sections 206 et seq. A Housing Project that does not meet all of the requirements of this subsection (b), but seeks a density bonus under State law may apply for a density bonus under Section 206.6 as an Individually Requested State Density Bonus Project. To qualify for the Analyzed State Density Bonus Program a Housing Project must meet all of the following:*~~

~~*(A) contain five or more residential units, as defined in Section 102, not including any Group Housing as defined in Section 102, efficiency dwelling units with reduced square footage defined in Section 318, and Density Bonus Units permitted through this Section 206.5 or other density program;*~~

~~*(B) is not seeking and receiving a density or development bonus under Section 207; the HOME-SF Program, Section 206.3; the 100 Percent Affordable Housing Bonus Program, Section 206.4; or any other local or State density bonus program that provides development bonuses;*~~

~~*(C) for projects located in Neighborhood Commercial Districts is not seeking to merge lots that result in more than 125 linear feet in lot frontage on any one street;*~~

~~*(D) is located in any zoning district that: (i) is not designated as an RH-1 or RH-2 Zoning District; (ii) establishes a maximum dwelling unit density through a ratio of number of units to lot area, including but not limited to, RH-3, RM, RC, C-2, Neighborhood Commercial, Named Neighborhood Commercial, and SoMa Mixed Use Districts, but only if the SoMa Mixed Use District has a density measured by a maximum number of dwelling units per square foot of lot area; (iii) is not in the North of Market Residential Special Use District, Planning Code Section 249.5 until the Affordable Housing Incentive Study is completed at which time the Board will review whether the North of Market Residential Special Use District should continue to be excluded from this Program. The Study will explore opportunities to support and encourage the provision of housing at the low, moderate, and middle income range in neighborhoods where density controls have been eliminated.*~~

~~*The goal of this analysis is to incentivize increased affordable housing production levels at deeper and wider ranges of AMI and larger unit sizes in these areas through 100% affordable housing development as well as below market rate units within market rate developments; (iv) is not located within the boundaries of the Northeastern Waterfront Area Plan south of the centerline of Broadway; and (v) is not located on property under the jurisdiction of the Port of San Francisco;*~~

~~*(E) is providing all Inclusionary Units as On-site Units under Section 415.6;*~~

~~*(F) includes a minimum of nine foot ceilings on all residential floors;*~~

~~*(G) is seeking only Concessions or Incentives set forth in subsection (c)(4);*~~

~~*(H) is seeking height increases only in the form of a waiver as described in subsection (c)(5);*~~

~~*(I) does not demolish, remove, or convert any residential units;*~~

~~*(J) consists only of new construction, and excluding any project that includes an addition to an existing structure;*~~

~~*(K) includes at the ground floor level active uses, as defined in Section 145.1 at the same square footages as any neighborhood commercial uses demolished or removed;*~~

~~*(L) if any retail use is demolished or removed, does not include a Formula Retail use, as defined in Section 303.1, unless the retail use demolished or removed was also a Formula Retail use, or one of the following uses: Gas Stations, Private or Public Parking Lots, Financial Services, Fringe Financial Services, Self Storage, Motel, Automobile Sales or Rental, Automotive Wash, Mortuaries, Adult Business, Massage Establishment, Medical Cannabis Dispensary, and Tobacco Paraphernalia Establishment, as those uses are defined in Planning Code Section 102;*~~

~~*(M) all on-site income-restricted residential units in the Housing Project are no smaller than the minimum unit sizes set forth by the California Tax Credit Allocation Committee as of May 16, 2017; and*~~

~~*(N) notwithstanding any other provision of this Code, includes a minimum*~~

~~*dwelling unit mix of at least 40% of all units as two or three bedroom units, including at least 10% of units as three bedroom units. Larger units should be distributed on all floors, and prioritized in spaces adjacent to open spaces or play yards. Units with two or three bedrooms should incorporate family friendly amenities, including bathtubs, dedicated cargo bicycle parking, dedicated stroller storage, and open space and yards designed for use by children.*~~

~~*(2) A Senior Housing Project, as defined in Section 102, may qualify as an Analyzed State Density Bonus Project if it follows all of the procedures and conditions set forth in Planning Code Section 202.2(f).*~~

~~*(3) If located north of the centerline of Post Street and east of the centerline of Van Ness Avenue, all otherwise eligible Analyzed State Law Density Bonus Projects shall only be permitted on:*~~

~~*(A) lots containing no existing buildings; or*~~

~~*(B) lots equal to or greater than 12,500 square feet where existing buildings are developed to less than 20% of the lot's principally permitted buildable gross floor area as determined by height limits, rear yard requirements and required setbacks.*~~

~~*(c) **Development Bonuses.** All Analyzed State Law Density Bonus Projects shall receive, at the project sponsor's written request, any or all of the following:*~~

~~*(1) **Priority Processing.** Analyzed Projects that provide 30% or more of Units as On-site Inclusionary Housing Units or Restricted Affordable Units that meet all of the requirements for an Inclusionary Housing Unit shall receive Priority Processing.*~~

~~*(2) **Density Bonus.** Analyzed Projects that provide On-site Inclusionary Housing Units or Restricted Affordable Units that meet all of the requirements for an Inclusionary Housing Unit shall receive a density bonus as described in Table 206.5A as follows:*~~

~~*Table 206.5A*~~
~~*Density Bonus Summary – Analyzed*~~

~~*A*~~	~~*B*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*D*~~	~~*E*~~

~~Restricted Affordable Units or Category~~	~~Minimum Percentage of Restricted Affordable Units~~	~~Percentage of Density Bonus Granted~~	~~Additional Bonus for Each 1% Increase In Restricted Affordable Units~~	~~Percentage of Restricted Units Required for Maximum 35% Density Bonus~~
~~Very Low Income~~	~~5%~~	~~20%~~	~~2.50%~~	~~11%~~
~~Lower Income~~	~~10%~~	~~20%~~	~~1.50%~~	~~20%~~
~~Moderate Income~~	~~10%~~	~~5%~~	~~1%~~	~~40%~~
~~Senior Citizen Housing, as defined in § 102, and meeting the requirements of § 202.2(f).~~	~~100%~~	~~50%~~	~~---~~	~~---~~

~~*Note: A density bonus may be selected from more than one category, up to a maximum of 35% of the Maximum Allowable Gross Residential Density.*~~

~~*In calculating density bonuses under this subsection 206.5(c)(2) the following shall apply:*~~

~~*(A) When calculating the number of permitted Density Bonus Units or Restricted Affordable Units, any fractions of units shall be rounded to the next highest number. Analyzed Density Bonus Program projects must include the minimum percentage of Restricted Affordable Units identified in Column B of Table 206.5A for at least one income category, but may combine density bonuses from more than one income category, up to a maximum of 35% of the Maximum Allowable Gross Residential Density.*~~

~~*(B) An applicant may elect to receive a Density Bonus that is less than the amount permitted by this Section; however, the City shall not be required to similarly reduce the number of Restricted Affordable Units required to be dedicated pursuant to this Section and Government Code Section 65915(b).*~~

~~*(C) In no case shall a Housing Project be entitled to a Density Bonus of more than 35%, unless it is a Senior Housing Project meeting the requirements of Section 202.2(f).*~~

~~*(D) The Density Bonus Units shall not be included when determining the*~~

~~*number of Restricted Affordable Units required to qualify for a Density Bonus. Density bonuses shall be calculated as a percentage of the Maximum Allowable Gross Residential Density.*~~

~~*(E) Any Restricted Affordable Unit provided pursuant to the on-site requirements of the Inclusionary Affordable Housing Program, Section 415 et seq., shall be included when determining the number of Restricted Affordable Units required to qualify for a Development Bonus under this Section 206.5. The payment of the Affordable Housing Fee shall not qualify for a Development Bonus under this Section. The provision of Off-site Units shall not qualify the Principal Project for a Density Bonus under this Section; however an Off-site Unit may qualify as a Restricted Affordable Unit to obtain a density bonus for the Off-site Project.*~~

~~*(F) In accordance with state law, neither the granting of a Concession, Incentive, waiver, or modification, nor the granting of a Density Bonus, shall be interpreted, in and of itself, to require a general plan amendment, zoning change, variance, or other discretionary approval.*~~

~~*(3) **Concessions and Incentives.** Analyzed Projects shall receive concessions or incentives, in the amounts specified in Table 206.5B:*~~

~~*Table 206.5B*~~
~~*Concessions and Incentives Summary – Analyzed Projects*~~

~~*Target Group*~~	~~*Restricted Affordable Units*~~		
~~*Very Low Income*~~	~~*5%*~~	~~*10%*~~	~~*15%*~~
~~*Lower Income*~~	~~*10%*~~	~~*20%*~~	~~*30%*~~
~~*Moderate Income (Common Interest Development)*~~	~~*10%*~~	~~*20%*~~	~~*30%*~~
~~*Maximum Incentive(s)/ Concession(s)*~~	~~*1*~~	~~*2*~~	~~*3*~~

~~*Notes: 1. Common Interest Development is defined in California Civil Code Section 4100.*~~

~~*(4) **Menu of Concessions and Incentives:** In submitting a request for Concessions or Incentives, an applicant for an Analyzed State Density Bonus Project may request the specific Concessions and Incentives set forth below. The Planning Department, based on Department research and a Residential Density Bonus Study prepared by David Baker Architects, Seifel Consulting, and the*~~

~~*San Francisco Planning Department dated August 2015, on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. 150969, has determined that the following Concessions and Incentives are generally consistent with Government Code Section 65915(d) because, in general, they: are required in order to provide for affordable housing costs; will not be deemed by the Department to have a specific adverse impact as defined in Government Code Section 65915(d); and are not contrary to State or Federal law.*~~

~~*(A) **Rear yard:** the required rear yard per Section 134 or any applicable special use district may be reduced to no less than 20% of the lot depth, or 15 feet, whichever is greater. Corner properties may provide 20% of the lot area at the interior corner of the property to meet the minimum rear yard requirement, provided that each horizontal dimension of the open area is a minimum of 15 feet; and that the open area is wholly or partially contiguous to the existing midblock open space, if any, formed by the rear yards of adjacent properties.*~~

~~*(B) **Dwelling Unit Exposure:** the dwelling unit exposure requirements of Section 140(a)(2) may be satisfied through qualifying windows facing an unobstructed open area that is no less than 25 feet in every horizontal dimension, and such open area is not required to expand in every horizontal dimension at each subsequent floor.*~~

~~*(C) **Off-Street Loading:** off-street loading spaces under Section 152 shall not be required.*~~

~~*(D) **Parking:** up to a 50% reduction in the residential and commercial parking requirement, per Section 151 or any applicable special use district.*~~

~~*(E) **Open Space:** up to a 5% reduction in required common open space per Section 135, or any applicable special use district.*~~

~~*(F) **Additional Open Space:** up to an additional 5% reduction in required common open space per Section 135 or any applicable special use district, beyond the 5% provided in subsection (E) above.*~~

~~*(5) **Waiver or Modification of Height Limits.** Analyzed Projects may request a waiver of the applicable height restrictions if the applicable height limitation will have the effect of physically precluding the construction of a Housing Project at the densities or with the Concessions or Incentives permitted by subsection (c)(4). Analyzed Projects may receive a height bonus as of right of up to twenty feet or two stories, excluding exceptions permitted per Section 260(b), if the applicant demonstrates that it qualifies for a height waiver through the following formula:*~~

~~***Step one: Calculate Base Density and Bonus Density Limits***~~

~~*Calculate Base Density (BD), as defined in Section 206.2.*~~

~~*Bonus Density Limit (BD): ED multiplied by 1.XX where XX is the density bonus requested per Section 206.5 of this Code (e.g. 7%, 23%, 35%), not to exceed 1.35, the maximum density bonus available by this Section.*~~

~~***Step two: Calculate Permitted Envelope (PE).** Buildable envelope available under existing height and bulk controls.*~~

~~*PE equals lot area multiplied by permitted lot coverage, where lot coverage equals .75, or .8 if the developer elects to request a rear yard modification under Section 206.5(c)(4)(A), multiplied by existing height limit (measured in number of stories), minus one story for projects in districts where non-residential uses are required on the ground floor, and minus any square footage subject to bulk limitations (for parcels that do not have an X bulk designation).*~~

~~***Step three: Calculate Bonus Envelope (BE).** Residential envelope necessary to accommodate additional density ("Bonus envelope" or "BE").*~~

~~*BE equals Bonus Density multiplied by 1,000 gross square feet.*~~

~~***Step four: Calculate Additional Residential Floors.** Determine the number of stories required to accommodate bonus:*~~

~~*(A) If BE is less than or equal to PE, the project is not awarded height under this subsection (c)(5).*~~

~~*(B) If BE is greater than PE, the project is awarded height, as follows:*~~

~~*(i) If BE minus PE is less than the lot area multiplied by 0.75, project is allowed one extra story; total gross square footage of building not to exceed BE; or*~~

~~*(ii) If BE minus PE is greater than the lot area multiplied by 0.75 (i.e. if the difference is greater than one story), project is allowed two extra stories; total gross square footage of building not to exceed BE.*~~

~~***(d) Application.** An application for an Analyzed State Density Bonus Project under this Section 206.5 shall be submitted with the first application for approval of a Housing Project and shall be processed concurrently with all other applications required for the Housing Project. The application shall be on a form prescribed by the City and, in addition to any information required for other applications, shall include the following information:*~~

~~*(1) A description of the proposed Housing Project, including the total number of dwelling units, Restricted Affordable Units, and Density Bonus Units proposed;*~~

~~*(2) Any zoning district designation, Base Density, assessor's parcel number(s) of the project site, and a description of any Density Bonus, Concession or Incentive, or waiver requested;*~~

~~*(3) A list of the requested Concessions and Incentives from Section 206.5(c)(4);*~~

~~*(4) If a waiver or modification of height is requested under Section 206.5(c)(5), a calculation demonstrating how the project qualifies for such waiver under the formula;*~~

~~*(5) A full plan set including site plan, elevations, sections, and floor plans, number of market-rate units, Restricted Affordable Units, and Density Bonus units within the proposed Housing Project. The location of all units must be approved by the Planning Department before the issuance of the building permit;*~~

~~*(6) Level of affordability of the Restricted Affordable Units and a draft Regulatory Agreement; and*~~

~~*(7) Documentation that the applicant has provided written notification to all existing*~~

~~*commercial tenants that the applicant intends to develop the property pursuant to this section. Any affected commercial tenants shall be given priority processing similar to the Department's Community Business Priority Processing Program, as adopted by the Planning Commission on February 12, 2015 under Resolution Number 19323 to support relocation of such business in concert with access to relevant local business support programs. In no case may a project receive a site permit or any demolition permit prior to 18 months from the date of written notification required by this Section 206.5(d)(7).*~~

~~***(e) Review Procedures.** An application for an Analyzed State Density Bonus Project, shall be acted upon concurrently with the application for other permits related to the Housing Project.*~~

~~*(1) Before approving an application for an Analyzed Project, the Planning Department or Commission shall make written findings that the Housing Project is qualified as an Analyzed State Density Bonus Project.*~~

~~*(2) Analyzed Projects shall be governed by the conditional use procedures of Section 303. All notices shall specify that the Housing Project is seeking a Development Bonus and shall provide a description of the Development Bonuses requested. Analyzed Projects shall also be reviewed for consistency with the Affordable Housing Bonus Program Design Guidelines.*~~

~~***(f) Regulatory Agreements.** Recipients of a Density Bonus, Incentive, Concession, waiver, or modification shall enter into a Regulatory Agreement with the City, as follows.*~~

~~*(1) The terms of the agreement shall be acceptable in form and content to the Planning Director, the Director of MOHCD, and the City Attorney. The Planning Director shall have the authority to execute such agreements.*~~

~~*(2) Following execution of the agreement by all parties, the completed Density Bonus Regulatory Agreement, or memorandum thereof, shall be recorded and the conditions filed and recorded on the Housing Project.*~~

~~*(3) The approval and recordation of the Regulatory Agreement shall take place prior to*~~

~~*the issuance of the First Construction Document. The Regulatory Agreement shall be binding to all future owners and successors in interest.*~~

~~*(4) The Regulatory Agreement shall be consistent with the guidelines of the City's Inclusionary Housing Program and shall include at a minimum the following:*~~

~~*(A) The total number of dwelling units approved for the Housing Project, including the number of Restricted Affordable Units, Inclusionary Units, HOME-SF Units or other restricted units;*~~

~~*(B) A description of the household income group to be accommodated by the Restricted Affordable Units, and the standards for determining the corresponding Affordable Rent or Affordable Sales Price;*~~

~~*(C) The location, dwelling unit sizes (in square feet), and number of bedrooms of the Restricted Affordable Units;*~~

~~*(D) Term of use restrictions for Restricted Affordable Units of at least 55 years for Moderate Income units and at least 55 years for Low and Very Low units;*~~

~~*(E) A schedule for completion and occupancy of Restricted Affordable Units;*~~

~~*(F) A description of any Concession, Incentive, waiver, or modification, if any, being provided by the City;*~~

~~*(G) A description of remedies for breach of the agreement (the City may identify tenants or qualified purchasers as third party beneficiaries under the agreement);*~~

~~*(H) A list of all on-site family friendly amenities. Family friendly amenities shall include, but are not limited to, dedicated cargo bicycle parking, dedicated stroller storage, and open space and yards designed for use by children; and*~~

~~*(I) Other provisions to ensure implementation and compliance with this Section.*~~

SEC. 306.1. APPLICATIONS AND FILING FEES.

* * * *

(c) **Content of Applications.** The content of applications shall be in accordance with the policies, rules and regulations of the Planning Department, Zoning Administrator and the Planning Commission. All applications shall be upon forms prescribed therefor, and shall contain or be accompanied by all information required to assure the presentation of pertinent facts for proper consideration of the case and for the permanent record. The applicant may be required to file with his application the information needed for the preparation and mailing of notices as specified in Section 306.3. In addition to any other information required by the Planning Department, the Zoning Administrator and the Planning Commission, an applicant for a conditional use permit or variance who proposes a commercial use for the subject property shall disclose the name under which business will be, or is expected to be, conducted at the subject property, if such name is known at the time of application. The term "known" shall mean actual, not imputed knowledge, and shall consist of direct evidence including but not limited to a contract of sale, lease, or rental, or letter of intent or agreement, between the applicant and a commercial entity. If the business name becomes known to the applicant during the conditional use permit or variance processing period, the applicant promptly shall amend the application to disclose such business name. *All applications must disclose whether there are existing residential uses and non-residential uses, and disclose the presence of any residential or non-residential tenants, located at the subject property at the time the application is submitted.*

SEC. 311. PERMIT REVIEW PROCEDURES.

(a) **Purpose.** The purpose of this Section 311 is to establish procedures for reviewing ~~*planning entitlement*~~ *Development Applications* ~~*applications*~~ to determine compatibility of the proposal with the neighborhood and for providing notice to property owners*, tenants,* and residents on the site and neighboring the site of the proposed project and to interested

neighborhood organizations, so that concerns about a project may be identified and resolved during the review of the permit. For purposes of this Section 311, a ~~*planning entitlement*~~ *Development Application* ~~*application*~~ means the application submitted by a project sponsor to the Planning Department, provided said application has been deemed complete by the Planning Department, that includes the information necessary to conduct environmental review, determine Planning Code compliance, and *assess* conformity with the General Plan.

(b) **Applicability.**

(1) Within the Priority Equity Geographies SUD, all ~~*planning entitlement*~~ *Development A*~~a~~pplications in Residential, NC, NCT, *RTO,* Chinatown Mixed Use Districts, and Eastern Neighborhoods Mixed Use Districts for demolition, new construction, or alteration of buildings shall be subject to the notification and review procedures required by this Section 311. Notwithstanding the foregoing or any other requirement of this Section 311, ~~*planning entitlement*~~ *Development A*~~a~~pplications to construct an Accessory Dwelling Unit pursuant to Section 207.2 shall not be subject to the notification or review requirements of this Section 311. A change of use to a principally permitted use in the Western SoMa Plan Area, Central SoMa Plan Area, or East SoMa Plan Area shall not be subject to the provisions of this Section 311.

* * * *

(3) **In all Other Projects in Residential, NC, NCT, and Eastern Neighborhoods Mixed Use Districts.** All ~~*planning entitlement*~~ *Development A*~~a~~pplications in Residential, NC, NCT, and Eastern Neighborhoods Mixed Use Districts that propose any of the following shall be subject to the notification and review procedures required by this Section 311.

* * * *

(c) ~~***Planning Entitlement***~~ ***Development*** **Application Review for Compliance.** Upon

acceptance of any *Development A~~a~~*pplication subject to this Section *311*, the Planning Department shall review the proposed project for compliance with the Planning Code and any applicable design guidelines*, and standards* approved by the Planning Commission. Applications determined ~~*not*~~ to be in compliance with the *Objective S~~s~~*tandards of Articles 1.2, 1.5, 2, and 2.5 of the Planning Code, *and any applicable Objective Standards adopted by the Commission shall be considered to be code-compliant. Development Applications for projects other than code-compliant residential projects may be subject to additional controls, including the* Residential Design Guidelines, ~~*including*~~ design guidelines for specific areas adopted by the Planning Commission, or ~~*with*~~ any applicable conditions of previous approvals regarding the project~~*, shall be held until either the application is determined to be in compliance, is disapproved or a recommendation for cancellation is sent to the Department of Building Inspection*~~.

(1) **Design Guidelines *and Standards*.** The construction of new buildings and alteration of existing buildings shall be consistent with the design policies and guidelines of the General Plan*, applicable Objective Standards,* ~~*and with*~~ the "Residential Design Guidelines," and all other applicable design guidelines *and standards* as adopted and periodically amended for specific areas or conditions by the Planning Commission. ~~*The design for new buildings with residential uses in RTO Districts shall also be consistent with the design standards and guidelines of the "Ground Floor Residential Units Design Guidelines" as adopted and periodically amended by the Planning Commission.*~~ The Planning Director may require modifications to the exterior of a proposed new building or proposed alteration of an existing building in order to bring it into conformity with the applicable design guidelines. These modifications may include, but are not limited to, changes in siting, building envelope, scale texture and detailing, openings, and landscaping.

* * * *

(d) **Notification.** Upon determination that an application ~~*is in compliance*~~ *complies* with

the development standards of the Planning Code, the Planning Department shall cause a notice to be posted on the site pursuant to rules established by the Zoning Administrator and shall cause a written notice describing the proposed project to be sent in the manner described below. This notice shall be in addition to any notices required by the Building Code and shall have a format and content determined by the Zoning Administrator. The notice shall describe the project review process and shall set forth the mailing date of the notice and the expiration date of the notification period.

* * * *

(5) **Notification Period.** All ~~*planning entitlement*~~ *Development A~~a~~*pplications shall be held for a period of 30 calendar days from the date of the mailed notice to allow review by residents and owners of neighboring properties and by neighborhood groups.

(6) **Elimination of Duplicate Notice.** The notice provisions of this Section *311* may be waived by the Zoning Administrator for ~~*planning entitlement*~~ *Development A~~a~~*pplications for projects that have been, or before approval will be, the subject of a duly noticed public hearing before the Planning Commission or Zoning Administrator, provided that the nature of work for which the ~~*planning entitlement*~~ *Development A~~a~~*pplication is required is both substantially included in the hearing notice and is the subject of the hearing.

(7) **Notification Package.** The notification package for a project subject to notice under this Section 311 shall include a written notice and reduced-size drawings of the project. Distributed plans and drawings may be limited to comply with applicable state laws.

* * * *

(D) The ~~*planning entitlement*~~ *Development A~~a~~*pplication number(s) shall be disclosed in the written notice. The start and expiration dates of the notice shall be stated. A description about the recipient's rights to request additional information, to request Discretionary Review by the Planning Commission and to appeal to other boards or

commissions shall be provided.

* * * *

(e) **Requests for Planning Commission Review.** A request for the Planning Commission to exercise its discretionary review powers over a specific ~~*planning entitlement*~~ *Development A~~a~~*pplication shall be considered by the Planning Commission if received by the Planning Department no later than 5:00 p.m. of the last day of the notification period as described in this Section 311, subject to guidelines adopted by the Planning Commission. The project sponsor of a ~~*planning entitlement*~~ *Development A~~a~~*pplication may request discretionary review by the Planning Commission to resolve conflicts between the Director of Planning and the project sponsor concerning requested modifications to comply with the Residential Design Guidelines, or other applicable design guideline~~s~~ *or standard*.

* * * *

SEC. 317. LOSS OF RESIDENTIAL AND UNAUTHORIZED UNITS THROUGH DEMOLITION, MERGER, AND CONVERSION.

(a) **Findings.** San Francisco faces a continuing shortage of affordable housing. There is a high ratio of rental to ownership tenure among the City's residents. 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. Therefore, a public hearing will be held prior to approval of any permit that would remove existing housing, *reduce the size of a Residential Flat, merge any portion of a Residential Flat with another unit, or change the configuration of a Residential Flat such that the unit is no longer considered a Residential Flat,* with certain exceptions, as described below. The Planning Commission shall develop a Code Implementation Document setting forth procedures and regulations for the implementation of this Section 317 as provided further below. The Zoning Administrator shall modify economic

criteria related to property values and construction costs in the Implementation Document as warranted by changing economic conditions to meet the intent of this Section.

(b) **Definitions.** For the purposes of this Section 317, the terms below shall be as defined below. Capitalized terms not defined below are defined in Section 102 of this Code.

* * * *

(7) "Residential Merger" shall mean the combining of two or more Residential or Unauthorized Units, resulting in a decrease in the number of Residential Units and Unauthorized Units within a building, or the enlargement of one or more existing units while ~~*substantially*~~ reducing the size of others by more than 25% of their original floor area, even if the number of units is not reduced. The Planning Commission may reduce the numerical element of this criterion by up to 20% of its value should it deem that adjustment is necessary to implement the intent of this Section 317, to conserve existing housing and preserve affordable housing. *Residential Merger shall also include the reconfiguration of a Residential Flat with another Dwelling Unit, if the proposed project would reconfigure an existing Residential Flat such that the reconfigured Residential Flat would no longer meet the definition of a Residential Flat, even if the number of Dwelling Units is not reduced and the Residential Flat is not reduced in size.*

* * * *

(c) **Applicability; Exemptions.**

* * * *

~~(12) Residential Flats. Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in this Section 317, projects that propose the Merger, reconfiguration, or reduction in size of Residential Flats shall not require a Conditional Use authorization if the project would increase the number of Dwelling Units on the property.~~

* * * *

(g) **Conditional Use Criteria.**

* * * *

(6) **Residential Demolition.** The Planning Commission shall consider the following additional criteria in the review of applications for Residential Demolition:

* * * *

(L) whether the project increases the number of family-sized units on-site~~, and in the case of demolition of any Residential Flats whether the proposed project is maintaining or increasing the number of units on the lot that contain at least two or more bedrooms or that are at least equivalent in size to the Residential Flats being demolished~~;

* * * *

(8) **Denial of Application to Remove an Unauthorized Unit; Requirement to Legalize the Unit.** If the Planning Commission denies an application to Remove an Unauthorized Unit, the property owner shall file a~~n~~ *Development Application and any necessary* application for a building permit to legalize the Unit. Failure to do so within a reasonable period of time, as determined by the Zoning Administrator, shall be deemed to be a violation of the Planning Code.

*(9) **Residential Flats.** In addition to the other considerations in this subsection (g), the Planning Commission shall consider the criteria below when reviewing a project application that would merge a Residential Flat such that it would no longer meet the definition of a Residential Flat:*

(A) whether reduction in size, reconfiguration, or merger of the Flat(s) would reduce the size of any Flat by more than 25% of its original floor area; and

(B) whether the proposed project is maintaining or increasing the number of units on the Lot that contain at least two or more bedrooms or that are at least equivalent in size to the Residential Flats being reduced or reconfigured.

* * * *

#

~~***SEC. 318. EFFICIENCY DWELLING UNITS WITH REDUCED SQUARE FOOTAGE.***~~

~~***(a) Definition.*** *For purposes of this Section, an "Efficiency Dwelling Unit with reduced square footage" shall mean an Efficiency Dwelling Unit with a living room of less than 220 square feet and meeting the requirements of Section 1208.4 of the San Francisco Building Code that is not affordable housing, group housing, or student housing as defined in this Code.*~~

~~***(b) Limitation on the Total Number of Efficiency Dwelling Units with Reduced Square Footage That Can Be Constructed.*** *The Planning Department may approve the construction of up to a total number of 375 Efficiency Dwelling Units with reduced square footage; provided, however, that Efficiency Dwelling Units shall not be included in this total. For purposes of this subsection, individual units will be counted even if they comprise less than the total number of units in the building.*~~

~~***(c) Reporting and Reauthorization.*** *After the approval of approximately 325 Efficiency Dwelling Units with reduced square footage, the Planning Department in collaboration with the Mayor's Office of Housing shall submit a report to the Board of Supervisors that provides whatever information those Departments believe will assist the Board in determining whether to increase the numerical cap on the number of Efficiency Units with reduced square footage or to otherwise modify the requirements. At a minimum, the report shall include the following information:*~~

~~*(1) Pricing information, based on data from the Assessor's Office, for sales properties and, to the extent feasible, rental prices for the Efficiency Dwelling Units with reduced square footage;*~~

~~*(2) A comparison of the sales and rental pricing information for Efficiency Dwelling Units with reduced square footage to similar data for studio and 1-bedroom dwelling units;*~~

~~*(3) A map showing where the Efficiency Dwelling Units with reduced square footage are located, both projects that are entitled but not yet built and projects that have been constructed;*~~

~~*(4) A comparison of the numbers of Efficiency Dwelling Units with reduced square footage that are entitled and/or built and the goals for other dwelling unit sizes within any adopted Area Plans; and*~~

~~*(5) A comparison of the numbers of Efficiency Dwelling Units with reduced square footage with the quantified housing production goals, to the extent available by household income level, set forth in the Regional Housing Needs Allocation.*~~

Section 13. Conforming Changes to Zoning Tables. Articles 2, 7, and 8 of the Planning Code is hereby amended by revising Sections 210.1, 210.2, 210.3, 210.4, 710, 711, 712, 713, 714, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 720, 721, 722, 723, 724, 725, 726, 727, 728, 729, 730, 731, 732, 733, 734, 735, 736, 737, 738, 739, 740, 741, 742, 743, 744, 745, 746, 750, 751, 752, 753, 754, 755, 756, 757, 758, 759, 760, 761, 762, 763, 764, 780.1, 780.3, 810, 811, 812, 825, 827, 829, 830, 831, 832, 833, 834, 835, 836, 837, 838, 839, and 840 to read as follows:

SEC. 210.1. C-2 DISTRICTS: COMMUNITY BUSINESS.

* * * *

Table 210.1

ZONING CONTROL TABLE FOR C-2 DISTRICTS

Zoning Category	***§ References***	***C-2***
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
Height and Bulk Limits	§§ 102, 105, 106, 132.1, 250-252, 260, *263.19,* 270, *270.3,* 271,	~~*Generally 40-X*~~*Varies*. Additional Height Limits of § 261 apply. See Height and Bulk District Maps.

	295	
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124, *207.9*	Basic FAR limit is 3.6 to 1. For a lot that is nearer to an RM-4 or RC-4 District than to any other R District, the FAR is 4.8 to 1. For a lot that is nearer to a C-3 District than to any R District the FAR is 10.0 to 1. FAR in the Waterfront and Washington-Broadway Special Use Districts is 5 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		
Signs	§ 607	As permitted by ~~*Section*~~ § 607.
Design Guidelines and Standards	*General Plan Commerce and Industry Element*	*Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
* * * *		
Residential Conversion, Demolition, or Merger	§ 317	C ~~*for Removal of one or more Residential Units or Unauthorized Units.*~~

of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats		
Dwelling Unit Mix	*§ 207.7*	*Generally required for creation of 10 or more Dwelling Units. No less than 25% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least two Bedrooms, and no less than 10% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least three Bedrooms.*
* * * *		
Residential Uses		
~~*Residential Density,*~~ Dwelling Unit~~s~~ *Density, General* (5)	§ 207	P at a density ratio not exceeding the number of dwelling units permitted in the nearest R District, with the distance to such R District measured from the midpoint of the front lot line or from a point directly across the street therefrom, whichever permits the greater density; provided, that the maximum density ratio shall in no case be less than one unit for each 800 square feet of lot area. NP above. (8) *Form-Based Density applies within the R-4 Height and Bulk District (§§ 263.19, 270(i)) and other parcels per footnote 8.*
Minimum Dwelling Unit	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally*

Densities, if Applicable		*ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*
Senior Housing *Density*	§§102, 202.2(f), *207*	P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location. *Form-Based Density applies within the R-4 Height and Bulk District (§§ 263.19, 270(i)) and other parcels per footnote 8.*
~~*Residential Density,*~~ Group Housing *Density*	§208	P at a density ratio not exceeding the maximum density permitted for group housing in the nearest R District, with the distance to such R District measured from the midpoint of the front lot line or from a point directly across the street therefrom, whichever permits the greater density; provided, that the maximum density ratio shall in no case be less than one bedroom for each 275

		square feet of lot area. NP above. (8) *Form-Based Density applies within the R-4 Height and Bulk District (§§ 263.19, 270(i)) and other parcels per footnote 8.*
* * * *		
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
* * * *		
Commercial Use Characteristics		
Drive-up Facility	§ 102	~~P~~*C*
* * * *		

* * * *

(5) Construction of Accessory Dwelling Units ~~*may be*~~ permitted pursuant to Sections 207.1 and 207.2.

* * * *

(8) *Form-Based Zoning applies* ~~*I*~~*i*n C-2 zoning districts*: (i) on parcels in the R-4 Height and Bulk District; and (ii) on parcels* east of or fronting Franklin Street/13th Street and north of Townsend Street, except for parcels within the Northeast Waterfront Historic District, the Jackson Square Historic District, and the Jackson Square Historic District Extension~~*, there is no density limit*~~. The Jackson Square Historic District Extension shall include parcels within the area bounded by the northern boundary of the Jackson Square Historic District and the centerline of Sansome Street, Kearny Street, and Broadway. ~~*On parcels with no density limit, density is regulated by the permitted height and bulk, and required setbacks, exposure, open space, and other Code requirements applicable to each development lot.*~~

//

SEC. 210.2. C-3 DISTRICTS: DOWNTOWN COMMERCIAL.

* * * *

Table 210.2

ZONING CONTROL TABLE FOR C-3 DISTRICTS

Zoning Category	***§ References***	***C-3-O***	***C-3-O(SD)***	***C-3-R***	***C-3-G***	***C-3-S***
BUILDING STANDARDS						
Massing and Setbacks						
Height and Bulk Limits	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250-252, 260, *263.19,* 261, 270, *270.3,* 271	Varies. See also Height and Bulk District Maps.				
* * * *						
Basic Floor Area Ratio *(2)*	§§ 102, 123, 124*, 207.9*	9.0 to 1	6.0 to 1	6.0 to 1	6.0 to 1	5.0 to 1
*** * * ***						
Miscellaneous						
* * * *						
Signs	§ 607	As permitted by ~~*Section*~~ § 607.				
Design Guidelines and Standards	*General Plan Commerce and Industry Element*	*Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*				

Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
* * * *		
Residential Conversion, Demolition, or Merger *of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	§ 317	C ~~*for Removal of one or more Residential Units or Unauthorized Units.*~~
Dwelling Unit Mix	*§ 207.7*	*Generally required for creation of 10 or more Dwelling Units. No less than 25% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least two Bedrooms, and no less than 10% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least three Bedrooms.*
* * * *		
Residential Uses		
~~*Residential Density,*~~ Dwelling Unit~~s~~ *Density, General* (7)	§ 207	~~*No density limit. Density is regulated by the permitted height and bulk, and required setbacks, exposure, and open space of each development lot.*~~*Form-Based Density*
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*

Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*
Senior Housing *Density*	§§102, 202.2(f)*, 207*	~~*No density limit. Density is regulated by the permitted height and bulk, and required setbacks, exposure, and open space of each development lot.*~~*Form-Based Density*
~~*Residential Density,*~~ Group Housing *Density*	§208	~~*No density limit. Density is regulated by the permitted height and bulk, and required setbacks, exposure, and open space of each development lot.*~~*Form-Based Density*
* * * *		
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
* * * *		

* * * *

(2) ~~*[Reserved.]*~~ *For Office Uses in all C-3 Districts minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*

* * * *

SEC. 210.3. PDR DISTRICTS.

* * * *

//

//

//

Table 210.3

ZONING CONTROL TABLE FOR PDR DISTRICTS

Zoning Category	***§ References***	***PDR-1-B***	***PDR-1-D***	***PDR-1-G***	***PDR-2***
* * * *					
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES					
Development Standards					
* * * *					
Residential Conversion, Demolition, or Merger *of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	§ 317	C *~~for Removal of one or more Residential Units or Unauthorized Units; in C-3, only for Removal above the ground floor.~~.*			
* * * *					

* * * *

SEC. 210.4. M DISTRICTS: INDUSTRIAL.

* * * *

//

//

//

Table 210.4

ZONING CONTROL TABLE FOR M DISTRICTS

Zoning Category	§ References	M-1	M-2
BUILDING STANDARDS			
* * * *			
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES			
Development Standards			
* * * *			
Residential Conversion, Demolition, or Merger *of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	§ 317	C ~~*for Removal of one or more Residential Units or Unauthorized Units.*~~	
Dwelling Unit Mix	*§ 207.7*	*Generally required for creation of 10 or more Dwelling Units. No less than 25% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least two Bedrooms, and no less than 10% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least three Bedrooms.*	
* * * *			
Residential Uses			
~~*Residential Density,*~~ Dwelling Unit~~s~~ *Density* (3)	§ 207	C at a density ratio not exceeding the number of dwelling units permitted in the nearest R District, with the distance to such R District measured from the midpoint of the front lot line or from a	

		point directly across the street therefrom, whichever permits the greater density; provided, that the maximum density ratio shall in no case be less than one unit for each 800 feet of lot area. Any remaining fraction of one-half or more of the minimum amount of lot area per dwelling unit shall be adjusted upward to the next higher whole number of dwelling units. NP above.	
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*	
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*	
Senior Housing	§ 102	NP	NP
* * * *			
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES			
Development Standards			
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, *207.9,* 124	5 to 1*. For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*	5 to 1*. For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*
* * * *			

* * * *

(3) Construction of Accessory Dwelling Units may be permitted pursuant to Sections

207.1 and 207.2.

* * * *

SEC. 710. NC-1 – NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL CLUSTER DISTRICT.

NC-1 Districts are intended to serve as local neighborhood shopping districts, providing convenience retail goods and services for the immediately surrounding neighborhoods primarily during daytime hours.

These NC-1 Districts are characterized by their location in residential neighborhoods, often in outlying areas of the City. The commercial intensity of these districts varies. Many of these districts have the lowest intensity of commercial development in the City, generally consisting of small clusters with three or more commercial establishments, commonly grouped around a corner; and in some cases short linear commercial strips with low-scale, interspersed mixed-use (residential-commercial) development.

Building controls for the NC-1 District promote low*er*-intensity development which is compatible with the existing scale and character of these neighborhood areas. Commercial development is limited to one story*, with certain exceptions*. Rear yard requirements at all levels preserve existing backyard space.

NC-1 commercial use provisions encourage the full range of neighborhood-serving convenience retail sales and services ~~*at the first story provided that the use size generally is limited to 3,000 square feet*~~*, subject to certain use size* limitations. However, commercial uses and features which could impact residential livability are prohibited, such as auto uses, financial services, general advertising signs, drive-up facilities, hotels, and late-night activity*.* ~~*; eating and drinking establishments are restricted, depending upon the intensity of such uses in nearby commercial districts.*~~

Housing development in new buildings is encouraged above the ground story*.* ~~*in most*~~

~~*districts. Existing residential units are protected by prohibitions of conversions above the ground story and limitations on demolitions.*~~ Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted ~~*within the District pursuant to Section 207.1 of this Code*~~.

Table 710. NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL CLUSTER DISTRICT NC-1

ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		NC-1
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
Height and Bulk Limits.	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250–252, 260, 261.1, *263.19,* 270, *270.3,* 271. See also Height and Bulk District Maps	Varies~~*, but generally 40-X*~~. See Height and Bulk Map Sheets HT02-08, HT10-13 for more information. Height sculpting required on Alleys per § 261.1.
5 Foot Height Bonus for Active Ground Floor Uses	§ 263.20	P(1) in some districts
Rear Yard	§§ 130, 134,	Required at Grade level and at each succeeding

	134(a)(e), 136	level or Story: 25% of lot depth, but in no case less than 15 feet
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally ~~N~~not ~~R~~required~~.~~; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).*
Street Frontage and Public Realm		
Streetscape and Pedestrian Improvements	§ 138.1	Required
Street Frontage Requirements	§ 145.1	Required; controls apply to above-grade parking setbacks, parking and loading entrances, active uses, ground floor ceiling height, street-facing ground-level spaces, transparency and fenestration, and gates, railings, and grillwork. Exceptions permitted for historic buildings.
Ground Floor Commercial	§ 145.4	Required on some streets, see § 145.4 for specific districts.
Vehicular Access Restrictions	§ 155(r)	Restricted on some streets, see § 155(r) for specific districts

Miscellaneous		
Lot Size (Per Development)	§§ 102, 121.1	P(2)
Planned Unit Development	§ 304	C
Awning	§ 136.1	P
Canopy or Marquee	§ 136.1	NP*(4)*
Signs	§§ 262, 602-604, 607, 607.1, 608, 609	As permitted by § 607.1
General Advertising Signs	§§ 262, 602, 604, 608, 609, 610, 611	NP
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		

Usable Open Space [Per Dwelling Unit]	§§ 135, 136	100 square feet if private, or 133 square feet if common, or the amount of open space required in the nearest Residential District, whichever is less.		
Off-Street Parking Requirements	§§ 145.1, 150, 151, 153 - 156, 161, 166, 204.5	No car parking required. Maximum permitted per § 151.~~.~~ Bike parking required per §155.2. If car parking is provided, car share spaces are required when a project has 50 units or more per §166.		
Dwelling Unit Mix	§ 207.7	Generally required for creation of 10 or more Dwelling Units. No less than 25% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least two Bedrooms, and no less than 10% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least three Bedrooms.		
Use Characteristics				
Intermediate Length Occupancy	§§ 102, 202.10	P(11)		
Single Room Occupancy	§ 102	P		
Student Housing	§ 102	P		
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit ~~*Density*~~	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code ~~*Sections*~~§§ 207.1 and 207.2.		

Dwelling Unit Density, *General*	§§ 102, 207	1 unit per 800 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater. ~~Form-Based Density applies within the R-4 Height and Bulk District (§§ 263.19, 270(i)).~~
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*
Group Housing Density	§208	1 bedroom per 275 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater. ~~Form-Based Density applies within the R-4 Height and Bulk District (§§ 263.19, 270(i)).~~
Homeless Shelter Density	§§ 102, 208	Density limits regulated by the Administrative Code
Senior Housing Density	§§102, 202.2(f), 207	P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the

		district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location. ~~Form-Based Density applies within the R-4 Height and Bulk District (§§ 263.19, 270(i)).~~		
Loss of Dwelling Units*:* *Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~	~~*NP*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124*, 207.9*	1.8 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
Use Size	§*§* 102, *121.2*	P up to 2,999 square feet; C 3,000 square feet and above		
Off-Street Parking Requirements	§§ 145.1, 150, 151, 153 - 156, 161, 166,	No car parking required.~~.~~ Maximum permitted per § 151. Bike parking required per Section 155.2. Car share spaces required when a project has 25 or more parking spaces per §166.		

	204.5			
Off-Street Freight Loading	§§ 150, 152, 153 - 155, 161, 204.5	None required if gross floor area is less than 10,000 square feet. Exceptions permitted per §§ 155 and 161.		
Commercial Use Characteristics				
Drive-up Facility	§ 102	NP		
Formula Retail	§ 102, 303.1	C		
Hours of Operation	§§ 102	P 6 a.m. - 11 p.m.; C 11 p.m. - 2 a.m.		
Maritime Use	§ 102	NP		
Open Air Sales	§§ 102, 703(b)	See § 703(b)		
Outdoor Activity Area	§§ 102, 145.2, 202.2	P if located in front of building or if it complies with Section 202.2(a)(7); C if located elsewhere.		
Walk-up Facility	§ 102	P		
NON-RESIDENTIAL USES		**CONTROLS BY STORY**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd+**
Agricultural Use Category				
Agriculture, Industrial	§§ 102, 202.2(c)	NP	NP	NP
Agriculture, Large Scale Urban	§§ 102, 202.2(c)	C	C	C
Agriculture, Neighborhood	§§ 102, 202.2(c)	P	P	P
Automotive Use Category				

Automotive Uses*	§ 102	NP	NP	NP
Electric Vehicle Charging Location	§§102, 202.2(b), 202.13	C(13)	C(13)	C(13)
Parking Garage, Private	§ 102	C	C	C
Parking Garage, Public	§ 102	C	NP	NP
Parking Lot, Private	§§ 102, 142, 156	C	C	C
Parking Lot, Public	§§ 102, 142, 156	C	NP	NP
Entertainment, Arts and Recreation Use Category				
Entertainment, Arts and Recreation Uses*	§ 102	NP	NP	NP
Arts Activities	§ 102	P	P	P
Entertainment, General	§ 102	P	P	NP
Entertainment, Nighttime	§ 102	C	NP	NP
Movie Theater	§§ 102, 202.4	C	C	C
Open Recreation Area	§ 102	C	C	C
Passive Outdoor Recreation	§ 102	C	C	C
Industrial Use Category				

Industrial Uses*	§§ 102, 202.2(d)	NP	NP	NP	NP
Institutional Use Category					
Institutional Uses*	§ 102	P	C	NP	
Child Care Facility	§ 102	P	P	P	
Community Facility	§ 102	P	P	P	
Hospital	§ 102	NP	NP	NP	
Medical Cannabis Dispensary	§§ 102, 202.2(e)	NP(6)	NP(6)	NP	
Public Facilities	§ 102	P	P	P	
Religious Institution	§ 102	P	C	NP	
Residential Care Facility	§ 102	P	P	P	
Social Service or Philanthropic Facility	§ 102	P	P	P	
Sales and Service Category					
Retail Sales and Service Uses*	§§ 102, 202.2(a), 202.3	P(3)	NP	NP	
Adult Business	§ 102	NP	NP	NP	
Adult Sex Venue	§ 102	NP	NP	NP	
Animal Hospital	§ 102	P	P	P	
Bar	§§ 102, 202.2(a)	P(6)	NP	NP	

Cannabis Retail	§§ 102, 202.2(a)	NP(6)	NP(6)	NP
Flexible Retail	§§ 102, 202.9	P	NP	NP
Gym	§ 102	P	NP	NP
Hotel	§ 102	NP	NP	NP
Kennel	§ 102	C	NP	NP
Liquor Store	§ 102	P(6)(9)	NP	NP
Massage Establishment	§§ 102, 204, 703	P	NP(12)	NP(12)
Mortuary	§ 102	NP	NP	NP
Motel	§§ 102, 202.2(a)	NP	NP	NP
Restaurant	§§ 102, 202.2(a)	P(3)	P(3)	NP
Restaurant, Limited	§§ 102, 202.2(a)	P(3)	P(3)	NP
Services, Financial	§ 102	C	NP	NP
Services, Fringe Financial	§ 102	NP(10)	NP(10)	NP(10)
Services, Health	§ 102	P	NP	NP
Services, Limited Financial	§ 102	P	NP	NP
Services, Personal	§ 102	P	NP	NP

Services, Retail Professional	§ 102	P	P	P
Storage, Self	§ 102	NP	NP	NP
Tobacco Paraphernalia Establishment	§ 102	C	NP	NP
Trade Shop	§ 102	P	NP	NP
Non-Retail Sales and Service Uses	§ 102	NP	NP	NP
Design Professional	§ 102	P	NP	NP
Service, Non-Retail Professional	§ 102	C	P	NP
Trade Office	§ 102	P	NP	NP
Utility and Infrastructure Use Category				
Utility and Infrastructure*	§ 102	C(5)	C(5)	C(5)
Power Plant	§ 102	NP	NP	NP
Public Utilities Yard	§ 102	NP	NP	NP

* Not listed below

(1) Additional 5 feet for NC-1 parcels with a Commercial use on the ground floor within the following areas:

(a) Within the boundaries of Sargent Street to Orizaba Avenue to Lobos Street to Plymouth Avenue to Farellones Street to San Jose Avenue to Alemany Boulevard to 19th Avenue to Randolph Street to Monticello Street and back to Sargent Street.

(b) On Noriega, Irving, Taraval, and Judah Streets west of 19th Avenue.

(2) C for 5,000 square feet and above if located within the Priority Equity Geographies

Special Use District established under Section 249.97.

(3) TARAVAL STREET RESTAURANT SUBDISTRICT. Applicable only for the Taraval Street NC-1 District between 40th and 41st Avenues and between 45th and 47th Avenues as mapped on Sectional Maps 5 SU and 6 SU. Within the Taraval Street Restaurant Subdistrict, Formula Retail Restaurants and Formula Retail Limited Restaurants are NP. Formula Retail Restaurants and Formula Retail Limited Restaurants are NP if located within one quarter of one mile from the Taraval Street Restaurant Subdistrict.

(4) ~~*[Note deleted.]*~~ *Canopy is P if required as a wind mitigation feature.*

(5) C if a Macro WTS Facility; P if a Micro WTS Facility.

(6) C in the area comprising all of that portion of the City and County commencing at the point of the intersection of the shoreline of the Pacific Ocean and a straight-line extension of Lincoln Way, and proceeding easterly along Lincoln Way to 17th Avenue, and proceeding southerly along 17th Avenue to Judah Street, and proceeding westerly along Judah Street to 19th Avenue, and proceeding southerly along 19th Avenue to Sloat Boulevard, and proceeding westerly along Sloat Boulevard, and following a straight-line extension of Sloat Boulevard to the shoreline of the Pacific Ocean and proceeding northerly along said line to the point of commencement.

(7) [Note deleted.]

(8) [Note deleted.]

(9) C within that portion of the City and County bounded as follows: commencing at the intersection of Arguello Boulevard and Frederick Street, then proceeding southerly along Arguello Boulevard to Carl Street, then proceeding easterly along Carl Street to Hillway Avenue, then proceeding southerly along Hillway Avenue to Parnassus Avenue, then proceeding easterly along Parnassus Avenue to Clayton Street, then proceeding northerly along Clayton Street to Frederick Street, then proceeding easterly along Frederick Street to

Buena Vista Avenue West, then proceeding generally northerly along Buena Vista Avenue West to Haight Street, then proceeding easterly along Haight Street to Baker Street, then proceeding northerly along Baker Street to Oak Street, then proceeding westerly along Oak Street to Stanyan Street, then proceeding southerly along Stanyan Street to Frederick Street, then proceeding westerly along Frederick Street to the point of commencement.

(10) FRINGE FINANCIAL SERVICE RESTRICTED USE DISTRICT (FFSRUD). Fringe Financial Services are NP within any FFSRUD and its one-quarter mile buffer pursuant to Section 249.35. Outside any FFSRUD and its one-quarter mile buffer, Fringe Financial Services are P subject to the restrictions set forth in Section 249.35(c)(3).

(11) NP for buildings with three or fewer Dwelling Units. C for buildings with 10 or more Dwelling Units.

(12) P if accessory to a Hotel, Personal Service or Health Service.

(13) P where existing use is any Automotive Use.

SEC. 711. NC-2 – SMALL-SCALE NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT.

The NC-2 District is intended to serve as the City's Small-Scale Neighborhood Commercial District. These districts are linear shopping streets which provide convenience goods and services to the surrounding neighborhoods as well as limited comparison shopping goods for a wider market. The range of comparison goods and services offered is varied and often includes specialty retail stores, restaurants, and neighborhood-serving offices. NC-2 Districts are commonly located along both collector and arterial streets which have transit routes.

These districts range in size from two or three blocks to many blocks, although the commercial development in longer districts may be interspersed with housing or other land uses. Buildings typically range in height from two to four stories with occasional one-story

commercial buildings.

The small-scale district controls provide for mixed-use buildings which approximate or slightly exceed the standard development pattern. Rear yard requirements above the ground story and at residential levels preserve open space corridors of interior blocks.

Most new commercial development is permitted at the ground and second stories. Neighborhood-serving businesses are strongly encouraged. ~~*The second story may be used by some retail stores, personal services, and medical, business and professional offices.*~~ Parking and hotels are monitored at all stories. Limits on late-night activity, drive-up facilities, and other automobile uses protect the livability within and around the district, and promote continuous retail frontage.

Housing development in new buildings is encouraged above the ground ~~*story*~~*floor*. ~~*Existing residential units are protected by limitations on demolition and upper-story conversions.*~~ Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted ~~*within the District pursuant to Section 207.1 of this Code*~~.

Table 711 SMALL-SCALE NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL CLUSTER DISTRICT NC-2

ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		NC-2
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
Height and Bulk Limits.	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250–252, 260,	Varies~~*, but generally 40-X*~~. See Height and Bulk Map Sheets HT10-13 for more information. Height sculpting required on Alleys per § 261.1.

	261.1, *263.19,* 270, *270.3,* 271. See also Height and Bulk District Maps	
5 Foot Height Bonus for Active Ground Floor Uses	§ 263.20	P(1) in some districts
Rear Yard	§§ 130, 134, 134(a)(e), 136	Required at the Second Story and at each succeeding level or Story of the building, and at the First Story if it contains a Dwelling Unit: 25% of lot depth, but in no case less than 15 feet
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	Not Required.
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally ~~N~~not ~~R~~required~~.~~; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).*
Street Frontage and Public Realm		

Streetscape and Pedestrian Improvements	§ 138.1	Required.
Street Frontage Requirements	§ 145.1	Required; controls apply to above-grade parking setbacks, parking and loading entrances, active uses, ground floor ceiling height, street-facing ground-level spaces, transparency and fenestration, and gates, railings, and grillwork. Exceptions permitted for historic buildings.
Ground Floor Commercial	§ 145.4	Required on some streets, see § 145.4 for specific districts.
Vehicular Access Restrictions	§ 155(r)	Restricted on some streets, see § 155(r) for specific districts
Miscellaneous		
Lot Size (Per Development)	§§ 102, 121.1	P(2)
Planned Unit Development	§ 304	C
Awning, Canopy or Marquee	§ 136.1	P
General Advertising Signs	§§ 262, 602, 604, 608, 609, 610, 611	NP
Signs	§§ 262, 602-	As permitted by § 607.1

	604, 607, 607.1, 608, 609	
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
Usable Open Space [Per Dwelling Unit]	§§ 135, 136	100 square feet if private, or 133 square feet if common, or the amount of open space required in the nearest Residential District, whichever is less.
Off-Street Parking Requirements	§§ 145.1, 150, 151, 153 - 156, 161, 166, 204.5	No car parking required. Maximum permitted per § 151. Bike parking required per §155.2. If car parking is provided, car share spaces are required when a project has 50 units or more per §166.
Dwelling Unit Mix	§ 207.7	Generally required for creation of 10 or more Dwelling Units. No less than 25% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least two Bedrooms, and no less than 10% of the

		total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least three Bedrooms.		
Use Characteristics				
Intermediate Length Occupancy	§§ 102, 202.10	P(12)		
Single Room Occupancy	§ 102	P		
Student Housing	§ 102	P		
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit ~~*Density*~~	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code ~~*Sections*~~*§§* 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Unit Density*,* *General*	§§ 102, 207	1 unit per 800 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater. ~~Form-Based Density applies within the R-4 Height and Bulk District (§§ 263.19, 270(i)).~~		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		

Group Housing Density	§208	1 bedroom per 275 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater. ~~Form-Based Density applies within the R-4 Height and Bulk District (§§ 263.19, 270(i)).~~		
Homeless Shelter Density	§§ 102, 208	Density limits regulated by the Administrative Code		
Senior Housing Density	§§102, 202.2(f), 207	P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location. ~~Form-Based Density applies within the R-4 Height and Bulk District (§§ 263.19, 270(i)).~~		
Loss of Dwelling Units*:* *Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~

~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124*, 207.9*	2.5 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
Use Size	§§ 102, 121.2	P up to 3,999 square feet; C 4,000 square feet and above		
Off-Street Parking Requirements	§§ 145.1, 150, 151, 153 - 156, 161, 166, 204.5	No car parking. Maximum permitted per § 151. Bike parking required per Section 155.2. Car share spaces required when a project has 25 or more parking spaces per § 166.		
Off-Street Freight Loading	§§ 150, 152, 153 - 155, 161, 204.5	None required if gross floor area is less than 10,000 square feet. Exceptions permitted per §§ 155 and 161.		
Commercial Use Characteristics				
Drive-up Facility	§ 102	NP		
Formula Retail	§ 102, 303.1	C		
Hours of Operation	§§ 102	P 6 a.m. - 2 a.m.; C 2 a.m. - 6 a.m.		
Maritime Use	§ 102	NP		
Open Air Sales	§§ 102, 703(b)	See § 703(b)		

Outdoor Activity Area	§§ 102, 145.2, 202.2	P if located in front or it complies with Section 202.2(a)(7); C if located elsewhere.		
Walk-up Facility	§ 102	P		
NON-RESIDENTIAL USES		**CONTROLS BY STORY**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd+**
Agricultural Use Category				
Agriculture, Industrial	§§ 102, 202.2(c)	NP	NP	NP
Agriculture, Large Scale Urban	§§ 102, 202.2(c)	C	C	C
Agriculture, Neighborhood	§§ 102, 202.2(c)	P	P	P
Automotive Use Category				
Automotive Uses*	§ 102	NP	NP	NP
Automotive Repair	§ 102	C	NP	NP
Automotive Service Station	§ 102	C	NP	NP
Electric Vehicle Charging Location	§§102, 202.2(b), 202.13	C(14)	C(14)	C(14)
Fleet Charging	§ 102	C	C	C
Gas Station	§§ 102, 187.1, 202.2(b)	C	NP	NP

Parking Garage, Private	§ 102	C		C	C
Parking Garage, Public	§ 102	C		C	C
Parking Lot, Private	§§ 102, 142, 156	C		C	C
Parking Lot, Public	§§ 102, 142, 156	C		C	C
Entertainment, Arts and Recreation Use Category					
Entertainment, Arts and Recreation Uses*	§ 102	NP		NP	NP
Arts Activities	§ 102	P		P	P
Entertainment, General	§ 102	P		P	NP
Entertainment, Nighttime	§ 102	P		NP	NP
Movie Theater	§§ 102, 202.4	P		P	P
Open Recreation Area	§ 102	C		C	C
Passive Outdoor Recreation	§ 102	C		C	C
Industrial Use Category					
Industrial Uses*	§§ 102, 202.2(d)	NP	NP	NP	NP
Institutional Use Category					
Institutional Uses*	§ 102	P		C	C

Child Care Facility	§ 102	P	P	P
Community Facility	§ 102	P	P	P
Hospital	§ 102	NP	NP	NP
Medical Cannabis Dispensary**	§§ 102, 202.2(e)	DR	DR	NP
Public Facilities	§ 102	P	P	P
Residential Care Facility	§ 102	P	P	P
Social Service or Philanthropic Facility	§ 102	P	P	P
Sales and Service Category				
Retail Sales and Service Uses*	§§ 102, 202.2(a), 202.3	P	P	NP
Adult Business	§ 102	NP	NP	NP
Adult Sex Venue	§ 102	NP	NP	NP
Animal Hospital	§ 102	P	P	NP
Bar	§§ 102, 202.2(a)	P(9)	NP	NP
Cannabis Retail	§§ 102, 202.2(a)	C	C	NP
Flexible Retail	§§ 102, 202.9	P	NP	NP
Hotel	§ 102	C	C	C

Kennel	§ 102	C	NP	NP
Liquor Store	§ 102	P(9)	NP	NP
Massage Establishment	§§ 102, 204, 303(n), 703	P(9)	C(13)	NP(13)
Massage, Foot/Chair	§ 102	P(9)	NP	NP
Mortuary	§ 102	NP	NP	NP
Motel	§§ 102, 202.2(a)	NP	NP	NP
Restaurant	§§ 102, 202.2(a)	P(4)	P(4)	NP
Restaurant, Limited	§§ 102, 202.2(a)	P(4)	P(4)	NP
Services, Financial	§ 102	P(5)	C(5)	NP
Services, Fringe Financial	§ 102	P(5)(6)	NP	NP
Services, Limited Financial	§ 102	P(5)	NP	NP
Services, Retail Professional	§ 102	P	P	P
Storage, Self	§ 102	NP	NP	NP
Tobacco Paraphernalia Establishment	§ 102	C	NP	NP
Trade Shop	§ 102	P	C	NP
Non-Retail Sales and	§ 102	NP	NP	NP

Service Uses				
Design Professional	§ 102	P	P	NP
Service, Non-Retail Professional	§ 102	C	P	NP
Trade Office	§ 102	P	P	NP
Utility and Infrastructure Use Category				
Utility and Infrastructure*	§ 102	C(7)	C(7)	C(7)
Power Plant	§ 102	NP	NP	NP
Public Utilities Yard	§ 102	NP	NP	NP

* Not listed below

(1) Additional 5 feet for NC-2 parcels zoned 40' or 50' with an Active Use on the ground floor within the following areas: Balboa Street between 2nd Avenue and 8th Avenue, and between 32nd Avenue and 39th Avenue.

(2) C for 10,000 square feet and above if located within the Priority Equity Geographies Special Use District established under Section 249.97.

(3) [Note deleted.]

(4) TARAVAL STREET RESTAURANT SUBDISTRICT: Applicable only for the Taraval Street NC-2 District between 12th and 19th Avenues as mapped on Sectional Maps 5 SU and 6 SU. Formula Retail Restaurants and Limited-Restaurants are NP.

(5) CHESTNUT STREET FINANCIAL SERVICE SUBDISTRICT: C for properties on Chestnut Street zoned NC-2 from Broderick to Fillmore Streets as mapped on Sectional Map 2 SU.

(6) FRINGE FINANCIAL SERVICE RESTRICTED USE DISTRICT (FFSRUD): The FFSRUD and its one-quarter mile buffer includes, but is not limited to, properties within: the

Mission Alcoholic Beverage Special Use District; the Haight Street Alcohol Restricted Use District; the Third Street Alcohol Restricted Use District; and the North of Market Residential Special Use District; and includes Small-Scale Neighborhood Commercial Districts within its boundaries.

Controls: Fringe Financial Services are NP within any FFSRUD and its one-quarter mile buffer pursuant to Section 249.35. Outside any FFSRUD and its one-quarter mile buffer, Fringe Financial Services are P subject to the restrictions set forth in Section 249.35(c)(3).

(7) C if a Macro WTS Facility; P if a Micro WTS Facility.

(8) P in the area comprising all of that portion of the City and County commencing at the point of the intersection of the shoreline of the Pacific Ocean and a straight-line extension of Lincoln Way, and proceeding easterly along Lincoln Way to 17th Avenue, and proceeding southerly along 17th Avenue to Judah Street, and proceeding westerly along Judah Street to 19th Avenue, and proceeding southerly along 19th Avenue to Sloat Boulevard, and proceeding westerly along Sloat Boulevard, and following a straight-line extension of Sloat Boulevard to the shoreline of the Pacific Ocean and proceeding northerly along said line to the point of commencement.

(9) C in the area comprising all of that portion of the City and County commencing at the point of the intersection of the shoreline of the Pacific Ocean and a straight-line extension of Lincoln Way, and proceeding easterly along Lincoln Way to 17th Avenue, and proceeding southerly along 17th Avenue to Judah Street, and proceeding westerly along Judah Street to 19th Avenue, and proceeding southerly along 19th Avenue to Sloat Boulevard, and proceeding westerly along Sloat Boulevard, and following a straight-line extension of Sloat Boulevard to the shoreline of the Pacific Ocean and proceeding northerly along said line to the point of commencement.

(10) [Note deleted.]

(11) [Note deleted.]

(12) NP for buildings with three or fewer Dwelling Units. C for buildings with 10 or more Dwelling Units.

(13) P if accessory to a Hotel~~,~~ Personal Service or Health Service, except C if accessory to a Hotel, Personal Service or Health Service within the boundaries described in note 9 to this Table.

(14) P where existing use is any Automotive Use.

SEC. 712. NC-3 – MODERATE-SCALE NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT.

NC-3 Districts are intended in most cases to offer a wide variety of comparison and specialty goods and services to a population greater than the immediate neighborhood, additionally providing convenience goods and services to the surrounding neighborhoods. NC-3 Districts are linear districts located along heavily trafficked thoroughfares which also serve as major transit routes.

NC-3 Districts include some of the longest linear commercial streets in the City, some of which have continuous retail development for many blocks. Large-scale lots and buildings and wide streets distinguish the districts from smaller-scaled commercial streets, although the districts may include small as well as moderately scaled lots. Buildings typically range in height from two to four stories with occasional taller structures.

NC-3 building standards permit moderately large commercial uses and buildings. Rear yards are protected at residential levels.

A diversified commercial environment is encouraged for the NC-3 District, and a wide variety of uses are permitted with special emphasis on neighborhood-serving businesses. Eating and drinking, entertainment, financial service and certain auto uses generally are

permitted with certain limitations at the first and second stories. Other retail businesses, personal services and offices are permitted at all stories of new buildings. Limited storage and administrative service activities are permitted with some restrictions.

Housing development in new buildings is encouraged above the second story. ~~*Existing residential units are protected by limitations on demolitions and upper-story conversions.*~~ Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted ~~*within the District pursuant to Section 207.1 of this Code*~~.

Table 712. MODERATE-SCALE NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT NC-3

ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		NC-3
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
Height and Bulk Limits	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250–252, 260, 261.1, *263.19,* 270, *270.3,* 271. See also Height and Bulk District Maps	Varies~~*, but generally 40-X*~~. See Height and Bulk Map Sheets HT01-04, HT07, HT08, HT10, and HT11 for more information. Height sculpting required on Alleys per § 261.1.
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ *130,* 131, 132, 133	*Generally* ~~*N*~~not ~~*R*~~required~~.~~*; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width*

		required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
* * * *		

Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit ~~*Density*~~	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code *§§Sections* ~~*and 207(c)(6)*~~ 207.1 and 207.2.		

Dwelling Unit Density, *General*	§§ 102, 207	1 unit per 600 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater. ~~Form-Based Density applies within the R-4 Height and Bulk District (§§ 263.19, 270(i)).~~
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*
Group Housing Density	§208	1 bedroom per 275 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater. ~~Form-Based Density applies within the R-4 Height and Bulk District (§§ 263.19, 270(i)).~~
* * * *		
Senior Housing Density	§§102, 202.2(f), 207	P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of §

		202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location. ~~Form-Based Density applies within the R-4 Height and Bulk District (§§ 263.19, 270(i)).~~		
Loss of Dwelling Units*:* *Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C(2)*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C(2)*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS *AND USES*				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124*, 207.9*	3.6 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* * * *

(2) THIRD FLOOR RESIDENTIAL CONVERSION:

Boundaries: Applicable to NC-3 Districts.

Controls: A residential use may be converted to an Institutional Use, other than a Medical Cannabis Dispensary, as a Conditional Use on the third story and above if in addition to the criteria set forth in Section ~~*303*~~*317*, the Commission finds that:

(a) The structure in which the residential use is to be converted has been found eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places;

(b) The proposed use is to be operated by a nonprofit public benefit corporation; and

(c) No legally residing residential tenants will be displaced.

* * * *

SEC. 713. NC-S – NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL SHOPPING CENTER DISTRICT.

NC-S Districts are intended to serve as small shopping centers or supermarket sites which provide retail goods and services for primarily car-oriented shoppers. They commonly contain at least one anchor store or supermarket, and some districts also have small medical office buildings. The range of services offered at their retail outlets usually is intended to serve the immediate and nearby neighborhoods. These districts encompass some of the most recent (post-1945) retail development in San Francisco's neighborhoods and serve as an alternative to the linear shopping street.

Shopping centers and supermarket sites contain mostly one-story buildings which are removed from the street edge and set in a parking lot. Outdoor pedestrian activity consists primarily of trips between the parking lot and the stores on-site. Ground and second stories are devoted to retail sales and some personal services and offices.

The NC-S standards and use provisions allow for medium-size commercial uses ~~*in low-scale buildings*~~. ~~*Rear yards are not required for new development.*~~ Most neighborhood-serving retail businesses are permitted at the first and second stories.

Housing development in new buildings is permitted. ~~*Existing residential units are protected by limitations on demolitions and prohibitions of upper-story conversions.*~~ Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted ~~*within the District pursuant to Section 207.1 of this Code*~~.

Table 713. NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL SHOPPING CENTER DISTRICT NC-S

ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		NC-S
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
Height and Bulk Limits	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250–252, 260, *263.19,* 261.1, 270, *270.3,* 271. See also Height and Bulk District Maps	Varies~~*, but generally 40-X*~~. See Height and Bulk Map Sheets HT02-05, HT07, and HT10-13 for more information. Height sculpting required on Alleys per §261.1.
* * * *		
Rear Yard	§§ 130, 134, 134(a)(e), 136	~~*Not Required.*~~*Required at the Second Story and at each succeeding level or Story of the building, and at the First Story if it contains a Dwelling Unit: 25% of lot depth, but in no case less than 15 feet.*
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ *130,* 131, 132, 133	*Generally* ~~*N*~~*n*ot ~~*R*~~*r*equired~~.~~*; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the*

		existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).			
* * * *					
Miscellaneous					
* * * *					
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*			
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*			
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES					
Development Standards					
* * * *					
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**			
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**	
Residential Uses	§102	P	P	P	
Accessory Dwelling Unit ~~*Density*~~	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code ~~*Sections*~~*§§* 207.1 and 207.2.			
Dwelling Unit Density*, General*	§§ 102, 207	1 unit per 800 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is			

			greater. ~~Form-Based Density applies within the R-4 Height and Bulk District (§§ 263.19, 270(i)).~~
	Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*
	Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*
	Group Housing Density	§208	1 bedroom per 275 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater. ~~Form-Based Density applies within the R-4 Height and Bulk District (§§ 263.19, 270(i)).~~
	* * * *		
	Senior Housing Density	§§102, 202.2(f), 207	P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.

		~~Form-Based Density applies within the R-4 Height and Bulk District (§§ 263.19, 270(i)).~~		
Loss of Dwelling Units*:* *Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~	~~*NP*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS *AND USES*				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124*, 207.9*	1.8 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* * * *

SEC. 714. BROADWAY NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT.

* * * *

Table 714. BROADWAY NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT

ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Broadway NCD
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**

BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally* ~~*N*~~not ~~*R*~~required~~.~~*; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).*
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	~~*Subject to the*~~ Urban Design Guidelines*,* ~~*and*~~ *Citywide Design Standards,* historic resource consideration*, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission*. Properties in this District have been identified as potentially eligible for the National Register or California Register.
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
* * * *		

Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit ~~*Density*~~	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code ~~*Sections*~~*§§* 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Unit Density*, General*	§§ 102, 207	1 unit per 400 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		
Group Housing Density	§ 208	1 bedroom per 140 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.		
* * * *				
Loss of Dwelling Units*: Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~

~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124, *207.9*	2.5 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* * * *

SEC. 715. CASTRO STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT.

* * * *

(b) **Intent of Controls.** The Castro Street District controls are designed to *accommodate various scales of* ~~*maintain existing small-scale*~~ development and promote a balanced mix of uses. Building standards permit small- *and mid-*scale buildings and uses and protect rear yards above the ground story and at residential levels. In new buildings, most commercial uses are permitted at the ground and second stories. Special controls are necessary to preserve the existing equilibrium of neighborhood-serving convenience and specialty commercial uses. In order to maintain convenience stores and protect adjacent residential livability, controls authorize some additional drinking establishments with a conditional use, permit self-service specialty food establishments, and permit with certain limitations new late-night uses, adult and other entertainment, and financial service uses. The continuous retail frontage is maintained by prohibiting most automobile and drive-up uses. Housing development in new buildings is encouraged above the second story. ~~*Existing housing units are protected by limitations on demolitions and upper-story conversions.*~~ Accessory Dwelling Units are

permitted ~~*within the district pursuant to Section 207.1 of this Code*~~.

Table 715. CASTRO STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT

ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Castro Street NCD
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
Height and Bulk Limits	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250–252, ~~*253.1,*~~ 260, *263.19,* 261.1, 270, *270.3,* 271. See also Height and Bulk District Maps	~~*40-X, 65-B.*~~*Varies.* See Height and Bulk Map Sheet HT07 for more information. Height Sculpting on Alleys per § 261.1.
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally* ~~*N*~~*n*ot ~~*R*~~*r*equired~~.~~*; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan.*

		This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
* * * *		

Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit ~~*Density*~~	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code ~~*Sections*~~*§§* 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Unit Density*, General*	§§ 102, 207	~~*1 unit per 600 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. 1 unit per 600 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.		

Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*
Group Housing Density	§208	~~*Up to 1 bedroom per 210 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. Up to 1 bedroom per 210 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.
* * * *		
Senior Housing Density	§§102, 202.2(f), 207	~~*P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.*~~Form-Based Density. P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in

		the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.		
Loss of Dwelling Units*:* *Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124*, 207.9*	3.0 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* * * *

SEC. 716. INNER CLEMENT STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT.

The Inner Clement Street *Neighborhood* Commercial District is located on Clement Street between Arguello Boulevard and Funston Avenue in the eastern portion of the Richmond District of northwest San Francisco. The ~~*d*~~*D*istrict provides a wide selection of convenience goods and services for the residents of the Inner Richmond neighborhood. Inner Clement Street has one of the greatest concentrations of restaurants of any commercial street

in San Francisco, drawing customers from throughout the City and region. There are also a significant number of professional, realty, and business offices as well as financial institutions. The pleasant pedestrian character of the district is derived directly from the intensely active retail frontage on Clement Street.

The ~~*Inner Clement Street*~~ District controls are designed to promote development that is consistent with its existing land use patterns and to maintain a harmony of uses that supports the ~~*d*~~*D*istrict's vitality. The building standards allow small-*to mid*-scale buildings and uses, protecting rear yards above the ground story and at residential levels. In new development, most commercial uses are permitted at the first two stories, although certain limitations apply to uses at the second story. Special controls are necessary to preserve the equilibrium of neighborhood-serving convenience and comparison shopping businesses and protect adjacent residential livability. These controls limit additional financial service uses, additional eating and drinking establishments, and late-night commercial uses. In order to maintain the street's active retail frontage, controls also prohibit most new automobile and drive-up uses.

Housing development is encouraged in new buildings above the ground story. ~~*Existing residential units are protected by prohibitions on upper-story conversions and limitations on demolitions.*~~ Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted ~~*within the district pursuant to Section 207.1 of this Code*~~.

Table 716. INNER CLEMENT STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Inner Clement Street
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		

Height and Bulk Limits	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250–252, 260, *263.19,* 261.1, 270, *270.3,* 271. See also Height and Bulk District Maps	~~*40-X.*~~ *Varies.* See Height and Bulk Map Sheet HT03 for more information. Height sculpting required on Alleys per § 261.1.
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally* ~~*N*~~*n*ot ~~*R*~~*r*equired~~.~~*; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).*
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning*

	Element	*Commission.*		
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*		
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
* * * *				
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit ~~*Density*~~	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code ~~*Sections*~~*§§* 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Unit Density*, General*	§§ 102, 207	~~*1 unit per 600 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. 1 unit per 600 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		
Group Housing Density	§208	~~*Up to 1 bedroom per 210 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever*~~		

		~~*is greater*~~.~~Form-Based Density~~. Up to 1 bedroom per 210 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.
* * * *		
Senior Housing Density	§§102, 202.2(f), 207	~~*P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.*~~Form-Based ~~Density~~. P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.
Loss of Dwelling Units*: Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*

		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~	~~*NP*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124, *207.9*	1.8 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* * * *

SEC. 717. OUTER CLEMENT STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT.

The Outer Clement Street Neighborhood Commercial District is located on Clement Street between 19th Avenue and 27th Avenue in the western portion of the Richmond District. The shopping area contains small-scale convenience businesses, as well as many restaurants and a movie theater. The ~~*d*~~*D*istrict's restaurants serve a neighborhood and Citywide clientele during the evening hours, while convenience shopping uses cater for the most part to daytime neighborhood shoppers. Outer Clement Street contains many mixed-use buildings with some fully commercial and fully residential buildings interspersed between them.

The Outer Clement Street District controls are designed to promote development that is in keeping with the ~~*d*~~*D*istrict's existing small-scale, mixed-use character. The building standards ~~*monitor*~~*guide* large-scale development and protect rear yards at all levels. Future commercial growth is directed to the ground story in order to promote more continuous and

active retail frontage. Additional eating and drinking establishments are regulated to prevent over-concentration, while ground-story entertainment and financial service uses are monitored in order to limit the problems of traffic, congestion, noise and late-night activity associated with such uses and to protect existing neighborhood-serving businesses. Other controls restricting late-night activity, hotels, automobile uses, and drive-up facilities are designed to preserve the low-intensity character of the district.

Housing development in new buildings is encouraged above the ground story. ~~*Existing residential units are protected by prohibitions of upper-story conversions and limitations on demolitions.*~~ Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted ~~*within the district pursuant to Section 207.1 of this Code*~~.

Table 717. OUTER CLEMENT STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Outer Clement Street
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
Height and Bulk Limits	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250–252, 260, *263.19,* 261.1, 270, *270.3,* 271. See also Height and	~~*40-X.*~~ *Varies.* See Height and Bulk Map Sheet HT03 and HT04 for more information. Height sculpting required on Alleys per § 261.1.

	Bulk District Maps	
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally ~~Nn~~*not *~~Rr~~*equired*~~.~~; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).*
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
* * * *		

Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit ~~*Density*~~	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code ~~*Sections*~~*§§* 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Unit Density*, General*	§§ 102, 207	~~*1 unit per 600 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. 1 unit per 600 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		
Group Housing Density	§208	~~*1 bedroom per 210 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. 1 bedroom per 210 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.		
* * * *				
Senior Housing Density	§§102, 202.2(f), 207	~~*P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to*~~		

			~~*twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.*~~ ~~Form-Based Density.~~ P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.		
Loss of Dwelling Units*: Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~	~~*NP*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124*, 207.9*	1.8 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		

* * * *

* * * *

SEC. 718. UPPER FILLMORE STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT.

The Upper Fillmore Street Neighborhood Commercial District is situated in the south-central portion of Pacific Heights. It runs north-south along Fillmore Street from Jackson to Bush and extends west one block along California and Pine Streets. This medium-scaled, multi-purpose commercial district provides convenience goods to its immediate neighborhood as well as comparison shopping goods and services on a specialized basis to a wider trade area. Commercial businesses are active during both day and evening and include a number of bars, restaurants, specialty groceries, and specialty clothing stores.

The Upper Fillmore District controls are designed to ~~*protect*~~ *reflect* the existing building scale and promote new mixed-use development which is in character with adjacent buildings. Building standards regulate large lot and use development and protect rear yards above the ground story and at residential levels. Most commercial uses are permitted at the first two stories of new buildings. Special controls are designed to preserve ~~*the existing*~~*an* equilibrium of neighborhood-serving convenience and specialty commercial uses. In order to maintain convenience stores and protect adjacent livability, additional bars (unless part of a restaurant) and formula retail establishments are prohibited, and financial service uses are limited. In order to promote continuous retail frontage, drive-up and most automobile uses are prohibited.

Housing development in new buildings is encouraged above the second story. ~~*Existing residential units are protected by limitations on demolitions and upper-story conversions.*~~ Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted ~~*within the district pursuant to Section 207.1 of this Code*~~.

Table 718. UPPER FILLMORE STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Upper Fillmore Street NCD
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
Height and Bulk Limits.	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250–252, 260, *263.19,* 261.1, 270, *270.3,* 271. See also Height and Bulk District Maps	~~*40-X.*~~ *Varies.* See Height and Bulk Map Sheet HT02 for more information. Height sculpting required on Alleys per § 261.1.
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally* ~~*N*~~*n*ot ~~*R*~~*r*equired~~.~~*; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan.*

		This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
* * * *		

Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit ~~*Density*~~	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code ~~*Sections*~~*§§* 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Unit Density*, General*	§§ 102, 207	~~*1 unit per 600 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~ ~~Form-Based Density.~~ 1 unit per 600 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.		

Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*
Group Housing Density	§208	~~*Up to 1 bedroom per 210 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~~~Form-Based Density.~~Up to 1 bedroom per 210 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.
* * * *		
Senior Housing Density	§§102, 202.2(f), 207	~~*P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.*~~~~Form-Based Density.~~ P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in

		the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.		
Loss of Dwelling Units: *Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124, *207.9*	2.5 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* * * *

SEC. 719. HAIGHT STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT.

Northwest of the City's geographical center, the Haight Street Neighborhood Commercial District is located in the Haight-Ashbury neighborhood, extending along Haight Street between Stanyan and Central Avenue, including a portion of Stanyan Street between Haight and Beulah. The shopping area provides convenience goods and services to local Haight-Ashbury residents, as well as comparison shopping goods and services to a larger

market area. The commercial district is also frequented by users of Golden Gate Park on weekends and by City residents for its eating, drinking, and entertainment places. Numerous housing units establish the ~~*d*~~*D*istrict's mixed residential-commercial character.

The Haight Street District controls are designed to ~~*protect*~~ *reflect* the existing building scale and promote new mixed-use development which is in character with adjacent buildings. The building standards regulate large-lot and use development and protect rear yards above the ground story and at residential levels. To promote the prevailing mixed-use character, most commercial uses are directed primarily to the ground story with some upper-story restrictions in new buildings. In order to maintain the balanced mix and variety of neighborhood-serving commercial uses and regulate the more intensive commercial uses which can generate congestion and nuisance problems, special controls limit additional drinking uses and tourist hotels. Prohibitions of most automobile and drive-up uses protect the ~~*d*~~*D*istrict's continuous retail frontage.

Housing development in new buildings is encouraged above the ground story. ~~*Existing residential units are protected by prohibition of upper-story conversions and limitations on demolitions.*~~ Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted ~~*within the district pursuant to Section 207.1 of this Code*~~.

Table 719. HAIGHT STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT

ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Haight Street NCD
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
Height and Bulk Limits.	§§ 102, 105,	~~*40-X.*~~ *Varies.* See Height and Bulk Map Sheets

	106, 250–252, 260, *263.19,* 261.1, 270, *270.3,* 271. See also Height and Bulk District Maps	HT06 and HT07 for more information. Height sculpting required on Alleys per § 261.1.
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally* ~~N~~not ~~R~~required~~.~~*; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).*
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*

Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*		
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
* * * *				
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit ~~*Density*~~	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code ~~*Sections*~~*§§* 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Unit Density*, General*	§§ 102, 207	~~*1 unit per 600 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. 1 unit per 600 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		
Group Housing Density	§208	~~*1 bedroom per 210 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density 1 bedroom per 210		

		square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.			
* * * *					
Senior Housing Density	§§102, 202.2(f), 207	~~*P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.*~~Form Based Density. P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.			
Loss of Dwelling Units*: Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*			
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~	
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~	~~*NP*~~	

~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124, *207.9*	1.8 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* * * *

SEC. 720. EXCELSIOR OUTER MISSION NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT.

* * * *

Table 720. EXCELSIOR OUTER MISSION STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT

ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Excelsior Outer Mission NCD
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally* ~~*N*~~not ~~*R*~~required~~.~~*; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to*

		the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).			
* * * *					
Miscellaneous					
* * * *					
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*			
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES					
Development Standards					
* * * *					
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**			
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**	
Residential Uses	§102	P	P	P	
Accessory Dwelling Unit	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code ~~*Sections*~~*§§* 207.1 and 207.2.			
Dwelling Unit~~s~~ *Density, General*	§§ 102, 207	1 unit per 600 square foot lot area			
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*			
Maximum Dwelling Unit	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an*			

Size		*equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		
Group Housing Density	§ 208	1 bedroom per 210 square foot lot area.		
* * * *				
Loss of Dwelling Units*: Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124*, 207.9*	3.6 to 1*. For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* * * *

SEC. 721. JAPANTOWN NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT.

* * * *

Table 721. JAPANTOWN NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT

ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Japantown NCD
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally ~~N~~not ~~R~~required~~.~~; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).*
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
* * * *		
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**

		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code ~~*Sections*~~§§ 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Unit Density, *General*	§§ 102, 207	1 unit per 400 square foot lot area.		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		
Group Housing Density	§ 208	1 bedroom per 210 square foot lot area.		
* * * *				
Loss of Dwelling Units: *Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				

Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124, *207.9*	3.6 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*
* * * *		

* * * *

SEC. 722. NORTH BEACH NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT.

The North Beach Neighborhood Commercial District is a nonlinear district centered on Columbus Avenue, located in the valley between Telegraph Hill and Russian Hill north of Broadway. North Beach functions as a neighborhood-serving marketplace, ~~c~~*C*itywide specialty shopping, and dining district, and a tourist attraction, as well as an apartment and residential hotel zone. Traditionally, the ~~d~~*D*istrict has provided most convenience goods and services for residents of North Beach and portions of Telegraph and Russian Hills. North Beach's eating, drinking, and entertainment establishments remain open into the evening to serve a much wider trade area and attract many tourists. The balance between neighborhood-serving convenience stores and Citywide specialty businesses has shifted, as convenience stores have been replaced by restaurants and bars. The proliferation of financial services, limited financial services, and professional services has also upset the ~~d~~*D*istrict's balance of uses. The relocation of business and professional offices from downtown to North Beach threatens the loss of upper-story residential units.

* * * *

In keeping with the ~~d~~*D*istrict's existing mixed-use character, housing development in new buildings is encouraged above the ground floor. Existing residential units are protected by ~~*prohibitions*~~*limitations* of upper-story conversions, mergers, removals, and demolitions. ~~*Per Section 207.1 of this Code,*~~ Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted within the existing building envelope, but may not eliminate or reduce ground-story retail or commercial space.

Table 722. NORTH BEACH NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT

ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		North Beach NCD
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
Height and Bulk Limits.	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250–252, 260, *263.19,* 261.1, 270, *270.3,* 271. See also Height and Bulk District Maps	~~*40-X.*~~ *Varies.* See Height and Bulk Map Sheet HT01 for more information. Height sculpting required on Alleys per § 261.1.
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally* ~~*N*~~not ~~*R*~~required~~.~~*; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street*

		grade. See § 132(e).
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the ~~*General Plan's*~~ Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards,* ~~*and*~~ historic resource consideration*, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission*. Properties in this District have been identified as potentially eligible for National Register or California Register.
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
* * * *		

Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	NP(11)	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Units	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code ~~*Sections*~~*§§* 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Unit~~s~~ *Density, General*	§§ 102, 207	1 unit per 400 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.		

		~~Form-Based Density applies within the R-4 Height and Bulk District (§§ 263.19, 270(i)).~~
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*
Group Housing *Density*	§208	1 bedroom per 140 square foot lot area*, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater*. ~~Form-Based Density applies within the R-4 Height and Bulk District (§§ 263.19, 270(i)).~~
* * * *		
Senior Housing *Density*	§§102, 202.2(f), 207	P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.

		~~Form-Based Density applies within the R-4 Height and Bulk District (§§ 263.19, 270(i)).~~		
Loss of Dwelling Units*:* *Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§§ 317, 780.3(c)(4)*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~	~~*NP*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§§ 317, 780.3(c)(4)*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~	~~*NP*~~
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124*, 207.9*	1.8 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* Not listed below

(1) NORTH BEACH OFF-STREET PARKING, RESIDENTIAL (Section 155(t))

* * * *

(a) Installing a garage in an existing or proposed residential building of two or more units requires a mandatory Discretionary Review by the Planning Commission. In order to approve the installation of any garage in these districts, the City shall find that:

* * * *

(iv) the garage would not front on an Alley pursuant to Section 155(r)(~~2~~*21*) of this

Code or on a public right-of-way narrower than 41 feet, and

* * * *

SEC. 723. POLK STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT.

* * * *

(b) Controls.

(1) **Purposes.** The Polk Street District controls are designed to encourage and promote development that is compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. The building standards ~~*monitor*~~*guide* large-scale development and protect rear yards at residential levels. Consistent with Polk Street's existing mixed-use character, new buildings may contain most commercial uses at the First Story. The controls encourage neighborhood-serving businesses. They also prohibit new adult entertainment uses. Restrictions on drive-up and most automobile uses protect the district's continuous retail frontage and prevent further traffic congestion.

Housing developed in new buildings is encouraged above the First Story, especially in the less intensely developed portions of the district along Larkin Street and on large lots throughout the district. New housing development requires 40% or more two-bedroom plus units to encourage families to live in the district. Parking is limited in new developments given the ~~*d*~~*D*istrict's transit access and the proximity to bus rapid transit along Van Ness Avenue parallel to the district. ~~*Existing housing units are protected by on demolitions and upper-story conversions.*~~ Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted ~~*within the district pursuant to Section 207.1 of this Code*~~.

* * * *

~~*(4) **Loss of Residential Units.** To prevent the loss of existing Residential Units, the removal, demolition, merger, or conversion of Residential Units above the First Story are prohibited*~~

~~*even if such loss of Residential Units would otherwise be allowed pursuant to Section 317 of this Code.*~~

(~~5~~4) **Neighborhood Commercial Design Guidelines.** The construction of new buildings and alteration of existing buildings in the Polk Street NC District shall be consistent with the design policies and guidelines of the General Plan and with the "Polk/Pacific Special Area Design Guidelines" as adopted by the Planning Commission. The Planning Director may require modifications to the exterior of a proposed new building or proposed alteration of an existing residential building in order to bring it into conformity with the *Citywide Design Standards,* "Polk/Pacific Special Area Design Guidelines" and with the General Plan. These modifications may include, but are not limited to, changes in siting, building envelope, scale texture and detailing, openings, and landscaping.

Table 723. POLK STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Polk Street NCD
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
Height and Bulk Limits.	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250–252, 260, *263.19,* 261.1, 270, *270.3,* 271. See also Height and Bulk District	*Varies.* ~~*65-A, 80-A, and 130-E.*~~ See Height and Bulk Map Sheet HT02 for more information. Height sculpting required on Alleys per § 261.1.

	Maps	
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally ~~N~~not ~~R~~required~~.~~; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).*
~~*Streetscape and Pedestrian Improvements*~~	~~*§ 138.1*~~	~~*Required.*~~
Street Frontage and Public Realm		
Streetscape and Pedestrian Improvements	*§ 138.1*	*Required.*
Street Frontage Requirements	§ 145.1	Required; controls apply to above-grade parking setbacks, parking and loading entrances, active uses, ground floor ceiling height, street-facing ground-level spaces, transparency and fenestration, and gates, railings, and grillwork. Exceptions permitted for historic buildings.
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		

Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element and the Polk/Pacific Special Area Design Guidelines	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, ~~and~~* the Polk/Pacific Special Area Design Guidelines*, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission*.		
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*		
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
* * * *				
Dwelling Unit Mix	§ 207.6	Generally *~~R~~r*equired for creation of five or more Dwelling Units. No less than 40% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least two bedrooms; or no less than 30% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least three bedrooms.		
* * * *				
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P	P	P

Accessory Dwelling Units	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code ~~*Sections*~~*§§* 207.1 and 207.2.
Dwelling Unit~~s~~ *Density, General*	§§ 102, 207	~~*1 unit per 400 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. 1 unit per 400 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*
~~*Residential Density,*~~ Group Housing *Density*	§208	~~*1 bedroom per 140 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. 1 bedroom per 140 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.
* * * *		
Senior Housing *Density*	§§102, 202.2(f), 207	~~*P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for §*~~

			~~202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.~~~~Form-Based Density.~~ P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.		
Loss *~~and Division~~* of Dwelling Units*:* *Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	*~~Controls by Story~~C*		
		~~1st~~	*~~2nd~~*	*~~3rd+~~*
~~Residential Conversion~~	*~~§ 317~~*	*~~NP~~*	*~~NP~~*	*~~NP~~*
~~Residential Demolition and Merger~~	*~~§ 317~~*	*~~NP~~*	*~~NP~~*	*~~NP~~*
Division of Dwelling Units	§ 207.8	Division of existing Dwelling Units P per § 207.8.		
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES (7)				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124, *207.9*	2.5 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		

* * * *

* * * *

SEC. 724. SACRAMENTO STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT.

Located in the Presidio Heights neighborhood in north-central San Francisco, the Sacramento Street Neighborhood Commercial District functions as a small-scale linear shopping area. It extends along Sacramento Street between Lyon and Spruce Streets. Interspersed among residential buildings and garages, the district's daytime-oriented retail stores provide a limited array of convenience goods to the immediate neighborhood. Sacramento Street also has many elegant clothing, accessory, and antique stores and services, such as hair salons, which attract customers from a wider trade area. Its numerous medical and business offices draw clients from throughout the City. Evening activity in the district is limited to one movie theater, a few restaurants, and some stores near Presidio Avenue.

The Sacramento Street District controls are designed to promote adequate growth opportunities for development that is compatible with the surrounding low-density residential neighborhood. The building standards ~~*monitor*~~*guide* large-scale development and protect rear yards at the grade level and above. Most new commercial development is permitted at the first story; *a conditional use authorization is required if a* general retail use~~*s are permitted at the second story only if such use*~~ would ~~*not*~~ involve conversion of any existing housing units. Special controls are designed to protect existing neighborhood-serving ground-story retail uses. Limits on financial service uses are intended to minimize the environmental impacts generated by the growth of such uses. The daytime orientation of the ~~*d*~~*D*istrict is encouraged by requiring

conditional use authorization for bars and restricting late-night commercial activity. New hotels and parking facilities are limited in scale and operation to minimize disruption to the neighborhood. Most new automobile and drive-up uses are prohibited to promote continuous retail frontage.

Housing development in new buildings is encouraged above the second story. ~~*Existing residential units are protected by limitations on demolitions and prohibitions of upper-story conversions.*~~ Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted ~~*within the district pursuant to Section 207.1 of this Code*~~.

Table 724. SACRAMENTO STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Sacramento Street NCD
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
Height and Bulk Limits.	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250–252, 260, *263.19,* 261.1, 270, *270.3,* 271. See also Height and Bulk District Maps	*Varies.* ~~*40-X.*~~ See Height and Bulk Map Sheets HT02 and HT03 for more information. Height sculpting required on Alleys per § 261.1.
* * * *		

Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally Nnot Rrequired.; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).*		
* * * *				
Miscellaneous				
* * * *				
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*		
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*		
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
* * * *				
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P	P	P

Accessory Dwelling Unit~~s~~	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code ~~*Sections*~~§§ 207.1 and 207.2.
Dwelling Unit~~s~~ *Density, General*	§§ 102, 207	~~*1 unit per 800 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. 1 unit per 800 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*
Group Housing *Density*	§208	~~*1 bedroom per 275 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. 1 bedroom per 275 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.
* * * *		
Senior Housing *Density*	§§102, 202.2(f), 207	~~*P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for §*~~

			~~202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.~~~~Form-Based Density.~~ P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.		
Loss of Dwelling Units*:* *Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	*~~Controls by Story~~C*		
		~~1st~~	*~~2nd~~*	*~~3rd+~~*
~~Residential Conversion~~	*~~§ 317~~*	*~~C~~*	*~~NP~~*	*~~NP~~*
~~Residential Demolition and Merger~~	*~~§ 317~~*	*~~C~~*	*~~C~~*	*~~C~~*
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124, *207.9*	1.8 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* * * *

SEC. 725. UNION STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT.

* * * *

The Union Street District controls are designed to provide sufficient growth opportunities for commercial development that is in keeping with the existing scale and character, promote continuous retail frontage, and protect adjacent residential livability. Small-*to mid*-scale buildings and neighborhood-serving uses are promoted, and rear yards above the ground story and at all residential levels are protected. Most commercial development is permitted at the first two stories of new buildings, while retail service uses are monitored at the third story and above. Controls are necessary to preserve the remaining convenience businesses and to reduce the cumulative impacts which the growth of certain uses have on neighborhood residents. Such controls require Conditional Use authorization for additional drinking establishments and limit additional entertainment, and financial service uses. Most automobile and drive-up uses are prohibited in order to maintain continuous retail frontage and minimize further traffic congestion.

Housing development in new buildings is encouraged above the second story. ~~*Existing residential units are protected by limitations on demolitions and upper-story conversions.*~~ Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted ~~*within the district pursuant to Section 207.1 of this Code*~~.

Table 725. UNION STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT

ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Union Street NCD
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		

Height and Bulk Limits.	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250–252, 260, *263.19,* 261.1, 270, *270.3,* 271. See also Height and Bulk District Maps	*Varies.* ~~*40-X.*~~ See Height and Bulk Map Sheet HT02 for more information. Height sculpting required on Alleys per § 261.1.
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally* ~~*N*~~not ~~*R*~~required~~.~~*; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).*
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning*

	Element	*Commission.*		
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*		
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
* * * *				
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit~~s~~ *Density*	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code ~~*Sections*~~*§§* 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Unit~~s~~ *Density, General*	§§ 102, 207	~~*1 unit per 600 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~~~Form-Based Density.~~ 1 unit per 600 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		
Group Housing *Density*	§208	~~*1 bedroom per 210 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is*~~		

			greater.~~Form-Based Density.~~ 1 bedroom per 210 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.		
* * * *					
Senior Housing *Density*	§§102, 202.2(f), 207		~~*P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.*~~Form-Based ~~Density.~~ P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.		
Loss of Dwelling Units*: Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*		~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
			~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~

~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124, *207.9*	3.0 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* * * *

SEC. 726. PACIFIC AVENUE NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT.

* * * *

(b) **Controls.**

(1) **Purposes.** The Pacific Avenue Neighborhood Commercial District controls are designed to promote a small, neighborhood serving mixed-use commercial street that preserves the surrounding neighborhood residential character. These controls are intended to preserve livability in a largely low-rise development residential neighborhood, enhance solar access on a narrow street right-of-way, and protect residential rear yard patterns at the ground floor. Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted ~~*within the district pursuant to Section 207.1 of this Code*~~.

* * * *

~~*(3) **Loss of Residential Units.** To prevent the loss of existing Residential Units, the removal, demolition, merger, or conversion of Residential Units above the First Story are prohibited even if such loss of Residential Units would otherwise be allowed pursuant to Section 317 of this Code.*~~

(*~~4~~3*) **Neighborhood Commercial Design Guidelines.** The construction of new

buildings and alteration of existing buildings in the Pacific Avenue Neighborhood Commercial District shall be consistent with the design policies and guidelines of the General Plan*, the Citywide Design Standards, the Urban Design Guidelines* and with the "Polk/Pacific Special Area Design Guidelines" as adopted by the Planning Commission. The Planning Director may require modifications to the exterior of a proposed new building or proposed alteration of an existing residential building in order to bring it into conformity with the *Citywide Design Standards and the* "Polk/Pacific Special Area Design Guidelines" and with the General Plan. These modifications may include, but are not limited to, changes in siting, building envelope, scale texture and detailing, openings, and landscaping.

Table 726. PACIFIC AVENUE NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Pacific Avenue NCD
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
Height and Bulk Limits.	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250–252, 260, *263.19,* 261.1, 270, *270.3,* 271. See also Height and Bulk District Maps	*Varies.* ~~*40-X.*~~ See Height and Bulk Map Sheets HT01 and HT02 for more information. Height sculpting required on Alleys per § 261.1.

* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally* ~~*N*~~not ~~*R*~~required~~.~~*; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).*
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element and the Polk/Pacific Special Area Design Guidelines	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards,* ~~*and*~~ the Polk/Pacific Special Area Design Guidelines*, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission*.
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*

RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
* * * *				
Dwelling Unit Mix	§~~§~~ 207.6	Generally ~~*R*~~*r*equired for creation of five or more Dwelling Units. No less than 40% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least two bedrooms; or no less than 30% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least three bedrooms.		
* * * *				
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code ~~*Sections*~~§§ 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Unit~~s~~ *Density, General*	§§ 102, 207	~~*1 unit per 1,000 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~ ~~Form-Based Density.~~ 1 unit per 1,000 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that*		

			exceed the greater of those thresholds.
	Group Housing *Density*	§208	~~*1 bedroom per 275 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. 1 bedroom per 275 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.
	* * * *		
	Senior Housing *Density*	§§102, 202.2(f), 207	~~*P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.*~~Form-Based Density. P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.
	Loss ~~*and Division*~~ of Dwelling Units*:* *Conversion, Demolition,*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*

or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats				
		~~1st~~	*~~2nd~~*	*~~3rd+~~*
~~Residential Conversion~~	*~~§ 317~~*	*~~NP~~*	*~~NP~~*	*~~NP~~*
~~Residential Demolition~~	*~~§ 317~~*	*~~NP~~*	*~~NP~~*	*~~NP~~*
~~Residential Merger~~	*~~§ 317~~*	*~~NP~~*	*~~NP~~*	*~~NP~~*
Division of Dwelling Units	§ 207.8	Division of existing Dwelling Units P per § 207.8.		
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124, *207.9*	1.5 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* * * *

SEC. 727. LAKESIDE VILLAGE NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT.

The Lakeside Village Neighborhood Commercial District is located in the southwestern part of the City and stretches along Ocean Avenue from Junipero Serra Boulevard to 19th Avenue. It is a neighborhood serving shopping corridor nestled among single-family homes. Lakeside Village has small ground-floor retail, restaurant, and medical office space and is serviced by the M-line streetcar.

Building controls for the Lakeside Village Neighborhood Commercial District promote *~~low-intensity~~* *various scales of* development which *~~is~~are* compatible with the existing scale and character of the District. Commercial development is limited *~~to one story~~*, *with certain exceptions*.

Rear yard requirements at all levels preserve existing backyard space.

Commercial use provisions encourage the full range of neighborhood-serving convenience retail sales and services provided that the use size generally is limited to 3,000 square feet. However, commercial uses and features which could impact residential livability are prohibited, such as auto uses, financial services, general advertising signs, drive-up facilities, hotels, and late-night activity.

Housing development in new buildings is encouraged above the ground story. ~~*Existing residential units are protected by prohibitions of conversions above the ground story and limitations on demolitions.*~~ Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted within the District ~~*pursuant to Sections 207.1 and 207.2 of this Code*~~.

Table 727. LAKESIDE VILLAGE NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Lakeside Village NCD
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
Height and Bulk Limits.	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250–252, 260, *263.19,* 261.1, 270, *270.3,* 271. See also Height and Bulk District	Varies~~*, but generally 26-X*~~. See Height and Bulk Map Sheet HT12 for more information. Height sculpting required on Alleys per § 261.1.

	Maps	
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally* ~~N~~not ~~R~~required~~.~~*; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).*
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		
Canopy or Marquee	§ 136.1	NP*(5)*
* * * *		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		

* * * *				
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit ~~*Density*~~	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code ~~*Sections*~~§§ 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Unit Density, *General*	§§ 102, 207	~~*1 unit per 800 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. 1 unit per 800 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		
Group Housing Density	§208	~~*1 bedroom per 275 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. 1 bedroom per 275 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.		
* * * *				
Senior Housing Density	§§102, 202.2(f), 207	~~*P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and*~~		

		~~*meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.*~~ ~~Form Based Density.~~ P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.		
Loss of Dwelling Units*: Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~	~~*NP*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123,	1.8 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may*		

	124, *207.9*	*apply pursuant to § 207.9.*
* * * *		

* * * *

(5) Canopy is P if required as a wind mitigation feature.

SEC. 728. 24TH STREET – NOE VALLEY NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT.

The 24th Street – Noe Valley Neighborhood Commercial District is situated along 24th Street between Chattanooga and Diamond in the Noe Valley neighborhood of central San Francisco. This daytime-oriented, multi-purpose commercial district provides a mixture of convenience and comparison shopping goods and services to a predominantly local market area. It contains primarily retail sales and personal services at the street level, some office uses on the second story, and residential use almost exclusively on the third and upper stories.

The 24th Street – Noe Valley District controls are designed to allow for development that is compatible with the existing ~~*small-scale,*~~ mixed-use neighborhood commercial character and surrounding residential area. The small*- to mid-* scale of new buildings and neighborhood-serving uses is encouraged and rear yard open space corridors at all levels are protected. Most commercial uses are directed to the ground story and limited at the second story of new buildings. In order to maintain the variety and mix of retail sales and services along the commercial strip and to control the problems of traffic, congestion, noise and late-night activity, certain potentially troublesome commercial uses are regulated. Financial service uses are restricted to and at the ground story. Prohibitions on drive-up and most automobile uses help prevent additional traffic and parking congestion.

Housing development in new buildings is encouraged above the ground story. ~~*Existing*~~

~~*housing units are protected by prohibitions on upper-story conversions and limitations on demolitions.*~~

Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted~~ *within the district pursuant to Section 207.1 of this Code*~~.

Table 728. 24TH STREET – NOE VALLEY NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		24th Street – Noe Valley NCD
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
Height and Bulk Limits.	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250–252, 260, *263.19,* 261.1, 270, *270.3,* 271. See also Height and Bulk District Maps	Varies~~*, but generally 40-X*~~. See Height and Bulk Map Sheet HT07 for more information. Height sculpting required on Alleys per § 261.1.
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally* ~~*N*~*n*~~ot ~~*R*~*r*~~equired~~.~~*; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required*

		recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).		
* * * *				
Miscellaneous				
* * * *				
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*		
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*		
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
* * * *				
Dwelling Unit Mix	§ 207.7	Generally *~~R~~r*equired for creation of 10 or more Dwelling Units. No less than 25% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least two Bedrooms, and no less than 10% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least three Bedrooms.		
* * * *				
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**

Residential Uses	§102	P	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit ~~*Density*~~	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code ~~*Sections*~~*§§* 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Unit~~s~~ *Density, General*	§§ 102, 207	~~*1 unit per 600 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. 1 unit per 600 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		
Group Housing *Density*	§208	~~*1 bedroom per 210 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. 1 bedroom per 210 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.		
* * * *				
Senior Housing *Density*	§§102, 202.2(f), 207	~~*P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and*~~		

			~~*meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.*~~Form ~~Based Density.~~ P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.		
Loss of Dwelling Units*: Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~	~~*NP*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124*, 207.9*	1.8 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* * * *

SEC. 729. WEST PORTAL AVENUE NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT.

Located in the southwestern part of the City, the West Portal Avenue Neighborhood Commercial District stretches for three long blocks along West Portal Avenue from Ulloa Street to 15th Avenue and extends one block east along Ulloa Street from the Twin Peaks Tunnel entrance to Claremont Boulevard. West Portal Avenue provides a selection of goods and services for customers coming mainly from the surrounding west of Twin Peaks and Sunset single-family residential neighborhoods. The lively, small-scale retail frontage is interrupted at several locations by large-scale financial institutions which take up a large amount of commercial ground-story frontage. More than half of the number of medical, professional and business offices are located at the ground level. ~~*Except for one three-movie theater complex, West Portal offers no entertainment uses and its restaurants are mainly family-oriented.*~~

The West Portal Avenue District controls are designed to preserve the existing family-oriented, village character of West Portal Avenue. ~~*The building standards limit building heights to 26 feet and two stories and maintain the existing pattern of rear yards at the ground level and above.*~~ The height, bulk and design of new development, especially on large lots, should respect the small-*to mid-*scale character of the district and its surrounding residential neighborhoods. Lot mergers creating large lots are discouraged. Individual nonresidential uses require conditional use permits above 2,500 square feet and are restricted to 4,000 square feet as an absolute limit to conform with the existing small use sizes in the district.

* * * *

Housing development ~~*is limited*~~*in new buildings is encouraged*. ~~*Existing residential units are protected by limitations on demolition and prohibition of upper-story conversions*~~; new construction ~~*is to be carefully reviewed to*~~ *should* ensure appropriate scale, design and compatibility with

adjacent development. Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted ~~*within the district pursuant to Section 207.1 of this Code*~~.

Table 729. WEST PORTAL AVENUE NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		West Portal Avenue NCD
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
Height and Bulk Limits.	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250–252, 260, *263.19,* 261.1, 270, *270.3,* 271. See also Height and Bulk District Maps	*Varies.* ~~*26-X.*~~ See Height and Bulk Map Sheets HT06 and HT12 for more information. Height sculpting required on Alleys per § 261.1.
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally* ~~*N*~~*n*ot ~~*R*~~*r*equired~~.~~*; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to*

		the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).		
* * * *				
Miscellaneous				
* * * *				
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*		
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*		
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
* * * *				
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P	P	~~*N*~~*P*
Accessory Dwelling Unit~~s~~ *Density*	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code ~~*Sections*~~*§§* 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Unit~~s~~ *Density, General*	§§ 102, 207	~~*1 unit per 800 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. 1 unit per 800		

			square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.
	Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*
	Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*
	Group Housing *Density*	§208	~~*1 bedroom per 275 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. 1 bedroom per 275 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.
	* * * *		
	Senior Housing *Density*	§§102, 202.2(f), 207	~~*P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.*~~Form-Based Density. P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling

		units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.		
Loss of Dwelling Units: *Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~	~~*NP*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124, *207.9*	1.8 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* * * *

SEC. 730. INNER SUNSET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT.

The Inner Sunset Neighborhood Commercial District is located in the Inner Sunset neighborhood~~, *consisting of the NC-2 district*~~ bounded by Lincoln Way on the north, Fifth Avenue on the east, Kirkham Street on the south, and Nineteenth Avenue on the west. The shopping area provides convenience goods and services to local Inner Sunset residents, as

well as comparison shopping goods and services to a larger market area. The commercial district is also frequented by users of Golden Gate Park on weekends and by City residents for its eating, drinking, and entertainment places. Numerous housing units establish the ~~*d*~~*D*istrict's mixed residential-commercial character.

* * * *

Housing development in new buildings is encouraged above the ground story. ~~*Existing residential units are protected by prohibition of upper-story conversions and limitations on demolitions.*~~ Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted ~~*within the district pursuant to Section 207.1 of this Code*~~.

Table 730. INNER SUNSET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Inner Sunset NCD
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
Height and Bulk Limits.	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250–252, 260, *263.19,* 261.1, 270, *270.3,* 271. See also Height and Bulk District Maps	Varies~~*, but generally 40-X*~~. See Height and Bulk Map Sheets HT05 and HT06 for more information. Height sculpting required on Alleys per § 261.1.

* * * *					
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally* ~~N~~not ~~R~~required~~.~~*; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).*			
* * * *					
Miscellaneous					
* * * *					
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*			
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*			
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES					
Development Standards					
* * * *					
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**			
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**	

Residential Uses	*§ 102*	P	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit~~s~~ *Density*	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code ~~*Sections*~~*§§* 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Unit~~s~~ *Density, General*	§§ 102, 207	~~*1 unit per 800 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. 1 unit per 800 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		
Group Housing *Density*	§208	~~*1 bedroom per 275 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. 1 bedroom per 275 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.		
* * * *				
Senior Housing *Density*	§§102, 202.2(f), 207	~~*P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and*~~		

			~~*meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.*~~Form ~~Based Density.~~ P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.		
Loss of Dwelling Units*: Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~	~~*NP*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124*, 207.9*	1.8 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* * * *

SEC. 731. NORIEGA STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT.

The Noriega Street Neighborhood Commercial District is located in the Outer Sunset neighborhood and includes ~~*the non-residential currently-zoned NC-2*~~ properties fronting both sides of Noriega Street between 19th and 27th and 30th through 33rd Avenues.

The District provides a selection of convenience goods and services for the residents of the Outer Sunset District. There are a high concentration of restaurants, drawing customers from throughout the City and the region. There are also a significant number of professional, realty, and business offices as well as financial institutions.

The Noriega Street Neighborhood Commercial District controls are designed to promote development that is consistent with its existing land use patterns and to maintain a harmony of uses that support the District's vitality. The building standards allow ~~*small-*~~*various* scale*s of* buildings and uses, protecting rear yards above the ground story and at residential levels. In new development, most commercial uses are permitted at the first two stories, although certain limitations apply to uses at the second story. Special controls are necessary to preserve the equilibrium of neighborhood-serving convenience and comparison shopping businesses and to protect adjacent residential livability. To protect continuous frontage, drive-up uses are prohibited and active, pedestrian-oriented ground floor uses generally must be provided, unless such uses are authorized by Conditional Use. These controls are designed to encourage the street's active retail frontage, and local fabrication and production of goods.

Housing development in new buildings is encouraged above the ground story. Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted.

//

//

//

Table 731. NORIEGA STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT

ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Noriega Street NCD
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
Height and Bulk Limits.	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250–252, 260, *263.19,* 261.1, 270, *270.3,* 271. See also Height and Bulk District Maps	Varies. See Height and Bulk Map Sheets HT05 and HT06 for more information. Height sculpting required on Alleys per § 261.1.
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally* ~~*N*~~not ~~*R*~~required~~.~~*; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).*

* * * *				
Miscellaneous				
* * * *				
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*		
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*		
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
* * * *				
Off-Street Parking Requirements	§§ 145.1, 150, 151, 153 - 156, 161, 166, 204.5	*No* car parking required. Maximum permitted per § 151. Bike parking required per § 155.2. If car parking is provided, car share spaces are required when a project has 50 units or more per § 166.		
* * * *				
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code ~~*Sections*~~*§§* 207.1 and 207.2.		

Dwelling Units ~~*Density,*~~ *General*	§§ 102, 207	~~*1 unit per 800 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. 1 unit per 800 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*
Group Housing *Density*	§208	~~*1 bedroom per 275 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. 1 bedroom per 275 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.
* * * *		
Senior Housing *Density*	§§102, 202.2(f), 207	~~*P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.*~~Form-Based Density. P up to twice the number of dwelling

		units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.		
Loss of Dwelling Units: *Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124, *207.9*	2.5 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* * * *

SEC. 732. IRVING STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT.

The Irving Street Neighborhood Commercial District is located in the Outer Sunset

neighborhood and includes ~~*the non-residential currently-zoned NC-2*~~ properties fronting both sides of Irving Street between 19th and 27th Avenues. The District provides a selection of convenience goods and services for the residents of the Outer Sunset District. There are a high concentration of restaurants, drawing customers from throughout the City and the region. There are also a significant number of professional, realty, and business offices as well as financial institutions.

The Irving Street Neighborhood Commercial District controls are designed to promote development that is consistent with its existing land use patterns and to maintain a harmony of uses that support the District's vitality. The building standards allow small-*to mid*-scale buildings and uses, protecting rear yards above the ground story and at residential levels. In new development, most commercial uses are permitted at the first two stories, although certain limitations apply to uses at the second story. Special controls are necessary to preserve the equilibrium of neighborhood-serving convenience and comparison shopping businesses and to protect adjacent residential livability. These controls are designed to encourage the street's active retail frontage, and local fabrication and production of goods.

Housing development in new buildings is encouraged above the ground story. Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted.

Table 732. IRVING STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT

ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Irving Street NCD
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
Height and Bulk Limits.	§§ 102, 105,	Varies. See Height and Bulk Map Sheet HT05 for

	106, 250–252, 260, *263.19,* 261.1, 270, *270.3,* 271. See also Height and Bulk District Maps	more information. Height sculpting required on Alleys per § 261.1.
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally* ~~N~~not ~~R~~required~~.~~*; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).*
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*

Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*		
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
* * * *				
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code ~~*Sections*~~*§§* 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Unit~~s~~ *Density, General*	§§ 102, 207	~~*1 unit per 800 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. 1 unit per 800 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		
Group Housing *Density*	§208	~~*1 bedroom per 275 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. 1 bedroom per 275		

		square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.			
* * * *					
Senior Housing *Density*	§§102, 202.2(f), 207	~~*P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.*~~Form Based ~~Density.~~ P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.			
Loss of Dwelling Units*: Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*			
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~	
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~	

~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124, *207.9*	2.5 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* * * *

SEC. 733. TARAVAL STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT.

The Taraval Street Neighborhood Commercial District is located in the Outer Sunset neighborhood and includes the ~~*non-residential currently-zoned NC-2*~~ properties fronting both sides of Taraval Street from 19th through 36th Avenues. The District provides a selection of convenience goods and services for the residents of the Outer Sunset District. There are a high concentration of restaurants, drawing customers from throughout the City and the region. There are also a significant number of professional, realty, and business offices as well as financial institutions.

The Taraval Street Neighborhood Commercial District controls are designed to promote development that is consistent with its existing land use patterns and to maintain a harmony of uses that support the District's vitality. The building standards allow small- *to mid-* scale buildings and uses, protecting rear yards above the ground story and at residential levels. In new development, most commercial uses are permitted at the first two stories, although certain limitations apply to uses at the second story. Special controls are necessary to preserve the equilibrium of neighborhood-serving convenience and comparison shopping businesses and to protect adjacent residential livability. These controls are designed to

encourage the street's active retail frontage, and local fabrication and production of goods.

Housing development in new buildings is encouraged above the ground story. Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted.

Table 733. TARAVAL STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Taraval Street NCD
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
Height and Bulk Limits.	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250–252, 260, *263.19,* 261.1, 270, *270.3,* 271. See also Height and Bulk District Maps.	Varies. See Height and Bulk Map Sheet HT05 for more information. Height sculpting required on Alleys per § 261.1.
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally* ~~N~~not ~~R~~required~~.~~*; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required*

		recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines, *Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
* * * *		

Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code ~~*Sections*~~*§§* 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Unit~~s~~ *Density, General*	§§ 102, 207	~~*1 unit per 800 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. 1 unit per 800 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in		

			the nearest R District, whichever is greater.
	Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*
	Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*
	Group Housing *Density*	§208	~~*1 bedroom per 275 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. 1 bedroom per 275 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.
	* * * *		
	Senior Housing *Density*	§§102, 202.2(f), 207	~~*P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.*~~Form-Based Density. P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in

		the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.		
Loss of Dwelling Units: *Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124, *207.9*	2.5 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* * * *

SEC. 734. JUDAH STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT.

The Judah Street Neighborhood Commercial District is located in the Outer Sunset neighborhood and includes the ~~*non-residential currently zoned NC-2*~~ properties fronting both sides of Judah Street from 29th through 33rd Avenues. The District provides a selection of convenience goods and services for the residents of the Outer Sunset District. There are a high concentration of restaurants, drawing customers from throughout the City and the region.

There are also a significant number of professional, realty, and business offices as well as financial institutions.

The Judah Street Neighborhood Commercial District controls are designed to promote development that is consistent with its existing land use patterns and to maintain a harmony of uses that support the District's vitality. The building standards allow small- *to mid*-scale buildings and uses, protecting rear yards above the ground story and at residential levels. In new development, most commercial uses are permitted at the first two stories, although certain limitations apply to uses at the second story. Special controls are necessary to preserve the equilibrium of neighborhood-serving convenience and comparison shopping businesses and to protect adjacent residential livability. These controls are designed to encourage the street's active retail frontage, and local fabrication and production of goods.

Housing development in new buildings is encouraged above the ground story. Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted.

Table 734. JUDAH STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Judah Street NCD
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
Height and Bulk Limits.	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250–252, 260, *263.19,* 261.1, 270, *270.3,* 271. See also	Varies. See Height and Bulk Map Sheet HT05 for more information. Height sculpting required on Alleys per § 261.1.

	Height and Bulk District Maps	
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally* ~~N~~not ~~R~~required~~.~~*; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).*
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		

* * * *				
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code ~~*Sections*~~*§§* 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Unit~~s~~ *Density, General*	§§ 102, 207	~~*1 unit per 800 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. 1 unit per 800 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		
Group Housing *Density*	§208	~~*1 bedroom per 275 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. 1 bedroom per 275 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.		
* * * *				
Senior Housing *Density*	§§102, 202.2(f), 207	~~*P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and*~~		

			~~*meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.*~~ ~~Form Based Density.~~ P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.		
Loss of Dwelling Units*: Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123,	2.5 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may*		

	124, *207.9*	*apply pursuant to § 207.9.*
* * * *		

* * * *

SEC. 735. INNER BALBOA STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT.

The Inner Balboa Street Neighborhood Commercial District is located along Balboa Street between 2nd Avenue and 8th Avenue in the Richmond District of San Francisco. The District is a small-scale linear shopping street which provides convenience goods and services to the surrounding neighborhood as well as limited comparison shopping goods for a wider market.

The Inner Balboa Street Neighborhood Commercial District controls provide for mixed-use buildings which approximate or slightly exceed the standard development pattern. Rear yard requirements above the ground story and at residential levels preserve open space corridors of interior blocks.

Most new commercial development is permitted at the ground and second stories. Neighborhood- serving businesses are strongly encouraged. The second story may be used by some retail stores, personal services, and medical, business and professional offices. Parking and hotels are monitored at all stories. Limits on late-night activity, drive-up facilities, and other automobile uses protect the livability within and around the District, and promote continuous retail frontage.

Housing development in new buildings is encouraged above the ground story. ~~*Existing residential units are protected by limitations on demolition and upper-story conversions.*~~ Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted ~~*within the District pursuant to Sections 207.1 and 207.2 of this Code*~~.

Table 735. INNER BALBOA STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT

ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Inner Balboa Street NCD
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
Height and Bulk Limits.	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250–252, 260, *263.19,* 261.1, 270, *270.3,* 271. See also Height and Bulk District Maps	Varies*, but generally 40-X*. See Height and Bulk Map Sheet HT03 for more information. Height sculpting required on Alleys per § 261.1.
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally Nn*ot *Rr*equired*.; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).*
* * * *		

Miscellaneous					
* * * *					
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*			
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*			
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES					
Development Standards					
* * * *					
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**			
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**	
Residential Uses	§102	P	P	P	
Accessory Dwelling Unit ~~*Density*~~	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code ~~*Sections*~~*§§* 207.1 and 207.2.			
Dwelling Unit Density*, General*	§§ 102, 207	~~*1 unit per 800 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~ ~~Form-Based Density.~~ 1 unit per 800 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.			
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*			
Maximum Dwelling Unit	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an*			

Size		*equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*
Group Housing Density	§208	~~*1 bedroom per 275 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. 1 bedroom per 275 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.
* * * *		
Senior Housing Density	§§102, 202.2(f), 207	~~*P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.*~~Form-Based Density. P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.
Loss of Dwelling Units:	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~C

Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats				
		~~1st~~	*~~2nd~~*	*~~3rd+~~*
~~Residential Conversion~~	*~~§ 317~~*	*~~C~~*	*~~C~~*	*~~NP~~*
~~Residential Demolition and Merger~~	*~~§ 317~~*	*~~C~~*	*~~C~~*	*~~C~~*
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124, *207.9*	2.5 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* * * *

SEC. 736. OUTER BALBOA STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT.

The Outer Balboa Street Neighborhood Commercial District is located along Balboa Street between 32nd Avenue and 39th Avenue in the Richmond District of San Francisco. The District is a small-scale linear shopping street which provides convenience goods and services to the surrounding neighborhood as well as limited comparison shopping goods for a wider market.

The Outer Balboa Street Neighborhood Commercial District controls provide for mixed-use buildings which approximate or *~~slightly~~moderately* exceed the standard development pattern. Rear yard requirements above the ground story and at residential levels preserve open space corridors of interior blocks.

Most new commercial development is permitted at the ground and second stories. Neighborhood-serving businesses are strongly encouraged. The second story may be used by some retail stores, personal services, and medical, business and professional offices. Parking and hotels are monitored at all stories. Limits on late-night activity, drive-up facilities, and other automobile uses protect the livability within and around the District, and promote continuous retail frontage.

Housing development in new buildings is encouraged above the ground story. ~~*Existing residential units are protected by limitations on demolition and upper-story conversions.*~~ Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted ~~*within the District pursuant to Sections 207.1 and 207.2 of this Code*~~.

Table 736. OUTER BALBOA STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Outer Balboa Street NCD
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
Height and Bulk Limits.	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250–252, 260, *263.19,* 261.1, 270, *270.3,* 271. See also Height and Bulk District Maps	Varies~~*, but generally 40-X*~~. See Height and Bulk Map Sheet HT04 for more information. Height sculpting required on Alleys per § 261.1.

* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally* ~~*N*~~*n*ot ~~*R*~~*r*equired~~.~~*; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).*
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
* * * *		

Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**

Residential Uses	§102	P	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit ~~*Density*~~	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code ~~*Sections*~~*§§* 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Unit Density, *General*	§§ 102, 207	~~*1 unit per 800 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. 1 unit per 800 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		
Group Housing Density	§208	~~*1 bedroom per 275 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. 1 bedroom per 275 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.		
* * * *				
Senior Housing Density	§§102, 202.2(f), 207	~~*P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and*~~		

			~~*meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.*~~Form-Based ~~Density.~~ P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.		
Loss of Dwelling Units*: Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124*, 207.9*	2.5 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* * * *

SEC. 737. BAYVIEW NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT.

* * * *

Table 737. BAYVIEW NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Bayview NCD
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ *130,* 131, 132, 133	*Generally* ~~*N*~~not ~~*R*~~required~~.~~*; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).*
*** * * ***		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning*

	Element	*Commission.*		
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
* * * *				
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit ~~*Density*~~	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code ~~*Sections*~~*§§* 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Unit Density*, General*	§§ 102, 207	1 unit per 600 square foot lot area.		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		
Group Housing Density	§ 208	1 bedroom per 210 square foot lot area.		
* * * *				
Loss of Dwelling Units*: Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C(1)*		

		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C(1)*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124, *207.9*	3.6 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* Not listed below

(1) THIRD FLOOR RESIDENTIAL CONVERSION:

Boundaries: Applicable to the Bayview NCD

Controls: A Residential Use may be converted to an Institutional Use, other than a Medical Cannabis Dispensary, as a Conditional Use on the third story and above if in addition to the criteria set forth in ~~*Section*~~*§* ~~*303*~~*317*, the Commission finds that:

(a) The structure in which the Residential Use is to be converted has been found eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places;

(b) The proposed use is to be operated by a nonprofit public benefit corporation; and

(c) No legally residing residential tenants will be displaced.

* * * *

SEC. 738. CORTLAND AVENUE NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT.

* * * *

Table 738. CORTLAND AVENUE NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT

ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Cortland Avenue NCD
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally ~~N~~not ~~R~~required~~.~~; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).*
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		

Development Standards				
* * * *				
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit ~~*Density*~~	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code ~~*Sections*~~*§§* 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Unit Density*, General*	§§ 102, 207	1 unit per 800 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		
Group Housing Density	§ 208	1 bedroom per 275 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.		
* * * *				
Loss of Dwelling Units*: Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		

		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124, *207.9*	2.5 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* * * *

SEC. 739. GEARY BOULEVARD NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT.

The Geary Boulevard Neighborhood Commercial District is located along Geary Boulevard between Masonic and 28th Avenues. It is a linear district located along a heavily trafficked thoroughfare which also serves as a major transit route. In addition to providing convenience goods and services to the surrounding neighborhood, the District offers a wide variety of comparison and specialty goods and services to a population greater than the immediate neighborhood.

The building standards permit moderately large commercial uses and buildings. Rear yards are protected at residential levels.

A diversified commercial environment is encouraged for the District, and a wide variety of uses are permitted with special emphasis on neighborhood-serving businesses. Financial service uses generally are permitted with certain limitations at the first and second stories. Other retail businesses, personal services, and offices are permitted at all stories of new

buildings. Limited storage and administrative service activities are permitted with some restrictions.

Housing development in new buildings is encouraged above the second story. ~~*Existing residential units are protected by limitations on demolitions and upper-story conversions.*~~ Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted ~~*within the District pursuant to Sections 207.1 and 207.2 of this Code*~~.

Table 739. GEARY BOULEVARD NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Geary Boulevard NCD
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
Height and Bulk Limits.	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250–252, 260, *263.19,* 261.1, 270, *270.3,* 271. See also Height and Bulk District Maps.	Varies~~*, but generally 40-X*~~. See Height and Bulk Map Sheets HT03-04 for more information. Height sculpting required on Alleys per § 261.1.
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ *130,* 131, 132, 133	*Generally* ~~*N*~~not ~~*R*~~required~~.~~*; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width*

		required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).		
* * * *				
Miscellaneous				
* * * *				
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*		
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*		
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
* * * *				
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P	P	P
Accessory Dwelling	§§102, 207.1,	P per Planning Code ~~*Sections*~~*§§* 207.1 and 207.2.		

Unit ~~*Density*~~	207.2	
Dwelling Unit Density, *General*	§§ 102, 207	~~*1 unit per 600 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. 1 unit per 600 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*
Group Housing Density	§208	~~*Up to 1 bedroom per 210 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. Up to 1 bedroom per 210 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.
* * * *		
Senior Housing Density	§§102, 202.2(f), 207	~~*P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for §*~~

			~~202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.~~~~Form-Based Density.~~ P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.		
Loss of Dwelling Units*:* *Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	*~~Controls by Story~~C(2)*		
		~~1st~~	*~~2nd~~*	*~~3rd+~~*
~~Residential Conversion~~	*~~§ 317~~*	*~~C~~*	*~~C~~*	*~~C(2)~~*
~~Residential Demolition and Merger~~	*~~§ 317~~*	*~~C~~*	*~~C~~*	*~~C~~*
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124, *207.9*	3.6 to 1*. For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* * * *

(2) THIRD FLOOR RESIDENTIAL CONVERSION:

Boundaries: Applicable to the Geary Boulevard NCD

Controls: A Residential Use may be converted to an Institutional Use, other than a Medical Cannabis Dispensary, as a Conditional Use on the third story and above if in addition to the criteria set forth in ~~*Section*~~*§ ~~303~~317*, the Commission finds that:

(a) The structure in which the Residential Use is to be converted has been found eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places;

(b) The proposed use is to be operated by a nonprofit public benefit corporation; and

(c) No legally residing residential tenants will be displaced.

* * * *

SEC. 740. MISSION BERNAL NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT.

* * * *

Table 740. MISSION BERNAL NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT

ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Mission Bernal NCD
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ *130,* 131, 132, 133	*Generally ~~N~~n*ot *~~R~~r*equired~~.~~*; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required*

		recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).		
* * * *				
Miscellaneous				
* * * *				
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*		
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
* * * *				
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit ~~*Density*~~	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code ~~*Sections*~~*§§* 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Unit Density*, General*	§§ 102, 207	1 unit per 600 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an*		

Size		*equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		
Group Housing Density	§ 208	1 bedroom per 210 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.		
* * * *				
Loss of Dwelling Units*: Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C(1)*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C(1)*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124*, 207.9*	3.6 to 1*. For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* Not listed below

(1) THIRD FLOOR RESIDENTIAL CONVERSION:

Boundaries: Applicable to the Mission Bernal NCD

Controls: A Residential Use may be converted to an Institutional Use, other than a

Medical Cannabis Dispensary, as a Conditional Use on the third story and above if in addition to the criteria set forth in ~~*Section*~~*§ ~~303~~317*, the Commission finds that:

(a) The structure in which the Residential Use is to be converted has been found eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places;

(b) The proposed use is to be operated by a nonprofit public benefit corporation; and

(c) No legally residing residential tenants will be displaced.

* * * *

SEC. 741. SAN BRUNO AVENUE NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT.

* * * *

Table 741. SAN BRUNO AVENUE NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT

ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		San Bruno Avenue NCD
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally ~~N~~n*ot ~~*R*~~*r*equired~~.~~*; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan.*

		This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
* * * *		

Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit ~~*Density*~~	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code ~~*Sections*~~*§§* 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Unit Density*, General*	§§ 102, 207	1 unit per 800 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual*		

		Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.		
Group Housing Density	§ 208	1 bedroom per 275 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.		
* * * *				
Loss of Dwelling Units*: Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124, *207.9*	2.5 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* * * *

SEC. 742. COLE VALLEY NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICTS.

The Cole Valley Neighborhood Commercial District is located along Cole Street from Frederick to Grattan Streets and includes some parcels north of Carl Street and south of

Parnassus. It is a local shopping district with a mix of retail uses in a residential neighborhood that is near a transit line.

Building controls for the Cole Valley Neighborhood Commercial District promote *small to mid-scale* ~~*low-intensity*~~ development which is compatible with the existing scale and character of the area. Commercial development is limited to one story *with some exceptions*. Rear yard requirements at all levels preserve existing backyard space.

Commercial use provisions encourage the full range of neighborhood-serving convenience retail sales and services at the first story provided that the use size generally is limited to 3,000 square feet. However, commercial uses and features which could impact residential livability are prohibited, such as auto uses, financial services, general advertising signs, drive-up facilities, hotels, and late-night activity.

Housing development in new buildings is encouraged above the ground story. ~~*Existing residential units are protected by prohibitions of conversions above the ground story and limitations on demolitions.*~~ Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted ~~*within the District pursuant to Sections 207.1 and 207.2 of this Code*~~.

Table 742. COLE VALLEY NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Cole Valley NCD
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
Height and Bulk Limits.	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250–252,	Varies~~*, but generally 40-X*~~. See Height and Bulk Map Sheet HT06 for more information. Height

	260, *263.19,* 261.1, 270, *270.3,* 271. See also Height and Bulk District Maps	sculpting required on Alleys per § 261.1.
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally* ~~N~~not ~~R~~required~~.~~*; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).*
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		
Canopy or Marquee	§ 136.1	NP*(5)*
* * * *		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning*

	Element	*Commission.*
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*

RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
* * * *				
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit ~~*Density*~~	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code ~~*Sections*~~*§§* 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Unit Density*, General*	§§ 102, 207	~~*1 unit per 800 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. 1 unit per 800 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		
Group Housing Density	§208	~~*1 bedroom per 275 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is*~~		

		greater.~~Form-Based Density.~~ 1 bedroom per 275 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.			
* * * *					
Senior Housing Density	§§102, 202.2(f), 207	~~*P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.*~~Form-Based Density.~~ P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.			
Loss of Dwelling Units*: Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*			
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~	

~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~	~~*NP*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124, *207.9*	1.8 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* * * *

(5) Canopy is P if required as a wind mitigation feature.

SEC. 743. LOWER HAIGHT STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT.

The Lower Haight Street Neighborhood Commercial District is located along Haight Street between Webster and Steiner Streets. The District is a small-scale linear shopping street which provides convenience goods and services to the surrounding neighborhood as well as limited comparison shopping goods for a wider market.

The District controls provide for mixed-use buildings which approximate or ~~*slightly*~~*moderately* exceed the standard development pattern. Rear yard requirements above the ground story and at residential levels preserve open space corridors of interior blocks.

Most new commercial development is permitted at the ground and second stories. Neighborhood-serving businesses are strongly encouraged. The second story may be used by some retail stores, personal services, and medical, business and professional offices. Parking and hotels are monitored at all stories. Limits on late-night activity, drive-up facilities, and other automobile uses protect the livability within and around the District, and promote continuous retail frontage.

Housing development in new buildings is encouraged above the ground story. ~~*Existing residential units are protected by limitations on demolition and upper-story conversions.*~~ Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted ~~*within the District pursuant to Sections 207.1 and 207.2 of this Code*~~.

Table 743. LOWER HAIGHT STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Lower Haight Street NCD
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
Height and Bulk Limits~~.~~	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250–252, 260, *263.19,* 261.1, 270, *270.3,* 271. See also Height and Bulk District Maps.	Varies~~, *but generally 40-X*~~. See Height and Bulk Map Sheet HT07 for more information. Height sculpting required on Alleys per § 261.1.
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally* ~~*N*~~*n*ot ~~*R*~~*r*equired~~.~~*; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to*

		the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).		
* * * *				
Miscellaneous				
* * * *				
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*		
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*		
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
* * * *				
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit ~~*Density*~~	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code ~~*Sections*~~*§§* 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Unit Density*, General*	§§ 102, 207	~~*1 unit per 800 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. 1 unit per 800		

		square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*
Group Housing Density	§208	~~*1 bedroom per 275 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. 1 bedroom per 275 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.
* * * *		
Senior Housing Density	§§102, 202.2(f), 207	~~*P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.*~~Form-Based Density. P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling

		units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.		
Loss of Dwelling Units*: Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124, *207.9*	2.5 to 1*. For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* * * *

SEC. 744. LOWER POLK STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT.

* * * *

Table 744. LOWER POLK STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Lower Polk Street NCD

Zoning Category	§ References	Controls		
BUILDING STANDARDS				
Massing and Setbacks				
* * * *				
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ *130,* 131, 132, 133	*Generally* ~~N~~not ~~R~~required~~.~~*; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).*		
* * * *				
Miscellaneous				
* * * *				
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*		
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
* * * *				
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**

Residential Uses	§102	P	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit ~~*Density*~~	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code ~~*Sections*~~*§§* 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Unit Density, *General*	§§ 102, 207	1 unit per 600 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		
Group Housing Density	§ 208	1 bedroom per 210 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.		
* * * *				
Loss of Dwelling Units*: Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C(1)*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C(1)*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~

NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124, *207.9*	3.6 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*
* * * *		

* Not listed below

(1) THIRD FLOOR RESIDENTIAL CONVERSION:

Boundaries: Applicable to the Lower Polk Street NCD

Controls: A Residential Use may be converted to an Institutional Use, other than a Medical Cannabis Dispensary, as a Conditional Use on the third story and above if in addition to the criteria set forth in ~~*Section*~~*§* ~~*303*~~*317*, the Commission finds that:

(a) The structure in which the Residential Use is to be converted has been found eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places;

(b) The proposed use is to be operated by a nonprofit public benefit corporation; and

(c) No legally residing residential tenants will be displaced.

* * * *

SEC. 745. INNER TARAVAL STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT.

The Inner Taraval Street Neighborhood Commercial District is located along Taraval Street between 19th and Forest Side Avenues in the Inner Sunset neighborhood. It is separated from the Taraval Street Neighborhood Commercial District by 19th Avenue. The District is a small-scale linear shopping street which provides convenience goods and services to the surrounding neighborhood as well as limited comparison shopping goods for a wider market.

The District controls provide for mixed-use buildings which approximate or ~~*slightly*~~*moderately* ~~exceed~~ the standard development pattern. Rear yard requirements above the ground story and at residential levels preserve open space corridors of interior blocks.

Most new commercial development is permitted at the ground and second stories. Neighborhood-serving businesses are strongly encouraged. The second story may be used by some retail stores, personal services, and medical, business and professional offices. Parking and hotels are monitored at all stories. Limits on late-night activity, drive-up facilities, and other automobile uses protect the livability within and around the District, and promote continuous retail frontage.

Housing development in new buildings is encouraged above the ground story. ~~*Existing residential units are protected by limitations on demolition and upper-story conversions.*~~ Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted ~~*within the District pursuant to Sections 207.1 and 207.2 of this Code*~~.

Table 745. INNER TARAVAL STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Inner Taraval Street NCD
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
Height and Bulk Limits.	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250–252, 260, *263.19,* 261.1, 270, *270.3,* 271. See also	Varies~~*, but generally 40-X*~~. See Height and Bulk Map Sheet~~s~~ HT06 for more information. Height sculpting required on Alleys per § 261.1.

	Height and Bulk District Maps.	
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally* ~~N~~not ~~R~~required~~.~~*; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).*
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		

* * * *				
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit ~~*Density*~~	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code ~~*Sections*~~§§ 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Unit Density, *General*	§§ 102, 207	~~*1 unit per 800 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. 1 unit per 800 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		
Group Housing Density	§208	~~*1 bedroom per 275 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. 1 bedroom per 275 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.		
* * * *				
Senior Housing Density	§§102, 202.2(f), 207	~~*P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and*~~		

			~~*meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.*~~ ~~Form Based Density.~~ P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.		
Loss of Dwelling Units*: Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123,	2.5 to 1*. For Office Uses minimum intensities may*		

	124, *207.9*	*apply pursuant to § 207.9.*
* * * *		

* * * *

SEC. 746. LELAND AVENUE NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT.

* * * *

Table 746. LELAND AVENUE NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Leland Avenue NCD
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally ~~N~~not ~~R~~required~~.~~; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).*
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		

Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*		
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
* * * *				
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit ~~*Density*~~	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code ~~*Sections*~~*§§* 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Unit Density*, General*	§§ 102, 207	1 unit per 800 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		
Group Housing Density	§ 208	1 bedroom per 275 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.		
* * * *				

Loss of Dwelling Units*:* *Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124*, 207.9*	2.5 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* * * *

SEC. 750. NCT-1 – NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL TRANSIT CLUSTER DISTRICT.

NC*T*-1 Districts are intended to serve as local neighborhood shopping districts, providing convenience retail goods and services for the immediately surrounding neighborhoods primarily during daytime hours. NCT-1 Districts are located near major transit services. They are small mixed-use clusters, generally surrounded by residential districts, with small-scale neighborhood-serving commercial uses on lower floors and housing above. Housing density is limited not by lot area, but by the regulations on the built envelope of buildings, including height, bulk, setbacks, and lot coverage, and standards for residential

uses, including open space and exposure, and urban design guidelines. There are prohibitions on access (i.e. driveways, garage entries) to off-street parking and loading on critical stretches of commercial and transit street frontages to preserve and enhance the pedestrian-oriented character and transit function. Residential parking is not required and generally limited. Commercial establishments are discouraged from building excessive accessory off-street parking in order to preserve the pedestrian-oriented character of the district and prevent attracting auto traffic.

NCT-1 Districts are generally characterized by their location in residential neighborhoods. The commercial intensity of these districts varies. Many of these districts have the lowest intensity of commercial development in the City, generally consisting of small clusters with three or more commercial establishments, commonly grouped around a corner; and in some cases short linear commercial strips with low-scale, interspersed mixed-use (residential-commercial) development. Building controls for the NCT-1 District promote low-intensity development which is compatible with the existing scale and character of these neighborhood areas. Commercial development is limited to one story*, with certain exceptions*. Rear yard requirements at all levels preserve existing backyard space.

* * * *

~~*Existing residential units are protected by prohibitions of conversions above the ground story and limitations on demolitions.*~~

Table 750. NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL TRANSIT CLUSTER DISTRICT NCT-1 ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		NCT-1
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**

BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
Height and Bulk Limits.	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250–252, 260, *263.19,* 261.1, 270, *270.3,* 271. See also Height and Bulk District Maps.	Varies. See Height and Bulk Map Sheets HT11 and HT12 for more information. Height sculpting required on Alleys per § 261.1.
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally* ~~*N*~~*n*ot ~~*R*~~*r*equired~~.~~*; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).*
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		
Canopy or Marquee	§ 136.1	NP*(2)*

* * * *					
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*			
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*			
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES					
Development Standards					
* * * *					
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**			
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**	
Residential Uses	§102	P(1)	P	P	
Accessory Dwelling Unit	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code ~~*Sections*~~*§§* 207.1 and 207.2.			
Dwelling Units, Senior Housing, and Group Housing~~.~~*, Generally*	§ 102, 202.2(f), 207, 208	~~*No density limit by lot area. Density restricted by physical envelope controls of height, bulk, setbacks, open space, exposure and other applicable controls of this and other Codes, as well as by applicable design guidelines, applicable elements and area plans of the General Plan, and design review by the Planning Department.*~~*Form-Based Density.*			
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*			

Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		
* * * *				
Loss ~~*and Division*~~ of Dwelling Units*:* *Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~	~~*NP*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
Division of Dwelling Units	§ 207.8	Division of existing Dwelling Units P per § 207.8		
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124*, 207.9*	1.8 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* * * *

(1) C required for ground floor Residential Use when street frontage is listed in *Section* 145.4(b).

(2) ~~*[Note deleted.]*~~ *Canopy is P if required as a wind mitigation feature.*

* * * *

SEC. 751. NCT-2 – SMALL-SCALE NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL TRANSIT DISTRICT.

* * * *

Housing development in new buildings is encouraged above the ground story. ~~*Existing residential units are protected by limitations on demolition and upper-story conversions.*~~ *Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted.*

Table 751. SMALL-SCALE NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL TRANSIT DISTRICT NCT-2 ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		NCT-2
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
Height and Bulk Limits.	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250–252, 260, *263.19,* 261.1, 270, *270.3,* 271. See also Height and Bulk District	Varies. See Height and Bulk Map Sheets HT08, HT11, and HT12 for more information. Height sculpting required on Alleys per § 261.1.

	Maps	
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally ~~N~~not ~~R~~required~~.~~; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).*
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines, *Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
* * * *		
Dwelling Unit Mix	§ 207.6	Generally ~~R~~required for creation of five or more

		Dwelling Units. No less than 40% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least two bedrooms; or no less than 30% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least three bedrooms.		
* * * *				
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P(1)	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code Sections 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Units, Senior Housing, and Group Housing~~.~~*, Generally*	§ 102, 202.2(f), 207, 208	~~*No density limit by lot area. Density restricted by physical envelope controls of height, bulk, setbacks, open space, exposure and other applicable controls of this and other Codes, as well as by applicable design guidelines, applicable elements and area plans of the General Plan, and design review by the Planning Department.*~~*Form-Based Density.*		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		
* * * *				

Loss ~~*and Division*~~ of Dwelling Units*:* *Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
Division of Dwelling Units	§ 207.8	Division of existing Dwelling Units P per § 207.8		
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124*, 207.9*	2.5 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* * * *

(1) C required for ground floor Residential Use when street frontage is listed in *Section* 145.4(b).

* * * *

SEC. 752. NCT-3 – MODERATE-SCALE NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL TRANSIT DISTRICT.

* * * *

(e) Housing development in new buildings is encouraged above the second story. ~~*Existing Residential Units are protected by limitations on demolitions and upper-story conversions.*~~ Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted ~~*within the district pursuant to Sections 207.1 and 207.2 of this Code*~~.

Table 752. MODERATE-SCALE NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL TRANSIT DISTRICT

NCT-3

ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		NCT-3
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
Height and Bulk Limits.	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250–252, 260, *263.19,* 261.1, 270, *270.3,* 271. See also Height and Bulk District Maps.	Varies. See Height and Bulk Map Sheets HT02 and HT07 for more information. Height sculpting required on Alleys per § 261.1.
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally* ~~*N*~~*n*ot ~~*R*~~*r*equired~~.~~*; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback*

		shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines, *Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
* * * *		
Dwelling Unit Mix	§ 207.6	Generally ~~R~~*r*equired for creation of five or more Dwelling Units. No less than 40% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least two bedrooms; or no less than 30% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least three bedrooms.

* * * *				
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P(1)	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code Sections 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Units, Senior Housing, and Group Housing~~.~~*, Generally*	§ 102, 202.2(f), 207, 208	~~*No density limit by lot area. Density restricted by physical envelope controls of height, bulk, setbacks, open space, exposure and other applicable controls of this and other Codes, as well as by applicable design guidelines, applicable elements and area plans of the General Plan, and design review by the Planning Department.*~~*Form-Based Density.*		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		
* * * *				
Loss ~~*and Division*~~ of Dwelling Units*: Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		

Residential Flats				
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
Division of Dwelling Units	§ 207.8	Division of existing Dwelling Units P per § 207.8		
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124, *207.9*	3.6 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* * * *

(1) C required for ground floor Residential Use when street frontage is listed in *Section* 145.4(b).

* * * *

SEC. 753. SOMA NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL TRANSIT DISTRICT.

* * * *

Table 753. SOMA NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL TRANSIT DISTRICT

ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		SoMa NCT
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		

* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally ~~N~~n*ot *~~R~~r*equired*~~.~~; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).*
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	*~~Subject to the~~* Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
* * * *		

Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P(1)	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code Sections 207.1 and 207.2.		

Dwelling Units, Senior Housing, and Group Housing~~.~~*, Generally*	§ 102, 202.2(f), 207, 208	~~*No density limit by lot area. Density restricted by physical envelope controls of height, bulk, setbacks, open space, exposure and other applicable controls of this and other Codes, as well as by applicable design guidelines, applicable elements and area plans of the General Plan, and design review by the Planning Department.*~~*Form-Based Density.*		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		
* * * *				
Loss ~~*and Division*~~ of Dwelling Units*: Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
Division of Dwelling	§ 207.8	Division of existing Dwelling Units P per § 207.8		

Units		
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124, *207.9*	2.5 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*
* * * *		

* Not listed below

(1) C required for ground floor residential use when street frontage is listed in 145.4(b)

* * * *

SEC. 754. MISSION STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL TRANSIT DISTRICT.

* * * *

Table 754. MISSION STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL TRANSIT DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Mission Street NCT
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally* ~~N~~not ~~R~~required~~.~~*; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to*

		the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).		
* * * *				
Miscellaneous				
* * * *				
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*		
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
* * * *				
Dwelling Unit Mix	§§ 207.6	Generally ~~R~~required for creation of five or more Dwelling Units. No less than 40% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least two bedrooms; or no less than 30% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least three bedrooms.		
* * * *				
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P(1)	P	P
Accessory Dwelling	§§102, 207.1,	P per Planning Code Sections 207.1 and 207.2.		

Unit	207.2			
Dwelling Units, Senior Housing, and Group Housing*, Generally*	§ 102, 202.2(f), 207, 208	~~*No density limit by lot area. Density restricted by physical envelope controls of height, bulk, setbacks, open space, exposure and other applicable controls of this and other Codes, as well as by applicable design guidelines, applicable elements and area plans of the General Plan, and design review by the Planning Department.*~~*Form-Based Density.*		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		
* * * *				
Loss ~~*and Division*~~ of Dwelling Units*: Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~

Division of Dwelling Units	§ 207.8	Division of existing Dwelling Units P per § 207.8
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124, *207.9*	3.6 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*
* * * *		

* * * *

SEC. 755. OCEAN AVENUE NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL TRANSIT DISTRICT.

* * * *

Housing development in new buildings is encouraged above the ground story. Existing residential units are protected by limitations on demolition and upper-story conversions. Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted ~~*within the district pursuant to Section 207.1 of this Code*~~.

Table 755. OCEAN AVENUE NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL TRANSIT DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Ocean Avenue NCT
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
Height and Bulk Limits.	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250–252, 260, 261.1, *263.19,* 270,	Varies~~*, but generally 45-X*~~. See Height and Bulk Map Sheet HT12 for more information. Height sculpting required on Alleys per § 261.1.

	*270.3,*271. See also Height and Bulk District Maps.	
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally ~~N~~not ~~R~~required~~.~~; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).*
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		

Development Standards				
* * * *				
Dwelling Unit Mix	§ 207.6	Generally ~~R~~r equired for creation of five or more Dwelling Units. No less than 40% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least two bedrooms; or no less than 30% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least three bedrooms.		
* * * *				
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P(1)	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code Sections 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Units, Senior Housing, and Group Housing~~.~~*, Generally*	§ 102, 202.2(f), 207, 208	~~*No density limit by lot area. Density restricted by physical envelope controls of height, bulk, setbacks, open space, exposure and other applicable controls of this and other Codes, as well as by applicable design guidelines, applicable elements and area plans of the General Plan, and design review by the Planning Department.*~~*Form-Based Density.*		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual*		

		Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.		
* * * *				
Loss ~~*and Division*~~ of Dwelling Units*:* *Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
Division of Dwelling Units	§ 207.8	Division of existing Dwelling Units P per § 207.8.		
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124, *207.9*	3.6 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

SEC. 756. GLEN PARK NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL TRANSIT DISTRICT.

* * * *

Commercial uses are encouraged at the ground story. Retail frontages and pedestrian-oriented streets are protected by limiting curb cuts (i.e. driveways, garage entries) as well as

requiring ground floor commercial uses on portions of Diamond and Chenery Streets. Housing development is encouraged above the ground story. Housing density is not controlled by the size of the lot but by dwelling unit standards, physical envelope controls and unit mix requirements. Given the area's location and accessibility to the transit network, accessory parking for residential and commercial uses is not required. Any new parking is required to be set back to support a pedestrian friendly streetscape. Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted ~~*within the district pursuant to Section 207.1 of this Code*~~.

Table 756. GLEN PARK NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL TRANSIT DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Glen Park NCT
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
Height and Bulk Limits~~.~~	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250–252, 260, 261.1, *263.19,* 270, *270.3,* 271. See also Height and Bulk District Maps	~~*30-X and 40-X*~~*Varies*. See Height and Bulk Map Sheet HT11 for more information. Height sculpting required on Alleys per § 261.1.
* * * *		
Front Setback and	§§ 130, 131,	*Generally* ~~*N*~~*n*ot ~~*R*~~*r*equired~~.~~*; however, if the existing*

Side Yard	132, 133	*sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).*
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines, *Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
* * * *		
Dwelling Unit Mix	§ 207.6	Generally, *minimum percentages of two bedroom and three bedroom Dwelling Units* ~~*R*~~*r*equired for creation of five or more Dwelling Units~~. *No less than 40% of the total number of proposed Dwelling*~~

		~~*Units shall contain at least two bedrooms; or no less than 30% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least three bedrooms.*~~		
* * * *				
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P(1)	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code Sections 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Units, Senior Housing, and Group Housing*, Generally*	§ 102, 202.2(f), 207, 208	~~*No density limit by lot area. Density restricted by physical envelope controls of height, bulk, setbacks, open space, exposure and other applicable controls of this and other Codes, as well as by applicable design guidelines, applicable elements and area plans of the General Plan, and design review by the Planning Department.*~~*Form-Based Density*		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		
* * * *				
Loss ~~*and Division*~~ of Dwelling Units*:*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		

Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats				
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
Division of Dwelling Units	§ 207.8	Division of existing Dwelling Units P per § 207.8		
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124, *207.9*	2.5 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* * * *

SEC. 757. FOLSOM STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL TRANSIT DISTRICT.

* * * *

Table 757. FOLSOM STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL TRANSIT DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Folsom Street NCT
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		

Massing and Setbacks		
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally ~~N~~not ~~R~~required~~.~~; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).*
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	§ 823(b), and General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	WSoMa Design Standards, ~~*and the*~~ Urban Design Guidelines, *Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
* * * *		
Dwelling Unit Mix	§~~§~~ 207.6	Generally ~~R~~required for creation of five or more Dwelling Units. No less than 40% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain

		at least two bedrooms; or no less than 30% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least three bedrooms.		
* * * *				
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P(1)	P	P
Group Housing	§§ 102, 208	C(1)	C	C
Accessory Dwelling Unit	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code Sections 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Units, Senior Housing, and Group Housing*, Generally*	§ 102, 202.2(f), 207, 208	~~*No density limit by lot area. Density restricted by physical envelope controls of height, bulk, setbacks, open space, exposure and other applicable controls of this and other Codes, as well as by applicable design guidelines, applicable elements and area plans of the General Plan, and design review by the Planning Department.*~~*Form-Based Density*		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		
* * * *				
Loss ~~*and Division*~~ of	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		

Dwelling Units*:* *Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*				
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~
~~*Residential Demolition or Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
Division of Dwelling Units	§ 207.8	Division of existing Dwelling Units P per § 207.8		
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124*, 207.9*	2.5 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* * * *

SEC. 758. REGIONAL COMMERCIAL DISTRICT.

* * * *

Table 758. REGIONAL COMMERCIAL DISTRICT

ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Regional Commercial District
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**

BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally ~~N~~not ~~R~~required~~.~~; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).*
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	§ 823(b), and General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	WSoMa Design Standards, ~~*and the*~~ Urban Design Guidelines, *Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
* * * *		
Dwelling Unit Mix	§~~§~~ 207.6	Generally ~~R~~required for creation of five or more Dwelling Units. No less than 40% of the total

		number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least two bedrooms; or no less than 30% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least three bedrooms.		
* * * *				
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses (Except for Group Housing, see below)	§102	P	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code Sections 207.1 and 207.2.		
Group Housing	§§ 102, 208	C(1)	C	C
Dwelling Units, Group Housing, and Senior Housing*, Generally*	§ 102, 202.2(f), 207, 208	~~*No density limit by lot area. Density restricted by physical envelope controls of height, bulk, setbacks, open space, exposure and other applicable controls of this and other Codes, as well as by applicable design guidelines, applicable elements and area plans of the General Plan, and design review by the Planning Department.*~~*Form-Based Density*		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that*		

		exceed the greater of those thresholds.		
* * * *				
Loss ~~*and Division*~~ of Dwelling Units*:* *Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
Division of Dwelling Units	§ 207.8	Division of existing Dwelling Units P per § 207.8		
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124*, 207.9*	2.5 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* Not listed below

(1) NP on 1st floor on lots with more than 25 feet of street frontage.

* * * *

SEC. 759. DIVISADERO STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL TRANSIT DISTRICT.

The Divisadero Street Neighborhood Commercial Transit District ("Divisadero Street NCT") extends along Divisadero Street between Haight and O'Farrell Streets. Divisadero Street's dense mixed-use character consists of buildings with residential units above ground-story commercial use. ~~*Buildings typically range in height from two to four stories with occasional one-story commercial buildings.*~~ The ~~*d*~~*D*istrict has an active and continuous commercial frontage along Divisadero Street for most of its length. Divisadero Street is an important public transit corridor and throughway street. The commercial district provides convenience goods and services to the surrounding neighborhoods as well as limited comparison shopping goods for a wider market.

The Divisadero Street NCT controls are designed to encourage and promote development that enhances the walkable, mixed-use character of the corridor and surrounding neighborhoods. Rear yard requirements above the ground story and at residential levels preserve open space corridors of interior blocks. Housing development in new buildings is encouraged above the ground story. ~~*Existing residential units are protected by limitations on demolition and upper-story conversions.*~~ Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted ~~*within the district pursuant to Section 207.1 of this Code*~~.

Consistent with Divisadero Street's existing mixed-use character, new commercial development is permitted at the ground and second stories. Most neighborhood-serving businesses are strongly encouraged. Controls on new Formula Retail uses are consistent with Citywide policy for Neighborhood Commercial Districts~~;~~. The second story may be used by some retail stores, personal services, and medical, business and professional offices. Additional flexibility is offered for second-floor Eating and Drinking, Entertainment, and Trade Shop uses in existing non-residential buildings to encourage the preservation and reuse of such buildings. Hotels are monitored at all stories. Limits on late-night activity, drive-up facilities, and other automobile uses protect the livability within and around the district, and

promote continuous retail frontage.

If the Planning Department determines that any site proposed for residential development and located within the Divisadero Street NCT has received a 50% or greater increase in residential densities over prior zoning through the adoption of Ordinance No. 127-15, any development project that is subject to the Inclusionary Affordable Housing Program on such site shall pay the Affordable Housing Fee, or provide one of the Alternatives to Payment of the Affordable Housing Fee, set forth in Planning Code Sections 415 et seq., except that the amount of the Affordable Housing Fee or Alternatives to Payment of the Affordable Housing Fee shall be modified as set forth in Planning Code Sections 428 et seq.

Table 759. DIVISADERO STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL TRANSIT DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Divisadero St. NCT
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
Height and Bulk Limits~~.~~	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250–252, 260, 261.1, *263.19,* 270, *270.3,* 271. See also Height and Bulk District	~~*65-A, and 40-X south of Oak Street*~~*Varies*. See Height and Bulk Map Sheets HT02 and HT07 for more information. Height sculpting required on Alleys per § 261.1.

	Maps	
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally ~~N~~not ~~R~~required~~.~~; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).*
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines, *Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
* * * *		
Dwelling Unit Mix	§ 207.6	Generally ~~R~~required for creation of five or more

		Dwelling Units. No less than 40% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least two bedrooms; or no less than 30% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least three bedrooms.		
* * * *				
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P(1)	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code Sections 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Units, Senior Housing, and Group Housing*, Generally*	§ 102, 202.2(f), 207, 208	~~*No density limit by lot area. Density restricted by physical envelope controls of height, bulk, setbacks, open space, exposure and other applicable controls of this and other Codes, as well as by applicable design guidelines, applicable elements and area plans of the General Plan, and design review by the Planning Department.*~~*Form-Based Density*		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		
* * * *				

Loss ~~*and Division*~~ of Dwelling Units*:* *Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
Division of Dwelling Units	§ 207.8	Division of existing Dwelling Units P per § 207.8		
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124*, 207.9*	2.5 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* * * *

SEC. 760. FILLMORE STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL TRANSIT DISTRICT.

* * * *

The Fillmore Street NCT controls are designed to encourage and promote development that enhances the walkable, mixed-use character of the corridor and surrounding neighborhoods. Rear yard requirements at residential levels preserve open space

corridors of interior blocks. Housing development in new buildings is encouraged above the ground story. ~~*Existing residential units are protected by limitations on demolition and upper-story conversions.*~~ Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted ~~*within the district pursuant to Section 207.1 of this Code*~~.

* * * *

Table 760. FILLMORE STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL TRANSIT DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Fillmore St. NCT
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally* ~~*N*~~not ~~*R*~~required~~.~~*; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).*
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		

Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*	
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES			
Development Standards			
* * * *			
Dwelling Unit Mix	§ 207.6	Generally ~~R~~*r*equired for creation of five or more Dwelling Units. No less than 40% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least two bedrooms; or no less than 30% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least three bedrooms.	
* * * *			
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**	
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P(1)	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code Sections 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Units, Senior Housing, and Group Housing*, Generally*	§ 102, 202.2(f), 207, 208	~~*No density limit by lot area. Density restricted by physical envelope controls of height, bulk, setbacks, open space, exposure and other applicable controls of this and other Codes, as well as by applicable design guidelines, applicable elements and area plans of the General Plan, and design review by the Planning*~~		

		~~*Department.*~~*Form-Based Density*		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		
* * * *				
Loss ~~*and Division*~~ of Dwelling Units*:* *Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~	~~*NP*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
Division of Dwelling Units	§ 207.8	Division of existing Dwelling Units P per § 207.8		
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124*, 207.9*	3.6 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* * * *

SEC. 761. HAYES-GOUGH NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL TRANSIT DISTRICT.

* * * *

The Hayes-Gough District controls are designed to allow for growth and expansion that is compatible with the existing building and use scales. Building standards protect the moderate building and Use Size and require rear yards at residential levels. To maintain the mixed-use character of the district, most commercial uses are permitted at the first and second stories and housing is strongly encouraged ~~*at the third story and above*~~. Retail sales activity, especially neighborhood-serving businesses, is further promoted by restricting new ground-story medical, business and professional offices. To protect continuous frontage, drive-up and most automobile uses are prohibited, above-ground parking is required to be setback or below ground, and active, pedestrian-oriented ground floor uses are required on Hayes Street and portions of Octavia Boulevard.

Housing development in new buildings is encouraged ~~*above the second story*~~, and is controlled not by lot area but by physical envelope controls. ~~*Existing residential units are protected by limitations on demolitions, mergers, subdivisions, and upper-story conversions.*~~ Given the area's central location and accessibility to the downtown and to the City's transit network, accessory parking for Residential Uses is not required. The code controls for this district are supported and augmented by design guidelines and policies in the Market and Octavia Area Plan of the General Plan. *Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted.*

Table 761. HAYES-GOUGH NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL TRANSIT DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Hayes-Gough NCT

Zoning Category	§ References	Controls
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
Height and Bulk Limits~~.~~	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250–252, 260, 261.1, *263.19,* 270, *270.3,* 271. See also Height and Bulk District Maps	Varies. See Height and Bulk Map Sheets HT02 and HT07 for more information. Height sculpting required on Alleys per § 261.1.
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally* ~~*N*~~not ~~*R*~~*r*equired~~.~~*; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).*
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		

Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
* * * *		
Dwelling Unit Mix	§ 207.6	Generally ~~R~~*r*equired for creation of five or more Dwelling Units. No less than 40% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least two bedrooms; or no less than 30% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least three bedrooms.
* * * *		
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**
		1st / **2nd** / **3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P(1) / P / P
Accessory Dwelling Unit	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code Sections 207.1 and 207.2.
Dwelling Units, Senior Housing, and Group Housing*, Generally*	§ 102, 202.2(f), 207, 208	~~*No density limit by lot area. Density restricted by physical envelope controls of height, bulk, setbacks, open space, exposure and other applicable controls of*~~

			~~*this and other Codes, as well as by applicable design guidelines, applicable elements and area plans of the General Plan, and design review by the Planning Department.*~~*Form-Based Density*		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		
* * * *				
Loss ~~*and Division*~~ of Dwelling Units*:* *Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
Division of Dwelling Units	§ 207.8	Division of existing Dwelling Units P per § 207.8		
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				

Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124, *207.9*	3.0 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*
* * * *		

* * * *

SEC. 762. VALENCIA STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL TRANSIT DISTRICT.

* * * *

Table 762. VALENCIA STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL TRANSIT DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

* * * *

		Valencia Street NCT
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally ~~Nn~~*not *~~Rr~~*equired*~~.~~; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).*

* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
* * * *		
Dwelling Unit Mix	§~~§~~ 207.6	Generally ~~R~~*r*equired for creation of five or more Dwelling Units. No less than 40% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least two bedrooms; or no less than 30% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least three bedrooms.
* * * *		

Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P(1)	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Units	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code Sections 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Units, Senior Housing, and Group Housing*, Generally*	§ 102, 202.2(f), 207, 208	~~*No residential density limit by lot area. Density restricted by physical envelope controls of height, bulk, setbacks, open space, exposure and other*~~		

			~~*applicable controls of this and other Codes, as well as by applicable design guidelines, applicable elements and area plans of the General Plan, and design review by the Planning Department.*~~*Form-Based Density*		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		
* * * *				
Loss ~~*and Division*~~ of Dwelling Units*:* *Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~	~~*NP*~~
~~*Residential Demolition or Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
Division of Dwelling Units	§ 207.8	Division of existing Dwelling Units P per § 207.8		
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				

Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124, *207.9*	2.5 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*
* * * *		

* Not listed below

(1) C required for ground floor residential use when street frontage is listed in 145.4(b)

* * * *

SEC. 763. 24TH STREET – MISSION NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL TRANSIT DISTRICT.

* * * *

Table 763. 24TH STREET – MISSION NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL TRANSIT DISTRICT

ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		24th Street – Mission NCT
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally* ~~*N*~~*n*ot ~~*R*~~*r*equired~~.~~*; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan.*

		This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
* * * *		
Dwelling Unit Mix	§§ 207.6	Generally ~~R~~required for creation of five or more Dwelling Units. No less than 40% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least two bedrooms; or no less than 30% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least three bedrooms.
* * * *		

Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P(1)	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Units	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code Sections 207.1 and 207.2.		

Dwelling Units, Senior Housing, and Group Housing*, Generally*	§ 102, 202.2(f), 207, 208	~~*No residential density limit by lot area. Density restricted by physical envelope controls of height, bulk, setbacks, open space, exposure and other applicable controls of this and other Codes, as well as by applicable design guidelines, applicable elements and area plans of the General Plan, and design review by the Planning Department.*~~*Form-Based Density.*		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		
* * * *				
Loss ~~*and Division*~~ of Dwelling Units*: Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~	~~*NP*~~
~~*Residential Demolition or Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
Division of Dwelling	§ 207.8	Division of existing Dwelling Units P per § 207.8		

Units		
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124, *207.9*	2.5 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*
* * * *		

* * * *

SEC. 764. UPPER MARKET STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL TRANSIT DISTRICT.

* * * *

The Upper Market Street Transit District controls are designed to promote moderate-scale development which contributes to the definition of Market Street's design and character. They are also intended to preserve the existing mix of Commercial Uses and maintain the livability of the district and its surrounding residential areas. Large-lot and use development is reviewed for consistency with existing development patterns. Rear yards are protected at all levels. To promote mixed-use buildings, most Commercial Uses are permitted with some limitations above the second story. In order to maintain continuous retail frontage and preserve a balanced mix of Commercial Uses, ground-story neighborhood-serving uses are encouraged, and financial service uses are limited. Ground floor-commercial space is required along Market and Church Streets. Most Automotive Service and Drive-Up ~~*Faciility*~~*Facility* uses are prohibited or conditional.

Housing development in new buildings is encouraged ~~*above the Second Story*~~. ~~*Existing upper-story Residential Units are protected by limitations on demolitions and upper-story conversions.*~~ Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted ~~*within the district pursuant to Sections 207.1 and 207.2 of*~~

~~*this Code*~~.

Table 764. UPPER MARKET STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL TRANSIT DISTRICT

ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Upper Market Street NCT
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
Height and Bulk Limits~~.~~	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250–252, 260, 261.1, *263.19,* 270, *270.3,* 271. See also Height and Bulk District Maps.	Varies. See Height and Bulk Map Sheet HT07 for more information. Height sculpting required on Alleys per § 261.1.
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally* ~~*N*~~not ~~*R*~~*r*equired~~.~~*; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required*

		recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).		
* * * *				
Miscellaneous				
* * * *				
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines, *Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*		
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*		
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
* * * *				
Dwelling Unit Mix	§ 207.6	Generally ~~R~~*r*equired for creation of five or more Dwelling Units. No less than 40% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least two bedrooms; or no less than 30% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least three bedrooms.		
* * * *				
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**

Residential Uses	§102	P(1)	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code Sections 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Units, Senior Housing, and Group Housing~~.~~*, Generally*	§ 102, 202.2(f), 207, 208	~~*No density limit by lot area. Density restricted by physical envelope controls of height, bulk, setbacks, open space, exposure and other applicable controls of this and other Codes, as well as by applicable design guidelines, applicable elements and area plans of the General Plan, and design review by the Planning Department.*~~*Form-Based Density*		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		
* * * *				
Loss ~~*and Division*~~ of Dwelling Units*: Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~

~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~C~~	~~C~~	~~C~~
Division of Dwelling Units	§ 207.8	Division of existing Dwelling Units P per § 207.8		
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124, *207.9*	3.0 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* * * *

SEC. 780.1. LAKESHORE PLAZA SPECIAL USE DISTRICT.

(a) Purpose and Findings. In addition to the purposes stated in Section 701 of this Code, the following purpose and findings form a basis for special regulations and provide guidance for their application in the Lakeshore Plaza Special Use District.

* * * *

(3) Housing development in new buildings is encouraged.

(b) **Controls.** The controls for the NC-S District, as set forth in Section 713 of this Code, shall apply to the Lakeshore Plaza Special Use District, except as provided below:

Zoning Category No.	**Controls**
.10	~~*The 26-40-X height district requires Conditional Use authorization for heights over 26 feet not exceeding 40 feet.*~~*Varies. See Height and Bulk District Maps.*
* * * *	

.90	*Residential uses are permitted at all stories.~~Residential uses are permitted as conditional uses at the first and second stories and not permitted above the second story.~~*
.91, .92, .93	*~~Residential density for dwelling units is one unit per 3,000 sq. ft. of lot area; group housing is not permitted; minimum usable open space per dwelling unit is 300 sq. ft. if private and 400 sq. ft. if common.~~Form-Based Density applies for all Residential Uses.*
* * * *	

SEC. 780.3. NORTH BEACH SPECIAL USE DISTRICT.

* * * *

(c) **Controls.** The following provisions shall apply within such District:

* * * *

(4) ***~~Loss of Residential Units.~~*** *~~To prevent the loss of existing Residential Units within the district, the removal, demolition, merger, or conversion of Residential Units above the First Story are prohibited.~~[Reserved]*

* * * *

SEC. 810. CHINATOWN COMMUNITY BUSINESS DISTRICT.

The Chinatown Community Business District, located in the northeast quadrant of San Francisco, extends along Broadway from the eastern portal of the Broadway Tunnel to Columbus Avenue and along Kearny Street from Columbus to Sacramento Street. This district

also includes portions of Commercial Street between Montgomery Street and Grant Avenue and portions of Grant Avenue between Bush and California Streets. It is part of the larger core area of Chinatown.

The portions of Broadway, Kearny, and Commercial Streets and Grant Avenue in this district are transitional edges or entries to Chinatown. North and east of the two blocks of Broadway contained in this district are North Beach and the Broadway Entertainment Districts. Kearny and Columbus Streets are close to intensive office development in the Downtown Financial District. Both Grant Avenue and Commercial Street provide important pedestrian entries to Chinatown. Generally, this district has more potential for added retail and commercial development than other parts of Chinatown.

This zoning district is intended to protect existing housing, encourage new housing and to accommodate modest expansion of Chinatown business activities as well as street-level retail uses. The size of individual professional or business office use is limited in order to prevent these areas from being used to accommodate larger office uses spilling over from the financial district.

Housing development in new buildings is encouraged at upper stories. ~~*Existing housing is protected by limitations on demolitions and upper-story conversions.*~~ Accessory dwelling units are permitted ~~*within the district pursuant to Subsection 207(c)(4) of this Code*~~.

Table 810

CHINATOWN COMMUNITY BUSINESS DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Chinatown Community Business District
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		

* * * *				
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*		
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
* * * *				
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit ~~*Density*~~	§§ 102, 207*.1(c)(4),* *207.2*	Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted to be constructed within an existing building zoned for residential use or within an existing and authorized auxiliary structure on the same lot, provided that it does not eliminate or reduce a ground-story retail or commercial space.		
Dwelling Unit Density	§ 207	Up to 1 unit per 200 sq. ft. lot area.		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		
Group Housing Density	§§ 208, 890.88(b)	1 bedroom per 140 sq. ft. lot area.		

* * * *				
Loss of Dwelling Units*: Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion, Demolition or Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
* * * *				
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124, *207.9*	1.8 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* * * *

SEC. 811. CHINATOWN VISITOR RETAIL DISTRICT.

* * * *

The height limit applicable to the district will accommodate two floors of housing or institutional use above two floors of retail use. ~~*Existing residential units are protected by prohibition of upper-story conversions and limitation on demolition.*~~ Accessory dwelling units are permitted ~~*within the district pursuant to Subsection 207(c)(4) of this Code*~~.

Table 811

CHINATOWN VISITOR RETAIL DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Chinatown Visitor Retail District		
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**		
BUILDING STANDARDS				
* * * *				
Miscellaneous				
* * * *				
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*		
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
* * * *				
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit ~~*Density*~~	§§ 102, 207*.1(c)(4),* *207.2*	Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted to be constructed within an existing building zoned for residential use or within an existing and authorized auxiliary structure on the same lot, provided that it does not eliminate or reduce a ground-story retail or commercial space.		
Dwelling Unit Density	§ 207	Up to 1 unit per 200 sq. ft. lot area.		
Minimum Dwelling Unit	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally*		

Densities, if Applicable		*ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		
Group Housing Density	§§ 208, 890.88(b)	1 bedroom per 140 sq. ft. lot area.		
* * * *				
Loss of Dwelling Units*: Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion, Demolition or Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
* * * *				
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124*, 207.9*	2.0 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* * * *

SEC. 812. CHINATOWN RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL

DISTRICT.

* * * *

Housing development in new and existing buildings is encouraged above the ground floor. Institutional uses are also encouraged. ~~*Existing residential units are protected by limits on demolition and conversion.*~~ Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted ~~*within the district pursuant to subsection 207(c)(4) of this Code*~~.

Table 812

CHINATOWN RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT

ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Chinatown Residential Neighborhood Commercial District
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
*** * * ***		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
* * * *		
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**

		1st	2nd	3rd +
Residential Uses	§102	P	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit ~~*Density*~~	§§ 102, 207*.1(c)(4)*, *207.2*	Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted to be constructed within an existing building zoned for residential use or within an existing and authorized auxiliary structure on the same lot, provided that it does not eliminate or reduce a ground-story retail or commercial space.		
Dwelling Unit Density	§ 207	Up to 1 unit per 200 sq. ft. lot area.		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		
Group Housing Density	§§ 208, 890.88(b)	1 bedroom per 140 sq. ft. lot area.		
* * * *				
Loss of Dwelling Units*: Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion,*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~

~~*Demolition or Merger*~~				
* * * *				
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124, *207.9*	1.0 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* * * *

SEC. 825. DTR – DOWNTOWN RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS.

* * * *

(c) **Use.** A use is the specified purpose for which a property or building is used, occupied, maintained, or leased. Uses in Downtown Residential Districts are either permitted, conditional, accessory, temporary or are not permitted. If there are two or more uses in a structure, any use not classified in Section 825(c)(1)(C) below as accessory will be considered separately as an independent permitted, conditional, temporary or not permitted use.

* * * *

(2) **Residential Use Controls.** Unless otherwise specified in a Section governing an individual DTR District, the following residential use controls shall apply:

* * * *

(C) **Residential Density.** *Form-Based Density applies in the Downtown Residential Districts.*~~*There shall be no density limit for residential uses in Downtown Residential Districts. The provisions of Sections 207 through 208 related to residential density shall not apply.*~~

* * * *

SEC. 827. RINCON HILL DOWNTOWN RESIDENTIAL MIXED USE DISTRICT (RH-

DTR).

* * * *

No.	Zoning Category	§ References	Rincon Hill Downtown Residential Mixed Use District Zoning Controls
Building and Siting Standards			
* * * *			
.13	Setbacks	~~*Ground Floor Residential Design Guidelines*~~ *Urban Design Guidelines, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*	Building setback of 3 to 10 ft. for all buildings except towers on Spear, Main, Beale, Fremont, and First Streets. § 827(a)(2) and (6). Upper-story setback of 10 ft. required above a height of 65 feet on both sides of Spear, Main, Beale, Fremont, and First Streets. § 827(a)(5).

				Sun access plane setback of 50 degrees for all buildings 85' and lower on the south side of east-west mid-block pathways. § 827(a)(5).
	.14	Street-Facing Uses	§§ 145.1, 145.4, ~~*Ground Floor Residential Design Guidelines*~~ *Urban Design Guidelines, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*	Active uses required on all street frontages. See §§ 145.1, 825(b). Ground-level residential or commercial requirements based on location. See §§ 145.4 and 827(a)(2).
	* * * *			
	Non-Residential Standards and Uses			
	* * * *			
	.21	Use Size [*Non-Residential*]	§§ 890.130, 145.14, *207.9*	P for non-residential uses up to 25,000 sq. ft., C above. No

			individual ground floor tenant may occupy more than 75' of frontage for a depth of 25' from Folsom Street. §§ 145.14. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*
* * * *			
Residential Standards and Uses			
* * * *			
.47	Residential Density, ~~*Dwelling Units*~~*General*	§*§ 207.5(d), 207.6,* 890.88(a)	~~*No Limit. § 207.5(d) # Form-Based Density. Dwelling*~~ Unit Mix Required § 207.6
.47b	*Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable*	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*
.47c	*Maximum Dwelling Unit Size*	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent*

			Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.
.48	Residential Density, Group Housing	§*§ 207.5,* 890.88(b)	~~*No Limit.*~~ ~~*§ 207.5(d)*~~*Form-Based Density*
* * * *			

* * * *

SEC. 829. SOUTH BEACH DOWNTOWN RESIDENTIAL MIXED USE DISTRICT (SB-DTR).

* * * *

While lot coverage is limited for all levels with residential uses that do not face onto streets or alleys, traditional rear yard open spaces are not required. Specific height, bulk, and setback controls establish appropriate heights for both towers and mid-rise podium development and ensure adequate spacing between towers in order to establish a neighborhood scale and ensure light and air to streets and open spaces. Setbacks are required where necessary to provide transition space for ground floor residential uses and to ensure sunlight access to streets and open spaces. Off-street parking must be located below grade. Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted within the district ~~*pursuant to Section 207.1 of this Code*~~.

Table 829

SOUTH BEACH DOWNTOWN RESIDENTIAL MIXED USE DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

No.	Zoning Category	§ References	South Beach Downtown Residential Mixed Use District Zoning Controls
Building and Siting Standards			
Non-Residential Standards and Uses			
* * * *			
.21	Use Size [*Non-Residential*]	§§ 890.130, *207.9*	P for non-residential uses up to 25,000 sq. ft., C above. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*
* * * *			
Residential Standards and Uses			
* * * *			
.47	Residential Density, ~~*Dwelling Units*~~*General*	§§ *207.5(d), 207.6,* 890.88(a)	~~*No Limit. § 207.5(d) # Form-Based Density. Dwelling*~~ Unit Mix Required § 207.6
.47b	*Minimum Dwelling Unit*	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on*

	Densities, if Applicable		*project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*
.47c	*Maximum Dwelling Unit Size*	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*
.48	Residential Density, Group Housing	§*§ 207.5,* 890.88(b)	~~*No Limit.*~~ ~~*§ 207.5(d)*~~*Form-Based Density.*
* * * *			

* * * *

SEC. 830. CMUO – CENTRAL SOMA MIXED USE-OFFICE DISTRICT.

* * * *

Table 830

CMUO – CENTRAL SOMA MIXED USE-OFFICE DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

Central SoMa Mixed Use-Office Controls

Zoning Category	§ References	Controls
BUILDING STANDARDS		
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element; Central SoMa Plan	Subject to the Citywide Urban Design Guidelines, *Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
* * * *		
* * * *		
Residential Uses		
Residential Uses	§102	P
Dwelling Units, Senior Housing, and Group Housing *Density, General*	§ 207	~~*No residential density limit by lot area. Density restricted by physical envelope controls of height, bulk, setbacks, open space, exposure and other applicable controls of this and other Codes, as well as by applicable design guidelines, applicable elements and area plans of the General Plan, and design review by the Planning Department.*~~*Form-Based Density.*
Minimum Dwelling Unit	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally*

Densities, if Applicable		*ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*
Group Housing	§§ 102, 249.78(c)(8)	NP, except Group Housing uses that are also defined as Student Housing or Senior Housing, ~~,~~ are designated for persons with disabilities, are designated for Transition Age Youth, or are contained in buildings that consist of 100% affordable units.
* * * *		
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124, 128.1, *207.9,* 249.78	In the Central SoMa SUD, ~~P~~*p*revailing Height and Density limits are determined by Section 249.78, subject to the requirements of Section 128. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*
* * * *		

SEC. 831. MUG – MIXED USE-GENERAL DISTRICT.

* * * *

Housing is encouraged over ground floor commercial and PDR uses. New residential or mixed use developments are encouraged to provide as much mixed-income family housing

as possible. Existing group housing and dwelling units would be protected from demolition or conversion to nonresidential use by requiring conditional use review. Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted ~~*within the district pursuant to Section 207.1 of this Code*~~.

* * * *

Table 831

MUG – MIXED USE-GENERAL DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

Zoning Category	§ References	Mixed Use-General Controls
BUILDING STANDARDS		
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element; Central SoMa Plan	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission*.~~.~~
* * * *		
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
* * * *		
Residential Conversion, Demolition, or Merger *of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	§ 317	C ~~*for Removal of one or more Residential Units or Unauthorized Units.*~~

* * * *		
Residential Uses		
* * * *		
Dwelling Unit and Group Housing Density, *General*	§ 207	~~*No density limit. Density is regulated by the permitted height and bulk, and required setbacks, exposure, and open space of each development lot.*~~*Form-Based Density.*
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 123, 124, *207.9*	FAR based on permitted height. See §124 for more information. (4) *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*
* * * *		

* * * *

(4) Within the Central SOMA SUD, see Planning Code Section 249.78 for specific controls.

* * * *

SEC. 832. MUO – MIXED USE-OFFICE DISTRICT.

The Mixed Use-Office (MUO) is designed to encourage office uses and housing, as well as small-scale light manufacturing and arts activities. Nighttime entertainment and small tourist hotels are permitted as a conditional use. Large tourist hotels are permitted as a conditional use in certain height districts. Dwelling units and group housing are permitted, while demolition or conversion of existing dwelling units or group housing requires conditional use authorization. Family-sized housing is encouraged. Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted ~~*within the district pursuant to Section 207.1 of this Code*~~.

* * * *

Table 832

MUO – MIXED USE-OFFICE DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

Zoning Category	§ References	Mixed Use-Office District Controls
BUILDING STANDARDS		
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission*.~~.~~
* * * *		
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
* * * *		
Residential Conversion, Demolition, or Merger *of Dwelling Units,*	§ 317	C ~~*for Removal of one or more Residential Units or Unauthorized Units.*~~

including Residential Flats		
* * * *		
Residential Uses		
* * * *		
Senior Housing	*§§ 102, 202.2(f)*	*P*
Homeless Shelters	§§ 102, 208	P
Dwelling Unit and Group Housing Density, *General*	§ 208	~~*No density limit. Density is regulated by the permitted height and bulk, and required setbacks, exposure, and open space of each development lot.*~~*Form-Based Density.*
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*
* * * *		
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 123, 124, *207.9*	Varies, depending on height, as set forth in § 124. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*
* * * *		

* * * *

SEC. 833. MUR – MIXED USE-RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT.

* * * *

Table 833

MUR – MIXED USE-RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

Zoning Category	§ References	Mixed Use-Residential District Controls
BUILDING STANDARDS		
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element; Central SoMa Plan	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission*.
* * * *		
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
* * * *		
Residential Conversion, Demolition, or Merger *of Dwelling Units, including Residential*	§ 317	C ~~*for Removal of one or more Residential Units or Unauthorized Units.*~~

Flats		
* * * *		
Residential Uses		
* * * *		
Senior Housing	*§§ 102, 202.2(f)*	*P*
Homeless Shelters	§*§ 102,* 208	P
Dwelling Unit and Group Housing Density*, General*	§ 208	~~*No density limit. Density is regulated by the permitted height and bulk, and required setbacks, exposure, and open space of each development lot.*~~*Form-Based Density.*
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*
* * * *		
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 123, 124, 128.1, 249.78*, 207.9*	FAR based on permitted height, see Section 124 for more information. (3) *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*
* * * *		

* * * *

(3) For projects within the Central SoMa SUD, see specific requirements in Section 249.78.

* * * *

SEC. 834. RED – RESIDENTIAL ENCLAVE DISTRICT.

* * * *

Dwelling units are permitted as a principal use. Nonresidential uses, except art related activities, are not permitted, except for certain uses in historic buildings. Existing commercial activities in nonresidential structures may continue as nonconforming uses subject to the termination requirements of Sections 185 and 186. Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted ~~*within the district pursuant to Section 207.1 of this Code*~~.

Table 834

RED – RESIDENTIAL ENCLAVE DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

Zoning Category	§ References	Residential Enclave District Controls
BUILDING STANDARDS		
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
Design Guidelines and Standards	*General Plan Commerce and Industry Element*	*Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*
Large Project Review	§ 329	As required by § 329.
* * * *		

Awnings, Canopy, or Marquee	§ 136	NP(6)
* * * *		
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
* * * *		
Residential Conversion, Demolition, or Merger *of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	§ 317	C ~~*for Removal of one or more Residential Units or Unauthorized Units.*~~
* * * *		
Residential Uses		
* * * *		
Senior Housing	*§§ 102, 202.2(f)*	*P*
Homeless Shelters	§ 102	C
Dwelling Unit Density, *General*	§§ 207, 208	~~*No density limit. Density is regulated by the permitted height and bulk, and required setbacks, exposure, and open space of each development lot.*~~*Form-Based Density.*
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual*

		Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.
* * * *		
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
* * * *		

* * * *

(6) *Awning or canopy is P if required as a wind mitigation feature.* Awnings are *also P permitted* ~~*only*~~ for Limited Commercial Uses, as described in Section 186 of this Code.

* * * *

SEC. 835. RED-MX – RESIDENTIAL ENCLAVE-MIXED DISTRICT.

* * * *

While residential uses are encouraged throughout these districts, group housing is limited, and student housing and single-room-occupancy units are prohibited. Small-scale retail, restaurants, arts activities, and other commercial uses are principally permitted to create the potential for more active, mixed use alleys. Some automobile-related and production, distribution, and repair uses are also permitted with limitations. Existing commercial activities in nonresidential structures may continue as nonconforming uses subject to the termination requirements of Article 1.7. Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted ~~*within the district pursuant to Section 207.1 of this Code*~~.

Table 835

RED-MX – RESIDENTIAL ENCLAVE-MIXED DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

Zoning Category	§ References	Residential Enclave-Mixed District Controls
BUILDING STANDARDS		

* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element.	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*
* * * *		
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
* * * *		
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*NP(5)*~~
Residential *Conversion,* Demolition, *or* Merger *of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	§ 317	C ~~*for Removal of one or more Residential Units or Unauthorized Units.*~~
* * * *		
Residential Uses		
* * * *		
Senior Housing	*§§ 102, 202.2(f)*	*P*
Homeless Shelters	§ 102	C
Dwelling Unit and Group Housing Density*, General*	§§ 207	~~*No density limit. Density is regulated by the permitted height and bulk, and required setbacks, exposure, and open space of each development lot.*~~*Form-Based*

		Density.
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*
* * * *		
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
* * * *		

* * * *

(5) ~~*C in Article 10 Landmark Buildings*~~*[Reserved]*

* * * *

SEC. 836. SALI – SERVICE/ARTS/LIGHT INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT.

The Service/Arts/Light Industrial (SALI) District is largely comprised of low-scale buildings with production, distribution, and repair uses. The ~~*d*~~*D*istrict is designed to protect and facilitate the expansion of existing general commercial, manufacturing, home and business service, and light manufacturing activities, with an emphasis on preserving and expanding arts activities. Nighttime Entertainment is permitted although limited by buffers around RED and RED-MX districts. Residential Uses, Offices, Hotels, and Adult Entertainment uses are not permitted, except that certain Affordable Housing Projects are permitted within the district pursuant to Section 846.24 of this Code, and Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted ~~*within the district pursuant to Section 207.1 of this Code*~~.

Table 836

SALI – SERVICE/ARTS/LIGHT INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

Zoning Category	§ References	Service/Arts/Light Industrial District Controls
BUILDING STANDARDS		
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element.	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*
* * * *		
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
* * * *		
Residential Conversion, Demolition, or Merger *of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	§ 317	C ~~*for Removal of one or more Residential Units or Unauthorized Units.*~~
* * * *		
Residential Uses		
Dwelling Units	§ 102	NP(3)
* * * *		
Dwelling Unit and	§§ 207	~~*No density limit. Density is regulated by the permitted*~~

Group Housing Density, *General*		~~*height and bulk, and required setbacks, exposure, and open space of each development lot.*~~*Form-Based Density.*
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*
* * * *		
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
* * * *		

* * * *

(3) NP, Except Affordable Housing Projects meeting the requirements of Section 803.8.

* * * *

SEC. 837. SPD – SOUTH PARK DISTRICT.

South Park is an attractive affordable mixed-use neighborhood. The South Park District (SPD) is intended to preserve the scale~~*, density*~~ and mix of commercial and residential activities within this unique neighborhood. The district is characterized by small-scale, continuous-frontage warehouse, retail and residential structures built in a ring around an oval-shaped, grassy park. Retention of the existing structures is encouraged, as is a continued mix of uses, family-sized housing units, and in-fill development which contributes positively to the neighborhood scale and use mix. Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted within the ~~*d*~~*D*istrict

~~*pursuant to Section 207.1 of this Code*~~.

* * * *

Table 837

SPD – SOUTH PARK DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

Zoning Category	§ References	South Park District Controls
BUILDING STANDARDS		
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
Design Guidelines and Standards	*General Plan Commerce and Industry Element*	*Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*
Large Project Review	§ 329	As required by § 329.
* * * *		
Awning, Canopy, or Marquee	§ 136, 136.1	NP*(4)*
* * * *		
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
* * * *		
Residential Conversion, Demolition, or Merger *of Dwelling Units, including Residential*	§ 317	C ~~*for Removal of one or more Residential Units or Unauthorized Units.*~~

Flats		
* * * *		
Residential Uses		
* * * *		
Senior Housing	*§§ 102, 202.2(f)*	*P*
Homeless Shelters	§ 102	C
Dwelling Unit and Group Housing Density, *General*	§§ 207	~~*No density limit. Density is regulated by the permitted height and bulk, and required setbacks, exposure, and open space of each development lot.*~~*Form-Based Density.*
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*
* * * *		
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124, *207.9*	FAR based on permitted height. See Section 124. Childcare Facilities and Residential Care Facilities are exempt from FAR limits. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*

* * * *

* * * *

(4) ~~*[Note Deleted]*~~ *Awning or canopy is P if required as a wind mitigation feature.*

* * * *

SEC. 838. UMU – URBAN MIXED USE DISTRICT.

* * * *

Table 838

UMU – URBAN MIXED USE DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

Zoning Category	§ References	Urban Mixed Use District Controls
BUILDING STANDARDS		
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*
* * * *		
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
* * * *		
Residential Conversion, Demolition, or Merger *of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	§ 317	C ~~*for Removal of one or more Residential Units or Unauthorized Units.*~~

* * * *		
Residential Uses		
* * * *		
Senior Housing	*§§ 102, 202.2(f)*	*P*
Homeless Shelter*s*	§ 102	P
Dwelling Unit and Group Housing Density*, General*	§*§* 207	~~*No density limit. Density is regulated by the permitted height and bulk, and required setbacks, exposure, and open space of each development lot.*~~*Form-Based Density.*
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*
* * * *		
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 123, 124*, 207.9*	Section 124 sets forth Basic FAR based on height. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*
* * * *		

* * * *

SEC. 839. WMUG – WSOMA MIXED USE-GENERAL DISTRICT.

* * * *

Table 839

WMUG – WSOMA MIXED USE-GENERAL DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

Zoning Category	§ References	Western SoMa Mixed Use-General District Controls
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
Height and Bulk Limits	§§~~,~~ 261.1, *263.19,* 270, 270.1, 270.2, *270.3,* 271	Varies; see also Height and Bulk District Maps. Height sculpting required on Alleys as set forth in § 261.1. Horizontal mass reduction required as set forth in §270.1. Mid-block alleys required as set forth in §270.2.
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element.	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*
* * * *		
Signs	§ 607.2	As permitted by ~~*Section*~~ § 607.2
* * * *		
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*

RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
* * * *		
Residential Conversion, Demolition, or Merger *of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	§ 317	C ~~*for Removal of one or more Residential Units or Unauthorized Units.*~~
Dwelling Unit Mix	§ 207.6	*Generally required for creation of five or more Dwelling Units.* At least 40% of all Dwelling Units must contain two or more bedrooms or 30% of all Dwelling Units must contain three or more bedrooms.
* * * *		
Residential Uses		
* * * *		
Senior Housing	*§§ 102, 202.2(f)*	*P*
Homeless Shelters	§ 208	P
Dwelling Unit and Group Housing Density, *General*	§§ 207	~~*No density limit. Density is regulated by the permitted height and bulk, and required setbacks, exposure, and open space of each development lot.*~~*Form-Based Density.*
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*

Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*
* * * *		
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 123, 124, *207.9*	FAR based on permitted height, see Section 124 for more information. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*
* * * *		

* * * *

SEC. 840. WMUO – WSOMA MIXED USE-OFFICE DISTRICT.

* * * *

Table 840

WMUO – WSOMA MIXED USE-OFFICE DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

Zoning Category	§ References	Western SoMa Mixed Use-Office District Controls
BUILDING STANDARDS		
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines, *Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning*

	Element.	*Commission.*
* * * *		
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
* * * *		
Residential Conversion, Demolition, or Merger *of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	§ 317	C ~~*for Removal of one or more Residential Units or Unauthorized Units.*~~
~~*Dwelling Unit Mix*~~	~~*§ 207.6*~~	~~*At least 40% of all Dwelling Units must contain two or more bedrooms or 30% of all Dwelling Units must contain three or more bedrooms.*~~
* * * *		
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124, *207.9*	Section 124 sets forth the Basic FAR based on height. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*
* * * *		

* * * *

Section 14. Article 1 of the Business and Tax Regulations Code is hereby amended to revise Section 8, as follows:

SEC. 8. METHOD OF APPEAL TO THE BOARD OF APPEALS.

(a) Except for variance decisions and permits issued by the Entertainment Commission or its Director, and as otherwise specified in this Section 8, appeals to the Board of Appeals shall be taken within 15 days from the making or entry of the order or decision from which the appeal is taken. Appeals of variance decisions shall be taken within 10 days.

(b) Appeals to the Board of Appeals of permit decisions made pursuant to *a Housing Sustainability District* ~~*Planning Code Section 343*~~ shall be taken within 10 days of the permit decision. This subsection (b) shall expire on the *latter of the* Sunset Date of Planning Code Section 343 *or Section 344*, as defined in ~~*that*~~ *those* Section*s*. Upon the expiration of this subsection, the City Attorney shall cause this subsection to be removed from the Business and Tax Regulations Code.

* * * *

Section 15. The Planning Code is hereby amended by replacing references to "Section 151" with "Section 151.1" in the following sections: 102, 153, 154, 204.5, 240.2, 209.1, 209.2, 209.3, 209.4, 210.1, 210.3, 210.4, 240.3, 249.13, 249.17, 249.24, 249.30, 249.35B, 249.42, 249.43, 249.54, 249.85, 249.89, 710, 711, 712, 713, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 723, 724, 725, 726, 727, 728, 729, 730, 731, 732, 733, 734, 735, 736, 737, 738, 739, 740, 741, 742, 743, 744, 745, 746, 750, 751, 763, 831, 832, 833, 834, 835, 836, 837, 838, 839, 840, 920, 960, 963, 964. In the event the Planning Code contains other references to "Section 151," the City Attorney shall direct the publisher of the Municipal Code to change such references to "Section 151.1."

Section 16. Local Coastal Program. This ordinance constitutes an amendment to the Implementation Plan ("IP") of the City's Local Coastal Program. In the event of an inconsistency between this ordinance and previously certified sections of the IP, this

ordinance shall prevail. The Local Coastal Program is hereby amended to:

(a) Add Planning Code Sections 206.10, 334, and 344, as set forth above in Section 3 of this ordinance ["Housing Choice – San Francisco Program"];

(b) Add Planning Code Section 270.3 and modify Planning Code Sections 260, 263.19, 263.20, and 270, as set forth above in Section 4 of this ordinance ["Height and Bulk Limits"];

(c) Modify Planning Code Sections 209, 209.1, and 209.2, as set forth above in Section 6 of this ordinance ["Residential Districts"]. For the purposes of certification by the Coastal Commission, Planning Code Tables 209.1 and 209.2 are reprinted in their entirety, which include the relevant use and development controls for RH, RM-1, and RM-2 properties in the Coastal Zone;

(d) Modify Planning Code Sections 124, 132, 134, 135, 144, 186, 186.3, 201, 207.6, 207.7, 208, 209.4, 231, 303, 304, 603, 606, and 607.1, as set forth above in Section 7 of this ordinance ["Residential, Transit Oriented (RTO) Districts"]. For the purposes of certification by the Coastal Commission, Planning Code Table 209.4 is reprinted in its entirety, which includes the relevant use and development controls for RTO-C properties in the Coastal Zone;

(e) Add Planning Code Sections 207.9 and 207.10 and modify Planning Code Sections 151.1, 153, 154, 155, 155.2, and 161, as set forth above in Section 8 of this ordinance ["Transit Oriented Communities and Parking"];

(f) Modify Planning Code Section 155, as set forth above in Section 9 of this ordinance ["Off-Street Parking and Curb Cuts"];

~~(g) Add Planning Code Section 249.11, as set forth above in Section 10 of this ordinance ["San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Special Use District"];~~

(~~h~~g) Add Planning Code Section 202.17, as set forth above in Section 11 of this ordinance ["Displaced Businesses"];

(~~i~~h) Modify Planning Code Sections 102, 202.2, 311, and 317, as set forth above in Section 12 of this ordinance ["Miscellaneous Amendments"]; and

(~~j~~i) Modify Planning Code Sections 710 and 711, as set forth above in Section 13 of this ordinance ["Conforming Changes to Zoning Tables"]. For the purposes of certification by the Coastal Commission, Planning Code Tables 710 and 711 are reprinted in their entirety, which include the relevant use and development controls for NC-1 and NC-2 properties in the Coastal Zone.

Section 17. Effective and Operative Dates Outside the Coastal Zone.

(a) In the portions of the City that are not located in the Coastal Zone Permit Area, as that permit area is designated on Section Maps CZ4, CZ5, and CZ13 of the Zoning Map, this ordinance shall become effective 30 days after enactment. Enactment occurs when the Mayor signs the ordinance, the Mayor returns the ordinance unsigned or does not sign the ordinance within ten days of receiving it, or the Board of Supervisors overrides the Mayor's veto of the ordinance.

(b) In the portions of the City that are not located in the Coastal Zone Permit Area, this ordinance shall become operative upon its effective date.

Section 18. Effective and Operative Dates in the Coastal Zone.

(a) In the portions of the City that are located in the Coastal Zone Permit Area, this ordinance shall become effective 30 days after enactment. Enactment occurs when the Mayor signs the ordinance, the Mayor returns the ordinance unsigned or does not sign the ordinance within ten days of receiving it, or the Board of Supervisors overrides the Mayor's veto of the ordinance.

(b) Upon enactment, the Director of the Planning Department shall submit this

ordinance to the California Coastal Commission for certification as a Local Coastal Program Amendment. This ordinance shall become operative in the Coastal Zone Permit Area upon final certification by the California Coastal Commission. If the California Coastal Commission certifies this ordinance subject to modifications, this ordinance, as so modified, shall become operative in the Coastal Zone Permit Area 30 days after enactment of the modifications.

(c) This ordinance satisfies the City's obligations pursuant to Government Code Section 65583(c). Any consideration of the Ordinance by the California Coastal Commission after the City's enactment is consistent with the Coastal Act, and permissible pursuant to Government Code Section 65583(f)(1). Certification of the Local Coastal Program Amendment shall proceed pursuant to the California Coastal Commissions regulations and procedures, including any public participation and scheduling requirements.

Section 19. Transmittal of Ordinance. To facilitate the Coastal Commission's review of the Local Coastal Program Amendment, the Director of the Planning Department is authorized to submit the amendment for certification in the form desired by the Coastal Commission, including making any necessary non-substantive changes (e.g., formatting or redlining), to show the changes to the text of the Local Coastal Program. Upon certification by the California Coastal Commission, the Director of the Planning Department shall transmit a copy of the certified Local Coastal Program Amendment to the Clerk of the Board for inclusion in File No. 251073. The Planning Department shall also retain a copy of the certified Local Coastal Program Amendment in its Local Coastal Program files.

Section 20. The ordinance in Board File No. _____ would amend the Planning Code to make various clarifying and typographical changes. Some of the changes in the ordinance in Board File No. _____ would amend portions of the Code that overlap with this ordinance.

In particular, the ordinance in Board File No. _____ proposes to reorganize Section 303.1(e) and (f), which list the formula retail controls for various districts, including RTO-C and the other RTO districts. That reorganization overlaps with formula retail controls for the RTO-C District listed in Section 303.1 of this ordinance. In the event this ordinance is enacted before the ordinance in Board File No. _____, the City Attorney shall direct the publisher of the Municipal Code to integrate the changes in this ordinance into Section 303.1, as amended by the ordinance in Board File No. _____, to ensure that the substantive changes to the formula retail controls for the RTO-C district established in this ordinance are included in the reorganized Section 303.1, such that both (a) RTO-C, and (b) Limited Commercial Uses in RTO-1 and RTO-M Districts are listed in Section 303.1(e).

Section 21. Housing Choice San Francisco Policy. It shall be the policy of the City of San Francisco that the Housing Choice San Francisco Program, codified in Planning Code Section 206.10, shall be interpreted liberally in favor of producing more units. Consistent with Housing Element Implementing Policy 8.1.6, the City shall not adopt changes to the Housing Choice San Francisco Program that constitute new governmental constraints to the development of housing unless those increased constraints are offset by the removal or reduction of other constraints. The Planning Department shall evaluate, and the Board shall consider, any proposed substantive amendments to the Housing Choice San Francisco Program for consistency with California Government Code 65583(a)(3).Section 22. Scope of Ordinance. In enacting this ordinance, the Board of Supervisors intends to amend only those words, phrases, paragraphs, subsections, sections, articles, numbers, punctuation marks, charts, diagrams, or any other constituent parts of the Municipal Code that are explicitly shown in this ordinance as additions, deletions, Board amendment additions, and Board amendment deletions in accordance with the “Note” that appears under the official title of the

ordinance.

Section 23. If any section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, or word of this ordinance, or any application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held to be invalid or unconstitutional by a decision of a court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions or applications of the ordinance; provided that if either Planning Code Section 206.10 or Section 334 is in any respect held to be invalid or unconstitutional by decision of a court of competent jurisdiction, both sections shall become inoperative and have no legal effect. Except as stated in the proviso above, the Board of Supervisors hereby declares that it would have passed this ordinance and each and every section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, and word not declared invalid or unconstitutional without regard to whether any other portion of this ordinance or application thereof would be subsequently declared invalid or unconstitutional.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
DAVID CHIU, City Attorney

By: /s/
AUSTIN M. YANG
Deputy City Attorney

n:\legana\as2025\2500203\01877097.docx

FILE NO. 251073

REVISED LEGISLATIVE DIGEST
(Amended in Committee – October 20, 2025)

[Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan]

Ordinance amending the Planning Code to: 1) create the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program to incent housing development through a local bonus program and by adopting a Housing Sustainability District, 2) modify height and bulk limits to provide for additional capacity in well-resourced neighborhoods, and to allow additional height and bulk for projects using the local bonus program, 3) require only buildings taller than 85 feet in certain Districts to reduce ground level wind currents, 4) make conforming changes to the RH (Residential, House), RM (Residential, Mixed), and RC (Residential-Commercial) District zoning tables to reflect the changes to density controls, and parking requirements made in this ordinance, 5) create the RTO-C (Residential Transit Oriented-Commercial) District, 6) implement the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's Transit-Oriented Communities Policy by making changes to parking requirements, minimum residential densities, and minimum office intensities, and requiring maximum dwelling unit sizes, 7) revise off-street parking and curb cut obligations citywide, 8) create the Non-contiguous San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Sites Special Use District, 9) permit businesses displaced by new construction to relocate without a conditional use authorization and waive development impact fees for those businesses, 10) make technical amendments to the Code to implement the above changes, 11) make conforming changes to zoning tables in various Districts, including the Neighborhood Commercial District and Mixed Use Districts, and 12) reduce usable open space and bicycle parking requirements for senior housing; amending the Business and Tax Regulations Code regarding the Board of Appeals' review of permits in the Housing Choice Program Housing Sustainability District; also, amending the Local Coastal Program to implement the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program and other associated changes in the City's Coastal Zone, and directing the Planning Director to transmit the ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment; 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 public necessity, convenience, and welfare findings under Planning Code, Section 302.

Existing Law

Under California Housing Element law, San Francisco must identify sites to accommodate its Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) goal of 82,069 new units at various income levels, in the next eight years. Because San Francisco does not currently have sufficient capacity to accommodate the RHNA goals, it must rezone sites to meet these goals, and must do so by January 31, 2026. Additional capacity will be created through amendments

to the Planning Code and Zoning Maps. The City must also maintain lists of sites that have been used in prior Housing Element cycles, and sites to accommodate its allocation for lower-income housing.

The Planning Code generally regulates the size of both residential and non-residential development in San Francisco through various height and bulk districts. In addition, the Planning Code regulates the size and intensity of residential and commercial uses, the number of parking spaces allowed or required, the location of curb cuts, floor area ratios, setbacks, rear yards, mid-block alleys, and specifies controls for wind impacts created by new buildings. Residential and non-residential (i.e. commercial, industrial, institutional) uses may be either principally permitted, not permitted, or conditionally permitted with authorization from the Planning Commission.

Specific use requirements, building form requirements, and procedural requirements found throughout the Code are consolidated in a number of zoning control tables that are organized by the type of use (Residential, Commercial, Mixed Use) or by location (Neighborhood Commercial, Named Neighborhood Commercial). Zoning districts for primarily residential uses include “Residential Housing” (RH), “Residential Mixed” (RM), “Residential Commercial” (RC), and “Residential Transit Oriented” (RTO) districts. RTO districts generally include a mixture of house and apartment buildings in a range of densities and building forms, primarily within one-quarter mile of transit and neighborhood commercial areas. Article 7 generally provides the planning requirements for Neighborhood Commercial Districts, and Article 8 generally provides the planning requirements for Mixed-Use Districts.

The Metropolitan Transportation Commission’s Transit Oriented Communities Policy prioritizes transportation and other funding to communities that adopt maximum parking and minimum density standards within a half-mile area around specified transit stops.

The San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency owns multiple parcels throughout the City. Many of these parcels are currently used for parking, and currently zoned for Public uses, which allows public facilities such as transportation maintenance yards and parking, as well as parks and 100% affordable housing. Other parcels are zoned the same as surrounding parcels. These parcels are generally located in Neighborhood Commercial Districts, and zoned Neighborhood Commercial (NC), which allows for a variety of residential and commercial uses, either as principally permitted uses, or conditionally permitted uses.

California law allows cities to create “housing sustainability districts” (HSDs), which allows for the ministerial approval of residential projects meeting certain criteria if the creation of the district was previously reviewed in an environmental impact report under the California Environmental Quality Act.

The Business and Tax Code, in Section 8, governs the Board of Appeals' review of certain permits and licenses, including building permits.

Under the California Coastal Act of 1976 (Public Resources Code Section 30000 et seq.), the City administers the Local Coastal Program ("LCP"), which has been certified by the Coastal Commission. The LCP addresses coastal access, public recreation, transportation, land use, and habitat protection within the San Francisco Coastal Zone. The LCP is comprised of the Land Use Plan – the Western Shoreline Area Plan – and the Implementation Program, which generally consists of the City's procedures for approving projects in the Coastal Zone and the applicable zoning controls for the Coastal Zone.

Amendments to Current Law

This ordinance would make several changes to the Planning Code, and one amendment to the Business and Tax Code.

Housing Choice-San Francisco Program
The ordinance would create the Housing Choice-San Francisco (HC-SF) program, or Local Program, which would apply to projects within "Housing Opportunity Areas." Generally, Housing Opportunity Areas, also sometimes described as "well-resourced areas," are neighborhoods or areas with existing infrastructure, transit, businesses, well-performing public schools and lower levels of environmental pollution. The HC-SF Program would also include a Housing Sustainability District ("HSD"), which would apply to qualifying projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District (described below). Projects that demolish or substantially alter Category A historic resources, or demolish or convert any portion of a Tourist Hotel would be excluded from the HSD. The Local Program would not apply to projects: on sites with three or more rent controlled units, and that require demolition of residential uses; that demolish or substantially alter Category A historic resources; that demolish, remove, or convert dwelling units or residential flats; or that demolish or convert any portion of a Tourist Hotel.

The Local Program would grant eligible projects additional density and height, as well as other Planning Code modifications, including requirements related to unit mix, front setback and rear yard, usable open space, and dwelling unit exposure. Projects would have additional options to comply with the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance (Planning Code Section 415). The following table lists existing zoning requirements and the allowable modifications for projects using the Local Program.

	Applicable Planning Code or Design Standard	Local Program modifications
Density	Depending on location, projects may be subject to density limits based on lot size.	Form-Based Density.

Height	Projects are subject to the height limits in the base zoning, which would match the existing Zoning Map. (Projects may exceed the height limit under the rules of the State Density Bonus law, or other state and local programs).	Additional height, as provided on the proposed Zoning Map, as described in the R-4 Height and Bulk District. Corner lots and lots larger than 8,000 square feet may go up to 65'. Projects may receive up to a 5' height increase to accommodate certain architectural features, such as stoops and entries.
Vertical Bonus for Community Serving Uses, Micro-Retail, Warm Shell Retail, Large Units, and Historic Preservation	n/a	Projects may receive additional square footage for providing specific uses. Additional square footage may be accommodated by adding up to a maximum of 10 feet in additional height: • Up to 2 additional feet of building square footage for every square foot provided of Community Serving uses, which includes but is not limited to: childcare, displaced business, grocery, laundromat, nonprofit office, trade office. • Up to 1.5 additional feet of building square footage for every square foot provided of "micro-retail" spaces (measuring 100-1,000 square feet). • Up to 3 additional feet of building square footage for every square foot provided of Food Warm Shell retail space. Up to 2.5 additional feet of building square footage for every square foot provided for General Warm Shell retail space. • Outside of Residential Districts, up to 250 additional feet of building square footage for

		every: two bedroom unit provided in excess of the Dwelling Unit requirements; three bedroom unit provided, including any required three bedroom units; and up to 400 additional feet of building square footage for every unit provided that contains four or more bedrooms, including any required units. Projects that adaptively reuse Historic Buildings located outside of Residential Districts may receive up to two stories (20 feet) of additional height to recapture gross floor area that the project foregoes in preserving the Historic Building and complying with Preservation Design Standards. A project can combine this preservation incentive with other incentives to receive a maximum of three stories (30 feet) of additional height.
Horizontal Bonus for Family Friendly Amenities, Large Units, and Historic Preservation		Projects may receive additional square footage for providing certain uses. Additional square footage may be accommodated by reducing required rear yard, required side yard, and upper-story setbacks for historic buildings. • up to 2 additional feet of building square footage for each square foot of Family Friendly Amenities (common areas, childcare units, guest suites, common storage) provided. • up to 250 additional feet of building square footage for every three bedroom unit

		provided, including any required three bedroom units. • up to 400 additional feet of building square footage for every unit provided that contains four or more bedrooms, including any required units. • For historic adaptive reuse, up to 1.5 times the gross floor area foregone by retaining the Historic Building. A project cannot reduce the required rear yard beyond the lowest of the limits provided in the Ordinance.
Inclusionary Housing	Projects (10+ units) may satisfy the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance (Section 415 et seq) through a combination of: • Affordable Housing Fee; • On-site Affordable Housing; • Off-Site Affordable Housing; • Small Sites; • Land Dedication (currently available in select districts).	Same as existing; however, projects that elect off-site or land-dedication must provide the required units or land within 1/2 mile of the project. In addition, projects of 10-24 units have the option to provide 100% of units subject to rent-control.
Dwelling Unit Mix	**Most rezoned areas (NC, C districts):** 25% 2+ bedrooms, including at least 10% 3 bedrooms (applicable starting at 10+ units). **RTO Districts and Van Ness & Market SUD:** 35% 2+ bedrooms, including at least 10% 3 BRs (applicable starting at 5+ units).	Same.

Street-facing legislated and front setback	Required dimensions vary depending on legislated setbacks or zoning district.	Projects on 19th Avenue may reduce legislated and front setback if sidewalk expands and is at least 15 feet wide.
Rear Yard	**RH, RM-1, RM-2, RTO, RTO-M Districts**: 30% rear yard required. **All other Zoning Districts:** 25% rear yard required.	Rear yard may be reduced by up to 18% of lot depth, or 15' whichever is greater; For corner lots, the required rear yard may be reduced up to 18% of the lot area. In NC and C Districts, where otherwise not permitted, the ground floor is allowed 100% lot coverage.
Usable Open Space	Outside of Eastern Neighborhoods Mixed Use Districts, requirement varies from 36 square feet per Dwelling Unit to 300 square feet per Dwelling Unit.	Not required.
Dwelling Unit Exposure	Dwelling Units citywide must face an open area meeting one of the following: • A public street, public alley at least 20 feet in width, side yard at least 25 feet in width, or rear yard; if an outer court whose width is less than 25 feet, then depth is no greater than its width; or • An open area (whether an inner court or a space between separate buildings on the same lot) that is unobstructed, (except for fire escapes not more than 4 1/2 feet, chimneys, and certain permitted obstructions), and is no less than 25 feet in every horizontal dimension at the	Not required.

	floor the Dwelling Unit is located.	
Ground Floor Ceiling Heights	Ground floor uses in various districts have required ceiling heights that range from 10-17 feet.	Ground floor ceiling heights in § 145.1 are not applicable to projects proposing 9 stories in a district with a height limit of 85 feet.
New ground floor non-residential use size limits	Use size cap varies from 2,000 square feet to 25,000 square feet, depending on the District.	No cap; no Conditional Use Authorization required.
Height limits for vertical non-habitable architectural elements	Height exceptions for non-habitable architectural elements are only available in Eastern Neighborhoods Mixed Use Districts in projects of 85 feet in height or less: • One element per lot; • Not to exceed 1,000 Gross Floor Area • Element shall not have a plan dimension greater than 50'; • Element's height should not exceed 50% of the applicable height limit; • Must be consistent with design, materials, and character of the building.	Allow same height exceptions for vertical non-habitable architectural elements on lots zoned for 85 feet or less (even outside the Eastern Neighborhoods Mixed Use District).
Additional "catchall" modifications	n/a	Projects may seek an additional 15% reduction of any other quantitative Planning Code standard, with some exceptions. No exceptions for height.
Additional modifications for 100% Affordable	Various Planning Code sections.	100% affordable projects can use any of the incentives above, plus: • Reduce active ground floor requirement by 20%

Housing Project		• Additional 20 feet of height above Local Program height. • Curb Cut restrictions do not apply. • Certain Ground floor ceiling height requirements do not apply. • Dwelling unit mix does not apply.
Ministerial project review	Qualifying projects may opt to use state laws that enable ministerial review (e.g., SB 423, AB 2011, Housing Element low-income sites provision).	Qualifying projects may use state laws that enable ministerial review, but may not combine ministerial approvals with additional height or relaxed zoning standards within those state laws. Qualifying projects may use new Housing Sustainability District (HSD).
Major modification from Planning Code Standards	Per Planning Code 304, where not specified elsewhere in the code, a modification is possible on lots of at least ½-acre through a discretionary Planning Commission approval of a Planned Unit Development.	Projects of any size may choose to seek a major modification for any additional relief needed beyond the above list and the 15% "catchall" modification, subject to certain exceptions. The Planning Commission must grant any Major Modification.
Performance Period	Generally 36 months to obtain building permit	Project approvals would expire after 30 months unless the project sponsor obtains a building permit, or the entitlement is extended up to six months by the Director.

Local Program projects would be reviewed and approved administratively by the Planning Director, unless the project seeks a "Major Modification" to an Objective Standard, which would be reviewed by the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission would not hear discretionary review of administratively reviewed projects. Review of projects using the Local Program would be completed within 30-60 days, unless additional environmental review was required.

Height and Bulk Districts, including the new R-4 Height and Bulk District
The ordinance would create the R-4 Height and Bulk District. Sites within the R-4 Height and Bulk District would be eligible for the Local Program (above), and therefore would not

be subject to numeric densities, but would instead be governed by form-based density, which is a density calculation based on the permitted building volume. Sites within the R-4 Height and Bulk District would also be governed by two height limits: the first height limit (base zoning) would apply to all projects, and the second, higher height limit would apply only to projects using the Local Program. The ordinance would also codify an objective design standard related to the bulk and spacing of towers. The tower bulk and spacing requirements would generally apply to towers above 85 feet, unless otherwise specified in the Code. In addition to the height and bulk requirements, the ordinance would create special bulk requirements for large development lots, similar to existing requirements for several districts located downtown, such as the Eastern Neighborhoods Commercial District and the C-3. But the requirement would not apply to large sites in PDR Districts, or certain government or public facilities in P Districts. The bulk requirement would include obligations based on the size of the frontage and resulting block sizes, and include obligations to keep walking paths open to the public, and maintained for the life of the project.

Objective Wind Standards.
The ordinance would create a new objective wind standard that requires projects to not exceed a ground-level equivalent wind speed of 26 miles per hour for more than nine or more hours per year. The standard would apply to new buildings taller than 85 feet in the C-3 District, Van Ness Special Use District, Folsom and Main Residential/Commercial Special Use District, DTR Districts, and Central SoMa Special Use District.

Residential Uses.
The ordinance would amend multiple sections in the Planning Code that regulate residential uses, either in specific areas or citywide. The following table identifies the amendments and the applicable geography.

Topic	Key Provisions	Applicable Geography
Density	**Establish maximum unit sizes, applicable to new construction.** New units may be up to 4,000 square feet, or have a Floor Area Ratio of 1.2:1 (whichever is greater). **Exceptions:** 5 – 9 unit building: one unit may be greater than 4,000 square feet; 10+ unit building: 10% of units may be greater than 4,000 square feet.	Citywide.

	Establish minimum residential densities, and non-residential intensities within ½ mile of fixed guideway transit stops and stations and on certain Housing Element sites.	Within ½ mile of transit hubs and on sites identified as appropriate for Very Low Income or Low Income in the Housing Element Sites Inventory, and as required by Housing Element law.
	Establish Form-Based zoning (aka "density decontrol") through the Local Program: In most rezoned areas, density limits would continue apply. Projects in these areas are eligible for form-based density by opting into the Local Program.	Rezoned properties in Housing Opportunity Areas. Create and establish new Residential Transit Oriented-Commercial (RTO-C) zoning district that would apply to portions of transit and commercial streets that are currently zoned residential.

Parking and Loading	**Reduce certain parking maximums:** For areas within ½-mile of BART stations and certain other designated transit stations: between 0.375 and 0.5 spaces/unit (and other non-residential maximums). For other areas (unless otherwise specified in Section 151.1): • Lots with 1 unit may have 2 spaces. • Lots with 2 units may have 3 spaces. • All projects 3+ units may have 1 space/unit.	Rezoned properties in Housing Opportunity Areas and areas subject to MTC Transit-Oriented Communities requirements.
	Restrict new curb cuts and garage entries on selected street segments. In some cases, a new curb cut would require a Conditional Use Authorization or a curb cut may be prohibited.	Specific restrictions on selected segments of Neighborhood Commercial Districts in Housing Opportunity Areas.
	Require a Driveway and Loading Operations Plan for development projects of 100,000 net new gross square feet.	Citywide
Residential Flats	**Codify the Planning Commission's Residential Flat Policy** The ordinance would: add a definition of Residential Flats to the Planning Code; and require Planning Commission approval for projects that would reduce the size or change the configuration of a Residential Flat such that the unit no longer meets the definition of a Residential Flat.	Citywide.
Height & Bulk	Increase base heights in certain areas.	Rezoned properties in

	Establish a new R-4 Height and Bulk District to codify elements of the adopted Citywide Design Standards and allow Local Program heights.	Housing Opportunity Areas.
Use Districts	**Establish new use district, RTO-C ("Residential Transit Oriented – Commercial").**	Some rezoned properties in Housing Opportunity Areas.
Senior Housing	The ordinance would: • reduce usable open space requirements for senior housing. • reduce bicycle parking requirements for senior housing. • eliminate requirement that senior housing contain a minimum of 35 units.	Citywide.
"By-right" approval	Provide that certain types of housing projects are a "use by right" as required by Housing Element law.	Residential projects on sites identified pursuant to Housing Element law that contain 20% on-site low-income units.
Code Clean-Up & Conforming Amendments	The ordinance would • Remove obsolete Planning Code sections related to Efficiency Dwelling Units. • Eliminate Analyzed State Density Bonus Program from the Planning Code. • Where relevant, update tables and other code requirements to be consistent with the other changes, including noting the applicability of the adopted Citywide Design Standards and other Objective Standards.	Citywide.

Displaced Businesses

The ordinance would allow a Displaced Businesses, as defined in the ordinance, to relocate anywhere in San Francisco where the Displaced Business's use (e.g., Bar, or Restaurant) is not prohibited, without the need for a conditional use authorization from the Planning Commission. The ordinance would waive applicable development impact fees for those Displaced Businesses. The ordinance would also require that the Planning

Department provide notice to non-residential uses and the Office of Small Business when a development application is received.

Non-contiguous San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Special Use District
The ordinance would create the Non-contiguous San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Special Use District (SFMTA SUD). The SFMTA SUD would amend the types of uses allowed on SFMTA owned parcels to include both public uses as well as the uses allowed in the surrounding districts, and modifies certain zoning controls for projects constructed in the SFMTA SUD. The SFMTA SUD would allow the Board of Supervisors to reduce or waive development impact fees for projects on the parcels, including the Jobs Housing Linkage Fee and the Transportation Sustainability Fee, upon the recommendation of the SFMTA Board of Directors. Projects in the SFMTA SUD must provide a feasibility study and documentation of pre-application meetings and how the project accomplishes the City's goals for affordable housing. Certain parcels in the Coastal Zone are excluded from the SFMTA SUD.

Business and Tax Regulations Code
The ordinance would amend the Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 8, to set forth the standards by which the grant or denial of a permit under the HC-SF HSD should be reviewed.

Local Coastal Program
The ordinance would amend the Implementation Program of the City's Local Coastal Program to incorporate the amendments described above that are applicable in the Coastal Zone. This includes the zoning controls for the RH, RM-1, RM-2, RTO-C, NC-1, and NC-2 use districts; the Housing Choice-SF Program; the R-4 Height and Bulk District; and the Displaced Business changes. The amendments to the LCP are subject to certification by the Coastal Commission.

Background Information

This ordinance (Version 3) is a substitute for the ordinance (Version 2) that was introduced on July 29, 2025. Version 1 of this ordinance was introduced on June 24, 2025. This ordinance (Version 3) incorporates the recommendations proposed by the Planning Department at the September 11, 2025 Planning Commission hearing, other than staff recommendation #13.

On October 20, 2025, the Land Use and Transportation Committee amended the ordinance in the following ways. First, the committee amended the ordinance to prohibit projects using the Local Program if the project requires demolition of housing where there are 3 or more rent controlled units. The committee also amended the bonus for "warm shell" commercial spaces by limiting the proposed 3 square foot bonus to food service-ready "warm shells" and creating a 2.5 square foot bonus for "general warm shells." The

committee also amended the local program bonus to offer an additional bonus where the Local Program project replaces existing commercial space.

The committee then duplicated the amended file and made the following additional amendments. The committee amended the Local Program to exclude projects that: demolish or substantially alter Category A historic resources, demolish, remove, or convert dwelling units or residential flats, or demolish or convert any portion of a Tourist Hotel. The committee further amended the Local Program to state that other City's laws would apply to Local Program projects, such as Dwelling Unit Mix requirements in Section 207.7, Article 4 development impact fees and requirements, displaced business requirements in new Section 202.17, tenant protections in the Planning Code or SF Rent Ordinance, or other permitting or licensing requirements outside of the Planning Code. The committee amended the ordinance to require projects that comply with the Inclusionary ordinance through off-site units or land dedication to provide those units within 1/2 mile of the project. The committee also amended to Local Program approvals to expire if the project sponsor fails to obtain a building permit within 30 days, subject to six-month extension. The committee also amended the Local Program to provide additional bonus square footage of 250 additional square feet for every two-bedroom unit in excess of the dwelling unit requirements for the Local Program.

The committee amended the Housing Sustainability District to prohibit any projects using the Housing Sustainability District streamlining from demolishing or substantially altering Category A historic resources, or demolishing or converting any portion of a Tourist Hotel. The committee amended the SFMTA SUD by adding findings regarding the purpose of the SUD, adding pre-application requirements, and excluding properties in the Coastal Zone.

The committee also amended the ordinance by removing the exception in the original file that did not require a Conditional Use Authorization to merge, reconfigure or reduce a residential flats, if the project adds at least one unit.

The original file is located in Board File No. 250701, and another duplicate ordinance is located in Board File No. 251072.

Housing Element Law

Under State law, every city and county must have a general plan, and each general plan must include a housing element. State law requires that a housing element identify and analyze the jurisdiction's existing and projected housing needs, include a statement of goals, policies and objectives for the preservation, improvement and development of housing, and identify adequate sites for housing for all economic segments of the community. (Gov't Code § 65583.) The City's adopted the 2022 Housing Element update on January 31, 2023.

A jurisdiction's existing and projected housing needs is known as its Regional Housing Needs Allocation ("RHNA"). If a jurisdiction does not have sufficient sites to accommodate

its RHNA, it must adopt zoning changes, generally within three years of housing element adoption. San Francisco's RHNA is approximately 82,000 units, and because the City does not have sufficient capacity to accommodate its RHNA, it must rezone sufficient sites to allow for additional units by January 31, 2026. State Housing Element law also mandates that jurisdictions affirmatively further fair housing, in part by providing housing opportunities in "well-resourced areas," a state law designation that takes into consideration access to amenities such as good schools, jobs, transportation and open space, and lower rates of poverty.

Housing Element law requires cities to maintain a list of sites that have been used in previous housing element cycles, or have been identified as appropriate to accommodate a city's allocation of lower-income housing. Cities must provide "by-right" approval for projects that propose to build 20% affordable housing these sites.

Family Zoning Plan

This ordinance is part of a package of ordinances that will implement the Family Zoning Plan. The Family Zoning Plan includes this ordinance as well as a Zoning Map amendment and a General Plan amendment. The Zoning Map amendment is in Board File 250700, and the General Plan amendment will be introduced in July 2025.

The Family Zoning Plan – Planning Code amendment implements several goals outlined in the 2022 Housing Element Update, which include:

- Concentrate new housing on major transit routes, commercial streets, and other major hubs of activity, which are generally better served by transit, retail, and other amenities, and contain more sites that are suitable and likely to be developed into housing.
- Add new housing across the "Housing Opportunity Areas."
- Rezone (with height changes and removal of density limits) certain corridors to result in mid-rise development (65' to 85', or 6-to-8 stories). Heights of 85' are generally proposed for wider streets adjacent to or near major transit lines and stations (such as rail and bus rapid transit).
- Increase heights (ranging from 140' – 650', or 14-to-65 stories) in areas that:
    - currently allow high-rise construction above 85' (e.g., the greater Van Ness corridor);
    - are key intersections and locations along major corridors (e.g., sections of Geary Boulevard and 19th Avenue);
    - have wider streets and contain medium- and large-sized parcels that are well suited for housing development (for example, Market Street and Lombard Street); and
    - are near major transit stops (e.g., Market Street, Geary Boulevard, Glen Park).
- Remove density limits and institute Form-based density in residential areas surrounding major transit and commercial streets.

- Encourage development on opportunity sites (public, nonprofit and religious sites) throughout the Well-Resourced neighborhoods that meet a certain size threshold by allowing higher height limits.
- Consider the core physical patterns of San Francisco in keeping with principles of the Urban Design Element. Include consideration of key characteristic views from major public vantage points, such as from the tops of hills, parks known for their views, and from the waterfront.
- Fulfill the Urban Design Element's guidance to locate taller buildings in areas of greater activity and transit access and to mark key locations in the City. While the visual impact of new buildings will be felt most acutely by properties that are in their immediate proximity, the Program is not intended to introduce major areas of tall buildings that would block key public views or change the overall perception of the landscape of the city.

MTC's Transit Oriented Communities Policy

In September 2022, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission endorsed a "Transit Oriented Communities" (TOC) policy, which supports transit investments by creating communities around transit stations and along transit corridors. MTC has indicated that future grant money will be prioritized for areas that comply with the TOC policy. The TOC Policy includes requirements for, among other zoning policies, minimum residential and commercial densities and parking and circulation requirements. This ordinance includes amendments to the Planning Code to comply with MTC's TOC policy.

Index

An index to the Planning Code Sections being amended in this ordinance follows on the next page.

n:\legana\as2025\2500203\01877103.docx

AMENDED IN COMMITTEE
10/20/2025

SAUTER MELGAR CHAN CHEN SHERRILL

FILE NO. 251073

[Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan]

Ordinance amending the Planning Code to: 1) create the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program to incent housing development through a local bonus program and by adopting a Housing Sustainability District, 2) modify height and bulk limits to provide for additional capacity in well-resourced neighborhoods, and to allow additional height and bulk for projects using the local bonus program, 3) require only buildings taller than 85 feet in certain Districts to reduce ground level wind currents, 4) make conforming changes to the RH (Residential, House), RM (Residential, Mixed), and RC (Residential-Commercial) District zoning tables to reflect the changes to density controls, and parking requirements made in this ordinance, 5) create the RTO-C (Residential Transit Oriented-Commercial) District, 6) implement the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's Transit-Oriented Communities Policy by making changes to parking requirements, minimum residential densities, and minimum office intensities, and requiring maximum dwelling unit sizes, 7) revise off-street parking and curb cut obligations citywide, 8) create the Non-contiguous San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Sites Special Use District, 9) permit businesses displaced by new construction to relocate without a conditional use authorization and waive development impact fees for those businesses, 10) make technical amendments to the Code to implement the above changes, 11) make conforming changes to zoning tables in various Districts, including the Neighborhood Commercial District and Mixed Use Districts, and 12) reduce usable open space and bicycle parking requirements for senior housing; amending the Business and Tax Regulations Code regarding the Board of Appeals' review of permits in the Housing Choice Program Housing

Sustainability District; also, amending the Local Coastal Program to implement the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program and other associated changes in the City's Coastal Zone, and directing the Planning Director to transmit the ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment; 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 public necessity, convenience, and welfare findings under Planning Code, Section 302.

NOTE: **Unchanged Code text and uncodified text** are in plain Arial font.
Additions to Codes are in *single-underline italics Times New Roman font*.
Deletions to Codes are in ~~*strikethrough italics Times New Roman font*~~.
Board amendment additions are in double-underlined Arial font.
Board amendment deletions are in ~~strikethrough Arial font~~.
Asterisks (* * * *) indicate the omission of unchanged Code subsections or parts of tables.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. Environmental and Land Use Findings

(a) On November 17, 2022, the Planning Commission, in Motion M-21206 certified the Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the 2022 Housing Element of the San Francisco General Plan (Housing Element EIR), as in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (California Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq), the CEQA Guidelines (14 Cal. Code Regs. Section 15000 et seq.), and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code. Copies of the Planning Commission Motion M-21206 and Housing Element EIR are on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. 230001.

(b) On December 15, 2022, at a duly noticed public hearing, the Planning Commission

adopted findings under CEQA regarding the 2022 Housing Element's environmental impacts, the disposition of mitigation measures, and project alternatives, as well as a statement of overriding considerations (CEQA Findings) and adopted a mitigation monitoring reporting program (MMRP), by Resolution 21220.

(c) The Planning Commission then adopted the proposed 2022 Housing Element in Resolution 21221, finding in accordance with Planning Code Section 340 that the public necessity, convenience, and general welfare required the proposed amendments to the General Plan.

(d) On January 31, 2023, in Ordinance 010-23, the Board of Supervisors, adopted the 2022 Housing Element. That ordinance confirmed the certification of the Housing Element EIR and made certain environmental findings, including adoption of the MMRP and a Statement of Overriding Considerations.

(e). On _____, 2025, the Planning Department published an addendum to the Housing Element EIR, which concluded that no supplemental or subsequent environmental review is required for the Family Housing Rezoning Program, because the environmental impacts of these amendments were adequately identified and analyzed under CEQA in the Housing Element EIR, and the proposed amendments would not result in any new or more severe environmental impacts than were identified previously.

(f) The Board of Supervisors has reviewed and considered the Housing Element EIR and the Addendum, and concurs with the Planning Department's analysis and conclusions, finding that the addendum adequately identified and analyzed the environmental impacts of the Family Housing Rezoning Program, and that no additional environmental review is required under CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guideline Sections 15162-15164 for the following reasons:

(1) the Family Housing Rezoning Program would not involve new significant

environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of significant effects previously identified in the Housing Element EIR;

(2) no substantial changes have occurred that would require major revisions to the Final EIR due to the involvement of new environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of effects identified in the Housing Element EIR; and

(3) no new information of substantial importance has become available which would indicate that (i) the Family Housing Rezoning Program will have significant effects not discussed in the Final EIR; (ii) significant environmental effects will be substantially more severe; (iii) mitigation measure or alternatives found not feasible that would reduce one or more significant effects have become feasible, or (iv) mitigation measures or alternatives that are considerably different from those in the Housing Element EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment. The Addendum is on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. _____.

(g) The Planning Department has determined that the amendments to the Local Coastal Program are exempt from CEQA review under Public Resources Code Sections 21080.5 and 21080.9, and CEQA Guidelines Section 15265. Said determination is on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. ___. The Board affirms this determination and incorporates the determination by reference.

(h) On _____, the Planning Commission, in Resolution No. _____, adopted findings that the actions contemplated in this ordinance are consistent, on balance, with the City's General Plan and eight priority policies of Planning Code Section 101.1. The Board adopts these findings as its own. A copy of said Resolution is on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. _____, and is incorporated herein by reference.

(i) Pursuant to Planning Code Section 302, this Board finds that these Planning Code amendments will serve the public necessity, convenience, and welfare for the reasons set

forth in Planning Commission Resolution No. _____, and the Board adopts such reasons as its own. A copy of said resolution is on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. _____ and is incorporated herein by reference.

Section 2. Additional Findings.

(a) This ordinance shall be known as the San Francisco Family Zoning Plan.

(b) California faces a severe crisis of housing affordability and availability, which has prompted the Legislature to declare, in Section 65589.5 of the Government Code, that "California has a housing supply and affordability crisis of historic proportions. The consequences of failing to effectively and aggressively confront this crisis are hurting millions of Californians, robbing future generations of a chance to call California home, stifling economic opportunities for workers and businesses, worsening poverty and homelessness, and undermining the state's environmental and climate objectives."

(c) Numerous factors have contributed to the high cost of housing in most of California's coastal cities and suburbs, including the dwindling supply and high cost of available land, and zoning regulations that restrict residential density, limit efficient land use, and create and reinforce inequitable patterns of discrimination and segregation.

(d) This crisis of housing affordability and availability is particularly severe in San Francisco. The City has seen dramatic increases in both rent prices and home sale prices over recent years.

(e) Limits on residential density can also contribute to the housing crisis by restricting the number of units per lot. The origins of density limits in San Francisco date back to the Cubic Air Ordinance, an 1870 anti-Chinese ordinance requiring 500 cubic feet of space for every person residing in a lodging. The City's first zoning law was passed in 1921 and largely reproduced the City's existing development pattern, limiting density in areas of the City that

were already low-density. In the 1960s, the City underwent a rezoning process, though the existing development patterns were largely maintained, with the exception of downtown and neighborhoods significantly impacted by City planning redevelopment plans.

(f) Starting in 1980, the Board of Supervisors, the Planning Commission, and the Planning Department responded to community concerns about neighborhood character by establishing and refining a set of new districts covering many of the City's neighborhood commercial streets. These districts imposed highly-detailed controls tailored to the specific character of each neighborhood. The 1987 Neighborhood Commercial Districts were based on the then-relatively new idea that the City should be more selective in its pursuit of economic growth. All of these Neighborhood Commercial District plans included numerical density limits for residential development.

(g) By removing these numerical density limits from Neighborhood Commercial Districts and replacing them with form-based density, which allows the density to be determined by the buildable area of a building, this ordinance aims to increase housing supply and reduce the factors that have contributed to the lack of housing in San Francisco.

(h) Under California Housing Element law, San Francisco must identify sites to accommodate its Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) goal of 82,069 new units in the next eight years. Because San Francisco does not currently have sufficient capacity to accommodate the RHNA goals, it must rezone sites to meet these goals, and must do so by January 31, 2026. Additional capacity will be created through amendments to the Planning Code and Zoning Maps. This ordinance implements commitments made in the City's 2022 Housing Element Update. The ordinance modifies zoning policies primarily in the well-resourced neighborhoods, which are sometimes referred to as Housing Opportunity Areas, are neighborhoods or areas with existing infrastructure, transit, businesses, well-performing public schools and lower levels of environmental pollution. The ordinance also aims to

increase capacity for multi-family housing. The ordinance satisfies the City's obligation to rezone and address the RHNA shortfall of 36,200 housing units.

(i) This ordinance, in Section 3, creates the Housing Choice-San Francisco (HC-SF) program which includes a local residential bonus program (Local Program), and a Housing Sustainability District (HSD). The bonus program is similar to state law programs (such as the State Density Bonus law), in that it allows additional residential development opportunities in certain circumstances. The HC-SF Program offers certain benefits compared to State Density Bonus law projects, however, by including more diverse affordable housing types and more predictable urban form.

(j) State law allows local jurisdictions to create HSDs to encourage housing production on infill sites near public transportation. Housing projects that are compliant with applicable general plan and zoning standards are eligible for streamlined approval by the City. There must be an approved Environmental Impact Report (EIR) in the area to establish an HSD, and HSD projects must adopt and implement any applicable mitigation measures. The City certified the 2022 Housing Element Update EIR on December 15, 2022. As of May 2025, the City has one HSD, the Central SoMa Housing Sustainability District, codified in Planning Code 343. This ordinance creates the Housing Choice-San Francisco (HC-SF) HSD that would work in conjunction with the HC-SF Program described above.

(k) This ordinance, in Section 4, makes changes to San Francisco's height and bulk requirements in the well-resourced neighborhoods, located primarily on the north and west sides of the City, which will create capacity to meet the City's RHNA obligation. The ordinance also creates a new R-4 Height and Bulk District, which will provide for form-based density, and increased height limits for projects using the HC-SF Program. The HC-SF HSD, mentioned above, would apply within the boundaries of the R-4 Height and Bulk District, except that it would not apply to any parcels zoned as Residential House (RH), or Residential

Mixed (RM).

(l) This ordinance, in Section 5, modifies the Planning Code's wind reduction obligations by creating a new objective standard for projects greater than 85 feet in the C-3, Van Ness SUD, Folsom and Main Residential/Commercial SUD, Downtown Residential, and Central SoMa SUD.

(m) This ordinance, in Section 6, makes conforming changes to the RH (Residential, House), RM (Residential, Mixed), and RC (Residential-Commercial) Districts and Zoning Tables. The changes implement the changes reflected in other parts of this ordinance.

(n) This ordinance, in Section 7, makes changes to the Residential Transit Oriented (RTO) zoning districts. RTO districts are composed of multi-family moderate-density areas, primarily areas that are well served within short walking distance of transit and neighborhood commercial areas. The Planning Code currently identifies two types of RTO zoning districts: RTO and RTO-M (Mission) districts. This ordinance creates a third type of RTO district: RTO-C (Commercial), which is an RTO district where a greater number of ground floor non-residential uses are permitted to provide goods and services to residents and visitors, especially adjacent to existing NC districts and along transit corridors, though ground floor commercial uses are not required. In addition, the ordinance refers to the three types of RTO zoning districts individually as RTO-1, RTO-M, and RTO-C, and collectively, as RTO zoning districts.

(o) This ordinance, in Section 8, makes changes to implement the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's (MTC) Transit-Oriented Communities (TOC) Policy, and Housing Element law. The MTC endorsed the TOC Policy in MTC Resolution 4530 in September 2022, to support the region's transit investments by creating communities around transit stations and along transit corridors that not only enable transit ridership, but also are places where Bay Area residents of all abilities, income levels, and racial and ethnic

backgrounds can live, work, and access services. The TOC Policy applies to the half-mile area around existing and planned fixed-guideway transit stops and stations (i.e., regional rail, commuter rail, light-rail transit, bus rapid transit, and ferries). MTC has indicated that subsequent One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) funding cycles will consider prioritizing investments in transit station areas that are subject to and compliant with the TOC Policy.

(p) The TOC Policy requirements consist of four elements: (1) minimum required and allowed residential and/or commercial office densities for new development; (2) policies focused on housing production, preservation and protection, and commercial anti-displacement and stabilization policies; (3) parking management; and (4) transit station access and circulation.

(q) Consistent with the TOC Policy, Planning Code Section 155.2 already requires one secure bike parking spot per Dwelling Unit, and one secure bike parking spot per 5,000 square feet of Occupied Floor Area for Office uses. This ordinance also creates minimum required and allowed residential densities and commercial development intensities for areas subject to the TOC Policy, and Housing Element law. Housing Element law (Government Code Section 65583.2(c) and (h)) requires cities to identify sites that were previously identified as appropriate for housing in prior Housing Element cycles, and sites that are appropriate to accommodate 100% of the City's allocation of lower-income housing. Lists of those sites are on file with the Clerk of the Board in File No. 250701. It also modifies the parking requirements be consistent with the TOC Policy.

(r) The ordinance also specifies that projects proposing the demolition, merger, or reduction in number of Dwelling Units are subject to a maximum Dwelling Unit size of 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area, but allows projects to seek a conditional use authorization to exceed this objective standard.

(s) This ordinance, in Section 9, makes changes to off-street parking and curb cut

requirements to clarify and simplify the requirements.

(t) This ordinance, in Section 10, creates the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) Non-Contiguous Sites Special Use District (SUD) consistent with the SFMTA's Joint Development Program, approved by the SFMTA's Board of Directors on February 4, 2025 in Resolution No. 250204-010. The SUD is comprised of parcels owned by the SFMTA, most of which are currently used as parking lots. The SUD allows development of market-rate and affordable housing consistent with each parcel's surrounding zoning district, as well as other zoning modifications specific to the SUD.

(u) Increased residential development could result in displacement of existing businesses. The City's Legacy Business program, in Administrative Code Section 2A.242, offers certain benefits for qualifying businesses. This ordinance, in Section 11, makes changes to the Planning Code that permit Displaced Businesses to relocate within the City without having to obtain a conditional use authorization or pay development impact fees.

(v) This ordinance, in Section 12, includes miscellaneous definitional and other changes that are appurtenant to the rezoning program.

(w) This ordinance, in Section 13, amends the Neighborhood Commercial District and Mixed-Use District tables to conform to the amendments in Sections 3-12. Section 13 also implements other changes contemplated in the Housing Element, such as eliminating numeric density controls in zoning districts that are located in well-resourced areas.

(x) This ordinance, In Section 14, amends the Business and Tax Regulations Code to include the new HC-HSD streamlining requirements.

(y) The Board of Supervisors finds that the Planning Code amendments in this ordinance constitute amendments to the City's Local Coastal Program ("LCP"). The Board of Supervisors finds that the LCP amendment conforms with the applicable provisions of the Coastal Act of 1976, and that the amendments are consistent with and adequate to carry out

the provisions of the City's certified LCP Land Use Plan—the Western Shoreline Area Plan. The Board further finds that the amendments will be implemented in full conformance with the Coastal Act's provisions, and acknowledges that the amendments in the Western Shoreline Area Plan are consistent with San Francisco's Housing Element's housing goals.

(z) The Board of Supervisors finds that promoting higher-density housing opportunities in the Coastal Zone is consistent with the Coastal Act's goal of providing "new affordable housing opportunities for persons of low and moderate income in the coastal zone." (Cal. Pub. Resources Code, § 30604(g).) Further, providing these opportunities in the Coastal Zone is consistent with the Housing Element's goal of creating new housing in well-resourced neighborhoods. To that end, this ordinance amends the Implementation Program of the City's certified LCP, including updating the use and development controls in the RH, RM, RTO-C, NC-1, and NC-2 use districts that comprise the Coastal Zone. These amendments are necessary to ensure housing opportunities in the Coastal Zone, and the City's approval of these amendments satisfies California Government Code Section 65583.

Section 3. Housing Choice – San Francisco Program. Articles 2 and 3 of the Planning Code are hereby amended by adding Sections 206.10, 334, and 344, to read, as follows:

SEC. 206.10 HOUSING CHOICE-SAN FRANCISCO PROGRAM.

*(a) **Purpose.** This Section 206.10 sets forth the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program (HC-SF Program). The HC-SF Program provides additional residential development capacity, additional options for complying with the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance, modifications to certain Planning Code and design standards, and an administrative or discretionary review process for eligible residential projects that comply with the program.* Except as provided in this Section 206.10, all HC-SF projects shall comply with Article 4 of the Planning Code.

*(b) **Applicability.** An HC-SF Project under this Section 206.10 shall be a project that*

complies with all of the following requirements:

(1) consists of new construction, an addition to an existing structure, or a conversion of an existing structure, and results in a net increase in the number of Dwelling Units or Group Housing bedrooms;

(2) contains two or more Dwelling Units or Group Housing bedrooms. Accessory Dwelling Units shall not count towards the minimum number of required Dwelling Units, but an HC-SF Project may contain ADUs;

(3) is located on a Lot in the R-4 Height and Bulk District;

(4) does not demolish or substantially alter *a* ~~building that is designated as a landmark under Article 10, is listed as a contributor to an historic district in Article 10, is listed as a Significant or Contributory Building under Article 11, is listed in the California Register of Historical Resources, or is listed on the National Register of Historic Places~~ 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*;*

(5) does not receive any density or development bonuses or relief from applicable Planning Code standards in any other State or local law or program, including but not limited to California Government Code Sections 65915 et seq., Government Code sections 65912.113(e), 65912.114(f)(1), 65912.123(b), (c), (d), (e), (i), (j)(1), and (j)(3) and 65912.124(f), and Sections 65852.28(b)(2), 65913.4.5, and 66499.41, as may be updated from time to time; and Planning Code

Section 124(f), Section 202.2(f), Sections 206.3 to 206.9, inclusive, Section 207(c), Section 304, and Section 328;

(6) complies with Objective Standards, except as otherwise modified by the HC-SF Program in this Section 206.10, or through the modification process in Section 334;

(7) is a project in which at least two-thirds of the new or converted square footage is designated for Residential Uses; or, a project with at least 50% new or converted square footage for Residential Uses if the project converts an existing Non-Residential Use and does not expand that use by more than 25%. Basements shall not count in the calculation of square footage. For additions to existing structures or conversions of existing buildings, only the net new or converted space shall be considered in the calculation of square footage; ~~and,~~

(8) is not located in a Special Use District that implements a Development Agreement adopted under California Government Code 65864 et seq and/or Administrative Code Chapter 56~~.~~;

(9) is not located on a site containing more than two residential units where the project would require the demolition of residential uses that are subject to the rent increase limitations set forth in Chapter 37 of the Administrative Code;

(10) does not demolish, remove, or convert to another use any existing Dwelling Unit(s), or Residential Flat; and

(11) does not demolish or convert any portion of a Tourist Hotel.

*(c) **Inclusionary Housing Ordinance Alternatives.** HC-SF Projects of 10 or more units shall comply with Section 415 et seq., and if applicable Section 419 et seq., except as allowed by this subsection (c). Projects that elect the off-site alternative in Section 415.5(g)(1)(B) or the Land Dedication Alternative in Section 419.5(a)(2) allowed in subsection (c)(2), shall provide the required units* ~~within the R-4 Height and Bulk District, or~~ *within one-half mile of the project. In addition to the alternatives set forth in Section 415.3(g), HC-SF Projects may satisfy the requirements of Section 415 et seq. by choosing one of the following options:*

(1) if the project is a Rental Project with 24 or fewer units, including any additional units allowed by this Section 206.10, a project sponsor shall subject all units in the project to the San Francisco Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance (Chapter 37 of the Administrative Code) for the Life of the Project; or

(2) applicants shall comply with the Land Dedication Alternative requirements of Section 419.5(a)(2), regardless of project location.

*(d) **Modified Development Standards.** Notwithstanding any contrary provisions found in the Planning Code, including any provision in a Special Use District not implementing a Development Agreement adopted under California Government Code 65864 et seq. and/or Administrative Code Chapter 56, or in any adopted Design Standard, the following development standards apply to eligible HC-SF Projects. Projects may also seek additional modifications under Section 334.*

*(1) **Standards Applicable to All Projects:** All HC-SF Projects shall receive the following zoning modifications:*

*(A) **Form-Based Residential Density.** An HC-SF Project shall be subject to Form-Based Density limits. Floor Area Ratio requirements or limitations shall not apply to the Residential Uses in an HC-SF Project.*

*(B) **Dwelling Unit Mix.** Section 207.6 and Section 207.7 shall* ~~not~~ *apply.* ~~HC-SF Projects of four units or more shall comply with the following:~~

~~(i) a project with four dwelling units shall contain at least one unit with two or more bedrooms;~~

~~(ii) for a project with between five and nine dwelling units, inclusive, at least 25% of its units shall contain two or more bedrooms, including at least one unit with three or more bedrooms; and~~

~~(iii) for a project with ten or more dwelling units, at least 25% of its units shall contain two or more bedrooms, including at least 5% of its units containing three or~~

~~more bedrooms.~~

~~(iv) The Dwelling Unit mix requirement in this subsection (d)(1)(B) shall not apply to 100% Affordable Housing projects or Residential Uses listed in Section 207.7(b)(2). The Dwelling Unit mix requirement may be modified pursuant to Section 334.~~

*(C) **Additional Height.** The applicable height limit for an HC-SF Project shall be the height pursuant to Section 263.19(b). Planning Code Section 261 shall not apply. Notwithstanding any lower height limit in this Code, including Section 263.19, the height limit of an HC-SF Project located on a Corner Lot or a Lot larger than 8,000 square feet shall be 65 feet, unless a higher height limit is provided elsewhere in the Code.*

*(D) **Ground Floor Setbacks on 19th Avenue.** Projects on a lot with frontage on 19th Avenue may reduce the setback required under Section 131 and 132 if the proposed project expands the publicly available sidewalk into the subject property and the resulting overall sidewalk width is not less than 15 feet. In such cases, the setback and sidewalk shall have a minimum vertical clearance of not less than 25 feet from grade, and the property owner shall record a Notice of Special Restrictions allowing for public access to the expanded sidewalk for the life of the project.*

*(E) **Rear Yard and Lot Coverage.** The rear yard requirements of Section 134 may be modified as follows:*

(i) Except for large lots subject to Section 134(d)(6), or lots in Residential Districts other than the Residential Transit Oriented-Commercial (RTO-C) district, the rear yard shall be equal to at least 18% of the total depth of the lot, or 15 feet, whichever is greater;

(ii) Except for large lots subject to the lot coverage limits of Section 134(d)(6), in Neighborhood Commercial, Named Neighborhood Commercial, Commercial Districts, Residential-Commercial (RC) and Residential Transit Oriented-Commercial (RTO-C) Districts, no rear yard is required at the ground floor;

(iii) On Corner Lots, or Lots at the intersection of a Street and an Alley

of at least 25 feet in width, where a rear yard can meet the requirements of Section 134(h), the area of the required open area shall be equal to 18% of the depth of the lot and a minimum of 15 feet in every horizontal direction.

(iv) In C districts, other than on large lots subject to Section 134(d)(6), lot coverage is limited to 82% at all levels containing Residential Uses. All other provisions of Section 134(d)(6) shall apply.

*(F) **Open Space.** The open space requirements of Section 135 shall not apply.*

*(G) **Dwelling Unit Exposure.** The dwelling unit exposure requirements of Section 140 shall not apply.*

*(H) **Non-Residential Use Size Limits.** Non-Residential Uses may exceed the non-residential use size limits in Section 121.2 without the need for a Conditional Use authorization.*

*(I) **Height Limits for Vertical Non-Habitable Architectural Elements.** Vertical Non-Habitable Architectural Elements may exceed height limits consistent with the requirements in Section 263.21(c).*

*(J) **Development of Large Lots in Residential Transit Oriented Commercial (RTO-C) Districts.** Sections 121.1 and 303(r) shall not apply to HC-SF Projects on large lots in the RTO-C Zoning District.*

*(K) **Ground Floor Ceiling Heights For Nine-Story Projects**. The ground floor ceiling height requirements in Section 145.1(c)(4) shall not apply to HC-SF Projects proposing nine stories in a district with a height limit of 85 feet.*

*(L) **Maximum Dwelling Unit Size.** Notwithstanding any other provision of this Code, Section 207.10 shall apply.*

*(M) **Reduction of Quantitative Objective Standards.** Any quantitative Objective Standard may be modified by up to 15% of the standard except for the following: standards set forth in subsection (d)(1)(A) through (d)(1)(L) inclusive, standards set forth in subsection (e), rear yard or lot*

coverage standards, standards ineligible for Major Modifications under Section 334(d)(3), and maximum average floor plate requirements in Section 270(i).

*(2) **Standards Applicable to 100% Affordable Projects.***

*(A) **Definitions.** A 100% Affordable HC-SF Housing Project shall be an eligible HC-SF Project where all Residential Uses, except a manager's unit, are comprised solely of Dwelling Units or Group Housing bedrooms that are restricted for the Life of the Project as "Affordable Units," as defined in Section 401, and meet the requirements in Section 406(b)(1)(A) and (C).*

*(B) **Additional Planning Code Modifications.** In addition to the modifications in subsection (d)(1), 100% Affordable HC-SF Housing Projects are entitled to the following Planning Code modifications:*

*(i) **Ground-floor ceiling height.** Ground floor ceiling height requirements in Section 145.1(c)(4) shall not apply.*

*(ii) **Active use requirement.** Active use requirements in Section 145.1(c)(3) shall be reduced by 20% of all the required dimensions.*

*(iii) **Curb cuts.** Curb cut restrictions in Section 155(r) shall not apply. However, where a site has two or more frontages, frontages with the fewest restrictions under Section 155(r) shall be prioritized for vehicular and loading access.*

*(iv) **Height Limit.** The height limit shall be 20 feet greater than the HC-SF height limit set forth in Section 263.19(b), and in subsection (d)(1)(C), and maybe be supplemented by any height bonus pursuant to subsection (e).*

*(3) **Authorization.** HC-SF Projects under this Section 206.10 shall be reviewed and approved under the provisions set forth in Section 334, and any other required entitlement except for Section 309 and Section 329. Approval procedures under Section 309 and Section 329 shall not apply.*

(4) **Exclusions.** In no event shall this Section 206.10 be interpreted as relieving a HC-SF project from complying with: Article 4 of the Planning Code other than as

specified in this subsection (d); Section 202.17; any tenant protections contained elsewhere in the Planning Code, including Section 317 et seq.; or Chapter 37 of the Administrative Code.

*(e) **Additional Height, Square Footage, and Other Bonuses.** HC-SF Projects that contain certain uses, amenities, or other building features are eligible for additional bonuses and code modifications, as described below.*

*(1) **Micro-Retail and/or Community Benefit Uses.** For projects that include, at or above grade, (A) one or more Micro-Retail spaces, which shall mean space for a Retail Use measuring no less than 100 gross square feet and no greater than 1,000 gross square feet; and/or (B) one or more Community Benefit Uses, shall receive additional square footage and height as set forth below. For the purposes of this subsection, Community Benefit Uses means: Child Care Facility, Community Facility, Job Training, Public Facilities, Social Service or Philanthropic Facility, Laundromat, Trade School, Grocery (General or Specialty), and/or any Displaced Business, as that term is defined in Section 202.17. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Code, all such Community Benefit Uses shall be principally permitted without limit on use size. The following provisions apply to projects providing Micro-Retail space(s) and/or on-site Community Benefit Use(s):*

(A) For every square foot of Community Benefit Use(s), or every 1.5 square feet of Micro-Retail, the Project shall be permitted to include an additional:

(i) up to two square feet for other project use(s); and

(ii) up to a maximum of 10 feet total above the permitted height limit to accommodate the additional square footage.

(B) On-site Community Benefits Use(s) and Micro-Retail space(s) must be included in the project for a minimum of 30 years, or the life of the project, whichever is shorter, and the use and space requirement shall be recorded in a Notice of Special Restrictions. If the Community Benefits Use(s) is discontinued, it must be replaced with another Community Benefits Use(s). If the Micro-Retail space(s) is reconfigured, the new resulting space(s) must meet the definition of a Micro-

Retail space and the cumulative square footage must not decrease in size.

(2) ***Warm Retail Shells****. For the purposes of this subsection (e)(2), "Warm Retail Shell" means a ground floor retail space* ~~in a "warm shell" condition suitable for food service use,~~ with the improvements described in this subsection (e)(2) as a Food Service Warm Shell or a General Warm Shell. ~~which space~~ A Food Service Warm Shell shall *contain*~~s~~ *all of the following: a concrete floor slab, exterior walls, roof, st*~~r~~*orefront, restroom(s)* ~~designed to~~ *meet*ing *ADA accessibility requirements, electrical panel with breakers* and outlets*, fire sprinklers* and alarm system *that* ~~meet shell~~ satisfy *building code, HVAC unit, Type 1 grease exhaust hood with appropriate ductwork, water meter(s), distribution piping for domestic water (hot/cold), and waste water plumbing, including floor drains.* A General Warm Shell shall contain all of the following: a finished concrete floor, exterior walls, sheet rock on walls, roof, restroom(s) satisfying ADA accessibility requirements, electrical panel with breakers and outlets, fire sprinklers and alarm system that satisfy building code, and basic lighting. *The following provisions apply to projects providing Warm Retail Shells.*

(A) For every square foot of Warm Retail Shell(s), the Project shall be permitted to include an additional:

(i) up to three square feet for other project use(s) for a Food Service Warm Shell*; and*

(ii) up to 2.5 square feet for other project use(s) for a General Warm Shell; and

*(ii*i*) up to a maximum of 10 feet total above the permitted height limit to accommodate the additional square footage.*

(B) The Warm Retail Shell shall be included in the project for a minimum of 30 years, or the life of the project, whichever is shorter, and the requirement shall be recorded in a Notice of Special Restrictions. If the space is modified within this period such that it no longer meets the

definition of a Warm Retail Shell, it must be replaced with a qualifying Community Benefit Use or a Micro-Retail use per subsection (e)(1) above. No Temporary or Final Certificate of Occupancy shall be issued unless the Planning Department, in consultation with the Department of Building Inspection, determines that the requirements of this subsection (e)(2) have been completed.

*(3) **Family-Friendly Amenities.** In Residential Districts, projects that provide certain Family Friendly Amenities, as defined below, shall be permitted to include an additional:*

(A) up to two square feet for project uses for each square foot of any one or more Family Friendly Amenity; and

(B) horizontal addition to the permitted building volume to accommodate this extra square footage through any combination of the following:

(i) reducing the required rear yard above the ground floor (Section 134) to 25% or 20 feet, whichever is greater;

(ii) reducing the required ground floor rear yard (Section 134) to 18% or 15 feet, whichever is greater;

(iii) reducing the required side yard (Section 133) to 0 feet, and/or

(iv) reducing the required upper-story setback to 10 feet for additions to Historic Buildings.

(C) Family Friendly Amenities shall be defined as the following:

(i) an indoor common recreational room of not less than 150 square feet that is directly accessible to an adjacent outdoor common open space of at least 150 square feet;

(ii) a common shared kitchen of not less than 150 square feet, equipped at minimum with a refrigerator, oven, stovetop, sink, dishwasher, and countertops for food preparation;

(iii) an overnight suite with a bedroom and bathroom, but that is not a Dwelling Unit and has no cooking facilities, that is a common building amenity and reservable

exclusively by residents for overnight guests;

(iv) secured storage space for residents, that is external to individual residential units, intended for large objects, and located on the ground floor or below or accessed from within a garage or loading area;

(v) bicycle parking space or storage area intended to accommodate cargo bicycles as shall be described in specifications published by the Zoning Administrator; and

(vi) an in-home childcare unit that meets the requirements of Section 414A.6(a)(2), (3), and (5). Projects that construct an in-home childcare unit shall receive a waiver of the requirements of Section 414A.

(D) Family-Friendly Amenities shall be included in the project for a minimum of 30 years, or the life of the project, whichever is shorter, and the use and space requirement shall be recorded in a Notice of Special Restrictions. If the Family-Friendly Amenity is discontinued, it must be replaced with another Family-Friendly Amenity.

*(4) **Units With** Two ~~Three~~ **or More Bedrooms.** Projects that contain units with two ~~three~~ or more bedrooms shall be permitted to include additional square footage, as set forth below:*

(A) 250 square feet for every two-bedroom unit provided in excess of the number of two-bedroom units required by subsection (d)(1)(B); and

(B) *250 square feet for every three-bedroom unit provided, including any three-bedroom units required pursuant to subsection (d)(1)(B); and*

(~~B~~C) 400 square feet for every unit provided that contains four or more bedrooms, including any such units required pursuant to subsection (d)(1)(B); and

(~~C~~D) horizontal additions to accommodate the extra square footage described in subsection (e)(4)(A)-(~~B~~C) through any combination of the following:

(i) reducing the required rear yard above the ground floor (Section 134) to 25% or 20 feet, whichever is greater; and

(ii) reducing the required ground floor rear yard (Section 134) to 18% or 15 feet, whichever is greater;

(iii) reducing the required side yard (Section 133) to zero feet, and/or

(iv) reducing the required upper-story setback to 10 feet for additions to Historic Buildings; and

(~~D~~E) in all districts except Residential districts, vertical additions not to exceed 10 feet total above the Housing Choice-SF height limit (Section 263.19) to accommodate the extra square footage described in subsections (e)(4)(A)~~and~~ -(~~B~~C).

(~~E~~F) The units containing two ~~three~~ *or more bedrooms shall be included in the project for a minimum of 30 years, or the life of the project, whichever is shorter, and the use and space requirement shall be recorded in a Notice of Special Restrictions.*

(5) ***Replacement of Commercial Space.*** In districts other than Residential districts, projects proposing the alteration or demolition of a building with existing Commercial Uses shall be permitted to include additional square footage, as set forth below. For the purposes of this subsection (e)(5), a "Replacement Commercial Space" shall satisfy all of the following for each Commercial Use: (1) the space(s) contains between 90% to 110% of the gross floor area of the existing Commercial Use(s); (2) the storefront(s) occupies between 90 to 110% of the length of the street frontage occupied by the existing Commercial Use(s), except that if the street frontage for the existing Commercial Use is 50 feet or less, up to 10 feet of frontage can be used for a lobby; and if the street frontage for the existing Commercial Use is greater than 50 feet, up to 15 feet of the frontage can be used for a lobby; and (3) the space contains a Warm Retail Shell, as that term is defined in subsection (e)(2), provided that if the existing Commercial Use involves food service, the project must provide a Food Service Warm Shell.

.

(A) up to 1.5 square feet for project uses for each square foot of Replacement Commercial Space; and

(B) up to a maximum of 10 feet total above the permitted height limit to accommodate the additional square footage.

(C) A project providing Replacement Commercial Space is also eligible for the Warm Retail Shell bonuses in subsection (e)(2).

(D) The Replacement Commercial Space shall be included in the project for a minimum of 30 years, or the life of the project, whichever is shorter, and the use requirement shall be recorded in a Notice of Special Restrictions.

(6) ***Preservation of Historic Buildings.*** *In districts other than Residential districts, projects proposing an alteration to a Historic Building and/or constructing new buildings on sites that contain a Historic Building shall be permitted to include additional square footage, as provided below:*

(A) up to 1.5 times the gross floor area foregone by retaining the Historic Building and complying with Objective Standards pertaining to Historic Buildings, including through setting back building additions and/or new construction in relation to the Historic Building. For the purposes of this subsection (e)(~~5~~6)(A), the foregone gross floor area shall be equal to the gross floor area within the volume that would otherwise be permitted under the Planning Code and all applicable Objective Standards, inclusive of modifications allowed pursuant to this Section 206.10, but is not being constructed in order to accommodate a reduced building mass above or around a Historic Building and that complies with or exceeds the setbacks or mass reductions required by the Objective Standards pertaining to Historic Buildings. The Zoning Administrator may publish further guidance on the calculation of foregone gross floor area; and

(B) for Historic Buildings with storefronts that contain character-defining features, an additional 0.25 square feet for every square foot of space in the storefront, provided that the project preserves the storefront in compliance with Objective Standards

pertaining to Historic Buildings; and

(C) *horizontal or vertical additions to accommodate this extra square footage, except that any such additions shall not:*

(i) exceed 20 feet above the Housing Choice-SF height limit (Section 263.19); or

(ii) reduce the required rear yard above the ground floor to less than 15 feet where the site abuts the rear yard of adjacent parcels containing residential uses.

(~~C~~D*) The Historic Building* and/or historic storefront *shall be maintained in compliance with the Preservation Design Standards for the life of the project, and the requirement shall be recorded in a Notice of Special Restrictions.*

(~~6~~7*)* ***Limits on Bonuses.*** Except as provided below, A~~a~~*n HC-SF Project can combine the heights, square footage, and additional bonuses in subsections (e)(1) through (e)(*~~5~~6*),* ~~as provided below:~~.

(1) ***Height.*** *A project may combine the bonuses in subsections (e)(1) through (e)(*~~4~~5*) provided that any height bonus is limited to 10 feet above the Housing Choice-SF height limit. A project may combine the bonuses in subsections (e)(1) through (e)(*~~5~~6*) provided that any height bonus is limited to 30 feet above the Housing Choice-SF height limit.*

(2) ***Rear Yard.*** *A project cannot reduce the required rear yard beyond the lowest of the limits set forth in subsections (e)(3)-(e)(*~~5~~6*).*

SEC. 334. HOUSING CHOICE-SAN FRANCISCO PROJECT AUTHORIZATION.

(a) ***Purpose and Applicability.*** *The purpose of this Section 334 is to provide for the review and approval of a Housing Choice San Francisco (HC-SF) project, as defined in Section 206.10.*

(b) ***General Process.***

(1) ***Application.*** *An HC-SF Project shall apply through the Planning Department's*

procedures for Development Applications and review. An HC-SF project application shall be submitted with and processed concurrently with all other applications. The HC-SF project application shall be submitted on a form prescribed by the Department, and shall include all of the following information:

(i) A full plan set, including a site plan, elevations, sections, and floor plans, showing total number of units, and the number of and location of affordable units as applicable; and a draft Regulatory Agreement, if the project elects to subject units to the Rent Stabilization Ordinance under Section 206.10(c)(1);

(ii) Except as noted in subsection (iii), demonstration of compliance with the Planning Code and provisions of the HC-SF Program, including any permitted zoning modifications;

(iii) Requested Major Modifications under subsection (d).

*(2) **Procedures.** The review of an HC-SF Project shall be conducted as part of, and incorporated into, a Development Application. Where there is a conflict, the provisions of Section 206.10 shall govern. Unless modified by Section 206.10, if a project requires a conditional use authorization, or any other entitlement that requires a public hearing before the Planning Commission and/or the Historic Preservation Commission, the HC-SF Project shall be reviewed by the Planning Commission and/or the Historic Preservation Commission, as applicable.*

*(3) **Discretionary Review.** As long as the Planning Commission has delegated its authority to the Planning Department to review applications for an HC-SF Project, the Planning Commission shall not hold a public hearing for discretionary review of an HC-SF that is subject to this Section 334.*

*(4) **Regulatory Agreement for Projects Using Section 206.10(c)(1).***

(A) Sponsors of HC-SF Projects that elect to comply with the provisions of Section 206.10(c)(1) shall enter into a regulatory agreement with the City subjecting all units, except for any units required to be Affordable Units as defined in Planning Code Section 401, to the Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance (Chapter 37 of the Administrative Code), as a

condition of approval ("Regulatory Agreement").

(B) The property owner and the Planning Director, or the Director's designee, on behalf of the City, will execute the Regulatory Agreement, which is subject to review and approval by the City Attorney's Office. The Regulatory Agreement shall be executed prior to the City's issuance of the First Construction Document for the project, as defined in Section 107A.13.1 of the Building Code. Following execution of the Regulatory Agreement by all parties and approval by the City Attorney, the Regulatory Agreement or a memorandum thereof shall be recorded in the title records in the Office of the Assessor-Recorder against the property and shall be binding on all future owners and successors in interest.

(C) At a minimum, the Regulatory Agreement shall contain the following:

(i) A description of the total number of Dwelling Units approved, including the number of units subject to the Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance and other restricted units, if any, and the location, square footage of Dwelling Units, and number of bedrooms in each unit;

(ii) A statement that the Dwelling Units are not subject to the Costa-Hawkins Rental Housing Act (California Civil Code Section 1954.50 et seq.). Further, that under Section 1954.52(b), the property owner has entered into and agreed to the terms of the agreement with the City in consideration for an exception from residential density limits, or other direct financial contribution or other forms of assistance specified in California Government Code Section 65915 et seq.;

(iii) A description of the residential density exception or other direct financial contribution or forms of assistance provided to the property owner; and

(iv) A description of the remedies for breach of the agreement and other provisions to ensure implementation and compliance with the agreement; and,

(v) An agreement that any lease, sublease, or other agreement regarding

tenancy of units not subject to the Costa-Hawkins Rental Housing Act (California Civil Code Sections 1954.50 et seq.) shall include the following text: "This unit is a rental unit subject to the San Francisco Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance."

*(5) **Other Agreements.** HC-SF Projects that provide on-site affordable units under Section 415 et seq. or other state or local program that requires or allows the provision of on-site affordable units, shall comply with any applicable recording or regulatory agreement requirement of that state or local program.*

*(6) **Timeline of Review.** Unless the Environmental Review Officer determines that compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act would take more than 180 days, review of an HC-SF Project not seeking a Major Modification under this Section 334 shall be completed within 180 days of submittal of a complete Development Application. Unless the Environmental Review Officer determines that compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act would take more than 180 days, the Planning Commission shall hold a public hearing for projects seeking a Major Modification within 180 days of submittal of a complete project application.*

*(c) **Administrative Review.** The Planning Department shall administratively review an HC-SF Project, unless the Project seeks a Major Modification pursuant to subsection (d), or any HC-SF Project that is a 100% Affordable HC-SF Project. The Planning Department's determination regarding an HC-SF Project under this subsection (c) shall not be appealable.* Nothing in this Section 334 abrogates permit, license, or other requirements codified outside the Planning Code.

*(d) **Projects Seeking Major Modifications to Standards and Requirements.** An HC-SF Project may seek a Major Modification using the process in this subsection (d).*

*(1) **Definition.** A "Major Modification" means any deviation from any quantitative standard in the Planning Code or any applicable Objective Standard not otherwise provided in Section 206.10(d) through (e). A project seeking a Major Modification to an Objective Standard shall not be considered code compliant.*

*(2) **Additional Modifications.** HC-SF Projects seeking Major Modifications pursuant to this subsection (d) may also pursue additional modifications that are not Major Modifications under the provisions elsewhere in this Code.*

*(3) **Exclusions.** In no case may an HC-SF Project receive a Major Modification or other exception under any provision of this Code to the following requirements: maximum building height; maximum permitted accessory off-street parking amounts; wind standards; minimum density requirements; Floor Area Ratio limits; any standard set forth in Articles 1.7, 3, 3.5, 4, 10, and 11 of the Planning Code; definitions; permitted land uses; the Transportation Demand Management Program under Section 169;* dwelling unit mix; *and any standard or provision adopted by the voters.*

*(4) **Required Findings for Major Modifications.** To grant a Major Modification, the Planning Commission shall find: (a) that the proposed modification achieves equal or superior design quality, and (b) the project would provide a significant community benefit by producing housing near transit, or otherwise promote the general welfare.*

*(5) **Conditions of Approval.** The Planning Commission may adopt conditions of approval for granted modification(s). Such conditions shall be limited to addressing the potential impact of such granted modification(s).*

*(6) **Process for Applicants Seeking Major Modifications.***

*(A) **Decision.** The Planning Commission, at a noticed public hearing, shall review, and approve, disapprove, or approve with conditions, a request for a Major Modification. The Planning Commission shall find that the proposed Major Modification(s) meet the criteria in subsection (d)(4). As part of its review and decision, the Planning Commission may impose additional conditions, requirements, modifications, and limitations on a proposed project in order to mitigate the effect of the requested modification(s) and thereby achieve the objectives, policies, and intent of the General Plan and/or applicable Objective Standards.*

*(B) **Notification.** Notice of a hearing required by subsection (6)(A) shall be*

provided in accordance with Planning Code Section 333.

(e) ***Notification and Record of Decision.*** *Notification and record of decision of an HC-SF Project shall be provided as set forth in the Planning Department procedures for review and approval of Development Applications.*

(f) ***Change of Conditions.*** *Once a project is approved, a change in any condition previously imposed by the Planning Commission shall require approval by the Planning Commission subject to the procedures set forth in this Section 334.*

(g) **Progress Requirement.** Approval of a project pursuant to this Section 334 shall expire if the project sponsor has not procured a building permit or site permit for construction of the project within 30 months of the date of project approval. If the Planning Director or the Director's designee finds that the project sponsor has demonstrated good faith in its efforts to obtain the first site or building permit for the project, the Planning Director or designee may extend the approval for the project for a maximum of six additional months. Such deadline shall additionally be extended in the event of any appeal of such approval for the duration of the appeal, and in the event of litigation seeking to invalidate the approval for the duration of the litigation.

SEC. 344. HOUSING CHOICE HOUSING SUSTAINABILITY DISTRICT.

(a) ***Purpose.*** *This Section 344 establishes the Housing Choice - San Francisco Housing Sustainability District ("HSD") under California Government Code Sections 66200 et seq. The purpose of the HSD is to encourage the development of on-site affordable housing in new residential and mixed-use projects by providing a streamlined, ministerial approval process for such projects. This Section 344 sets forth eligibility criteria, design review standards, and entitlement and approval procedures for projects seeking approval pursuant to the HSD.*

(b) ***Geography.*** *The HSD shall be comprised of all parcels, other than those zoned as RH or*

RM, in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.

(c) ***Relationship to Other Planning Code Provisions.*** *Except as otherwise provided in this Section 344, the Planning Code shall apply to projects approved pursuant to this Section 344. In the event of a conflict between other provisions of the Planning Code and this Section 344, this Section shall control.*

(d) ***Eligibility.*** *Projects seeking approval pursuant to this Section 344 shall meet all of the following requirements:*

(1) The project is located in a zoning district where Residential uses are principally permitted.

(2) For Dwelling Unit projects, the project's residential density is no less than 50 Dwelling Units per acre, and no more than 1,000 Dwelling Units per acre.

(3) At least one-half of the project's Gross Floor Area is designated for Residential uses. All proposed Non-Residential uses must be principally permitted in the underlying zoning district and any applicable SUD(s). The project shall not include more than 24,999 square feet of Gross Floor Area of Office use that would be subject to the annual limit on office development set forth in Sections 321 et seq.

(4) The project does not demolish 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 ~~a building that is~~

~~designated as a landmark under Article 10, is listed as a contributor to an historic district in Article 10, is listed as a Significant or Contributory Building under Article 11, is listed in the California Register of Historical Resources, or is listed on the National Register of Historic Places~~.

(5) Consistent with California Government Code Section 66201(f), the project shall provide no less than 10% of dwelling units as units affordable to very low or low income households. A project subject to Section 415 may apply any such affordable units towards its compliance with Section 415. Projects not subject to Section 415 shall enter into a regulatory agreement with the City to restrict the affordability of any such units for no less than 55 years.

(6) The project does not demolish, remove, or convert to another use any existing Dwelling Unit(s), or Residential Flat.

(7) The project complies with all applicable Planning Code requirements and any adopted Objective Standards. Projects seeking approval pursuant to this Section 344 may not seek any exceptions to height and bulk limits pursuant to Section 309(a)(17).

(8) The project sponsor complies with all applicable mitigation measures in the Housing Element 2022 Update Environmental Impact Report ("Housing Element EIR").

(9) The project sponsor certifies that the project will comply with all applicable requirements of California Government Code Section 66201(f)(4).

(10) The project complies with the requirement of Government Code Section 66201(f)(5).

(11) The project provides relocation assistance to any displaced residential tenants.

(12) A project is not deemed to be for residential use if it is infeasible for actual use as a single or multifamily residence.

(13) The project does not demolish or convert any portion of a Tourist Hotel.

(e) ***Approving Authority.*** *The Planning Department is the approving authority designated to*

review permit applications for compliance with this Section 344.

(f) ***Application.*** *In addition to any requirements under other provisions of this Code for submittal of application materials, an application under this Section 344 shall be submitted to the Department on a form prescribed by the Department and shall not be considered complete until the project sponsor has provided all of the following:*

(1) A full plan set, including site plan, elevations, sections, and floor plans, showing total number of units, and number of and location of units affordable to very low or low income households;

(2) All documentation required by the Planning Department and sufficient to support determinations that:

(A) The project meets all applicable zoning and any Objective Standards.

(B) The project sponsor will implement any and all mitigation measures in the Housing Element EIR that the Environmental Review Officer determines are applicable. The project sponsor shall submit scope(s) of work for any studies required as part of any mitigation measure, and the application shall not be deemed complete until such studies are completed to the satisfaction of the Environmental Review Officer.

(C) The project will comply with subsections (d)(10) and (d)(11) of this Section 344.

(g) ***Decision and Hearing.*** *The Department shall ministerially approve projects that meet all the requirements in this Section 344, as follows:*

(1) ***Hearing.*** *The Planning Department shall conduct an informational public hearing for all projects that are subject to this Section 344 within 100 days of receipt of a complete application, as set forth in subsection (f).*

(2) ***Decision.*** *Within 120 days of receipt of a complete application, as set forth in subsection (f), the Planning Director or the Director's designee shall issue a written decision*

approving, disapproving, or approving subject to conditions, the project. The applicant and the Department may mutually agree to extend this 120-day period. If no written decision is issued within 120 days of the Department's receipt of a complete application, or within the period mutually agreed upon by the Department and applicant, the project shall be deemed approved. The Planning Director or the Director's designee shall include any certifications required by California Government Code Section 66205(e) in a copy of the written decision.

*(3) **Grounds for Permit Denial.** The Department may deny an HSD project application only for one or more of the following reasons:*

(A) The proposed project does not fully comply with this Section 344, including but not limited to meeting all adopted Objective Standards and/or implementing all mitigation measures in the Housing Element EIR that the Department determines are applicable.

(B) The project sponsor has not submitted all of the information or paid any application fee required by this Section 344 and necessary for an adequate and timely design review or assessment of potential impacts on nearby properties.

(C) The Department determines, based upon substantial evidence in light of the whole record of the public hearing on the project, that a physical condition on the site of development that was not known and could not have been discovered with reasonable investigation at the time the application was submitted would have a specific adverse impact upon the public health or safety and that there is no feasible method to satisfactorily mitigate or avoid the specific adverse impact. As used in this subsection (g)(3)(C), "specific adverse impact" means a significant, quantifiable, direct, and unavoidable impact based on identified objective written public health or safety standards, policies, or conditions, in existence at the time the application was deemed complete.

*(4) **Appeal.** The procedures for appeal to the Board of Appeals of a decision by the Department under this Section 344 shall be as set forth in Section 8 of the Business and Tax Regulations Code.*

*(5) **Discretionary Review.** No requests for discretionary review shall be accepted by the Planning Department for projects subject to this Section 344. As long as the Planning Commission has delegated its authority to the Planning Department to review applications for projects subject to this Section 344, the Planning Commission shall not hold a public hearing for discretionary review of projects subject to this Section 344.*

*(6) **Progress Requirement.** Approval of a project pursuant to this Section 344 shall expire if the project sponsor has not procured a building permit or site permit for construction of the project within 30 months of the date of the Department's issuance of a written decision pursuant to subsection (g)(2). If the Planning Director or the Director's designee finds that the project sponsor has demonstrated good faith in its efforts to obtain the first site or building permit for the project, the Planning Director or designee may extend the approval for the project for a maximum of six additional months. Such deadline shall additionally be extended in the event of any appeal of such approval for the duration of the appeal, and in the event of litigation seeking to invalidate the approval for the duration of the litigation.*

*(h) **Design Review Standards.** Projects subject to this Section 344 shall be reviewed for compliance with the design standards set forth in the Planning Code and any Objective Standards.*

*(i) **District Affordability Requirement.** At the request of the California Department of Housing and Community Development, the Planning Department shall demonstrate that at least 20% of the residential units constructed in the HSD during the life of the District and pursuant to this Section 344 will be affordable to very low, low, and moderate-income households and subject to a recorded affordability restriction for at least 55 years.*

*(j) **Monitoring and Enforcement.** The Planning Department shall include, as conditions of approval of all projects approved pursuant to this Section 344, monitoring and enforcement provisions to ensure that the project meets all applicable labor and wage requirements and complies with all identified applicable mitigation measures. Projects found to be in violation of any of these conditions*

shall be subject to the Administrative Enforcement Procedures in Section 176 of this Code, including initiation of abatement proceedings or referral to the City Attorney or District Attorney for prosecution, if not corrected within 90 days of service of any notice of violation issued under Section 176(b)(1). Conditions of approval shall include, but are not limited to:

(1) A project sponsor shall submit weekly reports to the Office of Labor Standards Enforcement, certifying that a project approved pursuant to this Section 344 is complying with subsections (d)(11) and (d)(12), if applicable to the project. Projects found to be in violation of subsections (d)(11) and (d)(12) shall be subject to penalties pursuant to Section 1741 of the Labor Code, in addition to any penalties assessed pursuant to Section 176 of this Code. All penalties shall be paid prior to issuance of the project's First Certificate of Occupancy, as defined in Section 401 of this Code.

(2) The Planning Department shall monitor compliance with the Housing Element EIR mitigation measures for projects approved under the HSD.

(3) The Planning Department shall monitor and report the construction of affordable housing units under the HSD in its annual Housing Inventory, which shall include the following information:

(A) Number of projects approved pursuant to this Section 344.

(B) Number of projects under construction pursuant to approvals obtained under this Section 344.

(C) Number of projects completed pursuant to approvals obtained under this Section 344.

(D) Number of Dwelling Units or Group Housing beds within projects completed pursuant to approvals obtained under this Section 344.

(E) Number of Dwelling Units affordable to very low, low, moderate, and middle income households within projects completed pursuant to approvals obtained under this Section 344.

*(k) **Operative and Sunset Dates.***

(1) This Section 344 shall become operative upon confirmation of approval by the California Department of Housing and Community Development under California Government Code Section 66202(c) ("Operative Date").

(2) This Section 344 shall expire by operation of law seven years from the Operative Date, unless this Section 344 is renewed by ordinance pursuant to Government Code Section 66201(g), in which case this Section 344 shall expire on the date specified in that ordinance ("Sunset Date"). Upon the expiration of this Section 344, the City Attorney shall cause this Section 344 to be removed from the Planning Code. Pursuant to Government Code Section 66205(b), this Section 344 shall govern the processing and review of any complete application submitted pursuant to this Section 344 prior to the Sunset Date.

Section 4. Height and Bulk Limits. Article 2.5 of the Planning Code is hereby amended by revising Sections 260, 263.19, 263.20, and 270, and adding Sections 270.3 to read as follows:

SEC. 260. HEIGHT LIMITS: MEASUREMENT.

(a) **Method of Measurement.** The limits upon the height of buildings and structures shall be as specified on the Zoning Map, except as permitted by Section 206. In the measurement of height, the following rules shall be applicable:

(1) The point above which such measurements shall be taken shall be as specified as follows.

(A) In the case of either *subsection (a)(1)*(B) or (C) below, such point shall be taken at the centerline of the building or, where the building steps laterally in relation to a street that is the basis for height measurement, separate points shall be taken at the centerline of each building step.

(B) Where the lot is level with or slopes downward from a street at the centerline of the building or building step, such point shall be taken at curb level on such a street. This point shall be used for height measurement only for a lot depth not extending beyond a line 100 feet from and parallel to such street, or beyond a line equidistant between such street and the street on the opposite side of the block, whichever depth is greater. Measurement of height for any portion of the lot extending beyond such line shall be considered in relation to the opposite (lower) end of the lot, and that portion shall be considered an upward sloping lot in accordance with ~~S~~subsection *(a)(1)*(C) below, whether or not the lot also has frontage on a lower street.

(C) Where the lot slopes upward from a street at the centerline of the building or building step, such point shall be taken at curb level for purposes of measuring the height of the closest part of the building within 10 feet of the property line of such street; at every other cross-section of the building, at right angles to the centerline of the building or building step, such point shall be taken as the average of the ground elevations at either side of the building or building step at that cross-section. The ground elevations used shall be either existing elevations or the elevations resulting from new grading operations encompassing an entire block. Elevations beneath the building shall be taken by projecting a straight line between ground elevations at the exterior walls at either side of the entire building in the same plane.

(D) Where the lot has frontage on two or more streets, the owner may choose the street or streets from which the measurement of height is to be taken, within the scope of the rules stated above.

Where the height limits for buildings and structures are established by this Code, the upper points to be taken for measurement of height shall be as prescribed in the provisions relating to such height limits.

(2) The upper point to which such measurement shall be taken shall be the highest point on the finished roof in the case of a flat roof, and the average height of the rise in the case of a pitched or stepped roof, or similarly sculptured roof form, or any higher point of a feature not exempted under ~~S~~s*ubsection* (b) below. For any building taller than 550 feet in height in the S-2 Bulk District, the height of the building shall be measured at the upper point of all features of the building and exempted features in such cases shall be limited to only those permitted in ~~S~~s*ubsection* (b)(1)(M) and which are permitted by the Planning Commission according to the procedures of Section 309.

(3) In cases where the height limit is 65 feet or less and a street from which height measurements are made slopes laterally along the lot, or the ground slopes laterally on a lot that also slopes upward from the street, there shall be a maximum width for the portion of the building or structure that may be measured from a single point at curb or ground level, according to the definition of "height," as specified in the following table. These requirements shall not apply to any property to which the bulk limitations in Section 270 of this Code are applicable.

(4) The following requirements shall apply to all parcels within the R-4 Height and Bulk District, at or below 85 feet. In cases where the height limit is 85 feet or less and a street from which height measurements are made slopes laterally along the lot, or the ground slopes laterally on a lot that also slopes upward from the street, there shall be a maximum width for the portion of the building or structure that may be measured from a single point at curb or ground level, according to the definition of "height" as specified in the following table. These requirements shall not apply to any property to which the bulk limitations in Sections 270 through 270.3 of this Code are applicable.

TABLE 260-*1*
HEIGHT MEASUREMENT
ON LATERAL SLOPES WHERE
HEIGHT LIMIT IS 65 FEET OR LESS

Average Slope of Curb or Ground From Which Height is Measured	**Maximum Width for Portion of Building that May Be Measured from a Single Point**
5% ~~*percent*~~ or less	No requirement
More than 5% ~~*percent*~~ but no more than 15% ~~*percent*~~	65 feet
More than 15% ~~*percent*~~ but not more than 20% ~~*percent*~~	55 feet
More than 20% ~~*percent*~~ but no more than 25% ~~*percent*~~	45 feet
More than 25% ~~*percent*~~	35 feet

[image]

TABLE 260-2
HEIGHT MEASUREMENT
ON LATERAL SLOPES WHERE
HEIGHT LIMIT IS BETWEEN 65 AND 85 FEET

Average Slope of Curb or Ground From Which Height is Measured	*Maximum Width for Portion of Building that May Be Measured from a Single Point*
5% or less	*No requirement*
More than 5% but no more than 15%	*85 feet*
More than 15% but no more than 20%	*75 feet*
More than 20% but no more than 25%	*65 feet*
More than 25%	*55 feet*

(b) **Exemptions.** In addition to other height exceptions permitted by this Code, the

features listed in this subsection (b) shall be exempt from the height limits established by this Code, in an amount up to but not exceeding that which is specified.

* * * *

SEC. 263.19. HEIGHT LIMITS: PERMITTED ~~*PODIUM AND*~~ TOWER HEIGHTS IN THE R BULK DISTRICTS.

(a) This Section 263.19(a) shall apply to R Bulk Districts, except for the R-4 Height and Bulk District.

~~*(a)*~~*(1)* **Intent.** The general development concept for R Bulk Districts is of podium buildings that vary from 65 to 170 feet in height depending on the district and location, with adequately spaced slender towers up to 650 feet in height rising above the podium buildings.

~~*(b)*~~*(2)* **Maximum Height Controls for Podiums and Towers.** In the ~~*R bulk districts, which include the*~~ R, R-2, and R-3 bulk districts as designated on Sectional Map No. HT01, HT02, and HT07 of the Zoning Map, maximum permitted building heights for both podiums and towers are expressed as two numbers separated by a slash. The number preceding the slash represents the height limit for podium buildings. The number following the slash represents the height limit for towers. No building may exceed the podium height limit except for towers meeting the bulk and tower spacing controls established in Section 270(e) and (f).

~~*(c)*~~*(3)* **Maximum Height Controls for Podiums and Towers in the R-2 Bulk District and the Van Ness & Market Residential Special Use District**. In the R-2 bulk district and within the Van Ness & Market Residential Special Use District, maximum permitted building heights for both podiums and towers are expressed as two sets of numbers separated by a double slash in the format described above, in subsection *(a)*(~~*2b*~~). Each set of numbers represents the maximum heights for podium and tower applicable to the parcel and

as regulated per subsection *(a)*(2~~b~~) above as follows: The first set of numbers represents the principally permitted height limits for the parcel, both for the podium and for the tower. The second set of numbers after the double slash represents the maximum height limits for podium and tower that can be granted by the Planning Commission for that parcel through an exception pursuant to the procedures and findings of Section 309(a)(17).

(b) This Section 263.19(b) shall apply to the R-4 Height and Bulk District.

*(1) **Intent.** The general development concept for the R-4 Height and Bulk District is for buildings that vary in height depending on the location, and in some locations providing for adequately spaced slender towers rising above the podiums of lower height(s). In addition to establishing bulk controls for all buildings in the district as further described in Section 270(i), the R-4 district implements the Housing Choice-San Francisco (HC-SF) program by providing for a secondary height limit for projects using the HC-SF Program per Section 206.10.*

*(2) **Maximum Height Controls for the HC-SF Program.** In the R-4 Height and Bulk District, as designated on Sectional Maps Nos. HT01, 02, 03, 04, 05, 06, 07, 11, 12, and 13 of the Zoning Map, the permitted building heights are expressed as two sets of numbers separated by a double slash. Preceding the double slash is the permitted building height limit for projects not using the HC-SF Program. Following the double slash is the height limit for projects using the HC-SF Program per Section 206.10. Where there is a set of two numbers separated by a single slash, the number preceding the single slash is the maximum height for podium buildings and the number following the single slash is the maximum tower height subject to the bulk and tower spacing controls of Section 270(i).*

The following represents an example of height limits subject to both podium and tower controls, and high limits for projects not using the HC-SF Program and projects using the HC-SF Program.



SEC. 263.20. SPECIAL HEIGHT EXCEPTION: ADDITIONAL FIVE FEET HEIGHT FOR ACTIVE GROUND FLOOR USES IN CERTAIN DISTRICTS ***AND ALL GROUND FLOOR USES IN THE R-4 HEIGHT AND BULK DISTRICT*****.**

* * * *

(b) **Applicability.** The special height exception described in this ~~s~~Section *263.20* shall only apply to projects that meet ~~*all*~~ *both* of the following criteria:

(1) project is located in a 30-X, 40-X, or 50-X Height and Bulk District*, or in the R-4 Height and Bulk District with a height limit of 40, 50, or 80 feet,* as designated on the Zoning Map;

(2) ~~*project is located in one of the following districts:*~~

~~*(A) in an NCT district as designated on the Zoning Map;*~~

~~*(B) in the Castro Street, Inner Clement Street, Outer Clement Street, Excelsior Outer Mission Street, Irving Street, Japantown, Judah Street, Noriega Street, Taraval Street, and 24th Street – Noe Valley NCDs;*~~

~~*(C) on a NC-2 designated parcel on Balboa Street between 2nd Avenue and 8th Avenue, and between 32nd Avenue and 39th Avenue;*~~

~~*(D) on a NC-1 designated parcel within the boundaries of Sargent Street to Orizaba Avenue to Lobos Street to Plymouth Avenue to Farallones Street to San Jose Avenue to Alemany Boulevard to 19th Avenue to Randolph Street to Monticello Street and back to Sargent Street;*~~

~~*(E) on a NC-3 designated parcel fronting on Geary Boulevard from Masonic Avenue to 28th Avenue, except for parcels on the north side of Geary Boulevard between Palm Avenue and Parker Avenue; or*~~

~~*(F) on a parcel zoned NC-1 on Noriega, Irving, Taraval, or Judah Streets west of 19th Avenue.*~~

~~*(3)*~~ project features ground floor commercial space or other active use as defined by Section 145.1(b)(2) with clear ceiling heights in excess of ten feet from sidewalk grade, or in the case of residential uses, such walk-up residential units are raised up from sidewalk level.~~;~~

~~*(4) said ground floor commercial space, active use, or walk-up residential use is primarily oriented along a right-of-way wider than 40 feet;*~~

~~*(5) said ground floor commercial space or active use occupies at least 50% of the project's ground floor area; and*~~

~~*(6) except for projects located in NCT districts, the project sponsor has conclusively demonstrated that the additional 5' increment allowed through Section 263.20 would not add new shadow to any public open spaces.*~~

* * * *

SEC. 270. BULK LIMITS: MEASUREMENT.

(a) The limits upon the bulk of buildings and structures shall be as stated in this Section 270 *(including Sections 270.1, 270.2, and 270.3)* and in Sections 271 and 272. The terms Diagonal Dimension, Height, Length, and Plan Dimensions shall be as defined in this Code. In

each height and bulk district, the maximum plan dimensions shall be as specified in the following table, at all horizontal cross-sections above the height indicated.

TABLE 270 **BULK LIMITS**			
District Symbol on Zoning Map	***Height Above Which Maximum Dimensions Apply (in feet)***	***Maximum Plan Dimensions (in feet)***	
		Length	***Diagonal Dimension***
* * * *			
R	This table not applicable. But see Section 270(e)		
R-2	This table not applicable. But see Section 270(f)		
R-3	*This table not applicable. But see Section 270(g)*		
R-4	*This table not applicable. But see Section 270(i)*		
V		110	140
* * * *			

* * * *

*(i) **R-4 Height and Bulk District.** In the R-4 Height and Bulk District, the bulk limitation are as follows:*

*(1) **Tower Bulk and Spacing.** In the R-4 Height and Bulk District, the otherwise applicable bulk controls for structures below a height of 85 feet or below a different height threshold where explicitly specified elsewhere in the Code ("Podium Height") shall govern, including, but not limited to, those found in the Citywide Design Standards. Portions of structures above the podium height shall comply with the bulk limitations described in subsection (i)(1)(A) and (B) below.*

(A) Buildings between the Podium Height and 140 feet in height (exclusive of

permitted height exceptions) shall:

(i) Provide 15-foot setback(s) from any interior property line(s) for portion(s) of the building above the Podium Height.

(ii) For portions of structures above the Podium Height, the average floor plate shall not exceed 12,000 square feet.

(iii) For portions of structures above the Podium Height, a maximum length of 130 feet and a maximum diagonal of 160 feet are permitted.

(iv) Building portions above the Podium Height and up to 140 feet must maintain a 30-foot distance from other buildings above the Podium Height on any lot.

(B) Buildings above 140 feet in height (exclusive of permitted height exceptions) shall:

(i) Provide 15-foot setback(s) from any interior property line(s) for portion(s) of the building above the Podium Height.

(ii) For portions of structures above the Podium Height, the average floor plate shall not exceed 12,000 square feet.

(iii) For portions of structures above the Podium Height, a maximum length of 130 feet and a maximum diagonal of 160 feet are permitted.

(iv) Building portions above the Podium Height shall be separated by no less than 115 feet from other buildings above 85 feet on any lot.

(v) For portions of buildings above the Podium Height, a maximum unbroken wall width of 100 feet is permitted. For building masses above 85 feet in height and with a plan length in excess of 100 feet, relief shall be provided through:

a. a notch, defined as a building recess or volumetric reduction that is provided at the indicated height and extending the full vertical height of the subject facade above 85-feet, of at least 10 feet by 10 feet; or

b. a change in plane of at least 10 feet.

(vi) The top one-third of a building above 85 feet shall be reduced in both floor plate and the allowed maximum plan and diagonal dimensions set forth in subsection (i)(1)(B) by 10% each.

SEC. 270.3. SPECIAL BULK REQUIREMENTS: MID-BLOCK ALLEYS IN LARGE LOT DEVELOPMENT OUTSIDE OF THE EASTERN NEIGHBORHOODS MIXED USE DISTRICTS, SOUTH OF MARKET COMMERCIAL TRANSIT DISTRICT, FOLSOM STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL TRANSIT DISTRICT, REGIONAL COMMERCIAL DISTRICT, C-3 AND DTR DISTRICTS.

*(a) **Findings.** This Section 270.3 incorporates the findings in Section 270.2(a), and determines that the conditions in Section 270.2 are applicable outside of the geographic area specified in Section 270.2..*

*(b) **Purpose.** The mid-block alley requirements of this Section 270.3 are intended to ameliorate the conditions and impacts described in the findings in Section 270.2(a) and make the subject areas appropriate for a higher density of activity and population in areas being targeted for more intense development. The horizontal mass reductions and mid-block alleys will ensure that block sizes for new housing support walkable neighborhoods. To encourage pedestrian movement, walking to nearby destinations including to and from transit, and neighborhood blocks with shortened distances to facilitate this activity, the bulk limitations noted below will apply.*

*(c) **Applicability.** This Section 270.3 applies to all development lots not subject to the requirements of Section 270.2, except development lots in PDR districts or that contain exclusively government or Public Facilities, that:*

(1) Are two acres or larger; and/or

(2) Have a frontage of 200 feet or greater on a single block face that is 400 feet or

greater.

*(d) **Requirements.** New construction on development lots that meet the criteria in subsection (c) above must be divided into smaller resultant lots and blocks in either one of the two following ways:*

*(1) **Option 1.** Lots shall be divided into resultant blocks such that:*

(A) no block frontage exceeds a length of 300 feet between intersections;

(B) no block perimeter exceeds a total of 1,200 feet; and

(C) the resultant blocks shall be separated from each other by newly created public street(s), alley(s), or publicly-accessible privately-owned street(s) or alley(s). Such street(s) shall meet San Francisco street standards including the Better Streets Plan as codified in Section 138.1 and pursuant to Public Works Code requirements. If privately-owned street(s) or alley(s) are created, they shall be maintained and must provide public access pursuant to the standards provided in Planning Code Section 270.2(e).

*(2) **Option 2**. Lots shall be divided into resultant blocks of not more than 400 feet in length between intersections of streets or alleys per subsection (d)(1)(C) above, that are bisected by alleys or passageways, and that do not exceed a total block perimeter of 1,400 feet. Such mid-block alleys or passageways shall meet the following conditions:*

*(A) **Location.** Be located as close to the middle portion of the subject block face, defined as within 50 lateral feet from the block centerline, perpendicular to the subject frontage and connecting to any existing adjacent streets and alleys. If the subject lot is not within the central portion of the block, the passageway shall cross the subject lot at its centerline or within 50 lateral feet from the lot centerline. For Development projects that include a Public Facility or are immediately abutting a parcel containing a Public Facility, this locational requirement shall not apply.*

*(B) **Hours of Operation.** The passageway(s) must be open to the public 24 hours a day, seven days a week. Fences and/or gates that would prevent public access at any point within the passageway(s) are prohibited.*

*(C) **Width.** The passageway(s) must maintain minimum width(s) of 20 feet measured from building-to-building at any point.*

*(D) **Walking Width.** Have a minimum clear walking width of 10 feet free of any obstructions in the case of a pedestrian-only right-of-way, and dual sidewalks each of not less than six feet in width with not less than four feet minimum clear width in the case of an alley with vehicular access.*

*(E) **Open to the Sky.** At least 60% of the passageway area must be open to the sky. Obstructions permitted within setbacks pursuant to Planning Code Section 136, that do not conflict with or obstruct the required walking width, may be located within the portion of the alley or passageway that is required to be open to the sky. All portions of the alley or pathway not open to the sky shall have a minimum clearance height from grade of 15 feet at all points. For Development Projects that include a Public Facility or are immediately abutting a parcel containing to a Public Facility, the required percent of the passageway area that must be open to the sky may be reduced to 50%.*

*(F) **Topography.** Changes in grade or steps are not permitted in an alley or passageway unless required by the natural topography and average grade.*

*(G) **Frontage.** Alleys or passageways must be fronted by active ground-floor uses, as defined in Section 145.1, for no less than 60% of their fronting length and in no case feature more than 50 continuous feet of inactive use(s) in any segment. For development projects that include a Public Facility or are immediately abutting a parcel containing a Public Facility, the required percent for active ground-floor uses may be reduced to 40% and may be unevenly distributed between the alley's or passageway's two sides.*

*(H) **Visual access.** Alleys or passageways must be configured to allow clear visual access from one end of the passageway through the development lot to its opposite end.*

(e) Additional Requirements for Private Passageways and Alleys.

*(1) **Maintenance.** Mid-block passageways and alleys required under this Section 270.3 shall be maintained at no public expense unless a publicly-accepted street or alley is created pursuant to subsection (d)(1) above. The owner of the property on which the alley or passageway is located shall maintain it by keeping the area clean and free of litter and by keeping it in an acceptable state of repair. Conditions intended to assure continued maintenance of the right-of-way for the actual lifetime of the building giving rise to the open space requirement may be imposed.*

*(2) **Informational Plaque.** Prior to issuance of a permit of occupancy, a plaque shall be placed in a publicly conspicuous location for pedestrian viewing. The plaque shall state the right of the public to pass through the alley and stating the name and address of the owner or owner's agent responsible for maintenance. The plaque shall be of no less than 24 inches by 36 inches in size.*

(3) Property owners providing a pathway or alley under this Section 270.3 shall hold harmless the City and County of San Francisco, its officers, agents, and employees, from any damage or injury caused by the design, construction, or maintenance of the right-of-way, and are solely liable for any damage or loss occasioned by any act or neglect in respect to the design, construction, or maintenance of the right-of-way.

(f) Any non-vehicular portions of such a passageway or alley, including sidewalks or other walking areas, seating areas, or landscaping, may count toward any open space requirements of this Code which permit publicly-accessible open space, provided that such space meets the standards of Section 135.

Section 5. Wind Controls. Articles 1, and 2 of the Planning Code are hereby amended by revising Sections 148, 243, 249.1, and 249.78, to read as follows:

SEC. 148. REDUCTION OF GROUND-LEVEL WIND CURRENTS *FOR BUILDINGS TALLER THAN 85 FEET* IN ~~*C-3*~~ *CERTAIN* DISTRICTS.

*(a) **Applicability.** In the C-3 Districts, Van Ness Special Use District, Folsom and Main*

Residential/Commercial Special Use District, Downtown Residential (DTR) Districts, and Central SoMa Special Use District, this Section 148 shall apply to new buildings taller than 85 feet in Height, vertical additions of more than 30 feet resulting in a total building height greater than 85 feet, or vertical additions of more than 30 feet to an existing building that is taller than 85 feet. Building height for the purpose of applicability of this Section shall be calculated pursuant to the provisions of Sections 260 and 263.21.

(b) ***Definitions.***

"Equivalent Wind Speed" means an hourly average wind speed adjusted to incorporate the effects of gustiness or turbulence on pedestrians, pursuant to the methodology adopted by the Planning Commission, as amended from time to time.

"Nine-Hour Hazard Criterion" means a ground-level equivalent wind speed of 26 miles per hour for nine or more hours per year.

(c) ***Controls for Hazardous Winds.*** *Projects shall not result in any net new locations that exceed the Nine-Hour Hazard Criterion.*

(d) ***Wind-reducing Features.*** *All wind-reducing features necessary to meet the requirements of this Section 148 shall be identified on the approved project plan set.*

(e) ***Maintenance of Wind-reducing Features.*** *All wind-reducing features necessary to meet the requirements of this Section 148 must be maintained for the life of the project. The Zoning Administrator may approve, including after installation, substitution of alternate wind-reducing features that would have an equal or superior effect on reducing ground-level winds at the subject location, provided that such features do not conflict with or increase noncompliance with other provisions of the Planning Code or other adopted Citywide Design Standards.*

~~*(a)* ***Requirement and Exception.*** *In C-3 Districts, buildings and additions to existing buildings shall be shaped, or other wind-baffling measures shall be adopted, so that the developments will not cause ground-level wind currents to exceed, more than 10 percent of the time year round, between 7:00*~~

~~*a.m. and 6:00 p.m., the comfort level of 11 m.p.h. equivalent wind speed in areas of substantial pedestrian use and seven m.p.h. equivalent wind speed in public seating areas.*~~

~~*When preexisting ambient wind speeds exceed the comfort level, or when a proposed building or addition may cause ambient wind speeds to exceed the comfort level, the building shall be designed to reduce the ambient wind speeds to meet the requirements. An exception may be granted, in accordance with the provisions of Section 309, allowing the building or addition to add to the amount of time that the comfort level is exceeded by the least practical amount if (1) it can be shown that a building or addition cannot be shaped and other wind-baffling measures cannot be adopted to meet the foregoing requirements without creating an unattractive and ungainly building form and without unduly restricting the development potential of the building site in question, and (2) it is concluded that, because of the limited amount by which the comfort level is exceeded, the limited location in which the comfort level is exceeded, or the limited time during which the comfort level is exceeded, the addition is insubstantial.*~~

~~*No exception shall be granted and no building or addition shall be permitted that causes equivalent wind speeds to reach or exceed the hazard level of 26 miles per hour for a single hour of the year.*~~

~~*(b) **Definition.** The term "equivalent wind speed" shall mean an hourly mean wind speed adjusted to incorporate the effects of gustiness or turbulence on pedestrians.*~~

~~*(c) **Guidelines.** Procedures and Methodologies for implementing this Section shall be specified by the Office of Environmental Review of the Planning Department.*~~

SEC. 243. VAN NESS SPECIAL USE DISTRICT.

* * * *

(c) **Controls.** All provisions of the Planning Code applicable to an RC-4 District shall apply except as otherwise provided in this Section *243*.

* * * *

(15) ***Wind Standards.*** *Wind standards shall apply pursuant to Section 148.* ~~***Reduction of Ground Level Wind Currents.***~~

~~*(A) New buildings and additions to existing buildings shall be shaped, or other wind baffling measures shall be adopted, so that the development will not cause year-round ground level wind currents to exceed, more than 10 percent of the time, between 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m., the comfort level of 11 m.p.h. equivalent wind speed in areas of pedestrian use and seven m.p.h. equivalent wind speed in public seating areas. When pre-existing ambient wind speeds exceed the comfort levels specified above, the building shall be designed to reduce the ambient wind speeds in efforts to meet the goals of this requirement.*~~

~~*(B) An exception to this requirement may be permitted but only if and to the extent that the project sponsor demonstrates that the building or addition cannot be shaped or wind baffling measures cannot be adopted without unduly restricting the development potential of the building site in question.*~~

~~*(i) The exception may permit the building or addition to increase the time that the comfort level is exceeded, but only to the extent necessary to avoid undue restriction of the development potential of the site.*~~

~~*(ii) Notwithstanding the above, no exception shall be allowed and no building or addition shall be permitted that causes equivalent wind speeds to reach or exceed the hazard level of 26 m.p.h. for a single hour of the year. For the purposes of this Section, the term "equivalent wind speed" shall mean an hourly wind speed adjusted to incorporate the effects of gustiness or turbulence on pedestrians.*~~

* * * *

SEC. 249.1. FOLSOM AND MAIN RESIDENTIAL/COMMERCIAL SPECIAL USE

DISTRICT.

* * * *

(b) **Controls.** The following zoning controls are applicable in the Residential/Commercial Special Use District.

(1) ***Wind Standards.*** *Wind standards shall apply pursuant to Section 148.* ~~***Reduction of Ground-Level Wind Currents.***~~

~~*(A) **Requirement.** New buildings and additions to existing buildings shall be shaped, or other wind-baffling measures shall be adopted, so that the developments will not cause ground-level wind currents to exceed, more than 10 percent of the time year-round, between 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m., the comfort level of 11 m.p.h. equivalent wind speed in areas of substantial pedestrian use and seven m.p.h. equivalent wind speed in public seating areas. The term "equivalent wind speed" shall mean an hourly mean wind speed adjusted to incorporate the effects of gustiness or turbulence on pedestrians.*~~

~~*When preexisting ambient wind speeds exceed the comfort level, or when a proposed building or addition may cause ambient wind speeds to exceed the comfort level, the building shall be designed to reduce the ambient wind speeds to meet the requirements. The provisions of this Section 249.1(b)(3) shall not apply to any buildings or additions to existing buildings for which a draft EIR has been published prior to January 1, 1985.*~~

~~*(B) **Exception.** The Zoning Administrator may allow the building or addition to add to the amount of time the comfort level is exceeded by the least practical amount if (1) it can be shown that a building or addition cannot be shaped and other wind-baffling measures cannot be adopted to meet the foregoing requirements without creating an unattractive and ungainly building form and without unduly restricting the development potential of the building site in question, and (2) it is concluded that, because of the limited amount by which the comfort level is exceeded, the limited location in which the comfort level is exceeded, or the limited time during which the comfort level is*~~

~~*exceeded, the addition is insubstantial.*~~

~~*The Zoning Administrator shall not grant an exception and no building or addition shall be permitted that causes equivalent wind speeds to reach or exceed the hazard level of 26 miles per hour for a single hour of the year.*~~

~~*(C) **Procedures.** Procedures and methodologies for implementing this Section shall be specified by the Office of Environmental Review of the Planning Department.*~~

* * * *

SEC. 249.78. CENTRAL SOMA SPECIAL USE DISTRICT.

* * * *

(d) **Urban Design and Density Controls.**

* * * *

(9) **Wind** ***Standards.*** *Wind standards shall apply pursuant to Section 148.*

~~*(A) **Applicability.** This subsection shall apply to new buildings above 85 feet in Height and additions to existing buildings that result in a building above 85 feet in Height.*~~

~~*(B) **Definitions.***~~

~~*"Comfort Level" means ground-level equivalent wind speeds of 11 miles per hour in areas of substantial pedestrian use and seven miles per hour in public seating areas between 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. when occurring for more than 15 percent of the time year round.*~~

~~*"Equivalent Wind Speed" means an hourly mean wind speed adjusted to incorporate the effects of gustiness or turbulence on pedestrians.*~~

~~*"Nine-Hour Hazard Criterion" means a ground-level equivalent wind speed of 26 miles per hour for more than nine hours per year per test location.*~~

~~*"One-Hour Hazard Criterion" means a ground-level equivalent wind speed of 26 miles per hour for more than one hour per year per test location.*~~

~~*"Substantial Increase" means an increase in wind speeds of more than six miles per hour for more than 15 percent of the time year round.*~~

~~*(C) **Controls for Wind Comfort.***~~

~~*(i) Projects may not result in wind speeds that exceed the Comfort Level at any location.*~~

~~*(ii) Projects may not cause a Substantial Increase in wind speed at any location where the existing or resulting wind speed exceeds the Comfort Level.*~~

~~*(iii) Pursuant to Section 329, the Planning Commission may grant an exception to the standards of subsections (i) and (ii) above as applied to a project if it finds that the project meets the following criteria:*~~

~~*(aa) It has undertaken all feasible measures to reduce wind speeds through such means as building sculpting and appurtenances, permanent wind baffling measures, and landscaping; and*~~

~~*(bb) Reducing wind speeds further would substantially detract from the building design or unduly restrict the square footage of the project.*~~

~~*(D) **Controls for Hazardous Winds.***~~

~~*(i) Projects shall not result in net new locations with an exceedance of the One-Hour Hazard Criterion, except as allowed by the Planning Commission based on criteria described in subsection (ii) below.*~~

~~*(ii) Pursuant to Section 329, the Planning Commission may grant an exception to the standard of subsection (i) above as applied to a proposed project if it finds that the proposed project meets all of the following criteria:*~~

~~*(aa) The project with wind reduction measures does not result in net new locations with an exceedance of the Nine-Hour Hazard Criterion;*~~

~~*(bb) The project has undertaken all feasible measures to reduce*~~

~~*hazardous wind speeds, such as building sculpting and appurtenances, permanent wind baffling measures, and landscaping; and*~~

~~*(cc) Meeting the requirements of subsection (i) would detract from the building design or unduly restrict the square footage of the project.*~~

~~*(iii) No exception shall be granted and no building or addition shall be permitted for any project that causes net new locations with an exceedance in the Nine-Hour Hazard Criterion.*~~

~~*(E) **Guidelines.** Procedures and methodologies for implementing this subsection shall be issued by the Department.*~~

* * * *

Section 6. Residential Districts. Article 2 of the Planning Code is hereby amended by revising Sections 209, 209.1, 209.2, and 209.3, to read as follows:

SEC. 209. DESCRIPTION AND PURPOSE OF RESIDENTIAL AND RESIDENTIAL-COMMERCIAL DISTRICTS.

The following statements of description and purpose outline the main functions of the Residential and Residential-Commercial (Residential) Districts in the zoning plan for San Francisco, supplementing the statements of purpose contained in Section 101 of this Code.

(a) **Purpose.** These Districts are established for purposes of implementing the Residence element and other elements of the General Plan, according to the objectives, principles and policies stated therein. Among these purposes are the following:

(1) Preservation, improvement and maintenance of the existing housing stock through protection of neighborhood environments and encouragement of sound ownership practices and rehabilitation efforts;

(2) Recognition and protection of the architectural characteristics and *urban*

patterns densities of existing residential areas;

(3) Maximizing of housing choice by assuring the availability of quality owner and rental housing of various kinds, suitable for a whole range of household types, lifestyles and economic levels;

(4) Encouragement of residential development that will meet outstanding community needs, provide adequate indoor and outdoor spaces for its occupants, and relate well to the character and scale of existing neighborhoods and structures; and

(5) Promotion of balanced and convenient neighborhoods having appropriate public improvements and services, suitable nonresidential activities that are compatible with housing and meet the needs of residents, and other amenities that contribute to the livability of residential areas.

(b) **Uses and Features Permitted in Residential and Residential-Commercial Districts.** The uses and features permitted in Residential and Residential-Commercial Districts are listed in the Zoning Control Tables in Sections 209.1 through 209.4.

SEC. 209.1. RH (RESIDENTIAL, HOUSE) DISTRICTS.

These Districts are intended to recognize*, protect, conserve,* and enhance areas characterized by dwellings in the form of houses and small multi-family buildings, usually with one, two, or three units with separate entrances, and limited scale in terms of building width and height, and characterized by rear yards and a pattern of mid-block open spaces. Such areas tend to have similarity of building styles and predominantly contain large units suitable for family occupancy, considerable open space, and limited nonresidential uses. *In all RH Districts, multi-family buildings with four or more units are permitted under various provisions of this Code.* The RH Districts are composed of five separate classes of districts, as follows:

RH-1(D) Districts: One-Family (Detached Dwellings). These Districts are

characterized by lots of greater width and area than in other parts of the City, and by single-family houses with side yards. The structures are relatively large, but rarely exceed 35 feet in height. Ground level open space and landscaping at the front and rear are usually abundant. Much of the development has been in sizable tracts with similarities of building style and narrow streets following the contours of hills. ~~*In some cases private covenants have controlled the nature of development and helped to maintain the street areas.*~~

RH-1 Districts: One-Family. These Districts ~~*are*~~*have been* occupied almost entirely by single-family houses on lots 25 feet in width, without side yards. Floor sizes and building styles vary, but tend to be uniform within tracts developed in distinct time periods. Though built on separate lots, the structures have the appearance of small-scale row housing, rarely exceeding 35 feet in height. Front setbacks are common, and ground level open space is generous. ~~*In most cases the single-family character of these Districts has been maintained for a considerable time.*~~

RH-1(S) Districts: One-Family with Minor Second Unit. These Districts are similar in character to RH-1 Districts, except that a small second dwelling unit has been installed in many structures, usually by conversion of a ground-story space formerly part of the main unit or devoted to storage. The second unit remains subordinate to the owner's unit, and may house one or two persons related to the owner or be rented to others. Despite these conversions, the structures retain the appearance of single-family dwellings.

RH-2 Districts: Two-Family. These Districts ~~*are devoted to*~~*have been historically developed with* one-family and two-family houses, with the latter commonly consisting of two large flats, one occupied by the owner and the other available for rental. Structures are finely scaled and usually do not exceed 25 feet in width or 40 feet in height. Building styles are often more varied than in historically single-family areas, but certain streets and tracts are quite uniform. Considerable ground-level open space is available, and it frequently is private for

each unit. The Districts may have easy access to shopping facilities and transit lines. In some cases, Group Housing and institutions are found in these areas, although nonresidential uses tend to be quite limited.

RH-3 Districts: Three-Family. These Districts have many similarities to RH-2 Districts, but structures with three units are common in addition to one-family and two-family houses. The predominant form ~~is~~*has historically been* large flats rather than apartments, with lots 25 feet wide, a fine or moderate scale, and separate entrances for each unit. Building styles tend to be varied but complementary to one another. Outdoor space is available at ground level, and also on decks and balconies for individual units. Nonresidential uses are more common in these areas than in RH-2 Districts.

Table 209.1

ZONING CONTROL TABLE FOR RH DISTRICTS

Zoning Category	***§ References***	***RH-1(D)***	***RH-1***	***RH-1(S)***	***RH-2***	***RH-3***
BUILDING STANDARDS						
Massing and Setbacks						
Height and Bulk Limits	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250-252, 253, 260, 261, 261.1, *263.19,* 270, *270.3,* 271. See	No portion of a Dwelling may be taller than 35 feet. Structures with uses	~~*No portion of a Dwelling may be taller than*~~ *Varies, but generally* 40 feet. Structures with uses other than Dwellings may be constructed to the prescribed height limit. Per § 261 the height limit may be decreased based on the			Varies, but generally 40 feet. Height sculpting on Alleys per §

		also Height and Bulk District Maps.	other than Dwellings may be constructed to the prescribed height limit, which is generally 40 feet. Per § 261 the height limit may be decreased or increased based on the slope of the lot.	slope of the lot.	261.1.
	Front Setback	§§ 130, 131, 132	Required. Based on the front setback of the adjacent property with the shortest front setback or if subject property has a Legislated Setback. When front setback is based on adjacent properties, in no case shall the required setback be greater than 10 feet.		

Rear Yard	§§ 130, 134	30% of lot depth, but in no case less than 15 feet.		
Side Yard	§§ 130, 133	Required for Lots 28 feet and wider. Width of side setback depends on width of lot.	Not Required	
~~*Residential*~~ Design Guidelines *and Standards*	§ 311	Subject to the Residential Design Guidelines *and Citywide Design Standards and any o~~.~~ ~~O~~ther applicable* design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission ~~*may also apply*~~.		
Street Frontage and Public Realm				
Front Setback Landscaping and Permeability Requirements	§ 132	Required. At least 50% of Front Setback shall be permeable so as to increase storm water infiltration and 20% of Front Setback shall be unpaved and devoted to plant material.		
Streetscape and Pedestrian Improvements (Street Trees)	§ 138.1	Required.		

Street Frontage Requirements	§ 144	§ 144 applies generally. Additional requirements apply to Limited Commercial Uses, as specified in § 186.				
Street Frontage, Parking and Loading Access Restrictions	§ 155(r)	As specified in § 155(r)				
Miscellaneous						
Planned Unit Development	§ 304	C	C	C	C	C
Awning	§ 136.1	*N*P(1)	*N*P(1)	*N*P(1)	*N*P(1)	*N*P(1)
Canopy or Marquee	§ 136.1	NP*(2)*	*NP(2)*	NP*(2)*	NP*(2)*	NP*(2)*
Signs	§ 606	As permitted by ~~*Section*~~ § 606.				
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*				
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES						
Development Standards						
Usable Open Space [Per Dwelling Unit]	§§ 135, 136	At least 300 square feet if private, and 400 square	At least 300 square feet if private, and 400 square	At least 300 square feet for the first unit and 100 for the	At least 125 square feet if private, and 166 square	At least 100 square feet if private, and 133 square

		feet if common.	feet if common.	minor second unit if private, and 400 square feet for the first unit and 133 square feet for the second unit if common.	feet if common.	feet if common.
Parking Requirements	§§ 151, 161	None required. Maximum permitted per § 151.				
Residential Conversion, Demolition, or Merger *of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	§ 317	C ~~*for Removal of one or more Residential Units or Unauthorized Units.*~~				
Use Characteristics						
Intermediate Length Occupancy	§§ 102, 202.10	P(9)	P(9)	P(9)	P(9)	P(9)

Single Room Occupancy	§ 102	P	P	P	P	P
Student Housing	§ 102	P	P	P	P	P
Residential Uses							
~~*Residential Density,*~~ Dwelling Unit~~s~~ *Density, General* (6)(11)	§§ 102, 207	P up to one ~~*One*~~ unit per lot, or one unit per 3,000 square feet of lot area, with no more than three units per lot.	P up to one unit per lot, or up to one unit per 3,000 square feet of lot area.	P up to two units per lot, if the second unit is 600 sq. ft. or less, or up to one unit per 3,000 square feet of lot area, with	P up to two units per lot, or up to one unit per 1,500 square feet of lot area.	P up to three units per lot, or up to one unit per 1,000 square feet of lot area.

					no more than three units per lot.		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*					
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*					
Senior Housing *Density*	§§102, 202.2(f), *207*	P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a principal use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a principal use in the district and meeting all requirements of ~~*Section*~~ § 202.2(f)(1) except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.					
~~*Residential Density,*~~ Group Housing *Density*	§208	NP(10)	NP (10)	NP (10)	P, up to one bedroom for every	P, up to one bedroom for every	

					415 square feet of lot area.	275 square feet of lot area.
Homeless Shelter	§§ 102, 208	P	P	P	P	P
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES						
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124	1.8 to 1	1.8 to 1	1.8 to 1	1.8 to 1	1.8 to 1
Off-Street Parking	§§ 150, 151, 161	None required. Maximum permitted per § 151.				
Limited Commercial Uses	§§ 186, 186.3	Continuing nonconforming uses are permitted, subject to the requirements of § 186. Limited Commercial Uses may be conditionally permitted in historic buildings subject to § 186.3.				
Limited Corner Commercial Uses	§ 231	P on a Corner Lot, with no part of the use extending more than 50 feet in depth from said corner; NP if the LCCU would require the Residential Conversion of a Residential Unit or Unauthorized Unit under Planning Code Section 317, unless the space proposed for conversion is occupied by a garage or storage space located in the Basement or First Story.				
Commercial Use Characteristics						
Drive-up Facility	§ 102	NP				
Formula Retail	§ 102,	NP				

	303.1					
Hours of Operation	§§ 102, 186, 231	For Limited Corner Commercial Uses under § 231 and Limited Commercial Uses under § 186: P 6:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.; NP 10:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m.				
Maritime Use	§ 102	NP				
Open Air Sales	§ 102	NP				
Outdoor Activity Area	§§ 102, 145.2, 186, 202.2, 231	P if located in front of building; NP if elsewhere.				
Walk-up Facility	§ 102	NP				
Agricultural Use Category						
Agricultural Uses*	§§ 102, 202.2(c)	C	C	C	C	C
Agriculture, Industrial	§§ 102, 202.2(c)	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP
Agriculture, Neighborhood	§§ 102, 202.2(c)	P	P	P	P	P
Automotive Use Category						
Automotive Uses*	§ 102	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP
Parking Garage, Private	§ 102	C	C	C	C	C
Parking Lot, Private	§ 102	C	C	C	C	C
Parking Lot, Public	§§ 102,	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP

	142, 156					
Entertainment, Arts and Recreation Use Category						
Entertainment, Arts and Recreation Uses*	§ 102	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP
Open Recreation Area	§ 102	C	C	C	C	C
Passive Outdoor Recreation	§ 102	P	P	P	P	P
Industrial Use Category						
Industrial Uses*	§ 102	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP
Institutional Use Category						
Institutional Uses*	§ 102	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP
Child Care Facility	§ 102	P	P	P	P	P
Community Facility	§ 102	C	C	C	C	C
Hospital	§ 102	C	C	C	C	C
Post-Secondary Ed. Institution	§ 102	C	C	C	C	C
Public Facilities	§ 102	P	P	P	P	P
Religious Institution	§ 102	C	C	C	C	C
Residential Care Facility	§ 102	P	P	P	P	P
School	§ 102	C	C	C	C	C

Sales and Service Category						
Retail Sales and Service Uses*	§ 102	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP
Hotel	§ 102	NP	NP	NP	C(4)	C(4)
Mortuary	§ 102	C(5)	C(5)	C(5)	C(5)	C(5)
Non-Retail Sales and Service Uses	§ 102	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP
Utility and Infrastructure Use Category						
Utility and Infrastructure*	§ 102	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP
Internet Service Exchange	§ 102	C	C	C	C	C
Utility Installation	§ 102	C	C	C	C	C
Wireless Telecommunications Services Facility	§ 102	C or P (7)	C or P (7)	C or P (7)	C or P (7)	C or P (7)

* Not listed below.

(1) *P if required as a wind mitigation feature. Additionally,* P for Limited Commercial Uses and Limited Corner Commercial Uses per *§Section* 136.1 ~~*only, otherwise NP*~~.

(2) ~~*[Note Deleted]*~~ *Canopy is P if required as a wind mitigation feature.*

(4) C for five or fewer guest rooms or suites of rooms; NP for six or more guest rooms.

(5) Must be located on a landmark site, and where the site is within a Height and Bulk District of 40 feet or less, and where a columbarium use has lawfully and continuously operated since the time of designation.

(6) Construction of Accessory Dwelling Units may be permitted pursuant to Sections

207.1 and 207.2.

(7) C if a Macro WTS Facility; P if a Micro WTS Facility.

(8) [Note expired.]

(9) NP for buildings with three or fewer Dwelling Units; C for buildings with 10 or more Dwelling Units.

(10) Group Housing permitted at one room per 415 sq. ft. of lot area according to the provisions in Planning Code Section 207(c)(8).

(11) P for up to four dwelling units per lot, excluding Corner Lots, and P for up to six dwelling units in Corner Lots, pursuant to Section 207(c)(8).

SEC. 209.2. RM (RESIDENTIAL, MIXED) DISTRICTS.

* * * *

Table 209.2

ZONING CONTROL TABLE FOR RM DISTRICTS

Zoning Category	***§ References***	***RM-1***	***RM-2***	***RM-3***	***RM-4***
BUILDING STANDARDS					
Massing and Setbacks					
Height and Bulk Limits	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250-252, 253, 260, 261.1-, *263.19,* 270, *270.3,* 271	Varies~~,~~. See Height and Bulk Map and referenced sections. Height sculpting on Alleys per § 261.1.			
Front Setback	§§ 130, 131,	Based on the front setback of the adjacent property			

	132	with the shortest front setback or if subject property has a Legislated Setback. When front setback is based on adjacent properties, in no case shall the required setback be greater than 10 feet.	
Rear Yard	§§ 130, 134	30% of lot depth but in no case less than 15 feet.	25% of lot depth, but in no case less than 15 feet.
Side Yard	§§ 130, 133	Not Required.	
~~*Residential*~~ Design Guidelines *and Standards*	§ 311	Subject to the Residential Design Guidelines *and Citywide Design Standards and any* ~~. *O*~~*o*ther design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission ~~*may also apply*~~.	
Street Frontage and Public Realm			
Front Setback Landscaping and Permeability Requirements	§ 132	At least 50% of Front Setback shall be permeable so as to increase stormwater infiltration and 20% of Front Setback shall be unpaved and devoted to plant material.	
Streetscape and Pedestrian Improvements (Street Trees)	§ 138.1	Required.	
Street Frontage Requirements	§ 144	§ 144 applies generally. Additional requirements apply to Limited Commercial Uses, as specified in § 186.	
Moderation of	§ 144.1	Stepping of the front of the buildings required when	

Building Frontage		lot width is greater than 35 feet.				
Street Frontage, Parking and Loading Access Restrictions	§ 155(r)	As specified in § 155(r).				
Miscellaneous						
Planned Unit Development	§ 304	C	C	C	C	
Awning	§ 136.1	*N*P(1)	*N*P(1)	*N*P(1)	*N*P(1)	
Canopy or Marquee	§ 136.1	NP*(2)*	NP*(2)*	NP*(2)*	NP*(2)*	
Signs	§ 606	As permitted by ~~*Section*~~ § 606.				
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*				
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES						
Development Standards						
* * * *						
Usable Open Space [Per Dwelling Unit]	§§ 135, 136	At least 100 square feet if private, and 133 square feet per Dwelling Unit if	At least 80 square feet if private, and 106 square feet per Dwelling Unit if common.	At least 60 square feet if private and 80 square feet per Dwelling Unit if common.	At least 36 square feet if private, and 48 square feet per Dwelling Unit if common.	

		common.				
Parking Requirements	§§ 151, §155, 161	None required. Maximum permitted per § 151.				
Residential Conversion, Demolition, or Merger *of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	§ 317	C ~~*for Removal of one or more Residential Units or Unauthorized Units.*~~				
* * * *						
Use Characteristics						
Intermediate Length Occupancy	§§ 102, 202.10	P(10)	P(10)	P(10)	P(10)	P(10)
Single Room Occupancy	§ 102	P	P	P	P	P
Student Housing	§ 102	P	P	P	P	P
Residential Uses						
~~*Residential Density,*~~ Dwelling Unit~~s~~ *Density, General* (7)	§ 207	~~*P if 3 units per lot or at least one unit per 1067 square feet of lot area, whichever is greater.*~~	~~*P if 3 units per lot or at least one unit per 800 square feet of lot area, whichever is greater.*~~	~~*P if 3 units per lot or at least one unit per 533 square feet of lot area, whichever is greater.*~~	~~*P if 3 units per lot or at least one unit per 267 square feet of lot area, whichever is greater.*~~	

		Total maximum permitted density is one unit per 800 square feet of lot area. ~~*(11)*~~	Total maximum permitted density is one unit per 600 square feet of lot area. ~~*(11)*~~	Total maximum permitted density is one unit per 400 square feet of lot area ~~*(11)*~~	Total maximum permitted density is one unit per 200 square feet of lot area. (8)~~, *(11)*~~
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*			
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*			
Senior Housing *Density*	§§102, 202.2(f)*, 207*	P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of ~~*Section*~~ § 202.2(f)(1) except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.			
~~*Residential Density,*~~	§208	P (6), Up to	P (6), Up to	P (6), Up to	P (6), Up

Group Housing *Density*		one bedroom for every 275 square feet of lot area.	one bedroom for every 210 square feet of lot area.	one bedroom for every 140 square feet of lot area.	to one bedroom for every 70 square feet of lot area.
Homeless Shelter	§§ 102, 208	P	P	P	P
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES					
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124	1.8 to 1	1.8 to 1	3.6 to 1	4.8 to 1
Off-Street Parking	§§ 150, 151, 155, 161	None required. Maximum permitted per § 151.			
Limited Corner Commercial Uses	§ 231	P on a Corner Lot, with no part of the use extending more than 50 feet in depth from said corner; NP if the LCCU would require the Residential Conversion of a Residential Unit or Unauthorized Unit under Planning Code Section 317, unless the space proposed for conversion is	P on a Corner Lot, with no part of the use extending more than 100 feet in depth from said corner; NP if the LCCU would require the Residential Conversion of a Residential Unit or Unauthorized Unit under Planning Code Section 317, unless the space		

		occupied by a garage or storage space located in the Basement or First Story.		proposed for conversion is occupied by a garage or storage space located in the Basement or First Story. ~~*Limited Commercial*~~	
Limited Commercial Uses	§§ 186, 186.3	Continuing nonconforming uses are permitted, subject to the requirements of § 186. Limited Commercial Uses may be conditionally permitted in historic buildings subject to § 186.3.			
Commercial Use Characteristics					
Drive-up Facility	§ 102	NP			
Formula Retail	§ 102, 303.1	NP			
Hours of Operation	§§ 102, 186, 231	For Limited Corner Commercial Uses under § 231 and Limited Commercial Uses under § 186: P 6:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.; NP 10:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m.			
Maritime Use	§ 102	NP			
Open Air Sales	§ 102	NP			
Outdoor Activity Area	§§ 102, 145.2, 186, 202.2, 231	P if located in front of building; NP if elsewhere.			
Walk-up Facility	§ 102	NP		P	
Agricultural Use Category					
Agricultural Uses*	§§ 102, 202.2(c)	C	C	C	C

Agriculture, Industrial	§§ 102, 202.2(c)	NP	NP	NP	NP
Agriculture, Neighborhood	§§ 102, 202.2(c)	P	P	P	P
Automotive Use Category					
Automotive Uses*	§ 102	NP	NP	NP	NP
Parking Garage, Private	§ 102	C	C	C	C
Parking Lot, Private	§ 102	C	C	C	C
Entertainment, Arts and Recreation Use Category					
Entertainment, Arts and Recreation Uses*	§ 102	NP	NP	NP	NP
Open Recreation Area	§ 102	C	C	C	C
Passive Outdoor Recreation	§ 102	P	P	P	P
Industrial Use Category					
Industrial Uses*	§ 102	NP	NP	NP	NP
Institutional Use Category					
Institutional Uses*	§ 102	NP	NP	NP	NP
Child Care Facility	§ 102	P	P	P	P
Community Facility	§ 102	C	C	C	C
Hospital	§ 102	C	C	C	C

Post-Secondary Ed. Institution	§ 102	C	C	C	C
Public Facilities	§ 102	P	P	P	P
Religious Institution	§ 102	C	C	C	C
Residential Care Facility	§ 102	P	P	P	P
School	§ 102	C	C	C	C
Sales and Service Category					
Retail Sales and Service Uses*	§ 102	NP	NP	NP	NP
Hotel	§ 102	C(4)	C(4)	C(4)	C(4)
Mortuary	§ 102	C(5)	C(5)	C(5)	C(5)
Non-Retail Sales and Service Uses	§ 102	NP	NP	NP	NP
Utility and Infrastructure Use Category					
Utility and Infrastructure*	§ 102	NP	NP	NP	NP
Internet Service Exchange	§ 102	C	C	C	C
Utility Installation	§ 102	C	C	C	C
Wireless Telecommunications Services Facility	§ 102	C or P (9)	C or P (9)	C or P (9)	C or P (9)

* Not listed below.

(1) *P if required as a wind mitigation feature. Additionally,* P for Limited Commercial Uses and Limited Corner Commercial Uses per § 136.1 ~~*only, otherwise NP*~~.

(2) ~~*[Note Deleted]*~~ *Canopy is P if required as a wind mitigation feature.*

(3) [Note Deleted]

(4) C for 5 or fewer guest rooms or suites of rooms; NP for 6 or more guest rooms; provided, however, that a total of up to 47 Tourist Hotel rooms are Principally Permitted on Block 0976, Lot 001, subject to the provisions of Ordinance No. 251-22.

(5) Must be located on a landmark site, and where the site is within a Height and Bulk District of 40 feet or less, and where a columbarium use has lawfully and continuously operated since the time of designation.

(6) C required if the Group Housing is affiliated with and operated by a Hospital or an Institutional Educational Use as defined in Section 102.

(7) Construction of Accessory Dwelling Units may be permitted pursuant to Sections 207.1 and 207.2.

(8) For purposes of this calculation, a Dwelling Unit in this ~~d~~*D*istrict containing no more than 500 square feet of net floor area and consisting of not more than one habitable room in addition to a kitchen and a bathroom may be counted as equal to three-quarters of a Dwelling Unit.

(9) C if a Macro WTS Facility; P if a Micro WTS Facility.

(10) NP for buildings with three or fewer Dwelling Units; C for buildings with 10 or more Dwelling Units.

(11) *[Note Deleted]*~~*NP if less than minimum density as set forth in the table. Expansions of existing single-family residential buildings may not exceed more than 25% of Gross Floor Area over 10 years, or result in a building over 3,000 square feet. In new construction, no unit may be smaller than one-third the Gross Floor Area of the largest unit in the building.*~~

SEC. 209.3. RC (RESIDENTIAL-COMMERCIAL) DISTRICTS.

These Districts are intended to recognize, protect, conserve, and enhance areas characterized by structures combining Residential uses with neighborhood-serving Commercial uses. The predominant Residential uses are preserved, while provision is made for supporting Commercial uses, usually in or below the ground story, that meet the frequent needs of nearby residents without generating excessive vehicular traffic. The compact, walkable, transit-oriented and mixed-use nature of these Districts is recognized by no off-street parking requirements. The RC Districts are composed of two separate districts, as follows:

RC-3 Districts*~~: Medium Density~~*. These Districts provide for *Residential Uses*~~*a mixture of medium-density Dwellings similar to those in RM-3 Districts*~~, with supporting Commercial ~~u~~*U*ses. Open spaces are required for Dwellings in the same manner as in RM-3 Districts, except that rear yards need not be at ground level and front setback areas are not required.

RC-4 Districts*~~: High Density~~*. These Districts provide for *Residential Uses,*~~*a mixture of high-density Dwellings similar to those in RM-4 Districts*~~ with supporting Commercial uses. Open spaces are required for Dwellings in the same manner as in RM-4 Districts, except that rear yards need not be at ground level and front setback areas are not required.

* * * *

Table 209.3

ZONING CONTROL TABLE FOR RESIDENTIAL-COMMERCIAL DISTRICTS

Zoning Category	***§ References***	***RC-3***	***RC-4***
BUILDING STANDARDS			
Massing and Setbacks			
Height and Bulk	§§ 102, 105,	Varies~~,~~. See Height and Bulk Maps. Height sculpting	

Limits	106, 250-252, 260-, 261.1-, *263.19,* 270, *270.3,* 271	on Alleys per § 261.1.	
* * * *			
~~*Residential*~~Design Guidelines *and Standards*	§ 311	Subject to the Residential Design Guidelines *and Citywide Design Standards and any*~~*.*~~ ~~*O*~~*o*ther design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission may also apply.	
Street Frontage and Public Realm			
* * * *			
Street Frontage, Parking and Loading Access Restrictions	§ 155(r)	As specified in § 155(r).	As specified in § 155(r). ~~*Curb cuts are NP on The Embarcadero between King and Jefferson Streets, and on Broadway between Mason and The Embarcadero.*~~
Miscellaneous			
* * * *			
Signs	§ 607.1	Per § 607.1.	Per § 607.1.
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*	

RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES			
Development Standards			
* * * *			
Residential Conversion, Demolition, or Merger *of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	§ 317	C *for Removal of one or more Residential Units or Unauthorized Units.*	
* * * *			
Residential Uses			
Residential Density, Dwelling Unit*s* *Density, General* (7) (13)	§ 207	*Form-Based Density applies within the R-4 Height and Bulk District (§ 263.19). Outside the R-4 Height and Bulk District, P if 3 units per lot, or at least one unit per 533 square feet of lot area, whichever is greater. T*total maximum permitted density is one unit per 400 square feet of lot area. *(13)*	*Form-Based Density applies within the R-4 Height and Bulk District (§ 263.19). Outside the R-4 Height and Bulk District, P if 3 units per lot or at least one unit per 267 square feet of lot area, whichever is greater. T*total maximum permitted density is one unit per 200 square feet of lot area. No density limits in the Van Ness SUD (§

			243). (8)~~, (13)~~
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*	
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*	
Senior Housing *Density*	§§102, 202.2(f)*, 207*	*Form-Based Density applies within the R-4 Height and Bulk District (§ 263.19). Outside the R-4 Height and Bulk District,* P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a principal use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a principal use in the district and meeting all requirements of ~~*Section*~~ § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location. C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of ~~*Section*~~ § 202.2(f)(1) except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.	
~~*Residential Density,*~~ Group Housing *Density*	§208	*Form-Based Density applies within the R-4 Height and Bulk District (§*	*Form-Based Density applies within the R-4 Height and Bulk District (§*

		263.19). Outside the R-4 Height and Bulk District, P up to one bedroom for every 140 square feet of lot area. (9)	*263.19). Outside the R-4 Height and Bulk District,* P up to one bedroom for every 70 square feet of lot area. (9)
* * * *			
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES			
Development Standards			
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124*, 207.9*	3.6 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*	4.8 to 1. Other FAR controls apply in the Van Ness SUD; § 243(c)(1). *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*
* * * *			

* * * *

(7) Construction of Accessory Dwelling Units may be ~~*permitted*~~ *P* pursuant to Sections 207.1 and 207.2.

(8) For purposes of this calculation, a Dwelling Unit in this ~~*d*~~*D*istrict containing no more than 500 square feet of net floor area and consisting of not more than one habitable room in addition to a kitchen and a bathroom may be counted as equal to three-quarters of a Dwelling Unit.

(9) *Within the Priority Equity Geographies SUD,* C required if the Group Housing is affiliated with and operated by a Hospital or an Institutional Educational Use as defined in Section 102.

* * * *

(13) *[Note Deleted]* ~~*NP if less than minimum density as set forth in the table. Expansions of existing single-family residential buildings may not exceed more than 25% of Gross Floor Area over 10 years, or result in a building over 3,000 square feet. In new construction, no unit may be smaller than one-third the Gross Floor Area of the largest unit in the building.*~~

Section 7. Residential, Transit Oriented (RTO) Districts. Articles 1.2, 1.7, 2, 3, and 6 of the Planning Code are hereby amended by revising Sections 124, 132, 134, 135, 144, 186, 186.3, 201, 207.6, 207.7, 208, 209.4, 231, 303, 304, 603, 606, and 607.1, to read as follows:

SEC. 124. BASIC FLOOR AREA RATIO.

(a) Except as provided in subsections (b), (c), (d), (e), *(k),* and (l) of this Section 124, the basic Floor Area Ratio limits specified in the Zoning Control Table for the district in which the lot is located, or in Table 124 below, shall apply to each building or development in the districts indicated.

TABLE 124
BASIC FLOOR AREA RATIO LIMITS

District	***Basic Floor Area Ratio Limit***
RED, RED-MX	1.0 to 1
Pacific	1.5 to 1
* * * *	1.8 to 1
RTO~~*, RTO-M*~~	
* * * *	
* * * *	

(b) In R, RC, NC, and Mixed Use Districts, *F*~~f~~loor *A*~~a~~rea *R*~~r~~atio limits shall not apply to ~~*dwellings or to other*~~ ~~r~~*R*esidential ~~u~~*U*ses. *However, projects proposing new construction of a Dwelling Unit that would exceed the maximum dwelling unit size described in Section 207.10 may require Conditional Use authorization by the Planning Commission as set forth in Section 207.10.* In Chinatown Mixed Use Districts, the above floor area ratio limits shall not apply to institutions, and mezzanine commercial space shall not be calculated as part of the floor area ratio.

* * * *

SEC. 132. FRONT SETBACK AREAS IN RTO, RH, AND RM DISTRICTS AND FOR REQUIRED SETBACKS FOR *PROJECTS IN NC AND RTO-C DISTRICTS, AND* PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENTS.

The following requirements for minimum front setback areas shall apply to every building in all RH, RTO, and RM Districts, in order to relate the setbacks provided to the existing front setbacks of adjacent buildings. ~~*Buildings in RTO Districts which have more than 75 feet of street frontage are additionally subject to the Ground Floor Residential Design Guidelines, as adopted and periodically amended by the Planning Commission.*~~ Planned Unit Developments or PUDs, as defined in Section 304, shall also provide landscaping in required setbacks in accord with Section 132(g).

* * * *

(c) **Applicability to Special Lot Situations.**

* * * *

(3) **Lots Abutting RC, C, M, and P Districts.** In the case of any lot that abuts property in an RC, C, M, or P District, any property in such district shall be disregarded, and the required setback for the subject lot shall be equal to the front setback of the adjacent building in the RH, RTO, or RM District.

* * * *

*(e) **Required Front Setbacks and Sidewalk Widths in RTO-C and NC Districts.***

*(1) **Applicability.** This subsection (e) applies to projects located in RTO-C and Neighborhood Commercial (NC) Districts that meet any of the following criteria:*

(A) Have a street frontage of 50 feet or more;

(B) Are located on a Corner Lot; or

(C) Are adjacent to a building with a front setback consistent with the requirements of this subsection.

*(2) **Setback Requirement.** Where the sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided to widen the publicly accessible sidewalk. The setback must be wide enough so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. If a greater front setback is required under Section 132 or any other provision of this Code, the greater requirement shall apply. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade.*

* * * *

(h) **Permeable Surfaces.** The front setback area shall be at least 50% permeable so as to increase stormwater infiltration. The Permeable Surface may be inclusive of the area counted towards the landscaping requirement; provided, however, that turf pavers or similar planted hardscapes shall be counted only toward the Permeable Surface requirement and not the landscape requirement.

(1) The Zoning Administrator, after consultation with the Director of Public Works, may waive the Permeable Surface requirement if the site does not qualify as a suitable location pursuant to Department of Public Works rules and regulations.

(2) If the site receives stormwater run-off from outside the lot boundaries, the

Zoning Administrator, after consultation with the General Manager of the Public Utilities Commission, may modify the Permeable Surface requirement to include alternative management strategies, such as bio-retention or other strategies, pursuant to Public Utilities Commission rules and regulations.

(3) If a portion of the front setback is designed as a publicly-accessible sidewalk extension to satisfy the Better Streets Standard width standards under subsection (e), then the provisions of this subsection (h) do not apply.

* * * *

SEC. 134. REAR YARDS IN R, RC, *RTO,* NC, M, CMUO, MUG, MUO, MUR, RED, RED-MX, SPD, UMU, AND WMUG DISTRICTS; AND LOT COVERAGE REQUIREMENTS IN C DISTRICTS.

* * * *

(b) **Applicability.** The rear yard requirements established by this Section 134 shall apply to every building in the districts listed below~~, except NC-S Districts, where no rear yard is required~~. To the extent that these provisions are inconsistent with any Special Use District or Residential Character District, the provisions of the Special Use District or Residential Character District shall apply.

(c) **Basic Requirements.** The basic rear yard requirements shall be as follows for the districts indicated:

(1) In RH, RM-1, RM-2, RTO*-1*, *and* RTO-M Zoning Districts, the basic rear yard shall be equal to 30% of the total depth of the lot on which the building is situated, but in no case less than 15 feet.

* * * *

(d) **Rear Yard Location Requirements.**

(1) **RH, RM, RTO*-1, RTO-M*, NC-1, NCT-1, Inner Sunset, Outer Clement Street, Cole Valley, Haight Street, Lakeside Village, Sacramento Street, 24th Street-Noe Valley, Pacific Avenue, and West Portal Avenue *NC* Districts.** Rear yards shall be provided at grade level and at each succeeding level or story of the building.

(2) ***RTO-C, NC-S,* NC-2, NCT-2, Ocean Avenue, Inner Balboa Street, Outer Balboa Street, Castro Street, Cortland Avenue, Divisadero Street NCT, Excelsior-Outer Mission Street, Inner Clement Street, Upper Fillmore Street, Lower Haight Street, Judah Street, Noriega Street, North Beach, San Bruno Avenue, Taraval Street, Inner Taraval Street, Irving Street, Union Street, Valencia Street, 24th Street-Mission, Glen Park**, ***and Folsom Street NC Districts, and the* Regional Commercial District** ~~*and Folsom Street Districts*~~**.** Rear yards shall be provided at the second story, and at each succeeding story of the building, and at the First Story if it contains a Dwelling Unit.

* * * *

(*6*~~*H*~~) **Lot Coverage in C Districts.** Lot coverage is limited to 80% at all levels containing residential uses, except that on levels that include only lobbies and circulation areas and on levels in which all residential uses, including circulation areas, are within 40 horizontal feet from a property line fronting a street or alley, up to 100% lot coverage may occur. The unbuilt portion of the lot shall be open to the sky except for those obstructions permitted in yards pursuant to subsections (1) through (23) of Section 136(c). Where the adjacent properties have an existing rear yard, the unbuilt area of the new project shall be designed to adjoin that rear yard. In accordance with Section 210.5, lot coverage requirements shall not be applicable for Commercial to Residential Adaptive Reuse projects.

* * * *

(f) **Second Building on Corner Lots and Through Lots in RH, RTO~~*, RTO-M*~~, RM-1, and RM-2 Districts.** Where a lot is a Corner Lot, or is a through lot having both its front and

its rear lot line along Streets, Alleys, or a Street and an Alley, the subject lot may have two buildings, each fronting at one end of the lot, provided that all the other requirements of this Code are met. In such cases, the rear yard required by this Section 134 for the subject lot shall be located in the central portion of the lot, between the two buildings on such lot. In no case shall the total minimum rear yard for the subject lot be thus reduced to less than a depth equal to 30% of the total depth of the subject lot or to less than 15 feet, whichever is greater; provided, however, that the Zoning Administrator may reduce the total depth to 20% pursuant to Section 307(l) of this Code if the reduction is for the sole purpose of constructing an Accessory Dwelling Unit under Section 207.1, and provided further that the reduction/waiver is in consideration of the property owner entering into a Regulatory Agreement pursuant to Section 207.1 subjecting the ADU to the San Francisco Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance. For buildings fronting on a Narrow Street as defined in Section 261.1 of this Code, the additional height limits of Section 261.1 shall apply. Furthermore, in all cases in which this subsection (f) is applied, the requirements of Section 132 of this Code for front setback areas shall be applicable along both Street or Alley frontages of the subject through lot.

* * * *

*(l) **Lot Coverage for Large Lots.** This subsection (l) shall apply to all districts except C-3 districts. In lieu of rear yard and lot coverage controls described in this Section 134, where a development lot is two acres or greater, the allowed lot coverage for any project containing residential uses shall be limited to 60% of lot area at street grade and above with a corresponding requirement of 40% unbuilt area in Residential Districts other than RTO-C, and in all other districts 65% lot coverage from the second story and above with 35% lot area unbuilt. Obstructions permitted in setbacks and yards per Section 136 are permitted in the unbuilt area. New rights-of-way, pedestrian passageways or any portion of the site provided for publicly-accessible circulation or open space, including but not limited to any such space provided pursuant to Planning Code Sections 270.2, 270.3, or elsewhere in*

this Code, may count toward the required unbuilt area.

SEC. 135. USABLE OPEN SPACE FOR DWELLING UNITS AND GROUP HOUSING, R, NC, MIXED USE, C, AND M DISTRICTS.

* * * *

(a) **Character of Space Provided.** Usable open space shall *generally* be composed of an outdoor area or areas designed for outdoor living, recreation or landscaping, including such areas on the ground and on decks, balconies, porches and roofs, which are safe and suitably surfaced and screened, and which conform to the other requirements of this Section. Such area or areas shall be on the same lot as the dwelling units (or bedrooms in group housing) they serve, and shall be designed and oriented in a manner that will make the best practical use of available sun and other climatic advantages. "Private usable open space" shall mean an area or areas private to and designed for use by only one dwelling unit (or bedroom in group housing). "Common usable open space" shall mean an area or areas designed for use jointly by two or more dwelling units (or bedrooms in group housing). "Privately-owned public open space," only allowed in DTR and Eastern Neighborhood Mixed Use under this Section, shall mean an area of areas designed for use of the general public while owned and maintained by private owners as described in Section 138*. For senior housing, usable open space requirements are set forth in subsection (d)(3) below.*

* * * *

(d) **Amount Required.** Usable open space shall be provided for each building in the amounts specified herein and in Tables 135A and B for the district in which the building is located; provided, however, that (i) in the Downtown Residential (DTR) Districts, open space shall be provided in the amounts specified in Section 825, and (ii) in accordance with Section 210.5, usable open space shall not be required for Commercial to Residential Adaptive Reuse

projects.

* * * *

(3) *In all districts, ~~F~~f*or dwellings specifically designed for and occupied by senior citizens, as defined and regulated by Section 102.6.1 of this Code, the minimum amount of usable open space to be provided for use by each dwelling unit shall be one-half the amount required for each dwelling unit as specified in Paragraph (d)(1) above *or 36 square feet, whichever is less. Notwithstanding 135(a), for these dwellings, "common usable open space" shall also include indoor community space, defined as indoor space that is not less than 10 feet wide in all directions at all points, is accessible to all residents of the building or site equally at no additional cost, is specifically configured and designed for leisure and/or recreational use, and shall not include any building circulation spaces, lobbies, or other building or resident support facilities not specifically intended for leisure and/or recreational use*.

* * * *

(6) ***~~Efficiency Dwelling Units With Reduced Square Footage.~~*** *~~Common usable open space shall be the preferred method of meeting the open space requirement for Efficiency Dwelling Units with reduced square footage, as defined in Section 318 of this Code. Private open space shall not be credited toward satisfaction of the open space requirement for such units unless the Zoning Administrator determines that the provision of common open space is infeasible or undesirable, in whole or in part, due to~~*

~~(A) site constraints;~~

~~(B) the special needs of anticipated residents, or~~

~~(C) conflicts with other applicable policies and regulations, including but not limited to standards for the treatment of historic properties, the Americans with Disabilities Act, or the Building Code.~~

~~(7)~~ **Homeless Shelters.** Homeless Shelters, as defined in Section 102 of this

Code, are exempt from the open space requirements described in this Section 135.

TABLE 135A MINIMUM USABLE OPEN SPACE FOR DWELLING UNITS AND GROUP HOUSING OUTSIDE THE EASTERN NEIGHBORHOODS MIXED USE DISTRICT		
District	**Square Feet of Usable Open Space Required for Each Dwelling Unit If All Private**	**Ratio of Common Usable Open Space That May Be Substituted for Private**
* * * *		
RM-1, RC-1, ~~*RTO,*~~ RTO-M	100	1.33
RM-2, RC-2, SPD, *RTO-1*	80	1.33
RM-3, RC-3, RED, *RTO-C*	60	1.33
* * * *		

* * * *

(e) **Slope.** The slope of any area credited as either private or common usable open space shall not exceed *15%* ~~*five percent*~~.

* * * *

SEC. 144. STREET FRONTAGES IN RH, RTO, ~~*RTO-M,*~~ AND RM DISTRICTS.

(a) **Purpose.** This Section *144* is enacted to assure that in RH, RM, *and* RTO ~~*and RTO-M*~~ Districts the ground story of dwellings as viewed from the street is compatible with the scale and character of the existing street frontage, visually interesting and attractive in relation to the pattern of the neighborhood, and so designed that adequate areas are provided for front landscaping, street trees and on-street parking between driveways. The design of ground story frontages subject to this Section *144* shall also be reviewed for consistency with applicable design guidelines, including the Ground Floor Residential Design Guidelines.

(b) **Controls.**

(1) **Entrances to Off-Street Parking.** Except as otherwise provided herein, in the case of every dwelling in such districts no more than one-third of the width of the ground story along the front lot line, or along a street side lot line, or along a building wall that is set back from any such lot line, shall be devoted to entrances to off-street parking, except that in no event shall a lot be limited by this requirement to a single such entrance of less than *10* ~~*ten*~~ feet in width, or to a single such entrance of less than ~~*8*~~ *eight* feet in RTO ~~*and RTO-M d*~~*D*istricts. In addition, no entrance to off-street parking on any lot shall be wider than 20 feet, and where two or more separate entrances are provided there shall be a minimum separation between such entrances of six feet. Lots ~~*in RTO and RTO-M districts*~~ are limited to a total of 20 feet per block frontage devoted to entrances to off-street parking. Street-facing garage structures and garage doors may not extend closer to the street than a primary building facade unless the garage structure and garage door are consistent with the features listed in Section 136 of this Code. Entrances to off-street parking shall be located at least six feet from a lot corner located at the intersection of two public rights-of-way.

* * * *

SEC. 186. EXEMPTION OF LIMITED COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL NONCONFORMING USES IN RH, RM, RTO*-1, RTO-M*, AND RED DISTRICTS.

* * * *

(a) **Exemption from Termination Provisions.** The following nonconforming uses in R Districts shall be exempt from the termination provisions of Section 185, provided such uses comply with all the conditions specified in subsection (b) below:

* * * *

(4) In the RED Districts, any nonconforming use that is Arts Activities, Business

Service, Catering, Design Professional, Light Manufacturing, Personal Service, Trade Office, Trade Shop, Wholesale Sales,~~,~~ or Wholesale Storage~~,~~ use.

(b) **Conditions on Limited Nonconforming Uses.** The limited nonconforming uses described above shall meet the following conditions:

* * * *

(3) The hours during which the use is open to the public shall be limited to the period between 6:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m., however, in RED, RTO-*1*, and RTO-M Districts only, the Planning Commission may extend the hours of operation to 12:00 a.m. through Conditional Use authorization, as outlined in Section 303 of this Code;

* * * *

SEC. 186.3. NON-RESIDENTIAL USES IN LANDMARK BUILDINGS IN RH, RM, RTO-*1*, AND RTO-M DISTRICTS.

Any use listed as a Principal or Conditional Use permitted on the ground floor in an NC-1 District, when located in a structure on a landmark site designated pursuant to Article 10 of this Code, is permitted with Conditional Use authorization pursuant to Section 303 of this Code, provided that no Conditional Use shall be authorized under this ~~*provision*~~ *Section 186.3* unless (1) such authorization conforms to the applicable provisions of Section 303 of this Code, and (2) the specific use so authorized is essential to the feasibility of retaining and preserving the landmark.

SEC. 201. CLASSES OF USE DISTRICTS.

Residential Districts (Defined in Sec. 209.1-209.4)	
* * * *	
RTO-*1*	Residential, Transit-Oriented Neighborhood Districts (Defined in

	Sec. 209.4)
RTO-C	*Residential, Transit-Oriented, Commercial Districts (Defined in Sec. 209.4)*
RTO-M	Residential, Transit-Oriented, – Mission Neighborhood Districts (Defined in Sec. 209.4)

* * * *

In addition to the classes of use districts in the above table, the following terms shall apply:

* * * *

"RTO District" shall mean any RTO-*1, RTO-C,* or RTO-M District;

* * * *

SEC. 207.6. REQUIRED MINIMUM DWELLING UNIT MIX IN RTO-*1, RTO-M*, RCD, NCT, DTR, EASTERN NEIGHBORHOODS MIXED USE DISTRICTS, THE VAN NESS & MARKET RESIDENTIAL SPECIAL USE DISTRICT, AND THE POLK STREET AND PACIFIC AVENUE NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICTS.

(a) **Purpose.** In order to foster flexible and creative infill development while maintaining the character of the district, dwelling unit density is not controlled by lot area in RTO-*1, RTO-M*, NCT, and Eastern Neighborhoods Mixed Use Districts but rather by the physical constraints of this Code (such as height, bulk, setbacks, open space, and dwelling unit exposure). However, to ensure an adequate supply of family-sized units in existing and new housing stock, new residential construction must include a minimum percentage of units of at least two bedrooms. In the Pacific Avenue and Polk Street Neighborhood Commercial Districts, and the Van Ness & Market Residential Special Use District, a dwelling unit mix

requirement addresses the need for family-sized housing production in these districts.

(b) **Applicability.**

(1) This Section *207.6* shall apply in the RTO-*1, RTO-M*, RCD, NCT, DTR, Eastern Neighborhoods Mixed Use Districts, the Van Ness & Market Residential Special Use District, and the Pacific Avenue and Polk Street NCDs.

* * * *

(c) **Controls.** For all RTO-*1, RTO-M*, RCD and NCT districts, as well as DTR, Eastern Neighborhoods Mixed Use Districts, the Van Ness & Market Residential Special Use District, and the Pacific Avenue and Polk Street NCDs, one of the following three must apply:

(1) no less than 40% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least two bedrooms. Any fraction resulting from this calculation shall be rounded to the nearest whole number of Dwelling Units, or

(2) no less than 30% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least three bedrooms. Any fraction resulting from this calculation shall be rounded to the nearest whole number of Dwelling Units, or

(3) no less than 35% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least two or three bedrooms with at least 10% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units containing three bedrooms. Any fraction resulting from this calculation shall be rounded to the nearest whole number of Dwelling Units.

(d) **Modifications.**

(1) In NCT, RCD, RTO-*1, RTO-M* and the Pacific Avenue and Polk Street NC Districts, these requirements may be waived or modified with Conditional Use ~~*A*~~*a*uthorization. In addition to those conditions set forth in Section 303, the Planning Commission shall consider the following criteria:

(A) The project demonstrates a need or mission to serve unique

populations, or

(B) The project site or existing building(s), if any, feature physical constraints that make it unreasonable to fulfill these requirements.

(2) In Eastern Neighborhoods Mixed Use Districts, these requirements may be waived in return for provision of family-sized affordable units, pursuant to Section 419 et seq. To receive this waiver, 100*%* ~~*percent*~~ of the total number of inclusionary units required under Section 415 et seq. or Section 419 et seq. shall contain at least two bedrooms. Also in Eastern Neighborhoods Mixed Use Districts, these requirements may be waived or modified through the Variance process set forth in Section 305, or in the case of projects subject to Section 329, through the procedures of that section.

(3) In DTR Districts, these requirements may be modified per the procedures of Section 309.1.

(4) In the Van Ness & Market Residential Special Use District, these requirements may only be modified pursuant to the procedures of Section 309, regardless of the underlying zoning district.

* * * *

SEC. 207.7. REQUIRED MINIMUM DWELLING UNIT MIX.

(a) **Purpose.** To ensure an adequate supply of family-sized units in new housing stock, new residential construction must include a minimum percentage of units of at least two and three bedrooms.

(b) **Applicability.**

(1) This Section 207.7 shall apply to all applications for building permits and/or Planning Commission entitlements that propose the creation of 10 or more Dwelling Units in all districts that allow residential uses, unless that project is located in the RTO-*1, RTO-M*,

RCD, NCT, DTR, and Eastern Neighborhoods Mixed Use Districts, or in an area or Special Use District with higher specific bedroom mix requirements, or is a HOME SF project subject to the requirements of Planning Code Section 206.3.

* * * *

SEC. 208. DENSITY LIMITATIONS FOR GROUP HOUSING OR HOMELESS SHELTERS.

The density limitations for Group Housing or Homeless Shelters, as described in Sections 102 and 890.88(b) and (c) of this Code, shall be as follows:

(a) For Group Housing, the maximum number of Bedrooms on each Lot shall be as specified in the Zoning Control Table for the District in which the Lot is located, except that in RTO, ~~*RTO-M,*~~ RCD, UMU, MUG, WMUG, MUR, MUO, CMUO, WMUO, RED, RED-MX, SPD, DTR, and all NCT Districts the density of Group Housing shall not be limited by lot area, and except that for Lots in NC Districts, the group housing density shall not exceed the number of Bedrooms permitted in the nearest R District provided that the maximum density not be less than the amount permitted by the ratio specified for the NC District in which the lot is located. For Homeless Shelters, the maximum number of beds on each lot shall be regulated pursuant to the requirements of the Standards of Care for City Shelters contained in Administrative Code, Chapter 20, Article XIII, in addition to the applicable requirements of the Building Code and Fire Code.

* * * *

SEC. 209.4. RTO (RESIDENTIAL TRANSIT ORIENTED) DISTRICTS.

~~*These*~~*RTO (Residential Transit Oriented)* Districts*, inclusive of RTO-1, RTO-M, and RTO-C Districts,* are intended to recognize~~*, protect, conserve,*~~ and enhance areas characterized by a

mixture of houses and apartment buildings, covering a range of densities and building forms. RTO-*1* *(Residential, Transit -Oriented Neighborhood)* and RTO-M (Residential Transit Oriented, Mission) Districts are composed of multi-family moderate-density areas, primarily areas formerly designated RM and RH-3~~,~~. *RTO-C (Residential Transit Oriented, Commercial) permits neighborhood-serving uses at limited sizes along with housing. RTO Districts~~and~~* are well served within short walking distance, generally less than one-quarter mile, of transit and neighborhood commercial areas. Transit available on nearby streets is frequent and/or provides multiple lines serving different parts of the City or region. *In RTO-1 and RTO-M Districts, ~~L~~l*imited small-scale neighborhood-oriented retail and services ~~*is*~~*are* common and permitted throughout the neighborhood on Corner Lots only to provide goods and services to residents within walking distance, but the ~~*d*~~*D*istricts are otherwise residential. *In RTO-1 and RTO-M Districts, ~~O~~o*nly retail compatible with housing, generally those permitted in NC-1 Districts, is permitted and auto-oriented uses are not permitted~~.~~*;* ~~*H*~~*h*ours of operation are restricted and off-street parking is not permitted for these very locally-oriented uses. *In the RTO-C District, a greater amount and wider range of non-residential uses are permitted and not limited to corners, to provide goods and services to residents and visitors, especially adjacent to existing NC Districts and along transit corridors, though ground floor commercial uses are not required.*

Areas of these districts off of major commercial or transit streets are largely characterized by a~~A~~ fine-grain pattern of 25-foot to 35-foot building widths*, with some larger and wider structures on major streets ~~is prevalent, and structures typically range from two to five stories in height~~*. While some one- and two-family structures are present, the character of the District is primarily of structures with three or more units of a range of sizes and types suitable for a variety of households. Buildings are moderately scaled and segmented, and units or groups of units have separate entrances directly from the street. ~~*The overall residential density is regulated by the*~~

~~*permitted and required height, bulk, setbacks, and open space of each parcel, along with residential design guidelines.*~~ *Except in the RTO-1 District, housing density is generally limited not by lot area, but by the regulations on the built envelope of buildings, including height, bulk, setbacks, and lot coverage, and standards for Residential Uses, including open space and exposure, and urban design standards.* Because of the high availability of transit service and the proximity of retail and services within walking distance, many households do not own cars; it is common that not every Dwelling Unit has a parking space and overall off-street residential parking is limited. Open space is provided on site, in the form of rear yards, decks, balconies, roof-decks, and courtyards, and is augmented by nearby public parks, plazas, and enhanced streetscapes.

Table 209.4

ZONING CONTROL TABLE FOR RTO DISTRICTS

Zoning Category	***§ References***	***RTO-1***	***RTO-M***	***RTO-C***
BUILDING STANDARDS				
Massing and Setbacks				
Height and Bulk Limits	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250-252, 260, 261.1, *263.19,* 270, *270.3,* 271	Varies. See Height and Bulk Map and referenced sections.		
Front Building Setback	§ 132	~~*Required. Based on average of adjacent properties or if subject property has a Legislated Setback. When front setback is based on adjacent properties, in no case shall the required setback be greater than 15 feet.*~~		

		Required. Based on the front setback of the adjacent property with the shortest front setback or if subject property has a Legislated Setback. When front setback is based on adjacent properties, in no case shall the required setback be greater than 10 feet. *For RTO-C Districts, regardless of the depth of setback required by § 132, where the sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade.*	
Rear Yard	§§ 130, 134	30% of lot depth but in no case less than 15 feet.	*25% of the total depth of the lot on which the building is situated, but in no case less than 15 feet.*
Side Yard	§ 133	Not Required.	
~~*Residential*~~Design Guidelines *and*	§ 311	Subject to the Residential Design Guidelines, *Citywide Design Standards, and any* ~~*O*~~*o*ther design	

Standards		guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission ~~*may also apply*~~.
Street Frontage and Public Realm		
Front Setback Landscaping and Permeability Requirements	§ 132	*Generally* ~~*R*~~*r*equired. At least 50% of Front Setback shall be permeable so as to increase storm water infiltration and 20% of Front Setback shall be unpaved and devoted to plant material. *Not required where front setback is used to expand adjacent sidewalk to meet Better Streets Plan recommended dimensions.*
Streetscape and Pedestrian Improvements (Street Trees)	§ 138.1	Required.
Street Frontage Requirements	§§ 144, 186, 231	Controls of § 144 apply to residential frontages. Additional controls apply to Limited Commercial Uses per §§ 186 and 231.
Street Frontage, Parking and Loading Access Restrictions	§ 155(r)	As specified in § 155(r) ~~*curb cuts are restricted on certain specified streets and on Transit Preferential, Neighborhood Commercial Streets or official City bicycle routes or bicycle lanes*~~.
Miscellaneous		
Large Project Review	§ 303(r)	New buildings or significant enlargement of existing buildings on lots of 10,000 sq. ft. or larger requires C. New public rights-of-way may be required for sites larger than 1/2 acre.

Planned Unit Development	§ 304	C	C	*C*
Awning	§§ 136, 136.1	*N*P(1)	*N*P(1)	*P*
Canopy or Marquee	§§ 136, 136.1	NP*(2)*	NP*(2)*	*NP(2)*
Signs	§*§* 606*, 607.1*	As permitted by ~~*Section*~~ § 606.		*As permitted by controls of the nearest NC District described in § 607.1.*
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*		
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Usable Open Space [Per Dwelling Unit]	§§ 135, 136	At least ~~*100*~~*80* square feet if private, and ~~*133*~~ *106* square feet per Dwelling Unit if common.	*At least 100 square feet if private, and 133 square feet per Dwelling Unit if common.*	*At least 60 square feet if private, and 80 square feet per Dwelling Unit if common.*
Parking Requirements	§§ 150, 151.1	None required. Maximum permitted per § 151.1.		
Residential Conversion,	§ 317	C ~~*for Removal of one or more Residential Units or Unauthorized Units.*~~		

Demolition, or Merger *of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*				
Dwelling Unit Division	§ 207.8	P	P	*P*
~~*Required Dwelling Unit Mix*~~	~~*§ 207.6*~~	~~*No less than 40 percent of the total number of proposed dwelling units shall contain at least two bedrooms; or no less than 30 percent of the total number of proposed dwelling units shall contain at least three bedrooms.*~~		~~*No less than 40 percent of the total number of proposed dwelling units shall contain at least two bedrooms; or no less than 30 percent of the total number of proposed dwelling units shall contain at least three bedrooms.*~~
Dwelling Unit Mix	*§§ 207.6, 207.7*	*Generally required for creation of five or more Dwelling Units per § 207.6. No less than 40% of the total number*		*Generally required for creation of 10 or*

		of proposed dwelling units shall contain at least two bedrooms; or no less than 30% of the total number of proposed dwelling units shall contain at least three bedrooms.		*more Dwelling Units. No less than 25% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least two Bedrooms, and no less than 10% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least three Bedrooms.*
Use Characteristics				
Intermediate Length Occupancy	§§ 102, 202.10	P(10)	P(10)	*P(10)*
Single Room Occupancy	§ 102	P	P	*P*
Student Housing	§ 102	P	P	*P*
Residential Uses				
~~*Residential Density,*~~	§ 207	~~*P if at least one*~~	~~*No density limit.*~~	~~Form-Based~~

Dwelling Unit~~s~~ *Density, General* (7)		~~*unit per 800 square feet of lot area (8).*~~ Maximum density as of right is one unit per 600 square feet of lot area. C above, per criteria of § 207(a). ~~*(11)*~~*(8)*	~~*Density is regulated by the permitted height and bulk, and required setbacks, exposure, and open space of each parcel, along with Residential Design Guidelines.*~~ *Form-Based Density.*	~~Density.~~ Maximum density shall be as set forth in the nearest Neighborhood Commercial District.
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, If Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		
Senior Housing	§§102,	*Form-Based*	~~*No density limit.*~~	*Form-Based*

Density	202.2(f)*,* *207.9*	*Density applies within the R-4 Height and Bulk District (§ 263.19). Outside the R-4 Height and Bulk District,* P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a principal use in the district; C*,* *required to exceed that density limit.* ~~*density not limited by lot area, but by the applicable requirements and limitations elsewhere in this Code, including but not limited to*~~	~~*Density is regulated by the permitted height and bulk, and required setbacks, exposure, and open space of each parcel, along with Residential Design Guidelines.*~~*Form-Based Density.*	*Density.*

		~~height, bulk, setbacks, open space, exposure, unit mix, and relevant design guidelines.~~		
~~Residential Density,~~ Group Housing *Density*	§ 208	*~~No density limit. Density is regulated by the permitted height and bulk, and required setbacks, exposure, and open space of each parcel, along with Residential Design Guidelines.~~Form-Based Density.*		
Homeless Shelter	§§ 102, 208	P	P	*P*
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124, *207.9*	1.8 to 1	1.8 to 1	*1.8 to 1. For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*
Use Size	*§ 102*	*N/A*	*N/A*	*N/A: Non-Residential Uses of any size are either P or C, depending on*

				specified lot or use features. (11)
Off-Street Parking	§§ 150, 151.1	None required. Maximum permitted per § 151.1.		
Limited Corner Commercial Uses	§ 231	P on a Corner Lot, with no part of the use extending more than 50 feet in depth from said corner	P on a Corner Lot, with no part of the use extending more than 100 feet in depth from said corner	*N/A*
Limited Commercial Uses	§§ 186, 209	Continuing nonconforming uses are permitted, subject to the requirements of § 186.		*N/A*
Commercial Use Characteristics				
Hours of Operation	§§ 102, 186, 231	For Limited Corner Commercial Uses under § 231 and limited commercial uses under § 186: P 6:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.; C 10:00 p.m. to 12:00 a.m.; NP 12:00 a.m. to 6:00 a.m.		*P 6:00 a.m. to 2:00 a.m.; C 2:00 a.m. to 6:00 a.m.*
Formula Retail	*§§ 102, 303.1*	*NP(3)*	*NP(3)*	*C*
Outdoor Activity Area	§§ 102, 145.2, 186, 202.2, 231	P if located in front of building; P if elsewhere and compliant with § 202.2(a)(7); NP otherwise.		

Agricultural Use Category				
Agricultural Uses*	§§ 102, 202.2(c)	C	C	*C*
Agriculture, Neighborhood	§§ 102, 202.2(c)	P	P	*P*
Automotive Use Category				
Automotive Uses*	§ 102	NP	NP	*NP*
Electric Vehicle Charging Location	*§ 102*	*NP*	*NP*	*NP*
Parking Garage, Private	§ 102	C	C	*C*
Parking Garage, Public	*§ 102*	*C*	*C*	*C*
Parking Lot, Private	§§ 102, 144, 155(r), 158.1	C	C	*C*
Parking Lot, Public	*§§ 102, 144, 155(r), 158.1*	*C*	*C*	*C*
Entertainment, Arts and Recreation Use Category				
Entertainment, Arts and Recreation Uses*	§ 102	NP	NP	*P*
Entertainment, Nighttime	*§ 102*	*NP*	*NP*	*C*
Movie Theater	*§ 102*	*NP*	*NP*	*C*

Open Recreation Area	§ 102	C	C	*C*
Passive Outdoor Recreation	§ 102	P	P	*P*
Industrial Use Category				
Industrial Uses*	§ 102	NP	NP	*NP*
Institutional Use Category				
Institutional Uses*	§ 102	NP	NP	*P*
Childcare ~~*Child Care*~~ Facility	§ 102	P	P	*P*
Community Facility	§ 102	P	P	*P*
Hospital	§ 102	C	C	*C*
Post-Secondary Ed. Institution	§ 102	C	C	*P*
Public Facilities	§ 102	P	P	*P*
Religious Institution	§ 102	C	C	*P*
Residential Care Facility	§ 102	P	P	*P*
School	§ 102	C	C	*P*
Sales and Service Category				
Retail Sales and Service Uses*	§ 102	NP	NP	*P*
Flexible Retail	*§ 102*	*NP*	*NP*	*P*
Hotel	§ 102	C(4)	C(4)	*C*

Mobile Food Facility	§ 102	P(5)	P(5)	*P*
Services, Retail Professional	*§ 102*	*NP*	*NP*	*P*
Mortuary	§ 102	C(6)	C(6)	*P*
Non-Retail Sales and Service*	§ 102	NP	NP	*C*
Service, Non-Retail Professional	*§ 102*	*NP*	*NP*	*C*
Utility and Infrastructure Use Category				
Utility and Infrastructure*	§ 102	NP	NP	*C*
Internet Service Exchange	§ 102	C	C	*C*
Power Plant	*§ 102*	*NP*	*NP*	*NP*
Public Utilities Yard	*§ 102*	*NP*	*NP*	*NP*
Utility Installation	§ 102	C	C	*C*
Wireless Telecommunications Services Facility	§ 102	C or P (9)	C or P (9)	*C or P (9)*

* Not listed below.

(1) *P if required as a wind mitigation feature. Additionally,* P for Limited Commercial Uses and Limited Corner Commercial Uses per § 136.1 ~~*only, otherwise NP*~~.

(2) ~~*[Note Deleted]*~~ *Canopy is P if required as a wind mitigation feature.*

(3) ~~*[Note Deleted]*~~ *C for Limited Commercial Uses per § 303.1.*

* * * *

(7) Construction of Accessory Dwelling Units may be ~~*permitted*~~*P* pursuant to Sections 207.1 and 207.2.

(8) ~~*With Conditional Use authorization, f*~~*F*or purposes of this calculation, a Dwelling Unit in this ~~*d*~~*D*istrict containing no more than 500 square feet of net floor area and consisting of not more than one habitable room in addition to a kitchen and a bathroom may be counted as equal to three-quarters of a Dwelling Unit.

(9) C if a Macro WTS Facility; P if a Micro WTS Facility.

(10) NP for buildings with three or fewer Dwelling Units; C for buildings with 10 or more Dwelling Units.

(11) ~~*NP if less than minimum density as set forth in the table. Expansions of existing single-family residential buildings may not exceed more than 25% of Gross Floor Area over 10 years, or result in a building over 3,000 square feet. In new construction, no unit may be smaller than one-third the Gross Floor Area of the largest unit in the building.*~~ *No use size limit applies for Non-residential uses located on a lot where at least 2/3 of the total gross floor area contains Residential uses. No use size limit applies to a Non-residential use that is principally permitted in a RM-1 District. Conditional Use authorization is required for all use sizes if the Use does not meet one of those conditions. The controls applicable to each Use as provided in this Table 209.4 continue to apply. Nothing in the foregoing principally permits or conditionally authorizes a Use that is not permitted in this Table 209.4.*

SEC. 231. LIMITED CORNER COMMERCIAL USES IN RH, RTO*-1, RTO-M*, AND RM DISTRICTS.

(a) **Purpose.** Corner stores enhance and support the character and traditional pattern of development in San Francisco. These small neighborhood-oriented establishments provide convenience goods and services on a retail basis to meet the frequent and recurring needs of

neighborhood residents within a short walking distance of their homes. These uses tend to be small in scale, to serve primarily walk-in trade, and cause minimum interference with nearby streets and properties. These uses are permitted only on the ground floor of corner buildings, and their intensity and operating hours are limited to ensure compatibility with the predominantly residential character of the district. Accessory off-street parking is prohibited for these uses to maintain the local neighborhood walk-in character of the uses.

(b) **Location.** Uses permitted under this *Section 231* must be located:

(1) completely within an RH, RTO*-1*, RTO-M, or RM District;

(2) on or below the ground floor;

(3) in RH, RM-1, RM-2, ~~*and*~~ RTO*-1, and RTO-M* Districts, on a Corner Lot, with no part of the use extending more than 50 feet in depth from said corner, as illustrated in Figure 231~~.~~*; and*

(4) in a space that would not require the Residential Conversion of a Residential Unit or Unauthorized Unit under Planning Code Section 317, unless the space proposed for conversion is occupied by a garage or storage space located in the Basement or First Story~~.~~*; and*

[Figure 231 remains]

(5) in RM-3, RM-4, and RTO-M Districts, on a Corner Lot, with no part of the use extending more than 100 feet in depth from said corner.

* * * *

(d) **Use Size.** In any RH, RM-1, or RM-2 District, the use size shall comply with the use size limitations of a Neighborhood Commercial District or Special Use District located within one-quarter mile of the use, up to a maximum of 1,200 square feet of Occupied Floor Area of commercial area. In any RM-3 or RM-4 District, the use size shall comply with the use size limitations of a Neighborhood Commercial District or Special Use District located within

one-quarter mile of the use, up to a maximum of 2,500 square feet of Commercial Use. No more than 1,200 square feet of Occupied Floor Area of commercial area in a RTO-*1* District or in a RH, RM-1, or RM-2 District if the use is more than one-quarter mile from a Neighborhood Commercial District or Special Use District, and no more than 2,500 occupied square feet of Commercial Use in a RTO-M District or in a RM-3 or RM-4 District if the use is more than one-quarter mile from a Neighborhood Commercial District or Special Use District shall be allowed per Corner Lot, subject to the following exception. On lots which occupy more than one corner on a given block, an additional 1,200 square feet of Occupied Floor Area of Commercial Use shall be allowed per additional corner, so long as the commercial space is distributed equitably throughout appropriate parts of the parcel or project.

(e) **Formula Retail Uses.** All uses meeting the definition of "formula retail" use per Section 303.1 shall not be permitted except by Conditional Use through the procedures of Section 303 for RTO and RTO-M Districts and shall not be permitted in RH and RM Districts.

* * * *

(k) **Outdoor Activity Area.** An Outdoor Activity Area is principally permitted if it is located at the front of the building. An Outdoor Activity Area that is not at the front of the building is principally permitted in RTO-*1* and RTO-M Districts only if it complies with the operating restrictions in Section 202.2(a)(7) and shall not be permitted in RH or RM Districts.

SEC. 303. CONDITIONAL USES.

* * * *

(r) **Development of Large Lots in RTO-*1* and RTO-M Districts.** In order to promote, protect, and maintain a scale of development that is appropriate to each district and compatible with adjacent buildings, new construction or significant enlargement of existing buildings on lots of the same size or larger than the square footage stated in Table 209.4 under Large Project Review shall be permitted only as Conditional Uses subject to the

provisions set forth in this Section *303* of this Code.

* * * *

SEC. 303.1. FORMULA RETAIL USES.

* * * *

(e) **Conditional Use Authorization Required.** A Conditional Use Authorization shall be required for a Formula Retail use in the following zoning districts unless explicitly exempted:

* * * *

(8) Limited Commercial Uses in RTO-*1, RTO-M,* and RED Districts, as permitted by Sections 186, 186.3, and 231;

* * * *

(9) Third Street Formula Retail Restricted Use District, as defined in Section 786; ~~*and*~~

(10) Central SoMa Special Use District as defined in Section 848, except for those uses not permitted pursuant to subsection (f) below~~.~~*; and*

(11) RTO-C District, as defined in Section 209.4.

* * * *

SEC. 304. PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENTS.

* * * *

(d) **Criteria and Limitations.** The proposed development must meet the criteria applicable to conditional uses as stated in Section 303(c) and elsewhere in this Code. In addition, it shall:

* * * *

(5) In R Districts, include Commercial Uses only to the extent that such uses are necessary to serve residents of the immediate vicinity, subject to the limitations for NC-1 Districts under this Code, and in RTO*-1 and RTO-M* Districts include Commercial Uses only according to the provisions of Section 231 of this Code;

* * * *

SEC. 603. EXEMPTED SIGNS.

* * * *

(c) Two General Advertising Signs each not exceeding 24 square feet in area on either a transit shelter or associated advertising kiosk furnished by contract with the Municipal Transportation Agency or predecessor agency for the Municipal Railway in RTO~~*, RTO-M*~~, RM-2, RM-3, RM-4, RC, NC, C, M, PDR, Eastern Neighborhoods Mixed Use Districts, and in those P Districts where such Signs would not adversely affect the character, harmony, or visual integrity of the district as determined by the Planning Commission; eight General Advertising Signs each not exceeding 24 square feet in area on transit shelters located on publicly owned property on a high level Municipal Railway boarding platform in an RH-1D District adjacent to a C-2 District, provided that such advertising signs solely face the C-2 District; up to three double-sided General Advertising Signs each not exceeding 24 square feet in area on or adjacent to transit shelters on publicly owned high level Municipal Railway boarding platforms along The Embarcadero south of the Ferry Building, up to six double-sided panels at 2nd and King Streets, and up to four double-sided panels at 4th and King Streets; up to two double-sided panels not exceeding 24 square feet in area on each low-level boarding platform at the following E-Line stops: Folsom Street and The Embarcadero, Brannan Street and The Embarcadero, 2nd and King Streets, and 4th and King Streets; and a total of 71 double-sided General Advertising Signs each not exceeding 24 square feet in area on or adjacent to transit shelters on 28 publicly owned high level Municipal Railway boarding

platforms serving the Third Street Light Rail Line. Each advertising sign on a low-level or high-level boarding platform shall be designed and sited in such a manner as to minimize obstruction of public views from pedestrian walkways and/or public open space.

Notwithstanding the above, no Sign shall be placed on any transit shelter or associated advertising kiosk located on any sidewalk which shares a common boundary with any property under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Commission, with the exception of Justin Herman Plaza; on any sidewalk on Zoo Road; on Skyline Boulevard between Sloat Boulevard and John Muir Drive; on John Muir Drive between Skyline Boulevard and Lake Merced Boulevard; or on Lake Merced Boulevard on the side of Harding Park Municipal Golf Course, or on any sidewalk on Sunset Boulevard between Lincoln Way and Lake Merced Boulevard; on any sidewalk on Legion of Honor Drive; or in the Civic Center Special Sign Districts as established in Section 608.3 of this Code.

The provisions of this subsection (c) shall be subject to the authority of the Port Commission under Sections 4.114 and B3.581 of the City Charter and under State law.

* * * *

SEC. 606. RESIDENTIAL AND RESIDENTIAL ENCLAVE DISTRICTS.

Signs in Residential and Residential Enclave Districts, *excluding the Residential Transit Oriented-Commercial (RTO-C) District, and* other than those signs exempted by Section 603 of this Code, shall conform to the following provisions:

* * * *

SEC. 607.1. NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL AND RESIDENTIAL-COMMERCIAL DISTRICTS, *AND RESIDENTIAL TRANSIT ORIENTED-COMMERCIAL DISTRICTS*.

* * * *

(a) **Purposes and Findings.** In addition to the purposes stated in Sections 101 and 601 of this Code, the following purposes apply to Neighborhood Commercial and Residential-Commercial Districts. These purposes constitute findings that form a basis for regulations and provide guidance for their application.

(1) As Neighborhood Commercial, ~~and~~ Residential-Commercial, *and Residential Transit Oriented-Commercial* Districts change, they need to maintain their attractiveness to residents, customers and potential new businesses alike. Physical amenities and a pleasant appearance will profit both existing and new enterprises.

(2) The character of signs and other features projecting from buildings is an important part of the visual appeal of a street and the general quality and economic stability of the area. Opportunities exist to relate these signs and projections more effectively to street design and building design. These regulations establish a framework that will contribute toward a coherent appearance of Neighborhood Commercial and Residential-Commercial Districts.

(3) Neighborhood Commercial, ~~and~~ Residential-Commercial, *and Residential Transit Oriented-Commercial* Districts are typically mixed use areas with commercial units on the ground or lower stories and residential uses on upper stories. Although signs are essential to a vital commercial district, they should not be allowed to interfere with or diminish the livability of residential units within a Neighborhood Commercial District or in adjacent residential districts.

(4) The scale of most Neighborhood Commercial and Residential-Commercial Districts as characterized by building height, bulk, and appearance, and the width of streets and sidewalks differs from that of other commercial and industrial districts. Sign sizes should relate and be compatible with the surrounding district scale.

(5) Signs controls in Residential Transit Oriented-Commercial Districts are determined

by the sign controls of the nearest Neighborhood Commercial District described in this Section 607.1.

* * * *

Section 8. Transit Oriented Communities and Parking. Articles 1.5 and 2 of the Planning Code are hereby amended by deleting Section 151 in its entirety, revising Sections 151.1, 153, 154, 155, 155.2, and 161, and adding Sections 207.9 and 207.10, to read as follows:

~~***SEC. 151. SCHEDULE OF REQUIRED OFF-STREET PARKING SPACES.***~~

~~*(a) **Applicability.** Off-street parking spaces shall be provided in the minimum quantities specified in Table 151, except as otherwise provided in Section 151.1 and Section 161 of this Code. Where the building or lot contains uses in more than one of the categories listed, parking requirements shall be calculated in the manner provided in Section 153 of this Code. Where off-street parking is provided which exceeds certain amounts in relation to the quantities specified in Table 151, as set forth in subsection (c), such parking shall be classified not as accessory parking but as either a Principal or a Conditional Use, depending upon the use provisions applicable to the district in which the parking is located. In considering an application for a Conditional Use for any such parking, due to the amount being provided, the Planning Commission shall consider the criteria set forth in Section 303(t) or 303(u) of this Code. Minimum off-street parking requirements shall be reduced, to the extent needed, when such reduction is part of a Development Project's compliance with the Transportation Demand Management Program set forth in Section 169 of this Code.*~~

~~*(b) **Minimum Parking Required**.*~~

~~***Table 151***~~

~~***OFF-STREET PARKING SPACES REQUIRED***~~

~~***Use or Activity***~~	~~***Number of Off-Street Parking Spaces Required***~~

~~***RESIDENTIAL USES***~~	
~~*Dwelling*~~	~~*None required. P up to 1.5 parking spaces for each Dwelling Unit.*~~
~~*Dwelling, in the Telegraph Hill – North Beach Residential Special Use District*~~	~~*None required. P up to 0.5 parking spaces for each Dwelling Unit, subject to the controls and procedures of Section 249.49(c) and Section 155(t); NP above preceding ratio.*~~
~~*Dwelling, in the Polk Street Neighborhood Commercial District*~~	~~*None required. P up to 0.5 parking spaces for each Dwelling Unit; NP above preceding ratio.*~~
~~*Dwelling, in the Pacific Avenue Neighborhood Commercial District*~~	~~*None required. P up to 0.5 parking spaces for each Dwelling Unit; C up to one car for each Dwelling Unit; NP above preceding ratios.*~~
~~*Group Housing of any kind*~~	~~*None required.*~~
~~***NON-RESIDENTIAL USES***~~	
~~***Agricultural Use Category***~~	
~~*Agricultural Uses**~~	~~*None required*~~
~~*Greenhouse*~~	~~*None required. Maximum 1.5 parking spaces for each 4,000 square feet of Occupied Floor Area, where the Occupied Floor Area exceeds 5,000 square feet.*~~
~~***Automotive Use Category***~~	
~~*Automotive Uses*~~	~~*None required.*~~
~~***Entertainment, Arts and Recreation Use Category***~~	
~~*Entertainment, Arts and Recreation Uses**~~	~~*None required. Maximum 1.5 parking spaces for each 200 square feet of Occupied Floor Area, where the Occupied Floor Area exceeds 5,000 square feet.*~~
~~*Arts Activities, except theater or auditorium spaces*~~	~~*None required. Maximum 1.5 parking spaces for each 2,000 square feet of Occupied Floor Area, where the Occupied Floor Area exceeds 7,500 square feet.*~~
~~*Sports Stadium*~~	~~*None required. Maximum 1.5 parking spaces for each 15 seats.*~~
~~*Theater or auditorium*~~	~~*None required. Maximum 1.5 parking spaces for each 8 seats up to 1,000 seats where the number of seats exceeds 50 seats, plus 1.5 parking spaces for each 10 seats in excess of 1,000.*~~
~~***Industrial Use Category***~~	
~~*Industrial Uses**~~	~~*None required. Maximum 1.5 parking spaces for each 2,000 square feet of Occupied Floor Area, where the Occupied Floor Area exceeds 10,000 square feet.*~~
~~*Live/Work Units*~~	~~*None required. Maximum 1.5 parking spaces for each 2,000 square*~~

	~~*feet of Occupied Floor Area, where the Occupied Floor Area exceeds 7,500 square feet, except in RH or RM Districts, within which the requirement shall be one space for each Live/Work Unit.*~~
~~***Institutional Uses Category***~~	
~~*Institutional Uses**~~	~~*None required.*~~
~~*Child Care Facility*~~	~~*None required. Maximum 1.5 parking spaces for each 25 children to be accommodated at any one time, where the number of such children exceeds 24.*~~
~~*Hospital*~~	~~*None required. Maximum 1.5 parking spaces for each 8 beds excluding bassinets or for each 2,400 square feet of Occupied Floor Area devoted to sleeping rooms, whichever results in the greater requirement, provided that these requirements shall not apply if the calculated number of spaces is no more than two.*~~
~~*Post-Secondary Educational Institution*~~	~~*None required. Maximum 1.5 parking spaces for each two classrooms.*~~
~~*Religious Institution*~~	~~*None required. Maximum 1.5 parking spaces for each 20 seats by which the number of seats in the main auditorium exceeds 200.*~~
~~*Residential Care Facility*~~	~~*None required. Maximum in RH-1 and RH-2 Districts, 1.5 parking spaces for each 10 beds where the number of beds exceeds nine.*~~
~~*School*~~	~~*None required. Maximum 1.5 parking spaces for each six classrooms.*~~
~~*Trade School*~~	~~*None required. Maximum 1.5 parking spaces for each two classrooms.*~~
~~***Sales and Service Category***~~	
~~***Retail Sales and Services****~~	~~*None required. Maximum 1.5 parking spaces for each 500 square feet of Occupied Floor Area up to 20,000 where the Occupied Floor Area exceeds 5,000 square feet, plus 1.5 spaces for each 250 square feet of Occupied Floor Area in excess of 20,000.*~~
~~*Eating and Drinking Uses*~~	~~*None required. Maximum 1.5 parking spaces for each 200 square feet of Occupied Floor Area, where the Occupied Floor Area exceeds 5,000 square feet.*~~
~~*Health Services*~~	~~*None required. Maximum 1.5 parking spaces for each 300 square feet of Occupied Floor Area, where the Occupied Floor Area exceeds 5,000 square feet.*~~
~~*Hotel in NC Districts*~~	~~*None required. Maximum 1.2 parking spaces for each guest bedroom.*~~
~~*Hotel in districts other than NC*~~	~~*None required. Maximum 1.5 parking spaces for each 16 guest bedrooms where the number of guest bedrooms exceeds 23, plus one for the manager's Dwelling Unit, if any.*~~
~~*Mortuary*~~	~~*Eight*~~

~~*Motel*~~	~~*None required. Maximum 1.5 parking spaces for each guest unit, plus one for the manager's Dwelling Unit, if any.*~~
~~*Retail space devoted to the handling of bulky merchandise such as motor vehicles, machinery or furniture*~~	~~*None required. Maximum 1.5 parking spaces for each 1,000 square feet of Occupied Floor Area, where the Occupied Floor Area exceeds 5,000 square feet.*~~
~~*Retail Greenhouse or plant nursery*~~	~~*None required. Maximum 1.5 parking spaces for each 4,000 square feet of Occupied Floor Area, where the Occupied Floor Area exceeds 5,000 square feet.*~~
~~*Self-Storage*~~	~~*None required. Maximum 1.5 parking spaces for every three self-storage units.*~~
~~***Non-Retail Sales and Services****~~	~~*None required. Maximum 1.5 parking spaces for each 1,000 square feet of Occupied Floor Area, where the Occupied Floor Area exceeds 5,000 square feet.*~~
~~*Commercial Storage or Wholesale Storage*~~	~~*None required. Maximum 1.5 parking spaces for each 2,000 square feet of Occupied Floor Area, where the Occupied Floor Area exceeds 10,000 square feet.*~~
~~*Office*~~	~~*None required. Maximum 1.5 parking spaces for each 500 square feet of Occupied Floor Area, where the Occupied Floor Area exceeds 5,000 square feet.*~~
~~***Utility and Infrastructure Category***~~	
~~*Utility and infrastructure uses*~~	~~*None required.*~~

~~** Not listed below*~~

~~*(c) Where no parking is required for a use by this Section 151, the maximum permitted shall be one space per 2,000 square feet of Occupied Floor Area of use, three spaces where the use or activity has zero Occupied Floor Area or the maximum specified elsewhere in this Section.*~~

SEC. 151.1. SCHEDULE OF PERMITTED *ACCESSORY* OFF-STREET PARKING SPACES ~~*IN SPECIFIED DISTRICTS*~~.

(a) **Applicability.** *Unless otherwise specified in a Special Use District, this Section 151.1 shall apply.* ~~*This Section 151.1 shall apply only to NCT, RC, RCD, RTO, Mixed Use, M-1, PDR-1-D, PDR-1-G, and C-3 Districts, and to the Broadway, Excelsior Outer Mission Street, Japantown, North*~~

~~*Beach, Polk, and Pacific Avenue Neighborhood Commercial Districts.*~~

(b) ***Off-street Accessory Parking.*** *Off-street accessory parking shall not be required for any use, and the quantities of off-street parking specified in Tables 151.1-1 and 151.1-2 shall serve as the maximum amount of off-street parking that may be provided as accessory to the uses specified. In addition:*

(1) Accessory off-street parking spaces shall be permitted up to quantities specified in Tables 151.1-1 and 151.1-2, except where provision of such parking would conflict with other provisions of this Code, including but not limited to Sections 144, 145.1, 145.4, and 155(r), in which case the Code Sections other than this Section 151.1 shall apply.

(2) Where a building or lot contains more than one use, the applicable accessory parking limit shall be calculated in the manner provided in Section 153 of this Code.

(3) Where the amount of off-street parking exceeds the quantities specified in Tables 151.1-1 and 151.1-2, such parking shall be considered a separate use requiring a separate entitlement and not considered an accessory use, unless it is existing non-conforming accessory parking that may only be expanded or intensified pursuant to Section 150(e).

(4) Off-street parking shall be reduced, if required for a Development Project to comply with the Transportation Demand Management Program set forth in Section 169 of this Code.

~~*(b)* ***Controls.*** *Off-street accessory parking shall not be required for any use, and the quantities of off-street parking specified in Table 151.1 shall serve as the maximum amount of off-street parking that may be provided as accessory to the uses specified. Variances from accessory off-street parking limits, as described in this Section 151.1, may not be granted. Where off-street parking is provided that exceeds the quantities specified in Table 151.1 or as explicitly permitted by this Section, such parking shall be classified not as accessory parking but as either a principally permitted or Conditional Use, depending upon the use provisions applicable to the district in which the parking is located. In considering an application for a Conditional Use for any such parking due to the amount being*~~

~~*provided, the Planning Commission shall consider the criteria set forth in Sections 303(t) or 303(u) of this Code.*~~

(c) **Definition.** Where a number or ratio of spaces are described in Table*s* 151.1*-1 or 151.1-2*, such number or ratio shall refer to the total number of parked ~~*cars*~~ *vehicles* accommodated in the project ~~*proposal*~~, regardless of the arrangement of parking, and shall include all spaces accessed by mechanical means, valet, or non-independently accessible means. For the purposes of determining the total number of ~~*cars*~~ *vehicles* parked, the area of an individual parking space, except for those spaces specifically designated for persons with physical disabilities, may not exceed 185 square feet, including spaces in tandem, or in parking lifts, elevators, or other means of vertical stacking. Any off-street surface area accessible to motor vehicles with a width of 7.5 feet and a length of 17 feet (127.5 square feet) not otherwise designated on plans as a parking space may be considered and counted as an off-street parking space at the discretion of the Zoning Administrator if the Zoning Administrator, in considering the possibility for tandem and valet arrangements, determines that such area is likely to be used for parking a vehicle on a regular basis and that such area is not necessary for the exclusive purpose of vehicular circulation to the parking or loading facilities otherwise permitted.

(d) **Car-Share Parking.** Any off-street parking space dedicated for use as a car-share parking space, as defined in Section 166, shall not ~~*be credited*~~ *count* toward the total parking permitted as accessory in this Section *151.1*.

Table 151.1*-1*

OFF-STREET PARKING PERMITTED AS ACCESSORY

Use or Activity	Number of Off-Street ~~*Car*~~ *Vehicle* Parking Spaces or Space Devoted to Off-Street ~~*Car*~~

	Vehicle Parking Permitted
RESIDENTIAL USES	
Dwelling (in all Districts unless specified otherwise below)	*P up to 2.0 parking spaces on Lots with one Dwelling Unit; P up to 3.0 parking spaces on Lots with two Dwelling Units; P up to 1.0 parking space for each Dwelling Unit for Lots with three or more Dwelling Units; NP above preceding ratio.*
Dwelling, in the Telegraph Hill - North Beach Residential Special Use District	*P up to 0.5 parking space for each Dwelling Unit, subject to the controls and procedures of Section 249.49(c) and Section 155(t); NP above preceding ratio.*
Dwelling, in the Polk Street Neighborhood Commercial District	*P up to 0.5 parking space for each Dwelling Unit; NP above preceding ratio.*
Dwelling, in the Pacific Avenue Neighborhood Commercial District	*P up to 0.5 parking space for each Dwelling Unit; C above 0.5 and up to 1.0 parking space for each Dwelling Unit; NP above preceding ratios.*
~~*Dwelling Units in RH-DTR Districts*~~	~~*P up to one car for each two Dwelling Units; C up to one car for each Dwelling Unit, subject to the criteria and procedures of Section 151.1(e); NP above one space per unit.*~~
Dwelling Units in SB-DTR Districts, except as specified below	P up to *0.375 parking space for each Dwelling Unit* ~~*one car for each four Dwelling Units*~~; C *above 0.375 and* up to 0.75 ~~*cars*~~ *parking space* for each Dwelling Unit, subject to the criteria and procedures of Section 151.1(e); NP above 0.75 ~~*cars*~~ *parking space* for each Dwelling Unit.
Dwelling Units in SB-DTR Districts with at least 2 bedrooms and at least 1,000 square feet of Occupied Floor Area	P up to *0.375 parking space* ~~*one car*~~ for each ~~*four*~~ Dwelling Unit~~s~~; C *above 0.375 and* up to *1.0* ~~*one car*~~ *parking space* for each Dwelling Unit, subject to the criteria and procedures of Section 151.1(e); NP above *1.0* ~~*one car*~~ *parking space* for each Dwelling Unit.
Dwelling Units in C-3 *and RH-DTR* Districts	P up to *0.375 parking space* ~~*one car*~~ for each ~~*two*~~ Dwelling Unit~~s~~; C *above 0.375 and* up to 0.75 ~~*cars*~~ *parking space* for each Dwelling Unit, subject to the criteria and procedures of Section 151.1(e); NP above ~~*three cars for each four*~~ *0.75 parking space for each* Dwelling Unit~~s~~.
Dwelling Units in the Van Ness & Market Residential Special Use District	P up to ~~*one car*~~ *0.25 parking space* for each ~~*four*~~ Dwelling Unit~~s~~; NP above *0*.25 ~~*cars*~~ *parking space* for each Dwelling Unit.

Dwelling Units ~~*and SRO Units*~~ in SALI, MUG outside of the Central SoMa SUD, WMUG, MUR, MUO, WMUO, SPD Districts, except as specified below	P up to ~~*one car*~~ *0.25 parking space* for each ~~*four*~~ Dwelling ~~*or SRO*~~ Unit~~s~~; C *above 0.25 and* up to 0.75 ~~*cars*~~ *parking space* for each Dwelling Unit, subject to the criteria~~, *and*~~ conditions, and procedures of Section 151.1(e) or (f); NP above 0.75 ~~*cars*~~ *parking spaces* for each Dwelling ~~*or SRO*~~ Unit.
Dwelling Units in SALI, MUG outside of the Central SoMa SUD, WMUG, MUR, MUO, WMUO, and SPD Districts with at least two bedrooms and at least 1,000 square feet of Occupied Floor Area	P up to ~~*one car*~~ *0.25 parking space* for each ~~*four*~~ Dwelling Unit~~s~~; C *above 0.25 and* up to *1.0* ~~*one car*~~ *parking space* for each Dwelling Unit, subject to the criteria and conditions and procedures of Section 151.1(e) or (f); NP above *1.0* ~~*one car*~~ *parking space* for each Dwelling Unit.
Dwelling Units ~~*and SRO Units*~~ in NCT, RC, RCD, RSD, Chinatown Mixed Use Districts, except as specified below	P up to ~~*one car*~~ *0.5 parking space* for each ~~*two*~~ Dwelling ~~*or SRO*~~ Unit~~s~~; C *above 0.5 and* up to 0.75 ~~*cars*~~ *parking space* for each Dwelling Unit, subject to the criteria and procedures of Section 151.1(e); NP above 0.75 ~~*cars*~~ *parking space* for each Dwelling Unit.
Dwelling Units ~~*and SRO Units*~~ in the Telegraph Hill - North Beach Residential Special Use District	P up to 0.5 parking spaces for each Dwelling Unit, subject to the controls and procedures of Section 249.49(c) and Sections 155(r) and 155(t); NP above *preceding ratio*.
Dwelling Units ~~*and SRO Units*~~ in the Broadway and North Beach Neighborhood Commercial Districts outside of the boundaries of the Telegraph Hill - North Beach Residential Special Use District	P up to 0.5 parking space for each Dwelling Unit~~,~~*;* C *above 0.5 and* up to 0.75 ~~*cars*~~ *parking spaces* for each Dwelling Unit; NP above 0.75 ~~*cars*~~ *parking space* for each Dwelling Unit, subject to the controls and procedures of Sections 155(r), 155(t), and Section 151.1(e). *NP above preceding ratio.*
Dwelling Units in the Glen Park NCT District	*P up to 0.5 parking space for each Dwelling Unit; C above 0.5 and up to 1.0 parking space for each Dwelling Unit, subject to the criteria and procedures of Section 151.1(e); NP above 1.0 parking space for each Dwelling Unit.*
Dwelling Units in the ~~*Glen Park and*~~ Ocean Avenue NCT District~~s~~ and the Excelsior Outer Mission Street Neighborhood Commercial District	P up to ~~*one car*~~ *1.0 parking space* for each *Dwelling U*~~*u*~~nit; NP above *1.0 parking space for each Dwelling Unit*.
Dwelling Units in the Japantown NC District	P up to 0.75 ~~*cars*~~ *parking space* for each Dwelling Unit~~,~~*;* C *above 0.75 and* up to 1.0 ~~*cars*~~

	parking space for each Dwelling Unit, subject to the criteria and procedures of Section 151.1(e); NP above *1.0 parking space for each Dwelling Unit*.
Dwelling Units ~~*with*~~in the Central SoMa SUD	P up to ~~*one car*~~ *0.25 parking space* for each ~~*four*~~ Dwelling Unit~~*s*~~; C above 0.25 and up to 0.5 ~~*cars*~~ *parking space* for each Dwelling Unit. *NP above 0.5 parking space for each Dwelling Unit.*
Dwelling Units in RTO Districts.	*P up to 1.0 parking space for each Dwelling Unit; NP above 1.0 parking space for each Dwelling Unit. For Lots east of Divisadero and Castro Streets in RTO Districts, P up to 0.75 parking spaces for each Dwelling Unit; C above 0.75 and up to 1.0 parking space for each Dwelling Unit, subject to the criteria and procedures of Section 151.1(e) or (f). NP above 1.0 parking space for each Dwelling Unit.*
Dwelling Units in ~~*RTO,*~~ RED and RED-MX Districts, except as specified below	P up to ~~*three cars*~~ *0.75 parking spaces* for each ~~*four*~~ Dwelling Unit~~*s*~~; C *above 0.75 and* up to *1.0* ~~*one car*~~ *parking space* for each Dwelling Unit, subject to the criteria and procedures of Section 151.1(e) or (f); NP above *1.0* ~~*one car*~~ *parking space* for each Dwelling Unit.
Dwelling Units in UMU Districts, except as specified below	P up to 0.75 ~~*cars*~~ *parking spaces* for each Dwelling Unit; NP above *0.75 parking spaces for each Dwelling Unit*.
Dwelling Units in UMU District with at least 2 bedrooms and at least 1,000 square feet of occupied floor area	P up to 1*.0* ~~*car*~~ *parking space* for each Dwelling Unit and subject to the conditions of *Section* 151.1(e); NP above *1.0 parking space for each Dwelling Unit*.
Group Housing of any kind	P up to *1.0* ~~*one car*~~ *parking space* for each three bedrooms or for each six beds, whichever results in the greater *number of parking spaces* ~~*requirement*~~, plus *1.0* ~~*one*~~ *parking space* for the manager's Dwelling Unit if any; NP above *preceding ratios*.
NON-RESIDENTIAL USES IN C-3 DISTRICTS	
All non-residential uses in C-3 Districts	Not to exceed 7% of Occupied Floor Area of such uses, except not to exceed 3.5% of Occupied Floor Area in the C-3-O(SD) District, and subject to the pricing conditions of

	Section 155(g).
NON-RESIDENTIAL USES IN DISTRICTS OTHER THAN C-3	
Non-residential, non-office uses in PDR-1-D, PDR-1-G, and UMU Districts	P up to 50% greater than indicated for the uses specified below. *NP above preceding ratio.*
Agricultural Use Category	
Greenhouse	*P up to 1.5 parking spaces for each 4,000 square feet of Occupied Floor Area. NP above preceding ratio.*
Entertainment, Arts, and Recreation Uses Category	
Entertainment, Arts, and Recreation Uses*	*P up to 1.5 parking spaces for each 200 square feet of Occupied Floor Area. NP above preceding ratio.*
Arts Activities, except theaters and auditoriums	~~*P up to one car for each 200 square feet of Occupied Floor Area.*~~ *P up to 1.5 parking spaces for each 2,000 square feet of Occupied Floor Area. NP above preceding ratio.*
Sports Stadium	P up to *1.0 parking space* ~~*one car*~~ for each 15 seats. *NP above preceding ratio.*
Theater or auditorium	P up to *1.0* ~~*one car*~~ *parking space* for each ~~*eight*~~ *8* seats up to 1,000 seats, plus ~~*one*~~ *1.0 parking space* for each 10 seats in excess of 1,000. *NP above preceding ratio.*
Industrial Uses Category	
Industrial Uses*	P up to ~~*one car*~~ *1.0 parking space* for each 1,500 square feet of Occupied Floor Area. *NP above preceding ratio.*
Small Enterprise Workspace	P up to ~~*one car*~~ *1.0 parking space* for each 1,500 square feet of Occupied Floor Area. *NP above preceding ratio.*
Live/Work Units	*P up to 1.5 parking spaces for each 2,000 square feet of Occupied Floor Area, except in RH or RM Districts, within which the requirement shall be 1.0 parking space for each Live/Work Unit. NP above*

	preceding ratio.
Institutional Uses Category	
Institutional Uses*	P up to ~~*one car*~~ *1.0 parking space* per 1,500 square feet of Occupied Floor Area. NP above *preceding ratio*.
Child Care Facility	P up to ~~*one car*~~ *1.0 parking space* for each 25 children ~~*to be accommodated at any one time*~~. *NP above preceding ratio.*
Hospital	P up to ~~*one car*~~ *1.0 parking space* for each 8 guest beds excluding bassinets or for each 2,400 square feet of Occupied Floor Area devoted to sleeping rooms, whichever results in the lesser requirement. *NP above preceding ratio.*
Post-Secondary Educational Institution	P up to ~~*one car*~~ *1.0 parking space* for each ~~*two*~~ *2* classrooms. *NP above preceding ratio.*
Religious Institution	P up to ~~*one car*~~ *1.0 parking space* for each 20 seats. *NP above preceding ratio.*
Residential Care Facility	P up to ~~*one car*~~ *1.0 parking space* for each 10 beds. *NP above preceding ratio.*
School	P up to ~~*one car*~~ *1.0 parking space* for each ~~*six*~~ *6* classrooms. *NP above preceding ratio.*
Trade School	P up to ~~*one car*~~ *1.0 parking space* for each ~~*two*~~ *2* classrooms. *NP above preceding ratio.*
Sales and Services Category	
Retail Sales and Services*	P up to ~~*one car*~~ *1.0 parking space* for each 500 square feet of Occupied Floor Area. ~~*up to 20,000 square feet, plus one car for each 250 square feet of Occupied Floor Area in excess of 20,000.*~~ *NP above preceding ratio.*
Eating and Drinking Uses	P up to *1.25 parking spaces* ~~*one car*~~ for each *500* ~~*200*~~ square feet of Occupied Floor Area. *NP above preceding ratio.*

All retail in the Eastern Neighborhoods Mixed Use Districts where any portion of the parcel is within the Central SoMa Special Use District or is less than *one-quarter* ~~*1/4*~~ mile from Market, Mission, 3rd Streets and 4th Street north of Berry Street, except grocery stores of over 20,000 gross square feet.	P up to ~~*one*~~ *1.0 parking space* for each 1,500 square feet of Gross Floor Area. *NP above preceding ratio.*
General Grocery uses with over 20,000 square feet of Occupied Floor Area	P up to ~~*one car*~~ *1.0 parking space* per 500 square feet of Occupied Floor Area, and subject to the conditions of Section 303(u)(2). C up to ~~*one car*~~ *1.0 parking space* per 250 square feet of Occupied Floor Area ~~*for that area in excess of 20,000 square feet*~~, subject to the conditions and criteria of Section 303(t)(2). NP above *preceding ratio*.
Health Service	P up to *1.0* ~~*one*~~ *parking space* for each 300 square feet of Occupied Floor Area. *NP above preceding ratio.*
Hotel*s in Districts other than NC*	P up to ~~*one car*~~ *1.0 parking space* for each 16 guest bedrooms, plus ~~*one*~~ *1.0 parking space* for the manager's Dwelling Unit, if any. *NP above preceding ratio.*
Hotels in NC Districts	*P up to 1.2 parking spaces for each guest bedroom. NP above preceding ratio.*
Limited Corner Commercial Uses in *RH, RTO-1,* RTO-*M* and RM districts authorized under Section 231.	None permitted.
Mortuary	P up to *5.0 parking spaces.* ~~*five cars.*~~ *NP above preceding ratio.*
Motel	P up to *1.0 parking space* ~~*one car*~~ for each guest unit, plus ~~*one*~~ *1.0 parking space* for the manager's Dwelling Unit, if any. *NP above preceding ratio.*
Retail *Greenhouse or* plant nursery	P up to ~~*one car*~~ *1.0 parking space* for each 4,000 square feet of Occupied Floor Area. Such uses exceeding 20,000 square feet shall be

	subject to the conditions of Section 303(u)(2). *NP above preceding ratio.*
Retail space devoted to the handling of bulky merchandise such as motor vehicles, machinery, or furniture	P up to ~~*one car*~~ *1.0 parking space* for each 1,000 square feet of Occupied Floor Area. Such uses exceeding 20,000 square feet shall be subject to the conditions of Section 303(u)(2). *NP above preceding ratio.*
Self-Storage	P up to ~~*one car*~~ *1.0 parking space* for each ~~*three*~~ *3* self-storage units. *NP above preceding ratio.*
Non-Retail Sales and Services*	P up to ~~*one car*~~ *1.0 parking space* per 1,500 square feet of Occupied Floor Area. *NP above preceding ratio.*
Commercial Storage or Wholesale Storage	P up to ~~*one car*~~ *1.0 parking space* for each 2,000 square feet of Occupied Floor Area. *NP above preceding ratio.*
Office (unless otherwise specified below)	*P up to 1.25 parking spaces for each 500 square feet of Occupied Floor Area. NP above preceding ratio.*
Office uses in DTR, SPD, MUG, WMUG, MUR, WMUO, and MUO Districts	P up to 7% of the Occupied Floor Area of such uses and subject to the pricing conditions of Section 155(g); NP above *preceding ratio.*.
Office uses in the Central SoMa Special Use District	P up to ~~*one car*~~ *1.0 parking space* per 3,500 square feet of Occupied Floor Area. *NP above preceding ratio.*
Office uses in Chinatown Mixed Use Districts	P up to 7% of the Occupied Floor Area of such uses; NP above *preceding ratio*.
Office uses in M-1, UMU, SALI, PDR-1-D, and PDR-1-G Districts, except as specified below	P up to ~~*one car*~~ *1.0 parking space* per 1,000 square feet of Occupied Floor Area and subject to the pricing conditions of Section 155(g); NP above *preceding ratio*.
Office uses in M-1, UMU, SALI, PDR-1-D, and PDR-1-G Districts where the entire parcel is greater than *one-quarter* ~~¼~~ mile from Market, Mission, 3rd Streets and 4th Street north of Berry Street	P up to ~~*one car*~~ *1.0 parking space* per 500 square feet of Occupied Floor Area; NP above *preceding ratio*.

Utility and Infrastructure Uses Category	
Utility and Infrastructure Uses	P up to ~~*one car*~~ *1.0 parking space* per 1,500 square feet of Occupied Floor Area. NP above *preceding ratio*.

* Not listed below

*(e) **Non-Residential Uses.** Unless otherwise specified in Tables 151.1-1 or 151.1-2, or elsewhere in this Section 151.1, the maximum accessory parking permitted for non-residential uses shall be one of the following:*

(1) One parking space per 2,000 square feet of Occupied Floor Area of use; or

(2) Three parking spaces where the use or activity has no Occupied Floor Area.

(*f*~~e~~) **Excess Residential Parking.** Any request for accessory residential parking, in excess of what is principally permitted in Table*s* 151.1-*1 and 151.1-2*, shall be reviewed by the Planning Commission as a Conditional Use*, provided that the request does not exceed the maximum amount stated in Tables 151.1-1 and 151.1-2*. In MUG, WMUG, MUR, MUO, RED, RED-MX, and SPD Districts, any project subject to Section 329 and that requests residential accessory parking in excess of that which is principally permitted in Table*s* 151.1-*1 and 151.1-2*, but which does not exceed the maximum amount stated in Table*s* 151.1-*1 and 151.1-2*, shall be reviewed by the Planning Commission according to the procedures of Section 329. Projects that are not subject to Section 329 shall be reviewed under the procedures detailed in subsection (*g*) below.

(*f*~~g~~) **Small Residential Projects in MUG, WMUG, MUR, MUO, CMUO, WMUO, RED, RED-MX, and SPD Districts**. Any project that is not subject to the requirements of Section 329 and that requests residential accessory parking in excess of what is principally permitted in Table*s* 151.1-*1 and 151.1-2* shall be reviewed by the Zoning Administrator subject to Section 307(i). The Zoning Administrator may grant parking in excess of what is principally permitted in Table*s* 151.1-*1 and 151.1-2*, not to exceed the maximum amount stated in Table*s* 151.1-*1*

and 151.1-2, only if the Zoning Administrator determines that:

(1) all the following conditions have been met:

(A) Vehicle movement on or around the project does not unduly impact pedestrian spaces or movement, transit service, bicycle movement, or the overall traffic movement in the district;

(B) Accommodating excess accessory parking does not degrade the overall urban design quality of the project proposal;

(C) All above-grade parking is architecturally screened and lined with active uses according to the standards of Section 145.1, and the project sponsor is not requesting any exceptions or variances requiring such treatments elsewhere in this Code; and

(D) Excess accessory parking does not diminish the quality and viability of existing or planned streetscape enhancements;

(2) parking is not accessed from any protected Transit or Pedestrian Street described in Section 155(r), and

(3) where more than 10 spaces are proposed at least half of them, rounded down to the nearest whole number, are stored and accessed by mechanical stackers or lifts, valet, or other space-efficient means that reduces space used for parking and maneuvering, and maximizes other uses.

~~*(g) **Excess Parking for Non-Residential Uses greater than 20,000 square feet.** Where permitted by Table 151.1 for a Non-Residential Use greater than 20,000 square feet, any request for accessory parking in excess of what is principally permitted in Table 151.1, but which does not exceed the maximum amount stated in Table 151.1, shall be reviewed by the Planning Commission as a Conditional Use.*~~

*(h) **Transit-Oriented Communities Parking Limits.** Consistent with the Transit-Oriented Communities Policies of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, this Section 151.1 implements*

the maximum parking limits based on the presence of certain transit services within one-half mile of the development. Notwithstanding the provisions of Table 151.1-2, if any portion of the subject development falls within the geographic areas listed in Table 151.1-2, the lower of the maximum limits in either Table 151.1-1 or Table 151.1-2 shall apply as the maximum amount of parking.

Table 151.1-2

MAXIMUM PARKING LIMITS FOR TRANSIT STATION AREAS

Geographic Area	*Maximum Residential Parking per Dwelling Unit **	*Maximum Parking for Non-Retail Sales and Service Uses (including all Office and Laboratory uses) and Retail Sales and Service Uses, except for any use also classified as a Production, Distribution, and Repair Use.*
*Transit-Oriented Communities Tier 1: Sites within a half-mile of Embarcadero, Montgomery, Powell, or Civic Center BART stations; and Salesforce Transbay Transit Center.***	*0.375 parking space for each Dwelling Unit.*	*0.25 parking spaces per 1,000 square feet of Occupied Floor Area.*
Transit-Oriented Communities Tier 2: Sites within a half-mile of 16th Street, 24th Street, Glen Park, or Balboa Park BART	*0.5 parking spaces for each Dwelling Unit.*	*1.6 parking spaces per 1,000 square feet of Occupied Floor Area.*

*stations.***		
*Transit-Oriented Communities Tier 3: Sites within a half-mile of all Muni rail stops on the F, J, K, L, M, N, or T lines; Caltrain Stations; and Van Ness Bus Rapid Transit Stops (i.e., stops on Van Ness Avenue between and including Market Street and Union Street).***	*1.0 parking space for each Dwelling Unit.*	*2.5 parking spaces per 1,000 square feet of Occupied Floor Area.*
*Transit-Oriented Communities Tier 4: Sites within a half-mile of all ferry terminals, including the Ferry Building, 16th Street/Mission Bay, and Treasure Island.***	*1.0 parking space for each Dwelling Unit.*	*2.5 parking spaces per 1,000 square feet of Occupied Floor Area.*

** Refer to Table 151.1-1 for maximum parking limits applicable to Group Housing, including Group Housing projects in Transit Station Areas.*

*** As used in Table 151.1-2, the distance of one-half mile shall be measured in accordance with the methodology established by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission.*

SEC. 153. RULES FOR CALCULATION OF ~~*REQUIRED*~~ *PARKING* SPACES.

(a) In the calculation of off-street parking, freight loading spaces, and bicycle parking spaces *permitted or* required under Sections 151*.1*, 152, 152.1, 155.2, 155.3, and 155.4 of this

Code, *or pursuant to any Special Use District,* the following rules shall apply:

(1) In the case of mixed uses in the same structure, on the same lot, or in the same development, or more than one type of activity involved in the same use, the total ~~*requirements for*~~ *permitted* off-street parking and *requirements for* loading spaces shall be the sum of the requirements for the various uses or activities computed separately, including fractional values.

(2) Where an initial quantity of floor area, rooms, seats, or other form of measurement is exempted from ~~*off-street parking or*~~ loading requirements, such exemption shall apply only once to the aggregate of that form of measurement. If the initial exempted quantity is exceeded, for either a structure or a lot or a development, the requirement shall apply to the entire such structure, lot, or development, unless the contrary is specifically stated in this Code. In combining the requirements for use categories in mixed use buildings, all exemptions for initial quantities of square footage for the uses in question shall be disregarded, excepting the exemption for the initial quantity which is the least among all the uses in question.

(3) Where a structure or use is divided by a zoning district boundary line, the requirements as to quantity of ~~*off-street parking and*~~ loading spaces *and permitted off-street parking* shall be calculated in proportion to the amount of such structure or use located in each zoning district.

(4) Where seats are used as the form of measurement, each 22 inches of space on benches, pews and similar seating facilities shall be considered one seat.

(5) When the calculation of the ~~*required*~~ number of ~~*off-street parking or*~~ *required* freight loading *or permitted off-street parking* spaces results in a fractional number, a fraction of ~~*½*~~ *one-half* or more shall be adjusted to the next higher whole number of spaces, and a fraction of less than *one-half* ~~*½ may*~~ *shall* be disregarded, *except where the number of permitted spaces is*

less than one, in which case one parking space shall be permitted.

(6) In C-3, MUG, MUR, MUO, CMUO, and UMU *Districts*, substitution of two service vehicle spaces for each required off-street freight loading space may be made, provided that a minimum of 50*%* ~~*percent*~~ of the required number of spaces are provided for freight loading. Where the 50*%* ~~*percent*~~ allowable substitution results in a fraction, the fraction shall be disregarded.

(b) The requirements for off-street ~~*parking and*~~ loading *and permitted off-street parking* for any use not specifically mentioned in Sections 151*.1* and 152 shall be the same as for a use specified which is similar, as determined by the Zoning Administrator.

(c) For all uses and all districts covered by Section 151.1, the rules of calculation established by subsection (a) *of this Section 153* shall apply to the determination of maximum permitted spaces ~~*al*~~ allowed by Section 151.1.

SEC. 154. DIMENSIONS FOR OFF-STREET PARKING, FREIGHT LOADING, AND SERVICE VEHICLE SPACES.

(a) **Parking Spaces.** ~~*Required parking*~~ *Parking* spaces may be either independently accessible or space-efficient as described in *Section* 154(a)(4) and 154(a)(5), except as required elsewhere in the Building Code for spaces specifically designated for persons with physical disabilities. Space-efficient parking is encouraged.

(1) Each independently accessible off-street parking space ~~*shall have a minimum*~~ *measuring an* area of 144 square feet (8 feet by 18 feet) *shall count as* ~~*for*~~ a standard space and *measuring* 112.5 square feet ~~*for*~~ *shall count as* a compact space (7.5 feet by 15 feet), except for the types of parking spaces authorized by *subsection* ~~*Paragraph*~~ (a)(4) below and spaces specifically designated for persons with physical disabilities, the requirements for which are set forth in the Building Code. Every ~~*required*~~ *parking* space shall be of usable shape. The area

of any such space shall be exclusive of driveways, aisles, and maneuvering areas. ~~*The parking space requirements for the Bernal Heights Special Use District are set forth in Section 242.*~~

(2) Any ratio of standard spaces to compact spaces may be permitted, so long as compact car spaces are specifically marked and identified as a compact space. ~~*Special provisions relating to the Bernal Heights Special Use District are set forth in Section 242.*~~

(3) Off-street parking spaces in DTR, C-3, RTO, NCT, Eastern Neighborhoods Mixed Use, PDR-1-D, and PDR-1-G Districts shall have no ~~*minimum*~~ *defined* area or dimension requirements, except as required elsewhere in the Building Code for spaces specifically designated for persons with physical disabilities. For all uses in all Districts, ~~*for which there is no minimum off-street parking requirement, per Section 151.1,*~~ refer to *Sections 153 and* 151.1(c) for rules regarding calculation of parking spaces.

(4) *Permitted off-street parking* ~~*Parking*~~ spaces in mechanical parking structures that allow a vehicle to be accessed without having to move another vehicle under its own power shall be deemed to be independently accessible. Parking spaces that are accessed by a valet attendant and are subject to such conditions as may be imposed by the Zoning Administrator to insure the availability of attendant service at the time the vehicle may reasonably be needed or desired by the user ~~*for whom the space is required*~~, shall be deemed to be independently accessible. Any conditions imposed by the Zoning Administrator pursuant to this Section *154* shall be recorded as a Notice of Special Restriction.

(5) Space-efficient parking is parking in which vehicles are stored and accessed by valet, mechanical stackers or lifts, certain tandem spaces, or other space-efficient means. Tandem spaces shall ~~*only*~~ count ~~*towards satisfying the parking requirement*~~ *toward permitted off-street parking spaces* if no more than one car needs to be moved to access the desired parking space. ~~*Space-efficient parking is encouraged, and may be used to satisfy minimum parking requirements so long as the project sponsor can demonstrate that all required parking can be*~~

~~*accommodated by the means chosen.*~~

* * * *

SEC. 155. GENERAL STANDARDS AS TO LOCATION AND ARRANGEMENT OF OFF-STREET PARKING, FREIGHT LOADING, AND SERVICE VEHICLE FACILITIES.

Required off-street parking and freight loading facilities shall meet the following standards as to location and arrangement. Facilities which are not required but are actually provided shall also meet the following standards unless such standards are stated to be applicable solely to required facilities. In application of the standards of this Code for off-street parking and loading, reference may be made to provisions of other portions of the Municipal Code concerning off-street parking and loading facilities, and to standards of the Better Streets Plan and the Bureau of Engineering of the Department of Public Works. Final authority for the application of such standards under this Code, and for adoption of regulations and interpretations in furtherance of the stated provisions of this Code shall, however, rest with the Planning Department.

* * * *

(u) **Driveway and Loading Operations Plan (DLOP)** ~~***in the Central SoMa Special Use District and Van Ness & Market Residential Special Use District***~~**.**

(1) **Purpose.** The purpose of a Driveway and Loading Operations Plan (DLOP) is to reduce potential conflicts between driveway and loading operations, including passenger and freight loading activities, and pedestrians, bicycles, and vehicles, to maximize reliance of on-site loading spaces to accommodate new loading demand, and to ensure that off-site loading activity is considered in the design of new buildings.

(2) **Applicability.** Development projects of more than 100,000 net new *Gg*ross ~~*square feet*~~ *Floor Area* ~~*in the Central SoMa Special Use District and Van Ness & Market Residential*~~

~~*Special Use District*~~.

(3) **Requirement.** Applicable projects shall prepare a DLOP for review and approval by the Planning Department, in consultation with the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency. The DLOP shall be written in accordance with any guidelines issued by the Planning Department.

SEC. 155.2. BICYCLE PARKING: APPLICABILITY AND REQUIREMENTS FOR SPECIFIC USES.

* * * *

Table 155.2

BICYCLE PARKING SPACES REQUIRED

Use	**Minimum Number of Class 1 Spaces Required**	**Minimum Number of Class 2 Spaces Required**
RESIDENTIAL USES		
* * * *		
~~*Senior Housing or*~~ Dwelling Units dedicated to persons with physical disabilities	One Class 1 space for every 10 units or beds, whichever is applicable.	Minimum two spaces. Two Class 2 spaces for every 50 units or beds, whichever is applicable.
Senior Housing (Dwelling Units or Group Housing)	*One Class 1 space for every 20 units or beds, whichever is applicable. No Class 1 spaces are required for projects where the ratio would result in a requirement of less than 5*	*Two Class 2 spaces for every 100 units or beds, whichever is applicable.*

	spaces.	
* * * *		

* * * *

SEC. 161. EXEMPTIONS AND EXCEPTIONS FROM OFF-STREET PARKING, FREIGHT LOADING, AND SERVICE VEHICLE REQUIREMENTS.

The following exemptions shall apply to the requirements for off-street parking and loading spaces set forth in Sections 151*.1* through 155 of this Code. These provisions, as exemptions, shall be narrowly construed. Reductions or waivers by the Zoning Administrator permitted by this Section 161 shall be conducted pursuant to the procedures of Section 307(h)(2). Where exceptions in this Section *161* require approval by the Zoning Administrator, the Zoning Administrator shall consider the criteria of Section 307(i).

~~*(a) **Topography**. No off-street parking shall be required for a one-family or two-family dwelling where the lot on which such dwelling is located is entirely inaccessible by automobile because of topographic conditions.*~~

(~~b~~a) ~~***Parking or***~~ **Loading Across Very Wide Sidewalks.** No off-street ~~*parking or*~~ loading shall be required where access to the lot cannot be provided other than by means of a driveway across a sidewalk 25 feet or more in width from the curb to the front lot line which would cause serious disruption to pedestrian traffic.

(~~c~~b) **Joint Use of Off-Street Parking.** Joint use of the same off-street parking spaces ~~*to meet the requirements of this Code*~~ for two or more structures or uses *is* ~~*may be*~~ permitted~~*, where the normal hours of operation of such structures or uses are such as to assure the feasibility of such joint use of parking and where the total quantity of spaces provided is at least equal to the total of the required spaces for the structures or uses in operation at any given time*~~.

~~*(d) **Exceptions to Improve Conformity with Setbacks, Yards, Open Space, and Other***~~

~~***Requirements of the Code**. The Zoning Administrator may reduce or waive the off-street parking requirement for existing buildings if removal of parking and associated structures increases conformity with required front setbacks, side yards, and rear yards, increases conformity with open space or street frontage requirements, reduces or eliminates any nonconforming encroachment onto public rights-of-way or other public property or easement, and/or reduces or eliminates any other code nonconformity.~~

(~~e~~c) **Freight Loading and Service Vehicle Spaces.** In recognition of the fact that site constraints may make provision of required freight loading and service vehicle spaces impractical or undesirable, a reduction in or waiver of the provision of freight loading and service vehicle spaces for uses may be permitted, by the Zoning Administrator in all ~~d~~D districts, or in accordance with the provisions of Section 309 of this Code in C-3 Districts. In considering any such reduction or waiver, the following criteria shall be considered:

(1) Provision of freight loading and service vehicle spaces cannot be accomplished underground because site constraints will not permit ramps, elevators, turntables and maneuvering areas with reasonable safety;

(2) Provision of the required number of freight loading and service vehicle spaces on-site would result in the use of an unreasonable percentage of ground-floor area, and thereby preclude more desirable use of the ground floor for retail, pedestrian circulation or open space uses;

(3) A jointly used underground facility with access to a number of separate buildings and meeting the collective needs for freight loading and service vehicles for all uses in the buildings involved, cannot be provided; and

(4) Spaces for delivery functions can be provided at the adjacent curb without adverse effect on pedestrian circulation, transit operations or general traffic circulation, and off-street space permanently reserved for service vehicles is provided either on-site or in the immediate vicinity of the building.

(~~g~~d) **Historic Buildings.** There shall be no minimum off-street ~~*parking or*~~ loading requirements for any principal or Conditional Use located in (1) a landmark building designated per Article 10 of this Code, (2) a contributing building located within a designated historic district per Article 10, (3) any building designated Category I-IV per Article 11 of this Code, or (4) buildings listed on the National Register and/or California Register.

(~~h~~e) **Landmark and Significant Trees.** The required off-street ~~*parking and*~~ loading may be reduced or waived if the Zoning Administrator determines that provision of required ~~*off-street parking or*~~ loading would result in the loss of or damage to a designated Landmark Tree or Significant Tree, as defined in the Public Works Code. The Zoning Administrator's decision shall be governed by Section 307~~*(i)*~~ and shall require either (1) the recommendation of the Department of Public Works Bureau of Urban Forestry, or its successor agency, or (2) the recommendation of a certified arborist as documented in the subject tree's required tree protection plan.

(~~i~~f) **Geologic Hazards.** No off-street ~~*parking or*~~ loading shall be required where the Planning Department finds that required ~~*parking or*~~ loading cannot practically be provided without compromising the earthquake safety or geologic stability of a building and/or neighboring structures and properties.

(~~j~~g) **Protected Street Frontages and Transit Stops.** No off-street ~~*parking or*~~ loading is required on any lot whose sole feasible automobile access is across a protected street frontage identified in Section 155(r).

(~~k~~h) **Curbside Transit Lanes and Bikeways.** No off-street parking or loading is required on any lot whose sole feasible automobile access is across a curbside transit lane or bikeway.

SEC. 207.9. MINIMUM DWELLING UNIT DENSITIES AND MINIMUM OFFICE

INTENSITIES, USES "BY-RIGHT."

(a) ***Purpose.*** *This Section 207.9 establishes minimum residential and commercial density standards in Transit-Oriented Communities, as identified by the Metropolitan Transit Commission, and implements the City's Housing Element obligations pursuant to Government Code 65583, including requirements for both minimum densities and approval of certain projects on Housing Element Sites. Consistent with the Transit-Oriented Communities Policies of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, this Section establishes the minimum Dwelling Unit densities for residential development and minimum intensities for Office use. Consistent with Government Code Sections 65583.2(c), and (h), this Section permits certain types of housing projects as a "use by right," as that term is defined in Government Code Section 65583.2(i).*

(b) ***Minimum Dwelling Unit Density.***

(1) ***Applicability.***

(A) ***Transit-Oriented Community Tiers.*** *This Section 207.9 applies to all projects proposing new construction of one or more Residential Buildings on sites that do not already contain Residential uses unless such uses are demolished, and that are located in the geographic areas or satisfy the applicability criteria described in Table 207.9. These minimum residential densities shall apply only in zoning Districts where Residential uses are permitted. Changes of use of existing building space to Residential use, additions of Residential use to existing structures, and additions of Residential or Office uses to lots where such uses are already existing, and that are not proposed for demolition, are not subject to the requirements of this Section.*

(B) ***Housing Element Sites.*** *Residential projects on sites identified pursuant to Government Code Section 65583.2(c) and (h) in which at least 20% of the units are set aside to households with incomes at 80% of Area Median Income or lower shall be approved "by-right" as that term is defined in Government Code Section 65583.2(i).*

(2) ***Minimum Densities.*** *New construction proposing Dwelling Units on sites within*

the geographic areas described in Table 207.9 must provide at least the number of Dwelling Units specified in Table 207.9. Sites that meet more than one applicable Tier requirement in Table 207.9 shall comply with the higher minimum density. Fractions of units shall be rounded per Section 207(b)(1). For purposes of this Section 207.9, Accessory Dwelling Units shall count toward any minimum density requirement.

*(c) **Minimum Office Intensity.***

*(1) **Applicability.** This subsection (c) applies to all projects proposing new construction of Office use on sites that do not already contain Office uses, and that are located in the geographic areas or satisfy the applicability criteria described in Table 207.9; provided that the minimum Office intensities in this subsection (c) shall not exceed the amount of permissible Office use allowed in the District. These minimum densities shall only apply in Districts where Office uses are permitted. Changes of use of existing building space to Office use, additions of Office use to existing structures, and additions of Office uses to Lots where such uses are already existing, and that are not proposed for demolition are not subject to the requirements of this Section 207.9.*

*(2) **Minimum Intensity.** New construction proposing Office use on sites within the geographic areas described in Table 207.9 must comply with the FAR requirements in Table 207.9.*

Table 207.9

MINIMUM DENSITIES REQUIRED FOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT AND MINIMUM INTENSITIES FOR OFFICE USE

Applicability	***Minimum Dwelling Unit Density***	***Minimum Intensity for Office Use***
Transit-Oriented Communities Tier 1: Sites within a half-mile	*100 units per acre*	*Floor Area Ratio 4:1*

*of Embarcadero, Montgomery, Powell, or Civic Center BART stations; and Salesforce Transbay Transit Center.**		
*Transit-Oriented Communities Tier 2: Sites within a half-mile of 16th Street, 24th Street, Glen Park, or Balboa Park BART stations.**	*75 units per acre*	*Floor Area Ratio 3:1*
*Transit-Oriented Communities Tier 3: Sites within a half-mile of all Muni rail stops on the F, J, K, L, M, N, or T lines; Caltrain Stations; and Van Ness Bus Rapid Transit Stops (i.e. stops on Van Ness Avenue between and including Market Street and Union Street).**	*50 units per acre*	*Floor Area Ratio 2:1*
Transit-Oriented Communities Tier 4: Sites within a half-mile of all ferry terminals, including the Ferry Building, 16th Street/Mission Bay, and Treasure Island; and all other locations subject to the	*50 units per acre*	*Floor Area Ratio 1:1*

*applicability of Section 207.9.**		
*Sites identified as Reused Sites in the 2022 Housing Element Update.***	*50 units per acre*	*N/A*
*Sites identified as Appropriate for Very Low Income or Low Income Households in the 2022 Housing Element Update.****	*50 units per acre*	*N/A*

** As used in Table 207.9, the distance of one-half mile shall be measured in accordance with the methodology established by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission.*

*** Housing Projects in which at least 20% of the units are set aside to households with incomes at 80% of Area Median Income or lower on sites in this category shall be approved consistent with California Government Code Section 65583.2(c) and (i).*

**** Housing Projects in which at least 20% of the units are set aside to households with incomes at 80% of Area Median Income or lower on sites in this category shall be approved consistent with California Government Code Section 65583.2(h) and (i).*

*(d) **Gross Floor Area.** For purposes of determining the Gross Floor Area of a development Lot subject to this Section 207.9, the calculation shall exclude Gross Floor Area to be dedicated for publicly accessible streets. In instances where portions of a Lot are unbuildable due to topographic or geologic conditions, a development is proposed on only a portion of the Lot, or the Lot is otherwise constrained, the Zoning Administrator is authorized to determine that a smaller portion of a Lot shall serve as the development Lot.*

*(e) **Mixed-uses.** For purposes of determining minimum Residential Density and Office Intensity, as long as one of the land uses satisfies the minimum Residential Density and/or Office Intensity the*

respective land uses are prorated to comply individually.

(f) Conditional Use Authorizations for Projects that Fail to Comply with this Section. *Projects that fail to comply with the objective standards in this Section 207.9 shall be considered non-code-compliant. If not otherwise prohibited by the Code, a project may not comply with the minimum Residential Density and Office Intensity, if the Planning Commission approves a Conditional Use Authorization.*

SEC. 207.10. MAXIMUM DWELLING UNIT SIZE.

(a) ***Purpose.*** *To encourage new infill multi-family housing, limit the proliferation and expansion of large houses that do not increase the housing stock of moderately-priced units, support the preservation of existing housing that serves lower- and middle-income households, and encourage maximizing residential density, this Section 207.10 sets forth citywide maximum Dwelling Unit sizes.*

(b) ***Applicability.*** *This Section 207.10 applies to projects proposing to construct one or more Dwelling Units for which a Development Application is filed after January 31, 2026, and the project proposes any of the following:*

(1) construction of new Dwelling Unit(s), including the construction of a Dwelling Unit where an existing unit is proposed for demolition as defined in Section 317(b)(2);

(2) merger of two or more Dwelling Units as defined in Section 317(b)(7); or

(3) reduction in the number of existing Dwelling Units.

(c) ***Requirements.*** *Any project that meets one or more of the criteria in subsection (b) shall be restricted to a maximum Dwelling Unit size of 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1, whichever is greater, except in the following conditions:*

(1) any new construction project of four to nine Dwelling Units, where not more than one Dwelling Unit exceeds 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area; or

(2) any new construction project of 10 or more Dwelling Units, where not more than 10% of such units exceed 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area.

(d) ***Conditional Use Authorizations for Projects that Fail to Comply with this Section.*** *Projects that fail to comply with the objective standards in this Section 207.10 shall be considered non-code-compliant. If not otherwise prohibited by the Code, a project may exceed the maximum Dwelling Unit size, without satisfying the conditions in subsection (c), if the Planning Commission approves a Conditional Use Authorization for the larger Dwelling Unit(s).*

(e) ***Conditional Use Criteria.*** *In addition to the criteria outlined in Planning Code Section 303(c), in acting upon an application for Conditional Use Authorization, the Planning Commission shall consider whether facts are presented to establish based on the record before the Commission, that all of the following criteria are met:*

(1) the proposed project meets applicable Residential Design Guidelines, Citywide Design Standards, and other applicable adopted guidelines or standards;

(2) the proposed project does not propose to reduce the size of any other existing Dwelling Unit or negatively impact the characteristics of a Residential Flat, as set forth in Section 317(g);

(3) the proposed project increases the number of Dwelling Units on the Lot and, if applicable, meets the applicable minimum density requirement under Section 207.9; and

(4) the proposed project will not have specific adverse impacts on a Historic Building as defined in Planning Code Section 102 or would render the property ineligible for historic designation as an individual or contributing resource.

(f) ***Calculation of Gross Floor Area.*** *For the purposes of this Section 207.10, the following shall apply in the calculation of a Dwelling Unit's total Gross Floor Area:*

(1) Gross Floor Area shall have the meaning set forth in Planning Code Section 401;

(2) Shared spaces and common areas in multi-unit buildings shall not be included;

(3) Storage areas, sheds, or other enclosed areas on the property that are accessory to and assigned to a specific Dwelling Unit but not contiguous with and directly accessible from the unit shall not be included; and

(4) Gross Floor Area shall include (A) all expansions of the Residential Building for which a building permit was issued within the previous 10 years, and (B) any Gross Floor Area resulting from construction performed without a validly issued permit regardless of the date of construction.

Section 9. Off-Street Parking and Curb Cuts. Article 1 and Article 2 of the Planning Code are hereby amended by revising Sections 155, 249.49, and 249.71, to read as follows

SEC. 155. GENERAL STANDARDS AS TO LOCATION AND ARRANGEMENT OF OFF-STREET PARKING, FREIGHT LOADING, AND SERVICE VEHICLE FACILITIES.

* * * *

(r) **Protected Pedestrian-, Cycling-, and Transit-Oriented Street Frontages.** In order to *protect and improve* ~~*preserve the*~~ pedestrian *and bicycle safety and transit service,* ~~*character of certain districts and to minimize delays to transit, service, garage entries, driveways, or other*~~ vehicular access to off-street parking or loading via curb cuts ~~*on development lots*~~ shall be regulated as set forth in this subsection (r). *However,* ~~*T*~~*t*hese limitations ~~*do*~~ *shall* not apply to the creation of new publicly-accessible Streets and Alleys. Any lot *where the only* ~~*whose sole feasible*~~ vehicular access is via a protected street frontage described in this subsection (r) shall be exempt~~*ed*~~ from any off-street ~~*parking or*~~ loading requirement found elsewhere in this Code*, unless a curb cut is otherwise authorized*.

*(1) **Curb Cuts Not Permitted.** No new or expanded curb cuts shall be permitted on the frontages listed in Table 155(r)(1) below:*

TABLE 155(r)(1). PROHIBITED STREET FRONTAGES
2nd Street from Market to Townsend Streets
3rd Street in the UMU District for 100 feet north and south of Mariposa Street and 100 feet north and south of 20th Street
3rd Street from Folsom Street to Townsend Street
4th Street from Folsom Street to Townsend Street
6th Street from Folsom Street to Brannan Street
6th Street for its entirety within the SoMa NCT District
9th Avenue from Lincoln Way to Judah Street in the Inner Sunset NC District
16th Street between Kansas and Mississippi Streets in the UMU and PDR-1-D Districts
16th Street between Guerrero and Capp Streets within the Valencia Street NCT and Mission Street NCT Districts
17th Street in the Castro Street NC District
18th Street in the Castro Street NC District
22nd Street between 3rd Street and Minnesota Streets within the NCT-2 District
24th Street in the 24th Street - Noe Valley NC District east of Castro Street
24th Street for the entirety of the 24th Street-Mission NCT District
All Alleys within the North Beach NCD and the Telegraph Hill-North Beach Residential SUD
All Alleys in the Chinatown Mixed Use Districts
Balboa Street from 35th Avenue to 38th Avenue
Brannan Street from 2nd Street to 6th Street
Broadway between Van Ness Avenue and Larkin Street
Broadway from the Embarcadero on the east to Polk Street on the west

Buchanan Street from Post Street to Sutter Street
Bush Street between Van Ness Avenue and Larkin Street
California Street between Van Ness Avenue and Hyde Street
Carl Street in the Cole Valley NC District
Castro Street in the Castro Street NC District
Chenery Street within the Glen Park NCT District
Chestnut Street from Divisadero Street to Fillmore Street
Church Street in the Upper Market Street NCT and NCT-3 Districts
Clement Street from Arguello Boulevard to Park Presidio Boulevard
Cole Street in the Cole Valley NC District
Columbus Avenue between Washington and North Point Streets
Destination Alleyways, as designated in the Downtown Streetscape Plan
Diamond Street within the Glen Park NCT District
Divisadero from Page to Oak Streets, from Fell to Grove Streets, and from Geary to Pine Streets
Ecker Alley in its entirety
Fillmore Street in the Upper Fillmore NC District
Folsom Street from 2nd Street to 13th Street
Folsom Street, from Second Street to The Embarcadero, except as permitted pursuant to Section 827
Geneva Avenue from I-280 to San Jose Avenue within the NCT-2 District
Grant Avenue between Columbus Avenue and Filbert Street
Green Street between Grant Avenue and Columbus/Stockton
Haight Street in the Lower Haight NC District and Haight Street NC District
Hayes Street from Franklin Street to Laguna Street
Howard Street from 5th Street to 13th Street

Hyde Street between California Street and Pine Street
Irving Street from 19th Avenue to 25th Avenue
Irving Street from 6th Avenue to 10th Avenue in the Inner Sunset NC District
Market Street for its entirety from The Embarcadero to Castro Street
Mission Street for the entirety of the Mission Street NCT District
Mission Street from The Embarcadero to Annie Street and from 10th Street to Division Street
Natoma Street from 300 feet westerly of 1st Street to 2nd Street
Ocean Avenue from Junipero Serra Boulevard to Lagunitas Drive in the Lakeside Village NC District
Ocean Avenue within the Ocean Avenue NCT District
Octavia Street from Hayes Street to Fell Street
Parnassus Avenue in the Cole Valley NC District
Pine Street between Van Ness Avenue and Larkin Street
Polk Street between Filbert Street and Golden Gate Avenue
Post Street, on the north side from Webster Street to Laguna Street and on the south side from Fillmore Street to Webster Street
Shaw Alley in its entirety
Taraval Street from 19th Avenue to 22nd Avenue
The Embarcadero (the western/inland side) between King and Jefferson Streets
The Embarcadero in the DTR Districts
Townsend Street from 2nd Street to 6th Street, except as permitted pursuant to Section 329(e)(3)(B)
Union Street from Fillmore Street to Octavia Street
Valencia Street between 15th and 23rd Streets in the Valencia Street NCT District
Van Ness Avenue from Hayes Street to Mission Street

*(2) **Protected Street Features.** No new or expanded curb cuts shall be permitted within the following street features:*

(A) An adjacent on-street curbside striped bus stop (e.g., curbside bus stop zones with striping or red curb) that has been approved by the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) Board of Directors;

(B) A transit bulb-out, as defined in the Better Streets Plan; or

(C) A transit boarding island, as defined in the Better Streets Plan, if vehicles accessing the curb cut would be required to cross over the boarding island.

*(3) **Corner Lots in the SALI District.** For corner lots in the SALI District, no new curb cut shall be permitted, nor any existing curb cut expanded, on any Street or Alley identified as an Alley in the Western SoMa Area Plan of the General Plan if any property on the same block with frontage along that Street or Alley is designated as a RED or RED-MX District.*

*(4) **Curb Cuts Requiring Planning Commission Approval.** In all zoning districts except RH, M, NC-S, P, PDR, and SALI, no new or expanded curb cuts shall be permitted on the frontages listed in Table 155(r)(4), unless approved by the Planning Commission through a Conditional Use Authorization pursuant to Planning Code Section 303. However, if the new or expanded curb cut is part of a project that requires Planning Commission approval under a separate section, such as Section 309 or 329, then the Planning Commission shall consider the curb cut as part of that approval. Regardless of the type of approval, in order to approve such a curb cut, the Planning Commission must make the findings required by Section 303(y). For projects within the C-3-0(SD) and the Central SoMa Special Use District, in no case shall such curb cut approval be granted where the proposed accessory parking would be greater than the amount principally permitted.*

*(A) **Protected Streets.** Planning Commission approval is required for any new or expanded curb cut that directly fronts any of the streets listed in Table 155(r)(4) below.*

Table 155(r)(4). PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVAL OF CURB CUTS
1st Street from Market to Folsom Street
5th Street from Howard Street to Townsend Street
16th Street in the RTO Districts
Beale Street from Market Street to Folsom Street
Bryant Street from 2nd Street to 6th Street
California Street in its entirety
Church Street in the RTO Districts
Dolores Street from Market Street to 16th Street
Duboce Street from Noe Street to Market Street
Fillmore Street from Hermann Street to Duboce Avenue
Folsom Street in the C-3 Districts
Fremont Street from Market Street to Folsom Street
Geary Street in the C-3 Districts
Grant Avenue from Market Street to Sacramento Street
Harrison Street from 2nd Street to 6th Street
Mission Street in the C-3 Districts
Montgomery Street from Market Street to Columbus Avenue
Noe Street from Duboce Avenue to Market Street
Octavia Street from Fell Street to Market Street
Powell Street in the C-3 Districts
Stockton Street in the C-3 Districts
The Embarcadero (eastern/water side) between Townsend and Taylor Streets
West Portal Avenue in the West Portal NC District

*(B) **Protected Street Types with Alternative Frontage.** Planning Commission approval is required for any new or expanded curb cut that directly fronts any of the following when an alternative street frontage is available:*

(i) Transit Preferential Streets designated in the Transportation Element;

(ii) Neighborhood Commercial Streets or Commercial Throughways defined by the Better Streets Plan; or

(iii) Bicycle routes or lanes as adopted by SFMTA Board of Directors.

On such bicycle routes or lanes where the bicycle facility is only on one side of the street, the curb cut restriction shall apply to the side of the street with the bicycle facility, and shall not apply to the opposite side of the street.

*(C) **Protected Street Types with No Alternative Frontage.** A new or expanded curb cut on street types listed in subsection (r)(4)(B) where no alternative frontage exists shall still require Planning Commission approval. However, in such cases the Planning Commission shall not make the findings of Section 303(y) and instead must find that the final design minimizes negative impacts to transit movement and to the safety of pedestrians and bicyclists to the fullest extent feasible.*

*(5) **Existing Curb Cuts.** Existing curb cuts on frontages listed in subsections (r)(1)-(r)(4) shall not be retained as part of a project that involves new construction, a building alteration that increases the Gross Floor Area of a structure by 20% or more, or a change of use affecting more than 50% of the structure's Gross Floor Area. However, the Planning Commission may allow retention or relocation of up to one existing curb cut along any of the site's frontages, through Conditional Use authorization or other applicable discretionary Planning Commission approval, provided that no existing curb cut shall be maintained if it is located in or affects a protected transit stop feature pursuant to subsection (r)(2), and no existing curb cut may be relocated to newly affect such features. In granting such approval, the Planning Commission must make the additional findings required under Planning Code Section 303(y) and must also find that (1) the project represents an increase in*

residential density and/or non-residential intensity that is appropriate to the site, such as its proximity to transit or its location within a mixed-use area; and (2) the proposed curb cut is necessary to support the project's scale and function, while being sited and designed to minimize to the fullest extent feasible negative impacts on pedestrian activity, street-level commercial activity, the movement of transit vehicles and passengers, and bicycle facilities.

(6) Sites owned by the City and County of San Francisco under the jurisdiction of the SFMTA are not subject to the provisions of this Section 155(r).

~~*(1) Folsom Street, from Second Street to The Embarcadero, not permitted except as set forth in Section 827.*~~

~~*(2) Not permitted:*~~

~~*(A) The entire portion of Market Street from The Embarcadero to Castro Street,*~~

~~*(B) Hayes Street from Franklin Street to Laguna Street, and Church Street in the NCT-3 and Upper Market NCT Districts,*~~

~~*(C) Van Ness Avenue from Hayes Street to Mission Street,*~~

~~*(D) Mission Street from The Embarcadero to Annie Street and from 10th Street to Division Street,*~~

~~*(E) Octavia Street from Hayes Street to Fell Street,*~~

~~*(F) Embarcadero in the DTR Districts,*~~

~~*(G) 22nd Street between 3rd Street and Minnesota Streets within the NCT-2 District,*~~

~~*(H) Valencia Street between 15th and 23rd Streets in the Valencia Street NCT District,*~~

~~*(I) Mission Street for the entirety of the Mission Street NCT District,*~~

~~*(J) 24th Street for the entirety of the 24th Street-Mission NCT,*~~

~~*(K) 16th Street between Guerrero and Capp Streets within the Valencia Street NCT and Mission Street NCT Districts,*~~

~~*(L) 16th Street between Kansas and Mississippi Streets in the UMU and PDR-1-D*~~

~~*Districts,*~~

~~*(M) 6th Street for its entirety within the SoMa NCT District,*~~

~~*(N) 3rd Street, in the UMU districts for 100 feet north and south of Mariposa and 100 feet north and south of 20th Streets,*~~

~~*(O) Ocean Avenue within the Ocean Avenue NCT District,*~~

~~*(P) Geneva Avenue from I-280 to San Jose Avenue within the NCT-2 District,*~~

~~*(Q) Columbus Avenue between Washington and North Point Streets,*~~

~~*(R) Broadway from the Embarcadero on the east to Polk Street on the west,*~~

~~*(S) All alleyways in the Chinatown Mixed Use Districts,*~~

~~*(T) Diamond Street within the Glen Park NCT District,*~~

~~*(U) Chenery Street within the Glen Park NCT District,*~~

~~*(V) Natoma Street from 300 feet westerly of 1st Street to 2nd Street,*~~

~~*(W) Ecker Alley in its entirety,*~~

~~*(X) Shaw Alley in its entirety,*~~

~~*(Y) 2nd Street from Market to Townsend Streets,*~~

~~*(Z) Destination Alleyways, as designated in the Downtown Streetscape Plan,*~~

~~*(AA) The western (inland) side of the Embarcadero between Townsend and Jefferson Streets,*~~

~~*(BB) Post Street, on the north side from Webster Street to Laguna Street and on the south side from Fillmore Street to Webster Street,*~~

~~*(CC) Buchanan Street from Post Street to Sutter Street,*~~

~~*(DD) Grant Avenue between Columbus Avenue and Filbert Street,*~~

~~*(EE) Green Street between Grant Avenue and Columbus/Stockton,*~~

~~*(FF) All Alleys within the North Beach NCD and the Telegraph Hill-North Beach Residential SUD,*~~

~~*(GG)1 Polk Street between Filbert Street and Golden Gate Avenue,*~~

~~*(HH) California Street between Van Ness Avenue and Hyde Street,*~~

~~*(II) Hyde Street between California Street and Pine Street,*~~

~~*(JJ) Broadway between Van Ness Avenue and Larkin Street,*~~

~~*(KK) Bush Street between Van Ness Avenue and Larkin Street,*~~

~~*(LL) Pine Street between Van Ness Avenue and Larkin Street, and*~~

~~*(MM) Howard Street from 5th Street to 13th Street,*~~

~~*(NN) Folsom Street from 2nd Street to 13th Street,*~~

~~*(OO) Brannan Street from 2nd Street to 6th Street,*~~

~~*(PP) Townsend Street from 2nd Street to 6th Street, except as permitted pursuant to Section 329(e)(3)(B),*~~

~~*(QQ) 3rd Street from Folsom Street to Townsend Street,*~~

~~*(RR) 4th Street from Folsom Street to Townsend Street, and*~~

~~*(SS) 6th Street from Folsom Street to Brannan Street.*~~

~~*(TT) No curb cut shall be permitted that directly fronts an adjacent on-street striped bus stop (e.g., bus stop zones with striping or red curb) that has been approved by the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) Board of Directors, transit bulb-out as defined in the Better Streets Plan, or on street frontage directly adjacent to a transit boarding island as defined in the Better Streets Plan if vehicles accessing the curb cut would be required to cross over the boarding island.*~~

~~*(3) Not permitted without Conditional Use authorization or Sections 309 or 329 exception. In the C-3-O(SD) and the Central SoMa Special Use Districts, the Planning Commission may grant permission for a new curb cut or an expansion of an existing one as an exception pursuant to Sections 309 or 329 in lieu of a Conditional Use authorization as long as the Commission makes the findings required under Section 303(y) and where the amount of parking proposed does not exceed the*~~

~~*amounts permitted as accessory according to Section 151.1. In addition, in the MUG, WMUG, MUR, MUO, RED, RED-MX, and SPD Districts, the Planning Commission may grant permission for a new curb cut or an expansion of an existing one as an exception pursuant to Section 329 in lieu of a Conditional Use authorization as long as the Commission makes the findings required under Section 303(y). A Planning Commission Conditional Use authorization subject to the additional findings under Section 303(y) is required to allow a new curb cut or expansion of an existing one on any other restricted street identified in this subsection 155(r)(3).*~~

~~*(A) Except as provided in Section 155(r), in all zoning districts except RH, M, NC-S, P, PDR, and SALI, no curb cuts accessing off-street parking or loading shall be created or expanded on street frontages identified along any Transit Preferential Street as designated in the Transportation Element of the General Plan, or Neighborhood Commercial Street and Commercial Throughways as defined in the Better Streets Plan, or any SFMTA Board of Directors adopted bicycle routes or lanes, where an alternative frontage is available. On such bicycles routes or lanes where the bicycle facility is only on one side of the street, the curb cut restriction shall apply to the side of the street with the bicycle facility, and shall not apply to the opposite side of the street.*~~

~~*(B) The entire portion of California Street,*~~

~~*(C) Folsom Street, Geary Street, Mission Street, Powell Street and Stockton Street in the C-3 Districts,*~~

~~*(D) Grant Avenue from Market Street to Sacramento Street,*~~

~~*(E) Montgomery Street from Market Street to Columbus Avenue,*~~

~~*(F) Church Street and 16th Street in the RTO District,*~~

~~*(G) Duboce Street from Noe Street to Market Street,*~~

~~*(H) Octavia Street from Fell Street to Market Street,*~~

~~*(I) 1st, Fremont and Beale Streets from Market to Folsom Street,*~~

~~*(J) The eastern (water) side of The Embarcadero between Townsend and Taylor Streets,*~~

~~(K) Fillmore Street from Hermann Street to Duboce Avenue,~~

~~(L) Noe Street from Duboce Avenue to Market Street, and~~

~~(M) Dolores Street from Market Street to 16th Street.~~

~~(N) Harrison Street from 2nd Street to 6th Street,~~

~~(O) Bryant Street from 2nd Street to 6th Street, and~~

~~(P) 5th Street from Howard Street to Townsend Street.~~

~~(4) In all zoning districts except RH, M, NC-S, P, PDR, and SALI, where an alternative frontage is not available, parking or loading access along any Transit Preferential Street as designated in the Transportation Element of the General Plan, or Neighborhood Commercial Street or Commercial Throughways defined in the Better Streets Plan, or any SFMTA Board of Directors adopted bicycle routes or lanes, may be allowed on streets not listed in subsection (r)(2) above as an exception in the manner provided in Section 309 for C-3-O(SD) Districts, Section 329 for Mixed-Use Districts, and in Section 303 for all other Districts in cases where the Planning Commission can determine that the final design of the parking access minimizes negative impacts to transit movement and to the safety of pedestrians and bicyclists to the fullest extent feasible.~~

~~(5) Corner lots in the SALI District. For corner lots in the SALI District, no new curb cut shall be permitted, nor any existing curb cut expanded, on any Street or Alley identified as an alley in the Western SoMa Area Plan of the General Plan if any property on the same block with frontage along that Street or Alley is designated as a RED or RED-MX District.~~

~~(6) A "development lot" shall mean any lot containing a proposal for new construction, building alterations which would increase the gross square footage of a structure by 20 percent or more, or change of use of more than 50 percent of the gross floor area of a structure containing parking. Pre-existing access to off-street parking and loading on development lots that violates the restrictions of this Section 155(r) may not be maintained.~~

* * * *

(t) **Garage Additions in the North Beach Neighborhood Commercial District, North Beach-Telegraph Hill Residential Special Use District, and Chinatown Mixed Use Districts.** Notwithstanding any other provision of this Code to the contrary, a mandatory discretionary review hearing by the Planning Commission is required in order to install a garage in an existing or proposed structure of two units or more in the North Beach NCD, the North Beach-Telegraph Hill Residential SUD, and the Chinatown Mixed Use Districts.

In order to approve the installation of any garage in these districts, the City shall find that: (1) the proposed garage opening/addition of off-street parking will not cause the elimination or reduction of ground-story retail or commercial space; (2) the proposed garage opening/addition of off-street parking will not eliminate or decrease the square footage of any ~~d~~*Dwelling* ~~u~~*Unit*, (3) the building has not had two or more evictions with each eviction associated with a separate ~~u~~*Dwelling Unit*(s) within the past *10* ~~ten~~ years, and (4) the garage would not front on an Alley pursuant to Section 155(r)~~(2)~~*(1)* of this Code or on a public right-of-way narrower than 41 feet, and (5) the proposed garage/addition of off-street parking is consistent with the Priority Policies of Section 101.1 of this Code. Prior to the issuance of notification under Section 311 or 312 of this Code, the Department shall require a signed affidavit by the project sponsor attesting to (1), (2), and (3) above, which the Department shall independently verify, and the Department shall determine whether the project complies with subsection (4) above. If the project sponsor does not provide such signed affidavit, or the garage would front on an Alley or on a public right-of-way narrower than 41 feet, the Department shall disapprove the application and no Planning Commission hearing shall be required.

* * * *

SEC. 249.49. TELEGRAPH HILL – NORTH BEACH RESIDENTIAL SPECIAL USE

DISTRICT.

* * * *

(c) **Controls.**

* * * *

(2) **Installation of a Parking Garage.** Installation of a garage in an existing or proposed residential building of two or more units requires a mandatory discretionary review hearing by the Planning Commission. In order to approve the installation of any garage in these districts, the Commission shall find that: (1) the proposed garage opening/addition of off-street parking will not cause the elimination or reduction of ground-story retail or commercial space; (2) the proposed garage opening/addition of off-street parking will not eliminate or decrease the square footage of any dwelling unit; (3) the building has not had two or more evictions within the past 10 years, with each eviction associated with a separate unit(s), (4) the garage would not front on an Alley pursuant to Section 155(r)~~*(2)*~~*(1)* of this Code or on a public right-of-way narrower than 41 feet, and (5) the proposed garage opening/ addition of off-street parking is consistent with the Priority Policies of Section 101.1 of this Code.

* * * *

SEC. 249.71. YERBA BUENA CENTER MIXED-USE SPECIAL USE DISTRICT.

* * * *

(c) **Use Controls.** The following provisions shall apply to the special use district:

* * * *

(8) **Protected Street Frontages.**

(A) Section 155(r)~~*(3)*~~*(4)(A)-(B)* shall not apply within the special use district.

(B) For the purposes of Section 155(r)(4)*(C)*, the project does not have alternative frontage to Third Street and Mission Street, and therefore curb cuts accessing off-street parking or loading off Third Street and Mission Street may be permitted as an exception pursuant to Section 309 and Section 155(r)(4)*(C)*.

* * * *

Section 10. San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Special Use District. Article 2 of the Planning Code is hereby amended by adding Section 249.11, to read as follows:

SEC. 249.11 NON-CONTIGUOUS SAN FRANCISCO MUNICIPAL TRANSPORTATION AGENCY SITES SPECIAL USE DISTRICT.

*(a) **Purpose** and Findings.*

(1) There shall be a non-contiguous Special Use District ("SUD") for sites owned by the City and County of San Francisco and under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) to enable SFMTA to use the sites for transportation and other Public uses as well as uses permitted by the underlying zoning district. This SUD also enables mixed-use residential development with characteristics not accommodated by underlying zoning.

(2) The SUD facilitates the SFMTA's Joint Development Program Goals and Policy ("Program Policy"), approved by the SFMTA's Board of Directors on February 4, 2025 in Resolution No. 250204-010. The Program Policy guides SFMTA decision making, and, consistent with state and local law, requires the provision of affordable housing and open, competitive solicitation processes for the residential development of large sites in the SFMTA portfolio. The Program Policy guides SFMTA's approach to development of the sites within the SUD to maximize community development, housing affordability, and green sustainable development goals, as urged by the Board of Supervisors in Resolution No. 87-25. The development of 100% affordable housing within the SUD, particularly on sites located within

the Priority Equity Geographies (Section 249.97), should be prioritized where transit uses or other on-site development that supports neighborhood needs—such as improved access to services, infrastructure, or economic opportunity—are not feasible. The SUD facilitates these housing, equity, and sustainability goals by providing for a diversity of land use types and building characteristics.

*(b) **Applicability.** The provisions in this Section 249.11 shall apply to the following Assessor's Block/Lots: 0019/001; 0490/009, 010, 011, 012, 013; 0635/009, 009A; 0669/012; 1072/001; 1439/035, 036, 045, 048, 049; 1440/028, 029, 030; 1453/020; 1526/002, 028, 028A; ~~1596/044, 045~~; 1730/050; 1763/044; 2647/034, 017; 2864/050; 2979A/002, 034; 2988A/007; 3582/087; 6507/023; 6972/036; 7225/013; 7226/016. Notwithstanding Planning Code Section 206.10, which prohibits projects within SUDs that implement Development Agreements from using the HC-SF Program, residential development projects within this SUD may use the HC-SF Program even when such development is associated with a Development Agreement, Project Agreement or other similar agreement.*

*(c) **General Controls.***

*(1) **Permitted Uses.** In addition to any uses permitted by the zoning district in which the lot is located, uses permitted under Section 211.1 shall be principally permitted and uses conditionally permitted under 211.2 shall be conditionally permitted. Where there is a conflict between land use controls in the underlying zoning district and those in Sections 211.1 or 211.2, the more permissive control shall apply.*

*(2) **Residential Density.** Maximum residential density limits or Floor Area Ratio limits shall not apply to Residential Uses in the SUD. Form Based density shall apply to Residential Uses in the SUD.*

*(3) **Measurement of Height.** Notwithstanding Planning Code Section 260(a) regarding Method of Measurement, the height of a structure containing a Public Facility may be measured from the centerline of such structure along any frontage for that structure's entire depth.*

*(4) **Bulk and Lot Coverage.** For Development projects that are in height districts that allow heights of 400 feet or greater, and are using the HC-SF Program in Section 206.10, the following bulk controls and lot coverage provisions shall apply:*

(A) Notwithstanding Sections 270(i)(1)(A)(i) and 270(i)(1)(B)(i) no setbacks are required for interior property lines abutting lots with a Public Facility.

(B) Below a height of 85 feet, no rear yard or lot coverage limits shall apply. For portions of a building between 85 feet in height and 120 feet in height, the bulk controls of Section 270(i) shall not apply; rather, for a lot that does not include a Public Facility, the lot coverage shall be limited to 60% of the lot area.

(C) For portions of a building above 120 feet in height (herein "above the podium"), building mass may be provided in up to two towers that meet the bulk limits of Section 270(i)(1). However, the following exceptions to Section 270(i)(1) shall apply:

(i) Tower separation may be reduced to not less than 50 feet if the height of the shorter tower above the podium is no taller than one-half the height of the taller tower above the podium.

(ii) A tower's average floorplate above the podium shall be no larger than 14,000 square feet.

(iii) If there are two towers, one of the towers shall not be taller than 360 feet.

(iv) The combined maximum gross floor area of two towers, measured for floors between 120 feet and 360 feet in height shall be limited to 576,000 square feet.

(v) The average floorplate for the top 1/3 portion of a tower above the podium shall be reduced in square footage by 10% from the average floorplate of the lower 2/3 portion of the tower, and the allowed maximum dimensions in Section 270(i)(B) for such top 1/3 portion of the tower shall be reduced by 5% from the lower 2/3 portion of the tower.

(vi) The standards in this subsection (c)(4)(C) are not eligible for the reduction or modification of standards in Section 206.10(d)(1)(M).

*(5) **Open Space.** Section 135 shall apply, except as follows:*

*(A) **On-Site Publicly Accessible Usable Open Space.** The usable open space requirement may be met for projects subject to the SUD with on-site publicly accessible usable open space, including open space otherwise required by Planning Code Section 270.3. When on-site publicly accessible usable open space is provided, the maintenance, information plaque, and liability provisions of Section 270.3(e) shall apply.*

*(B) **Off-Site Publicly Accessible Usable Open Space.** When additional off-site improvements are made to meet the usable open space requirement, including improvements on adjacent sidewalks and public rights-of-way, such open space improvements shall comply with all applicable regulations of the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency, San Francisco Art Commission, the Department of Public Works, the Bureau of Light, Heat and Power of the Public Utility Commission, or any other public agency, as applicable. The property owner shall maintain all such improvements and meet the liability provisions of Section 270.3(e) for the life of the project.*

*(6) **Development Impact Fees.** For a development project on land subject to the SUD:*

(A) With the recommendation of the SFMTA Board of Directors, the Board of Supervisors may waive all or a portion of any applicable Transportation Sustainability Fee under Section 411A, and all or a portion of any applicable Jobs-Housing Linkage Program requirements under Section 413.

(B) The provisions of Section 415 et seq., as amended or replaced from time to time, shall apply. Notwithstanding Section 415.6(h)(1), a development project may receive development subsidies if the development provides the same number of on-site affordable units as required by the applicable on-site affordable housing requirement in Section 415 et seq., or any temporary reduction as set forth in Sections 415A et seq. or 415B et seq., plus an additional number of on-site affordable

units equal to 25% of the applicable on-site affordable units. Additional units shall be provided as affordable to households at or below 80% of Area Median Income. Any units required to be affordable to middle- or moderate-income households under Sections 415.6(a), 415A, or 415B, as applicable, or this subsection 249.11(c)(6)(B), may instead be affordable to moderate- or low-income households. Notwithstanding Section 415.6(f)(1), the moderate and low income units may be located anywhere in the project.

(d) Pre-Application Requirements. When a Development Application is submitted pursuant to this Section 249.11, the project sponsor, in conjunction with SFMTA, shall provide:

(1) A feasibility study that models the development of the project site as 100% affordable housing, as that term is defined in Section 406(b)(1)(A) and (C);

(2) Documentation that the project sponsor, in conjunction with SFMTA, has conducted at least one pre-application meeting. Mailed notice of the meeting shall be provided to the individuals and neighborhood organizations specified in Planning Code Section 333(e)(2)(A) and (C), as well as posted notice as set forth in Planning Code Section 333(e)(1). The Planning Department may establish procedures and requirements to administer this subsection; and

(3) Documentation of how the project advances the City's goals for affordable housing on public lands, as identified in Housing Element Policy Actions 1.2.6 and 1.2.7.

Section 11. Displaced Businesses. Article 2 of the Planning Code is hereby amended by adding Section 202.17, to read as follows:

SEC. 202.17. PERMITTED USES AND USE SIZE LIMITS FOR DISPLACED BUSINESSES; NOTICE REQUIREMENT.

*(a) **Purpose.** It is to the general benefit of the people of San Francisco and the unique*

character of the City and its neighborhoods to retain commercially viable businesses that are forced to close and relocate for a variety of reasons, including but not limited to new development, escalating commercial rent, or other economic hardship. The provisions of this Section 202.17 are intended to streamline and increase opportunities for Displaced Businesses to relocate within the City, but do not override any controls enacted by voter initiative.

(b) ***Definitions.*** *The following definitions shall apply to this Section 202.17.*

New Location *means the site or location where a Displaced Business seeks to be permitted.*

Prior Location *means the place of operation where a Displaced Business was lawfully permitted and operated for at least five years prior to relocating to the New Location.*

Displaced Business *means a commercial or institutional use with less than 50,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area, whose lease expired and was not renewed, or was otherwise terminated by the property owner, and submits a complete Development Application to relocate to a New Location within five years of the property owner submitting a complete Development Application for development at the site of the Prior Location. Any Displaced Business shall not be considered a Displaced Business upon the Department's approval of the first Development Application to relocate to the New Location.*

(c) ***Controls.***

(1) ***Conditional Use Authorization Not Required.*** *Notwithstanding any other provision of this Code, if the use and use size associated with a Displaced Business is either principally or conditionally permitted in the zoning district of the New Location, the use and use size of the Displaced Business shall be principally permitted. In no event shall this subsection be construed to permit a use or use size that is not permitted in the zoning district of a proposed New Location, or to allow Formula Retail uses in the Neighborhood Commercial Districts without Conditional Use authorization.*

(2) ***No Development Impact Fees.*** *A relocating Displaced Business shall not be subject*

to fees pursuant to Article 4.

*(d) **Notice of Development Applications to Existing Businesses.** Within 15 days of determining that a Development Application is complete or deemed complete, if the Development Application is proposed at a property where there is an existing commercial or industrial use with less than 50,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area, the Department shall provide mailed and electronic notice of the Development Application to the existing non-residential tenant and the Office of Small Business. This provision does not increase or decrease the rights or obligations of the property owner or non-residential tenant pursuant to a private agreement, such as a lease.*

Section 12. Miscellaneous Amendments. These amendments are related to the Housing Element rezoning, and include other code changes to streamline the consideration of housing projects. Articles 1, 1.2, 2, and 3 of the Planning Code are hereby amended by revising Sections 102, 202.2, 306.1, 311 and 317, and deleting Sections 140.1, 206.5, and 318, to read as follows.

SEC. 102. DEFINITIONS.

* * * *

DBI. The San Francisco Department of Building Inspection or its successor.

Density, Form-Based. *A type of residential density where the maximum number of residential units is not numerically limited by lot or lot area but by the number of units that could be built within the volume of a proposed development that complies with all applicable Planning Code requirements and Objective Standards. Such requirements and standards include, but are not limited to, Height, Bulk, Rear Yard, Lot Coverage, Setbacks, Open Space, Dwelling Unit Exposure, and Dwelling Unit Mix.*

Density, Numeric. *A type of residential density where the permitted maximum number of residential units is calculated based on a specified number of units per lot, or number of units per lot*

area.

* * * *

Objective Standard. *A standard that does not involve personal or subjective judgment and is publicly available and uniformly verifiable by reference to a benchmark or criterion and knowable, including but not limited to those in the Planning Code or any applicable standards adopted by the Planning Commission, Zoning Administrator, or Board of Supervisors (by ordinance), which are under the purview of the Planning Commission, Planning Department, or Zoning Administrator, including any Citywide Design Standards.*

Occupied Floor Area. See Floor Area, Occupied.

* * * *

Residential Care Facility. An Institutional Healthcare Use providing lodging, board, and care for a period of 24 hours or more to persons in need of specialized aid by personnel licensed by the State of California. Such facility shall display nothing on or near the facility that gives an outward indication of the nature of the occupancy except for a sign as permitted by Article 6 of this Code, shall not provide outpatient services, and shall be located in a structure which remains residential in character. Such facilities shall include, but not necessarily be limited to, a board and care home, family care home, long-term nursery, orphanage, rest home or home for the treatment of addictive, contagious or other diseases, or psychological disorders.

Residential Flat. *A Residential Unit in a building containing two or more Dwelling Units, that has contiguous habitable space that extends the full depth of the building on the same story from the front street-facing façade to the rear of the building, and has windows or doorways on both front and rear facades from at least one habitable room that is not a hallway.*

* * * *

~~***SEC. 140.1. COMMON AREA REQUIREMENT FOR EFFICIENCY DWELLING UNITS WITH REDUCED SQUARE FOOTAGE.***~~

~~*Buildings with 20 or more Efficiency Dwelling Units with reduced square footage, as defined in Section 318 of this Code, shall include at least one common room for use by the residents. Such common room(s) may be used as study or reading rooms, shared kitchen or dining facilities, media rooms, game rooms, fitness facilities, or similar uses appropriate to the needs of residents. Interior common areas shall be of sufficient size to reasonably accommodate residents' needs, but in no event shall the area required be less than ten square feet per unit.*~~

SEC. 202.2. LOCATION AND OPERATING CONDITIONS.

* * * *

(f) **Residential Uses.** The Residential Uses listed below shall be subject to the corresponding conditions:

(1) **Senior Housing.** To qualify as Senior Housing, as defined in Section 102 of this Code, the following definitions shall apply and shall have the same meaning as the definitions in California Civil Code Sections 51.2, 51.3, and 51.4, as amended from time to time. These definitions shall apply as shall all of the other provisions of Civil Code Sections 51.2, 51.3, and 51.4. Any Senior Housing must also be consistent with the Fair Housing Act, 42 U.S.C. §§ 3601-3631 and the Fair Employment and Housing Act, California Government Code Sections 12900-12996.

* * * *

(C) **Definition**. "Senior Citizen Housing Development" means a residential development developed, substantially rehabilitated, or substantially renovated for senior citizens ~~*that has at least 35 Dwelling Units*~~. Any Senior Citizen Housing Development that is required to obtain a public report under Section 11010 of the Business and Professions

Code and that submits its application for a public report after July 1, 2001, shall be required to have been issued a public report as a Senior Citizen Housing Development under Section 11010.05 of the Business and Professions Code. No housing development constructed prior to January 1, 1985, shall fail to qualify as a Senior Citizen Housing Development because it was not originally developed or put to use or occupancy by senior citizens.

* * * *

~~***SEC. 206.5. STATE RESIDENTIAL DENSITY BONUS PROGRAM: ANALYZED.***~~

~~*(a) **Purpose.** Sections 206.5, 206.6, and 206.7 shall be referred to as the San Francisco State Residential Density Bonus Program or the State Density Bonus Program. First, the Analyzed State Density Bonus Program in Section 206.5 offers an expedited process for projects that seek a density bonus that is consistent with the pre-vetted menu of incentives, concessions and waivers that the Planning Department and its consultants have already determined are feasible, result in actual cost reductions, and do not have specific adverse impacts upon public health and safety of the physical environment. Second the Individually Requested State Density Bonus Program in Section 206.6 details the review, analysis and approval process for any project seeking a density bonus that is consistent with State Law, but is not consistent with the requirements for the Analyzed State Density Bonus Program established in Section 206.5. Third, Section 206.7 describes density bonuses available under the State code for the provision of childcare facilities.*~~

~~*This Section 206.5 implements the Analyzed State Density Bonus Program or "Analyzed State Program." The Analyzed State Program offers an expedited process for projects that seek a density bonus that is consistent with, among other requirements set forth below, the pre-vetted menu of incentives, waiver and concessions.*~~

~~*(b) **Applicability.***~~

~~*(1) A Housing Project that meets all of the requirements of this subsection (b)(1) or is a*~~

~~*Senior Housing Project meeting the criteria of (b)(2) shall be an Analyzed State Density Bonus Project or an "Analyzed Project" for purposes of Sections 206 et seq. A Housing Project that does not meet all of the requirements of this subsection (b), but seeks a density bonus under State law may apply for a density bonus under Section 206.6 as an Individually Requested State Density Bonus Project. To qualify for the Analyzed State Density Bonus Program a Housing Project must meet all of the following:*~~

~~*(A) contain five or more residential units, as defined in Section 102, not including any Group Housing as defined in Section 102, efficiency dwelling units with reduced square footage defined in Section 318, and Density Bonus Units permitted through this Section 206.5 or other density program;*~~

~~*(B) is not seeking and receiving a density or development bonus under Section 207; the HOME-SF Program, Section 206.3; the 100 Percent Affordable Housing Bonus Program, Section 206.4; or any other local or State density bonus program that provides development bonuses;*~~

~~*(C) for projects located in Neighborhood Commercial Districts is not seeking to merge lots that result in more than 125 linear feet in lot frontage on any one street;*~~

~~*(D) is located in any zoning district that: (i) is not designated as an RH-1 or RH-2 Zoning District; (ii) establishes a maximum dwelling unit density through a ratio of number of units to lot area, including but not limited to, RH-3, RM, RC, C-2, Neighborhood Commercial, Named Neighborhood Commercial, and SoMa Mixed Use Districts, but only if the SoMa Mixed Use District has a density measured by a maximum number of dwelling units per square foot of lot area; (iii) is not in the North of Market Residential Special Use District, Planning Code Section 249.5 until the Affordable Housing Incentive Study is completed at which time the Board will review whether the North of Market Residential Special Use District should continue to be excluded from this Program. The Study will explore opportunities to support and encourage the provision of housing at the low, moderate, and middle income range in neighborhoods where density controls have been eliminated.*~~

~~*The goal of this analysis is to incentivize increased affordable housing production levels at deeper and wider ranges of AMI and larger unit sizes in these areas through 100% affordable housing development as well as below market rate units within market rate developments; (iv) is not located within the boundaries of the Northeastern Waterfront Area Plan south of the centerline of Broadway; and (v) is not located on property under the jurisdiction of the Port of San Francisco;*~~

~~*(E) is providing all Inclusionary Units as On-site Units under Section 415.6;*~~

~~*(F) includes a minimum of nine foot ceilings on all residential floors;*~~

~~*(G) is seeking only Concessions or Incentives set forth in subsection (c)(4);*~~

~~*(H) is seeking height increases only in the form of a waiver as described in subsection (c)(5);*~~

~~*(I) does not demolish, remove, or convert any residential units;*~~

~~*(J) consists only of new construction, and excluding any project that includes an addition to an existing structure;*~~

~~*(K) includes at the ground floor level active uses, as defined in Section 145.1 at the same square footages as any neighborhood commercial uses demolished or removed;*~~

~~*(L) if any retail use is demolished or removed, does not include a Formula Retail use, as defined in Section 303.1, unless the retail use demolished or removed was also a Formula Retail use, or one of the following uses: Gas Stations, Private or Public Parking Lots, Financial Services, Fringe Financial Services, Self Storage, Motel, Automobile Sales or Rental, Automotive Wash, Mortuaries, Adult Business, Massage Establishment, Medical Cannabis Dispensary, and Tobacco Paraphernalia Establishment, as those uses are defined in Planning Code Section 102;*~~

~~*(M) all on-site income-restricted residential units in the Housing Project are no smaller than the minimum unit sizes set forth by the California Tax Credit Allocation Committee as of May 16, 2017; and*~~

~~*(N) notwithstanding any other provision of this Code, includes a minimum*~~

~~*dwelling unit mix of at least 40% of all units as two or three bedroom units, including at least 10% of units as three bedroom units. Larger units should be distributed on all floors, and prioritized in spaces adjacent to open spaces or play yards. Units with two or three bedrooms should incorporate family friendly amenities, including bathtubs, dedicated cargo bicycle parking, dedicated stroller storage, and open space and yards designed for use by children.*~~

~~*(2) A Senior Housing Project, as defined in Section 102, may qualify as an Analyzed State Density Bonus Project if it follows all of the procedures and conditions set forth in Planning Code Section 202.2(f).*~~

~~*(3) If located north of the centerline of Post Street and east of the centerline of Van Ness Avenue, all otherwise eligible Analyzed State Law Density Bonus Projects shall only be permitted on:*~~

~~*(A) lots containing no existing buildings; or*~~

~~*(B) lots equal to or greater than 12,500 square feet where existing buildings are developed to less than 20% of the lot's principally permitted buildable gross floor area as determined by height limits, rear yard requirements and required setbacks.*~~

~~*(c) **Development Bonuses.** All Analyzed State Law Density Bonus Projects shall receive, at the project sponsor's written request, any or all of the following:*~~

~~*(1) **Priority Processing.** Analyzed Projects that provide 30% or more of Units as On-site Inclusionary Housing Units or Restricted Affordable Units that meet all of the requirements for an Inclusionary Housing Unit shall receive Priority Processing.*~~

~~*(2) **Density Bonus.** Analyzed Projects that provide On-site Inclusionary Housing Units or Restricted Affordable Units that meet all of the requirements for an Inclusionary Housing Unit shall receive a density bonus as described in Table 206.5A as follows:*~~

~~*Table 206.5A*~~
~~*Density Bonus Summary – Analyzed*~~

~~*A*~~	~~*B*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*D*~~	~~*E*~~

~~Restricted Affordable Units or Category~~	~~Minimum Percentage of Restricted Affordable Units~~	~~Percentage of Density Bonus Granted~~	~~Additional Bonus for Each 1% Increase In Restricted Affordable Units~~	~~Percentage of Restricted Units Required for Maximum 35% Density Bonus~~
~~Very Low Income~~	~~5%~~	~~20%~~	~~2.50%~~	~~11%~~
~~Lower Income~~	~~10%~~	~~20%~~	~~1.50%~~	~~20%~~
~~Moderate Income~~	~~10%~~	~~5%~~	~~1%~~	~~40%~~
~~Senior Citizen Housing, as defined in § 102, and meeting the requirements of § 202.2(f).~~	~~100%~~	~~50%~~	~~---~~	~~---~~

~~*Note: A density bonus may be selected from more than one category, up to a maximum of 35% of the Maximum Allowable Gross Residential Density.*~~

~~*In calculating density bonuses under this subsection 206.5(c)(2) the following shall apply:*~~

~~*(A) When calculating the number of permitted Density Bonus Units or Restricted Affordable Units, any fractions of units shall be rounded to the next highest number. Analyzed Density Bonus Program projects must include the minimum percentage of Restricted Affordable Units identified in Column B of Table 206.5A for at least one income category, but may combine density bonuses from more than one income category, up to a maximum of 35% of the Maximum Allowable Gross Residential Density.*~~

~~*(B) An applicant may elect to receive a Density Bonus that is less than the amount permitted by this Section; however, the City shall not be required to similarly reduce the number of Restricted Affordable Units required to be dedicated pursuant to this Section and Government Code Section 65915(b).*~~

~~*(C) In no case shall a Housing Project be entitled to a Density Bonus of more than 35%, unless it is a Senior Housing Project meeting the requirements of Section 202.2(f).*~~

~~*(D) The Density Bonus Units shall not be included when determining the*~~

~~*number of Restricted Affordable Units required to qualify for a Density Bonus. Density bonuses shall be calculated as a percentage of the Maximum Allowable Gross Residential Density.*~~

~~*(E) Any Restricted Affordable Unit provided pursuant to the on-site requirements of the Inclusionary Affordable Housing Program, Section 415 et seq., shall be included when determining the number of Restricted Affordable Units required to qualify for a Development Bonus under this Section 206.5. The payment of the Affordable Housing Fee shall not qualify for a Development Bonus under this Section. The provision of Off-site Units shall not qualify the Principal Project for a Density Bonus under this Section; however an Off-site Unit may qualify as a Restricted Affordable Unit to obtain a density bonus for the Off-site Project.*~~

~~*(F) In accordance with state law, neither the granting of a Concession, Incentive, waiver, or modification, nor the granting of a Density Bonus, shall be interpreted, in and of itself, to require a general plan amendment, zoning change, variance, or other discretionary approval.*~~

~~*(3) **Concessions and Incentives.** Analyzed Projects shall receive concessions or incentives, in the amounts specified in Table 206.5B:*~~

~~*Table 206.5B*~~
~~*Concessions and Incentives Summary – Analyzed Projects*~~

~~*Target Group*~~	~~*Restricted Affordable Units*~~		
~~*Very Low Income*~~	~~*5%*~~	~~*10%*~~	~~*15%*~~
~~*Lower Income*~~	~~*10%*~~	~~*20%*~~	~~*30%*~~
~~*Moderate Income (Common Interest Development)*~~	~~*10%*~~	~~*20%*~~	~~*30%*~~
~~*Maximum Incentive(s)/ Concession(s)*~~	~~*1*~~	~~*2*~~	~~*3*~~

~~*Notes: 1. Common Interest Development is defined in California Civil Code Section 4100.*~~

~~*(4) **Menu of Concessions and Incentives:** In submitting a request for Concessions or Incentives, an applicant for an Analyzed State Density Bonus Project may request the specific Concessions and Incentives set forth below. The Planning Department, based on Department research and a Residential Density Bonus Study prepared by David Baker Architects, Seifel Consulting, and the*~~

~~*San Francisco Planning Department dated August 2015, on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. 150969, has determined that the following Concessions and Incentives are generally consistent with Government Code Section 65915(d) because, in general, they: are required in order to provide for affordable housing costs; will not be deemed by the Department to have a specific adverse impact as defined in Government Code Section 65915(d); and are not contrary to State or Federal law.*~~

~~*(A) **Rear yard:** the required rear yard per Section 134 or any applicable special use district may be reduced to no less than 20% of the lot depth, or 15 feet, whichever is greater. Corner properties may provide 20% of the lot area at the interior corner of the property to meet the minimum rear yard requirement, provided that each horizontal dimension of the open area is a minimum of 15 feet; and that the open area is wholly or partially contiguous to the existing midblock open space, if any, formed by the rear yards of adjacent properties.*~~

~~*(B) **Dwelling Unit Exposure:** the dwelling unit exposure requirements of Section 140(a)(2) may be satisfied through qualifying windows facing an unobstructed open area that is no less than 25 feet in every horizontal dimension, and such open area is not required to expand in every horizontal dimension at each subsequent floor.*~~

~~*(C) **Off-Street Loading:** off-street loading spaces under Section 152 shall not be required.*~~

~~*(D) **Parking:** up to a 50% reduction in the residential and commercial parking requirement, per Section 151 or any applicable special use district.*~~

~~*(E) **Open Space:** up to a 5% reduction in required common open space per Section 135, or any applicable special use district.*~~

~~*(F) **Additional Open Space:** up to an additional 5% reduction in required common open space per Section 135 or any applicable special use district, beyond the 5% provided in subsection (E) above.*~~

~~*(5) **Waiver or Modification of Height Limits.** Analyzed Projects may request a waiver of the applicable height restrictions if the applicable height limitation will have the effect of physically precluding the construction of a Housing Project at the densities or with the Concessions or Incentives permitted by subsection (c)(4). Analyzed Projects may receive a height bonus as of right of up to twenty feet or two stories, excluding exceptions permitted per Section 260(b), if the applicant demonstrates that it qualifies for a height waiver through the following formula:*~~

~~***Step one: Calculate Base Density and Bonus Density Limits***~~

~~*Calculate Base Density (BD), as defined in Section 206.2.*~~

~~*Bonus Density Limit (BD): ED multiplied by 1.XX where XX is the density bonus requested per Section 206.5 of this Code (e.g. 7%, 23%, 35%), not to exceed 1.35, the maximum density bonus available by this Section.*~~

~~***Step two: Calculate Permitted Envelope (PE).** Buildable envelope available under existing height and bulk controls.*~~

~~*PE equals lot area multiplied by permitted lot coverage, where lot coverage equals .75, or .8 if the developer elects to request a rear yard modification under Section 206.5(c)(4)(A), multiplied by existing height limit (measured in number of stories), minus one story for projects in districts where non-residential uses are required on the ground floor, and minus any square footage subject to bulk limitations (for parcels that do not have an X bulk designation).*~~

~~***Step three: Calculate Bonus Envelope (BE).** Residential envelope necessary to accommodate additional density ("Bonus envelope" or "BE").*~~

~~*BE equals Bonus Density multiplied by 1,000 gross square feet.*~~

~~***Step four: Calculate Additional Residential Floors.** Determine the number of stories required to accommodate bonus:*~~

~~*(A) If BE is less than or equal to PE, the project is not awarded height under this subsection (c)(5).*~~

~~*(B) If BE is greater than PE, the project is awarded height, as follows:*~~

~~*(i) If BE minus PE is less than the lot area multiplied by 0.75, project is allowed one extra story; total gross square footage of building not to exceed BE; or*~~

~~*(ii) If BE minus PE is greater than the lot area multiplied by 0.75 (i.e. if the difference is greater than one story), project is allowed two extra stories; total gross square footage of building not to exceed BE.*~~

~~***(d) Application.** An application for an Analyzed State Density Bonus Project under this Section 206.5 shall be submitted with the first application for approval of a Housing Project and shall be processed concurrently with all other applications required for the Housing Project. The application shall be on a form prescribed by the City and, in addition to any information required for other applications, shall include the following information:*~~

~~*(1) A description of the proposed Housing Project, including the total number of dwelling units, Restricted Affordable Units, and Density Bonus Units proposed;*~~

~~*(2) Any zoning district designation, Base Density, assessor's parcel number(s) of the project site, and a description of any Density Bonus, Concession or Incentive, or waiver requested;*~~

~~*(3) A list of the requested Concessions and Incentives from Section 206.5(c)(4);*~~

~~*(4) If a waiver or modification of height is requested under Section 206.5(c)(5), a calculation demonstrating how the project qualifies for such waiver under the formula;*~~

~~*(5) A full plan set including site plan, elevations, sections, and floor plans, number of market-rate units, Restricted Affordable Units, and Density Bonus units within the proposed Housing Project. The location of all units must be approved by the Planning Department before the issuance of the building permit;*~~

~~*(6) Level of affordability of the Restricted Affordable Units and a draft Regulatory Agreement; and*~~

~~*(7) Documentation that the applicant has provided written notification to all existing*~~

~~*commercial tenants that the applicant intends to develop the property pursuant to this section. Any affected commercial tenants shall be given priority processing similar to the Department's Community Business Priority Processing Program, as adopted by the Planning Commission on February 12, 2015 under Resolution Number 19323 to support relocation of such business in concert with access to relevant local business support programs. In no case may a project receive a site permit or any demolition permit prior to 18 months from the date of written notification required by this Section 206.5(d)(7).*~~

~~***(e) Review Procedures.** An application for an Analyzed State Density Bonus Project, shall be acted upon concurrently with the application for other permits related to the Housing Project.*~~

~~*(1) Before approving an application for an Analyzed Project, the Planning Department or Commission shall make written findings that the Housing Project is qualified as an Analyzed State Density Bonus Project.*~~

~~*(2) Analyzed Projects shall be governed by the conditional use procedures of Section 303. All notices shall specify that the Housing Project is seeking a Development Bonus and shall provide a description of the Development Bonuses requested. Analyzed Projects shall also be reviewed for consistency with the Affordable Housing Bonus Program Design Guidelines.*~~

~~***(f) Regulatory Agreements.** Recipients of a Density Bonus, Incentive, Concession, waiver, or modification shall enter into a Regulatory Agreement with the City, as follows.*~~

~~*(1) The terms of the agreement shall be acceptable in form and content to the Planning Director, the Director of MOHCD, and the City Attorney. The Planning Director shall have the authority to execute such agreements.*~~

~~*(2) Following execution of the agreement by all parties, the completed Density Bonus Regulatory Agreement, or memorandum thereof, shall be recorded and the conditions filed and recorded on the Housing Project.*~~

~~*(3) The approval and recordation of the Regulatory Agreement shall take place prior to*~~

~~*the issuance of the First Construction Document. The Regulatory Agreement shall be binding to all future owners and successors in interest.*~~

~~*(4) The Regulatory Agreement shall be consistent with the guidelines of the City's Inclusionary Housing Program and shall include at a minimum the following:*~~

~~*(A) The total number of dwelling units approved for the Housing Project, including the number of Restricted Affordable Units, Inclusionary Units, HOME-SF Units or other restricted units;*~~

~~*(B) A description of the household income group to be accommodated by the Restricted Affordable Units, and the standards for determining the corresponding Affordable Rent or Affordable Sales Price;*~~

~~*(C) The location, dwelling unit sizes (in square feet), and number of bedrooms of the Restricted Affordable Units;*~~

~~*(D) Term of use restrictions for Restricted Affordable Units of at least 55 years for Moderate Income units and at least 55 years for Low and Very Low units;*~~

~~*(E) A schedule for completion and occupancy of Restricted Affordable Units;*~~

~~*(F) A description of any Concession, Incentive, waiver, or modification, if any, being provided by the City;*~~

~~*(G) A description of remedies for breach of the agreement (the City may identify tenants or qualified purchasers as third party beneficiaries under the agreement);*~~

~~*(H) A list of all on-site family friendly amenities. Family friendly amenities shall include, but are not limited to, dedicated cargo bicycle parking, dedicated stroller storage, and open space and yards designed for use by children; and*~~

~~*(I) Other provisions to ensure implementation and compliance with this Section.*~~

SEC. 306.1. APPLICATIONS AND FILING FEES.

* * * *

(c) **Content of Applications.** The content of applications shall be in accordance with the policies, rules and regulations of the Planning Department, Zoning Administrator and the Planning Commission. All applications shall be upon forms prescribed therefor, and shall contain or be accompanied by all information required to assure the presentation of pertinent facts for proper consideration of the case and for the permanent record. The applicant may be required to file with his application the information needed for the preparation and mailing of notices as specified in Section 306.3. In addition to any other information required by the Planning Department, the Zoning Administrator and the Planning Commission, an applicant for a conditional use permit or variance who proposes a commercial use for the subject property shall disclose the name under which business will be, or is expected to be, conducted at the subject property, if such name is known at the time of application. The term "known" shall mean actual, not imputed knowledge, and shall consist of direct evidence including but not limited to a contract of sale, lease, or rental, or letter of intent or agreement, between the applicant and a commercial entity. If the business name becomes known to the applicant during the conditional use permit or variance processing period, the applicant promptly shall amend the application to disclose such business name. *All applications must disclose whether there are existing residential uses and non-residential uses, and disclose the presence of any residential or non-residential tenants, located at the subject property at the time the application is submitted.*

SEC. 311. PERMIT REVIEW PROCEDURES.

(a) **Purpose.** The purpose of this Section 311 is to establish procedures for reviewing ~~*planning entitlement*~~ *Development Applications* ~~*applications*~~ to determine compatibility of the proposal with the neighborhood and for providing notice to property owners*, tenants,* and residents on the site and neighboring the site of the proposed project and to interested

neighborhood organizations, so that concerns about a project may be identified and resolved during the review of the permit. For purposes of this Section 311, a ~~*planning entitlement*~~ *Development Application* ~~*application*~~ means the application submitted by a project sponsor to the Planning Department, provided said application has been deemed complete by the Planning Department, that includes the information necessary to conduct environmental review, determine Planning Code compliance, and *assess* conformity with the General Plan.

(b) **Applicability.**

(1) Within the Priority Equity Geographies SUD, all ~~*planning entitlement*~~ *Development A*~~a~~pplications in Residential, NC, NCT, *RTO,* Chinatown Mixed Use Districts, and Eastern Neighborhoods Mixed Use Districts for demolition, new construction, or alteration of buildings shall be subject to the notification and review procedures required by this Section 311. Notwithstanding the foregoing or any other requirement of this Section 311, ~~*planning entitlement*~~ *Development A*~~a~~pplications to construct an Accessory Dwelling Unit pursuant to Section 207.2 shall not be subject to the notification or review requirements of this Section 311. A change of use to a principally permitted use in the Western SoMa Plan Area, Central SoMa Plan Area, or East SoMa Plan Area shall not be subject to the provisions of this Section 311.

* * * *

(3) **In all Other Projects in Residential, NC, NCT, and Eastern Neighborhoods Mixed Use Districts.** All ~~*planning entitlement*~~ *Development A*~~a~~pplications in Residential, NC, NCT, and Eastern Neighborhoods Mixed Use Districts that propose any of the following shall be subject to the notification and review procedures required by this Section 311.

* * * *

(c) ~~***Planning Entitlement***~~ ***Development*** **Application Review for Compliance.** Upon

acceptance of any *Development A~~a~~*pplication subject to this Section *311*, the Planning Department shall review the proposed project for compliance with the Planning Code and any applicable design guidelines*, and standards* approved by the Planning Commission. Applications determined ~~*not*~~ to be in compliance with the *Objective S~~s~~*tandards of Articles 1.2, 1.5, 2, and 2.5 of the Planning Code, *and any applicable Objective Standards adopted by the Commission shall be considered to be code-compliant. Development Applications for projects other than code-compliant residential projects may be subject to additional controls, including the* Residential Design Guidelines, ~~*including*~~ design guidelines for specific areas adopted by the Planning Commission, or ~~*with*~~ any applicable conditions of previous approvals regarding the project~~*, shall be held until either the application is determined to be in compliance, is disapproved or a recommendation for cancellation is sent to the Department of Building Inspection*~~.

(1) **Design Guidelines *and Standards*.** The construction of new buildings and alteration of existing buildings shall be consistent with the design policies and guidelines of the General Plan*, applicable Objective Standards,* ~~*and with*~~ the "Residential Design Guidelines," and all other applicable design guidelines *and standards* as adopted and periodically amended for specific areas or conditions by the Planning Commission. ~~*The design for new buildings with residential uses in RTO Districts shall also be consistent with the design standards and guidelines of the "Ground Floor Residential Units Design Guidelines" as adopted and periodically amended by the Planning Commission.*~~ The Planning Director may require modifications to the exterior of a proposed new building or proposed alteration of an existing building in order to bring it into conformity with the applicable design guidelines. These modifications may include, but are not limited to, changes in siting, building envelope, scale texture and detailing, openings, and landscaping.

* * * *

(d) **Notification.** Upon determination that an application ~~*is in compliance*~~ *complies* with

the development standards of the Planning Code, the Planning Department shall cause a notice to be posted on the site pursuant to rules established by the Zoning Administrator and shall cause a written notice describing the proposed project to be sent in the manner described below. This notice shall be in addition to any notices required by the Building Code and shall have a format and content determined by the Zoning Administrator. The notice shall describe the project review process and shall set forth the mailing date of the notice and the expiration date of the notification period.

* * * *

(5) **Notification Period.** All ~~*planning entitlement*~~ *Development A~~a~~*pplications shall be held for a period of 30 calendar days from the date of the mailed notice to allow review by residents and owners of neighboring properties and by neighborhood groups.

(6) **Elimination of Duplicate Notice.** The notice provisions of this Section *311* may be waived by the Zoning Administrator for ~~*planning entitlement*~~ *Development A~~a~~*pplications for projects that have been, or before approval will be, the subject of a duly noticed public hearing before the Planning Commission or Zoning Administrator, provided that the nature of work for which the ~~*planning entitlement*~~ *Development A~~a~~*pplication is required is both substantially included in the hearing notice and is the subject of the hearing.

(7) **Notification Package.** The notification package for a project subject to notice under this Section 311 shall include a written notice and reduced-size drawings of the project. Distributed plans and drawings may be limited to comply with applicable state laws.

* * * *

(D) The ~~*planning entitlement*~~ *Development A~~a~~*pplication number(s) shall be disclosed in the written notice. The start and expiration dates of the notice shall be stated. A description about the recipient's rights to request additional information, to request Discretionary Review by the Planning Commission and to appeal to other boards or

commissions shall be provided.

* * * *

(e) **Requests for Planning Commission Review.** A request for the Planning Commission to exercise its discretionary review powers over a specific ~~*planning entitlement*~~ *Development A~~a~~*pplication shall be considered by the Planning Commission if received by the Planning Department no later than 5:00 p.m. of the last day of the notification period as described in this Section 311, subject to guidelines adopted by the Planning Commission. The project sponsor of a ~~*planning entitlement*~~ *Development A~~a~~*pplication may request discretionary review by the Planning Commission to resolve conflicts between the Director of Planning and the project sponsor concerning requested modifications to comply with the Residential Design Guidelines, or other applicable design guideline~~s~~ *or standard*.

* * * *

SEC. 317. LOSS OF RESIDENTIAL AND UNAUTHORIZED UNITS THROUGH DEMOLITION, MERGER, AND CONVERSION.

(a) **Findings.** San Francisco faces a continuing shortage of affordable housing. There is a high ratio of rental to ownership tenure among the City's residents. 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. Therefore, a public hearing will be held prior to approval of any permit that would remove existing housing, *reduce the size of a Residential Flat, merge any portion of a Residential Flat with another unit, or change the configuration of a Residential Flat such that the unit is no longer considered a Residential Flat,* with certain exceptions, as described below. The Planning Commission shall develop a Code Implementation Document setting forth procedures and regulations for the implementation of this Section 317 as provided further below. The Zoning Administrator shall modify economic

criteria related to property values and construction costs in the Implementation Document as warranted by changing economic conditions to meet the intent of this Section.

(b) **Definitions.** For the purposes of this Section 317, the terms below shall be as defined below. Capitalized terms not defined below are defined in Section 102 of this Code.

* * * *

(7) "Residential Merger" shall mean the combining of two or more Residential or Unauthorized Units, resulting in a decrease in the number of Residential Units and Unauthorized Units within a building, or the enlargement of one or more existing units while ~~*substantially*~~ reducing the size of others by more than 25% of their original floor area, even if the number of units is not reduced. The Planning Commission may reduce the numerical element of this criterion by up to 20% of its value should it deem that adjustment is necessary to implement the intent of this Section 317, to conserve existing housing and preserve affordable housing. *Residential Merger shall also include the reconfiguration of a Residential Flat with another Dwelling Unit, if the proposed project would reconfigure an existing Residential Flat such that the reconfigured Residential Flat would no longer meet the definition of a Residential Flat, even if the number of Dwelling Units is not reduced and the Residential Flat is not reduced in size.*

* * * *

(c) **Applicability; Exemptions.**

* * * *

~~(12) Residential Flats. Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in this Section 317, projects that propose the Merger, reconfiguration, or reduction in size of Residential Flats shall not require a Conditional Use authorization if the project would increase the number of Dwelling Units on the property.~~

* * * *

(g) **Conditional Use Criteria.**

* * * *

(6) **Residential Demolition.** The Planning Commission shall consider the following additional criteria in the review of applications for Residential Demolition:

* * * *

(L) whether the project increases the number of family-sized units on-site~~, and in the case of demolition of any Residential Flats whether the proposed project is maintaining or increasing the number of units on the lot that contain at least two or more bedrooms or that are at least equivalent in size to the Residential Flats being demolished~~;

* * * *

(8) **Denial of Application to Remove an Unauthorized Unit; Requirement to Legalize the Unit.** If the Planning Commission denies an application to Remove an Unauthorized Unit, the property owner shall file a~~n~~ *Development Application and any necessary* application for a building permit to legalize the Unit. Failure to do so within a reasonable period of time, as determined by the Zoning Administrator, shall be deemed to be a violation of the Planning Code.

*(9) **Residential Flats.** In addition to the other considerations in this subsection (g), the Planning Commission shall consider the criteria below when reviewing a project application that would merge a Residential Flat such that it would no longer meet the definition of a Residential Flat:*

(A) whether reduction in size, reconfiguration, or merger of the Flat(s) would reduce the size of any Flat by more than 25% of its original floor area; and

(B) whether the proposed project is maintaining or increasing the number of units on the Lot that contain at least two or more bedrooms or that are at least equivalent in size to the Residential Flats being reduced or reconfigured.

* * * *

#

~~***SEC. 318. EFFICIENCY DWELLING UNITS WITH REDUCED SQUARE FOOTAGE.***~~

~~***(a) Definition.*** *For purposes of this Section, an "Efficiency Dwelling Unit with reduced square footage" shall mean an Efficiency Dwelling Unit with a living room of less than 220 square feet and meeting the requirements of Section 1208.4 of the San Francisco Building Code that is not affordable housing, group housing, or student housing as defined in this Code.*~~

~~***(b) Limitation on the Total Number of Efficiency Dwelling Units with Reduced Square Footage That Can Be Constructed.*** *The Planning Department may approve the construction of up to a total number of 375 Efficiency Dwelling Units with reduced square footage; provided, however, that Efficiency Dwelling Units shall not be included in this total. For purposes of this subsection, individual units will be counted even if they comprise less than the total number of units in the building.*~~

~~***(c) Reporting and Reauthorization.*** *After the approval of approximately 325 Efficiency Dwelling Units with reduced square footage, the Planning Department in collaboration with the Mayor's Office of Housing shall submit a report to the Board of Supervisors that provides whatever information those Departments believe will assist the Board in determining whether to increase the numerical cap on the number of Efficiency Units with reduced square footage or to otherwise modify the requirements. At a minimum, the report shall include the following information:*~~

~~*(1) Pricing information, based on data from the Assessor's Office, for sales properties and, to the extent feasible, rental prices for the Efficiency Dwelling Units with reduced square footage;*~~

~~*(2) A comparison of the sales and rental pricing information for Efficiency Dwelling Units with reduced square footage to similar data for studio and 1-bedroom dwelling units;*~~

~~*(3) A map showing where the Efficiency Dwelling Units with reduced square footage are located, both projects that are entitled but not yet built and projects that have been constructed;*~~

~~*(4) A comparison of the numbers of Efficiency Dwelling Units with reduced square footage that are entitled and/or built and the goals for other dwelling unit sizes within any adopted Area Plans; and*~~

~~*(5) A comparison of the numbers of Efficiency Dwelling Units with reduced square footage with the quantified housing production goals, to the extent available by household income level, set forth in the Regional Housing Needs Allocation.*~~

Section 13. Conforming Changes to Zoning Tables. Articles 2, 7, and 8 of the Planning Code is hereby amended by revising Sections 210.1, 210.2, 210.3, 210.4, 710, 711, 712, 713, 714, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 720, 721, 722, 723, 724, 725, 726, 727, 728, 729, 730, 731, 732, 733, 734, 735, 736, 737, 738, 739, 740, 741, 742, 743, 744, 745, 746, 750, 751, 752, 753, 754, 755, 756, 757, 758, 759, 760, 761, 762, 763, 764, 780.1, 780.3, 810, 811, 812, 825, 827, 829, 830, 831, 832, 833, 834, 835, 836, 837, 838, 839, and 840 to read as follows:

SEC. 210.1. C-2 DISTRICTS: COMMUNITY BUSINESS.

* * * *

Table 210.1

ZONING CONTROL TABLE FOR C-2 DISTRICTS

Zoning Category	***§ References***	***C-2***
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
Height and Bulk Limits	§§ 102, 105, 106, 132.1, 250-252, 260, *263.19,* 270, *270.3,* 271,	~~*Generally 40-X*~~*Varies*. Additional Height Limits of § 261 apply. See Height and Bulk District Maps.

	295	
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124, *207.9*	Basic FAR limit is 3.6 to 1. For a lot that is nearer to an RM-4 or RC-4 District than to any other R District, the FAR is 4.8 to 1. For a lot that is nearer to a C-3 District than to any R District the FAR is 10.0 to 1. FAR in the Waterfront and Washington-Broadway Special Use Districts is 5 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		
Signs	§ 607	As permitted by ~~*Section*~~ § 607.
Design Guidelines and Standards	*General Plan Commerce and Industry Element*	*Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
* * * *		
Residential Conversion, Demolition, or Merger	§ 317	C ~~*for Removal of one or more Residential Units or Unauthorized Units.*~~

of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats		
Dwelling Unit Mix	*§ 207.7*	*Generally required for creation of 10 or more Dwelling Units. No less than 25% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least two Bedrooms, and no less than 10% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least three Bedrooms.*
* * * *		
Residential Uses		
~~*Residential Density,*~~ Dwelling Unit~~s~~ *Density, General* (5)	§ 207	P at a density ratio not exceeding the number of dwelling units permitted in the nearest R District, with the distance to such R District measured from the midpoint of the front lot line or from a point directly across the street therefrom, whichever permits the greater density; provided, that the maximum density ratio shall in no case be less than one unit for each 800 square feet of lot area. NP above. (8) *Form-Based Density applies within the R-4 Height and Bulk District (§§ 263.19, 270(i)) and other parcels per footnote 8.*
Minimum Dwelling Unit	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally*

Densities, if Applicable		*ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*
Senior Housing *Density*	§§102, 202.2(f), *207*	P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location. *Form-Based Density applies within the R-4 Height and Bulk District (§§ 263.19, 270(i)) and other parcels per footnote 8.*
~~*Residential Density,*~~ Group Housing *Density*	§208	P at a density ratio not exceeding the maximum density permitted for group housing in the nearest R District, with the distance to such R District measured from the midpoint of the front lot line or from a point directly across the street therefrom, whichever permits the greater density; provided, that the maximum density ratio shall in no case be less than one bedroom for each 275

		square feet of lot area. NP above. (8) *Form-Based Density applies within the R-4 Height and Bulk District (§§ 263.19, 270(i)) and other parcels per footnote 8.*
* * * *		
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
* * * *		
Commercial Use Characteristics		
Drive-up Facility	§ 102	~~P~~*C*
* * * *		

* * * *

(5) Construction of Accessory Dwelling Units ~~*may be*~~ permitted pursuant to Sections 207.1 and 207.2.

* * * *

(8) *Form-Based Zoning applies* ~~*I*~~*i*n C-2 zoning districts*: (i) on parcels in the R-4 Height and Bulk District; and (ii) on parcels* east of or fronting Franklin Street/13th Street and north of Townsend Street, except for parcels within the Northeast Waterfront Historic District, the Jackson Square Historic District, and the Jackson Square Historic District Extension~~*, there is no density limit*~~. The Jackson Square Historic District Extension shall include parcels within the area bounded by the northern boundary of the Jackson Square Historic District and the centerline of Sansome Street, Kearny Street, and Broadway. ~~*On parcels with no density limit, density is regulated by the permitted height and bulk, and required setbacks, exposure, open space, and other Code requirements applicable to each development lot.*~~

//

SEC. 210.2. C-3 DISTRICTS: DOWNTOWN COMMERCIAL.

* * * *

Table 210.2

ZONING CONTROL TABLE FOR C-3 DISTRICTS

Zoning Category	***§ References***	***C-3-O***	***C-3-O(SD)***	***C-3-R***	***C-3-G***	***C-3-S***
BUILDING STANDARDS						
Massing and Setbacks						
Height and Bulk Limits	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250-252, 260, *263.19,* 261, 270, *270.3,* 271	Varies. See also Height and Bulk District Maps.				
* * * *						
Basic Floor Area Ratio *(2)*	§§ 102, 123, 124*, 207.9*	9.0 to 1	6.0 to 1	6.0 to 1	6.0 to 1	5.0 to 1
*** * * ***						
Miscellaneous						
* * * *						
Signs	§ 607	As permitted by ~~*Section*~~ § 607.				
Design Guidelines and Standards	*General Plan Commerce and Industry Element*	*Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*				

Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
* * * *		
Residential Conversion, Demolition, or Merger *of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	§ 317	C ~~*for Removal of one or more Residential Units or Unauthorized Units.*~~
Dwelling Unit Mix	*§ 207.7*	*Generally required for creation of 10 or more Dwelling Units. No less than 25% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least two Bedrooms, and no less than 10% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least three Bedrooms.*
* * * *		
Residential Uses		
~~*Residential Density,*~~ Dwelling Unit~~s~~ *Density, General* (7)	§ 207	~~*No density limit. Density is regulated by the permitted height and bulk, and required setbacks, exposure, and open space of each development lot.*~~*Form-Based Density*
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*

Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*
Senior Housing *Density*	§§102, 202.2(f)*, 207*	~~*No density limit. Density is regulated by the permitted height and bulk, and required setbacks, exposure, and open space of each development lot.*~~*Form-Based Density*
~~*Residential Density,*~~ Group Housing *Density*	§208	~~*No density limit. Density is regulated by the permitted height and bulk, and required setbacks, exposure, and open space of each development lot.*~~*Form-Based Density*
* * * *		
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
* * * *		

* * * *

(2) ~~*[Reserved.]*~~ *For Office Uses in all C-3 Districts minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*

* * * *

SEC. 210.3. PDR DISTRICTS.

* * * *

//

//

//

Table 210.3

ZONING CONTROL TABLE FOR PDR DISTRICTS

Zoning Category	***§ References***	***PDR-1-B***	***PDR-1-D***	***PDR-1-G***	***PDR-2***
* * * *					
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES					
Development Standards					
* * * *					
Residential Conversion, Demolition, or Merger *of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	§ 317	C *~~for Removal of one or more Residential Units or Unauthorized Units; in C-3, only for Removal above the ground floor.~~.*			
* * * *					

* * * *

SEC. 210.4. M DISTRICTS: INDUSTRIAL.

* * * *

//

//

//

Table 210.4

ZONING CONTROL TABLE FOR M DISTRICTS

Zoning Category	§ References	M-1	M-2
BUILDING STANDARDS			
* * * *			
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES			
Development Standards			
* * * *			
Residential Conversion, Demolition, or Merger *of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	§ 317	C ~~*for Removal of one or more Residential Units or Unauthorized Units.*~~	
Dwelling Unit Mix	*§ 207.7*	*Generally required for creation of 10 or more Dwelling Units. No less than 25% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least two Bedrooms, and no less than 10% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least three Bedrooms.*	
* * * *			
Residential Uses			
~~*Residential Density,*~~ Dwelling Unit~~s~~ *Density* (3)	§ 207	C at a density ratio not exceeding the number of dwelling units permitted in the nearest R District, with the distance to such R District measured from the midpoint of the front lot line or from a	

		point directly across the street therefrom, whichever permits the greater density; provided, that the maximum density ratio shall in no case be less than one unit for each 800 feet of lot area. Any remaining fraction of one-half or more of the minimum amount of lot area per dwelling unit shall be adjusted upward to the next higher whole number of dwelling units. NP above.	
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*	
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*	
Senior Housing	§ 102	NP	NP
* * * *			
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES			
Development Standards			
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, *207.9,* 124	5 to 1*. For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*	5 to 1*. For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*
* * * *			

* * * *

(3) Construction of Accessory Dwelling Units may be permitted pursuant to Sections

207.1 and 207.2.

* * * *

SEC. 710. NC-1 – NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL CLUSTER DISTRICT.

NC-1 Districts are intended to serve as local neighborhood shopping districts, providing convenience retail goods and services for the immediately surrounding neighborhoods primarily during daytime hours.

These NC-1 Districts are characterized by their location in residential neighborhoods, often in outlying areas of the City. The commercial intensity of these districts varies. Many of these districts have the lowest intensity of commercial development in the City, generally consisting of small clusters with three or more commercial establishments, commonly grouped around a corner; and in some cases short linear commercial strips with low-scale, interspersed mixed-use (residential-commercial) development.

Building controls for the NC-1 District promote low*er*-intensity development which is compatible with the existing scale and character of these neighborhood areas. Commercial development is limited to one story*, with certain exceptions*. Rear yard requirements at all levels preserve existing backyard space.

NC-1 commercial use provisions encourage the full range of neighborhood-serving convenience retail sales and services ~~*at the first story provided that the use size generally is limited to 3,000 square feet*~~*, subject to certain use size* limitations. However, commercial uses and features which could impact residential livability are prohibited, such as auto uses, financial services, general advertising signs, drive-up facilities, hotels, and late-night activity*.* ~~*; eating and drinking establishments are restricted, depending upon the intensity of such uses in nearby commercial districts.*~~

Housing development in new buildings is encouraged above the ground story*.* ~~*in most*~~

~~*districts. Existing residential units are protected by prohibitions of conversions above the ground story and limitations on demolitions.*~~ Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted ~~*within the District pursuant to Section 207.1 of this Code*~~.

Table 710. NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL CLUSTER DISTRICT NC-1

ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		NC-1
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
Height and Bulk Limits.	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250–252, 260, 261.1, *263.19,* 270, *270.3,* 271. See also Height and Bulk District Maps	Varies~~*, but generally 40-X*~~. See Height and Bulk Map Sheets HT02-08, HT10-13 for more information. Height sculpting required on Alleys per § 261.1.
5 Foot Height Bonus for Active Ground Floor Uses	§ 263.20	P(1) in some districts
Rear Yard	§§ 130, 134,	Required at Grade level and at each succeeding

	134(a)(e), 136	level or Story: 25% of lot depth, but in no case less than 15 feet
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally ~~N~~not ~~R~~required~~.~~; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).*
Street Frontage and Public Realm		
Streetscape and Pedestrian Improvements	§ 138.1	Required
Street Frontage Requirements	§ 145.1	Required; controls apply to above-grade parking setbacks, parking and loading entrances, active uses, ground floor ceiling height, street-facing ground-level spaces, transparency and fenestration, and gates, railings, and grillwork. Exceptions permitted for historic buildings.
Ground Floor Commercial	§ 145.4	Required on some streets, see § 145.4 for specific districts.
Vehicular Access Restrictions	§ 155(r)	Restricted on some streets, see § 155(r) for specific districts

Miscellaneous		
Lot Size (Per Development)	§§ 102, 121.1	P(2)
Planned Unit Development	§ 304	C
Awning	§ 136.1	P
Canopy or Marquee	§ 136.1	NP*(4)*
Signs	§§ 262, 602-604, 607, 607.1, 608, 609	As permitted by § 607.1
General Advertising Signs	§§ 262, 602, 604, 608, 609, 610, 611	NP
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		

Usable Open Space [Per Dwelling Unit]	§§ 135, 136	100 square feet if private, or 133 square feet if common, or the amount of open space required in the nearest Residential District, whichever is less.		
Off-Street Parking Requirements	§§ 145.1, 150, 151, 153 - 156, 161, 166, 204.5	No car parking required. Maximum permitted per § 151.~~.~~ Bike parking required per §155.2. If car parking is provided, car share spaces are required when a project has 50 units or more per §166.		
Dwelling Unit Mix	§ 207.7	Generally required for creation of 10 or more Dwelling Units. No less than 25% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least two Bedrooms, and no less than 10% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least three Bedrooms.		
Use Characteristics				
Intermediate Length Occupancy	§§ 102, 202.10	P(11)		
Single Room Occupancy	§ 102	P		
Student Housing	§ 102	P		
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit ~~*Density*~~	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code ~~*Sections*~~*§§* 207.1 and 207.2.		

Dwelling Unit Density, *General*	§§ 102, 207	1 unit per 800 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater. ~~Form-Based Density applies within the R-4 Height and Bulk District (§§ 263.19, 270(i)).~~
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*
Group Housing Density	§208	1 bedroom per 275 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater. ~~Form-Based Density applies within the R-4 Height and Bulk District (§§ 263.19, 270(i)).~~
Homeless Shelter Density	§§ 102, 208	Density limits regulated by the Administrative Code
Senior Housing Density	§§102, 202.2(f), 207	P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the

		district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location. ~~Form-Based Density applies within the R-4 Height and Bulk District (§§ 263.19, 270(i)).~~		
Loss of Dwelling Units*:* *Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~	~~*NP*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124*, 207.9*	1.8 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
Use Size	§*§* 102, *121.2*	P up to 2,999 square feet; C 3,000 square feet and above		
Off-Street Parking Requirements	§§ 145.1, 150, 151, 153 - 156, 161, 166,	No car parking required.~~.~~ Maximum permitted per § 151. Bike parking required per Section 155.2. Car share spaces required when a project has 25 or more parking spaces per §166.		

	204.5			
Off-Street Freight Loading	§§ 150, 152, 153 - 155, 161, 204.5	None required if gross floor area is less than 10,000 square feet. Exceptions permitted per §§ 155 and 161.		
Commercial Use Characteristics				
Drive-up Facility	§ 102	NP		
Formula Retail	§ 102, 303.1	C		
Hours of Operation	§§ 102	P 6 a.m. - 11 p.m.; C 11 p.m. - 2 a.m.		
Maritime Use	§ 102	NP		
Open Air Sales	§§ 102, 703(b)	See § 703(b)		
Outdoor Activity Area	§§ 102, 145.2, 202.2	P if located in front of building or if it complies with Section 202.2(a)(7); C if located elsewhere.		
Walk-up Facility	§ 102	P		
NON-RESIDENTIAL USES		**CONTROLS BY STORY**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd+**
Agricultural Use Category				
Agriculture, Industrial	§§ 102, 202.2(c)	NP	NP	NP
Agriculture, Large Scale Urban	§§ 102, 202.2(c)	C	C	C
Agriculture, Neighborhood	§§ 102, 202.2(c)	P	P	P
Automotive Use Category				

Automotive Uses*	§ 102	NP	NP	NP
Electric Vehicle Charging Location	§§102, 202.2(b), 202.13	C(13)	C(13)	C(13)
Parking Garage, Private	§ 102	C	C	C
Parking Garage, Public	§ 102	C	NP	NP
Parking Lot, Private	§§ 102, 142, 156	C	C	C
Parking Lot, Public	§§ 102, 142, 156	C	NP	NP
Entertainment, Arts and Recreation Use Category				
Entertainment, Arts and Recreation Uses*	§ 102	NP	NP	NP
Arts Activities	§ 102	P	P	P
Entertainment, General	§ 102	P	P	NP
Entertainment, Nighttime	§ 102	C	NP	NP
Movie Theater	§§ 102, 202.4	C	C	C
Open Recreation Area	§ 102	C	C	C
Passive Outdoor Recreation	§ 102	C	C	C
Industrial Use Category				

Industrial Uses*	§§ 102, 202.2(d)	NP	NP	NP	NP
Institutional Use Category					
Institutional Uses*	§ 102	P	C	NP	
Child Care Facility	§ 102	P	P	P	
Community Facility	§ 102	P	P	P	
Hospital	§ 102	NP	NP	NP	
Medical Cannabis Dispensary	§§ 102, 202.2(e)	NP(6)	NP(6)	NP	
Public Facilities	§ 102	P	P	P	
Religious Institution	§ 102	P	C	NP	
Residential Care Facility	§ 102	P	P	P	
Social Service or Philanthropic Facility	§ 102	P	P	P	
Sales and Service Category					
Retail Sales and Service Uses*	§§ 102, 202.2(a), 202.3	P(3)	NP	NP	
Adult Business	§ 102	NP	NP	NP	
Adult Sex Venue	§ 102	NP	NP	NP	
Animal Hospital	§ 102	P	P	P	
Bar	§§ 102, 202.2(a)	P(6)	NP	NP	

Cannabis Retail	§§ 102, 202.2(a)	NP(6)	NP(6)	NP
Flexible Retail	§§ 102, 202.9	P	NP	NP
Gym	§ 102	P	NP	NP
Hotel	§ 102	NP	NP	NP
Kennel	§ 102	C	NP	NP
Liquor Store	§ 102	P(6)(9)	NP	NP
Massage Establishment	§§ 102, 204, 703	P	NP(12)	NP(12)
Mortuary	§ 102	NP	NP	NP
Motel	§§ 102, 202.2(a)	NP	NP	NP
Restaurant	§§ 102, 202.2(a)	P(3)	P(3)	NP
Restaurant, Limited	§§ 102, 202.2(a)	P(3)	P(3)	NP
Services, Financial	§ 102	C	NP	NP
Services, Fringe Financial	§ 102	NP(10)	NP(10)	NP(10)
Services, Health	§ 102	P	NP	NP
Services, Limited Financial	§ 102	P	NP	NP
Services, Personal	§ 102	P	NP	NP

Services, Retail Professional	§ 102	P	P	P
Storage, Self	§ 102	NP	NP	NP
Tobacco Paraphernalia Establishment	§ 102	C	NP	NP
Trade Shop	§ 102	P	NP	NP
Non-Retail Sales and Service Uses	§ 102	NP	NP	NP
Design Professional	§ 102	P	NP	NP
Service, Non-Retail Professional	§ 102	C	P	NP
Trade Office	§ 102	P	NP	NP
Utility and Infrastructure Use Category				
Utility and Infrastructure*	§ 102	C(5)	C(5)	C(5)
Power Plant	§ 102	NP	NP	NP
Public Utilities Yard	§ 102	NP	NP	NP

* Not listed below

(1) Additional 5 feet for NC-1 parcels with a Commercial use on the ground floor within the following areas:

(a) Within the boundaries of Sargent Street to Orizaba Avenue to Lobos Street to Plymouth Avenue to Farellones Street to San Jose Avenue to Alemany Boulevard to 19th Avenue to Randolph Street to Monticello Street and back to Sargent Street.

(b) On Noriega, Irving, Taraval, and Judah Streets west of 19th Avenue.

(2) C for 5,000 square feet and above if located within the Priority Equity Geographies

Special Use District established under Section 249.97.

(3) TARAVAL STREET RESTAURANT SUBDISTRICT. Applicable only for the Taraval Street NC-1 District between 40th and 41st Avenues and between 45th and 47th Avenues as mapped on Sectional Maps 5 SU and 6 SU. Within the Taraval Street Restaurant Subdistrict, Formula Retail Restaurants and Formula Retail Limited Restaurants are NP. Formula Retail Restaurants and Formula Retail Limited Restaurants are NP if located within one quarter of one mile from the Taraval Street Restaurant Subdistrict.

(4) ~~*[Note deleted.]*~~ *Canopy is P if required as a wind mitigation feature.*

(5) C if a Macro WTS Facility; P if a Micro WTS Facility.

(6) C in the area comprising all of that portion of the City and County commencing at the point of the intersection of the shoreline of the Pacific Ocean and a straight-line extension of Lincoln Way, and proceeding easterly along Lincoln Way to 17th Avenue, and proceeding southerly along 17th Avenue to Judah Street, and proceeding westerly along Judah Street to 19th Avenue, and proceeding southerly along 19th Avenue to Sloat Boulevard, and proceeding westerly along Sloat Boulevard, and following a straight-line extension of Sloat Boulevard to the shoreline of the Pacific Ocean and proceeding northerly along said line to the point of commencement.

(7) [Note deleted.]

(8) [Note deleted.]

(9) C within that portion of the City and County bounded as follows: commencing at the intersection of Arguello Boulevard and Frederick Street, then proceeding southerly along Arguello Boulevard to Carl Street, then proceeding easterly along Carl Street to Hillway Avenue, then proceeding southerly along Hillway Avenue to Parnassus Avenue, then proceeding easterly along Parnassus Avenue to Clayton Street, then proceeding northerly along Clayton Street to Frederick Street, then proceeding easterly along Frederick Street to

Buena Vista Avenue West, then proceeding generally northerly along Buena Vista Avenue West to Haight Street, then proceeding easterly along Haight Street to Baker Street, then proceeding northerly along Baker Street to Oak Street, then proceeding westerly along Oak Street to Stanyan Street, then proceeding southerly along Stanyan Street to Frederick Street, then proceeding westerly along Frederick Street to the point of commencement.

(10) FRINGE FINANCIAL SERVICE RESTRICTED USE DISTRICT (FFSRUD). Fringe Financial Services are NP within any FFSRUD and its one-quarter mile buffer pursuant to Section 249.35. Outside any FFSRUD and its one-quarter mile buffer, Fringe Financial Services are P subject to the restrictions set forth in Section 249.35(c)(3).

(11) NP for buildings with three or fewer Dwelling Units. C for buildings with 10 or more Dwelling Units.

(12) P if accessory to a Hotel, Personal Service or Health Service.

(13) P where existing use is any Automotive Use.

SEC. 711. NC-2 – SMALL-SCALE NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT.

The NC-2 District is intended to serve as the City's Small-Scale Neighborhood Commercial District. These districts are linear shopping streets which provide convenience goods and services to the surrounding neighborhoods as well as limited comparison shopping goods for a wider market. The range of comparison goods and services offered is varied and often includes specialty retail stores, restaurants, and neighborhood-serving offices. NC-2 Districts are commonly located along both collector and arterial streets which have transit routes.

These districts range in size from two or three blocks to many blocks, although the commercial development in longer districts may be interspersed with housing or other land uses. Buildings typically range in height from two to four stories with occasional one-story

commercial buildings.

The small-scale district controls provide for mixed-use buildings which approximate or slightly exceed the standard development pattern. Rear yard requirements above the ground story and at residential levels preserve open space corridors of interior blocks.

Most new commercial development is permitted at the ground and second stories. Neighborhood-serving businesses are strongly encouraged. ~~*The second story may be used by some retail stores, personal services, and medical, business and professional offices.*~~ Parking and hotels are monitored at all stories. Limits on late-night activity, drive-up facilities, and other automobile uses protect the livability within and around the district, and promote continuous retail frontage.

Housing development in new buildings is encouraged above the ground ~~*story*~~*floor*. ~~*Existing residential units are protected by limitations on demolition and upper-story conversions.*~~ Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted ~~*within the District pursuant to Section 207.1 of this Code*~~.

Table 711 SMALL-SCALE NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL CLUSTER DISTRICT NC-2

ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		NC-2
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
Height and Bulk Limits.	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250–252, 260,	Varies~~*, but generally 40-X*~~. See Height and Bulk Map Sheets HT10-13 for more information. Height sculpting required on Alleys per § 261.1.

	261.1, *263.19,* 270, *270.3,* 271. See also Height and Bulk District Maps	
5 Foot Height Bonus for Active Ground Floor Uses	§ 263.20	P(1) in some districts
Rear Yard	§§ 130, 134, 134(a)(e), 136	Required at the Second Story and at each succeeding level or Story of the building, and at the First Story if it contains a Dwelling Unit: 25% of lot depth, but in no case less than 15 feet
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	Not Required.
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally ~~N~~not ~~R~~required~~.~~; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).*
Street Frontage and Public Realm		

Streetscape and Pedestrian Improvements	§ 138.1	Required.
Street Frontage Requirements	§ 145.1	Required; controls apply to above-grade parking setbacks, parking and loading entrances, active uses, ground floor ceiling height, street-facing ground-level spaces, transparency and fenestration, and gates, railings, and grillwork. Exceptions permitted for historic buildings.
Ground Floor Commercial	§ 145.4	Required on some streets, see § 145.4 for specific districts.
Vehicular Access Restrictions	§ 155(r)	Restricted on some streets, see § 155(r) for specific districts
Miscellaneous		
Lot Size (Per Development)	§§ 102, 121.1	P(2)
Planned Unit Development	§ 304	C
Awning, Canopy or Marquee	§ 136.1	P
General Advertising Signs	§§ 262, 602, 604, 608, 609, 610, 611	NP
Signs	§§ 262, 602-	As permitted by § 607.1

	604, 607, 607.1, 608, 609	
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
Usable Open Space [Per Dwelling Unit]	§§ 135, 136	100 square feet if private, or 133 square feet if common, or the amount of open space required in the nearest Residential District, whichever is less.
Off-Street Parking Requirements	§§ 145.1, 150, 151, 153 - 156, 161, 166, 204.5	No car parking required. Maximum permitted per § 151. Bike parking required per §155.2. If car parking is provided, car share spaces are required when a project has 50 units or more per §166.
Dwelling Unit Mix	§ 207.7	Generally required for creation of 10 or more Dwelling Units. No less than 25% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least two Bedrooms, and no less than 10% of the

		total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least three Bedrooms.		
Use Characteristics				
Intermediate Length Occupancy	§§ 102, 202.10	P(12)		
Single Room Occupancy	§ 102	P		
Student Housing	§ 102	P		
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit ~~*Density*~~	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code ~~*Sections*~~*§§* 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Unit Density*,* *General*	§§ 102, 207	1 unit per 800 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater. ~~Form-Based Density applies within the R-4 Height and Bulk District (§§ 263.19, 270(i)).~~		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		

Group Housing Density	§208	1 bedroom per 275 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater. ~~Form-Based Density applies within the R-4 Height and Bulk District (§§ 263.19, 270(i)).~~		
Homeless Shelter Density	§§ 102, 208	Density limits regulated by the Administrative Code		
Senior Housing Density	§§102, 202.2(f), 207	P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location. ~~Form-Based Density applies within the R-4 Height and Bulk District (§§ 263.19, 270(i)).~~		
Loss of Dwelling Units*:* *Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~

~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124*, 207.9*	2.5 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
Use Size	§§ 102, 121.2	P up to 3,999 square feet; C 4,000 square feet and above		
Off-Street Parking Requirements	§§ 145.1, 150, 151, 153 - 156, 161, 166, 204.5	No car parking. Maximum permitted per § 151. Bike parking required per Section 155.2. Car share spaces required when a project has 25 or more parking spaces per § 166.		
Off-Street Freight Loading	§§ 150, 152, 153 - 155, 161, 204.5	None required if gross floor area is less than 10,000 square feet. Exceptions permitted per §§ 155 and 161.		
Commercial Use Characteristics				
Drive-up Facility	§ 102	NP		
Formula Retail	§ 102, 303.1	C		
Hours of Operation	§§ 102	P 6 a.m. - 2 a.m.; C 2 a.m. - 6 a.m.		
Maritime Use	§ 102	NP		
Open Air Sales	§§ 102, 703(b)	See § 703(b)		

Outdoor Activity Area	§§ 102, 145.2, 202.2	P if located in front or it complies with Section 202.2(a)(7); C if located elsewhere.		
Walk-up Facility	§ 102	P		
NON-RESIDENTIAL USES		**CONTROLS BY STORY**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd+**
Agricultural Use Category				
Agriculture, Industrial	§§ 102, 202.2(c)	NP	NP	NP
Agriculture, Large Scale Urban	§§ 102, 202.2(c)	C	C	C
Agriculture, Neighborhood	§§ 102, 202.2(c)	P	P	P
Automotive Use Category				
Automotive Uses*	§ 102	NP	NP	NP
Automotive Repair	§ 102	C	NP	NP
Automotive Service Station	§ 102	C	NP	NP
Electric Vehicle Charging Location	§§102, 202.2(b), 202.13	C(14)	C(14)	C(14)
Fleet Charging	§ 102	C	C	C
Gas Station	§§ 102, 187.1, 202.2(b)	C	NP	NP

Parking Garage, Private	§ 102	C		C	C
Parking Garage, Public	§ 102	C		C	C
Parking Lot, Private	§§ 102, 142, 156	C		C	C
Parking Lot, Public	§§ 102, 142, 156	C		C	C
Entertainment, Arts and Recreation Use Category					
Entertainment, Arts and Recreation Uses*	§ 102	NP		NP	NP
Arts Activities	§ 102	P		P	P
Entertainment, General	§ 102	P		P	NP
Entertainment, Nighttime	§ 102	P		NP	NP
Movie Theater	§§ 102, 202.4	P		P	P
Open Recreation Area	§ 102	C		C	C
Passive Outdoor Recreation	§ 102	C		C	C
Industrial Use Category					
Industrial Uses*	§§ 102, 202.2(d)	NP	NP	NP	NP
Institutional Use Category					
Institutional Uses*	§ 102	P		C	C

Child Care Facility	§ 102	P	P	P
Community Facility	§ 102	P	P	P
Hospital	§ 102	NP	NP	NP
Medical Cannabis Dispensary**	§§ 102, 202.2(e)	DR	DR	NP
Public Facilities	§ 102	P	P	P
Residential Care Facility	§ 102	P	P	P
Social Service or Philanthropic Facility	§ 102	P	P	P
Sales and Service Category				
Retail Sales and Service Uses*	§§ 102, 202.2(a), 202.3	P	P	NP
Adult Business	§ 102	NP	NP	NP
Adult Sex Venue	§ 102	NP	NP	NP
Animal Hospital	§ 102	P	P	NP
Bar	§§ 102, 202.2(a)	P(9)	NP	NP
Cannabis Retail	§§ 102, 202.2(a)	C	C	NP
Flexible Retail	§§ 102, 202.9	P	NP	NP
Hotel	§ 102	C	C	C

Kennel	§ 102	C	NP	NP
Liquor Store	§ 102	P(9)	NP	NP
Massage Establishment	§§ 102, 204, 303(n), 703	P(9)	C(13)	NP(13)
Massage, Foot/Chair	§ 102	P(9)	NP	NP
Mortuary	§ 102	NP	NP	NP
Motel	§§ 102, 202.2(a)	NP	NP	NP
Restaurant	§§ 102, 202.2(a)	P(4)	P(4)	NP
Restaurant, Limited	§§ 102, 202.2(a)	P(4)	P(4)	NP
Services, Financial	§ 102	P(5)	C(5)	NP
Services, Fringe Financial	§ 102	P(5)(6)	NP	NP
Services, Limited Financial	§ 102	P(5)	NP	NP
Services, Retail Professional	§ 102	P	P	P
Storage, Self	§ 102	NP	NP	NP
Tobacco Paraphernalia Establishment	§ 102	C	NP	NP
Trade Shop	§ 102	P	C	NP
Non-Retail Sales and	§ 102	NP	NP	NP

Service Uses				
Design Professional	§ 102	P	P	NP
Service, Non-Retail Professional	§ 102	C	P	NP
Trade Office	§ 102	P	P	NP
Utility and Infrastructure Use Category				
Utility and Infrastructure*	§ 102	C(7)	C(7)	C(7)
Power Plant	§ 102	NP	NP	NP
Public Utilities Yard	§ 102	NP	NP	NP

* Not listed below

(1) Additional 5 feet for NC-2 parcels zoned 40' or 50' with an Active Use on the ground floor within the following areas: Balboa Street between 2nd Avenue and 8th Avenue, and between 32nd Avenue and 39th Avenue.

(2) C for 10,000 square feet and above if located within the Priority Equity Geographies Special Use District established under Section 249.97.

(3) [Note deleted.]

(4) TARAVAL STREET RESTAURANT SUBDISTRICT: Applicable only for the Taraval Street NC-2 District between 12th and 19th Avenues as mapped on Sectional Maps 5 SU and 6 SU. Formula Retail Restaurants and Limited-Restaurants are NP.

(5) CHESTNUT STREET FINANCIAL SERVICE SUBDISTRICT: C for properties on Chestnut Street zoned NC-2 from Broderick to Fillmore Streets as mapped on Sectional Map 2 SU.

(6) FRINGE FINANCIAL SERVICE RESTRICTED USE DISTRICT (FFSRUD): The FFSRUD and its one-quarter mile buffer includes, but is not limited to, properties within: the

Mission Alcoholic Beverage Special Use District; the Haight Street Alcohol Restricted Use District; the Third Street Alcohol Restricted Use District; and the North of Market Residential Special Use District; and includes Small-Scale Neighborhood Commercial Districts within its boundaries.

Controls: Fringe Financial Services are NP within any FFSRUD and its one-quarter mile buffer pursuant to Section 249.35. Outside any FFSRUD and its one-quarter mile buffer, Fringe Financial Services are P subject to the restrictions set forth in Section 249.35(c)(3).

(7) C if a Macro WTS Facility; P if a Micro WTS Facility.

(8) P in the area comprising all of that portion of the City and County commencing at the point of the intersection of the shoreline of the Pacific Ocean and a straight-line extension of Lincoln Way, and proceeding easterly along Lincoln Way to 17th Avenue, and proceeding southerly along 17th Avenue to Judah Street, and proceeding westerly along Judah Street to 19th Avenue, and proceeding southerly along 19th Avenue to Sloat Boulevard, and proceeding westerly along Sloat Boulevard, and following a straight-line extension of Sloat Boulevard to the shoreline of the Pacific Ocean and proceeding northerly along said line to the point of commencement.

(9) C in the area comprising all of that portion of the City and County commencing at the point of the intersection of the shoreline of the Pacific Ocean and a straight-line extension of Lincoln Way, and proceeding easterly along Lincoln Way to 17th Avenue, and proceeding southerly along 17th Avenue to Judah Street, and proceeding westerly along Judah Street to 19th Avenue, and proceeding southerly along 19th Avenue to Sloat Boulevard, and proceeding westerly along Sloat Boulevard, and following a straight-line extension of Sloat Boulevard to the shoreline of the Pacific Ocean and proceeding northerly along said line to the point of commencement.

(10) [Note deleted.]

(11) [Note deleted.]

(12) NP for buildings with three or fewer Dwelling Units. C for buildings with 10 or more Dwelling Units.

(13) P if accessory to a Hotel~~,~~ Personal Service or Health Service, except C if accessory to a Hotel, Personal Service or Health Service within the boundaries described in note 9 to this Table.

(14) P where existing use is any Automotive Use.

SEC. 712. NC-3 – MODERATE-SCALE NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT.

NC-3 Districts are intended in most cases to offer a wide variety of comparison and specialty goods and services to a population greater than the immediate neighborhood, additionally providing convenience goods and services to the surrounding neighborhoods. NC-3 Districts are linear districts located along heavily trafficked thoroughfares which also serve as major transit routes.

NC-3 Districts include some of the longest linear commercial streets in the City, some of which have continuous retail development for many blocks. Large-scale lots and buildings and wide streets distinguish the districts from smaller-scaled commercial streets, although the districts may include small as well as moderately scaled lots. Buildings typically range in height from two to four stories with occasional taller structures.

NC-3 building standards permit moderately large commercial uses and buildings. Rear yards are protected at residential levels.

A diversified commercial environment is encouraged for the NC-3 District, and a wide variety of uses are permitted with special emphasis on neighborhood-serving businesses. Eating and drinking, entertainment, financial service and certain auto uses generally are

permitted with certain limitations at the first and second stories. Other retail businesses, personal services and offices are permitted at all stories of new buildings. Limited storage and administrative service activities are permitted with some restrictions.

Housing development in new buildings is encouraged above the second story. ~~*Existing residential units are protected by limitations on demolitions and upper-story conversions.*~~ Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted ~~*within the District pursuant to Section 207.1 of this Code*~~.

Table 712. MODERATE-SCALE NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT NC-3

ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		NC-3
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
Height and Bulk Limits	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250–252, 260, 261.1, *263.19,* 270, *270.3,* 271. See also Height and Bulk District Maps	Varies~~*, but generally 40-X*~~. See Height and Bulk Map Sheets HT01-04, HT07, HT08, HT10, and HT11 for more information. Height sculpting required on Alleys per § 261.1.
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ *130,* 131, 132, 133	*Generally* ~~*N*~~not ~~*R*~~required~~.~~*; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width*

		required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
* * * *		

Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit ~~*Density*~~	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code *§§Sections* ~~*and 207(c)(6)*~~ 207.1 and 207.2.		

Dwelling Unit Density, *General*	§§ 102, 207	1 unit per 600 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater. ~~Form-Based Density applies within the R-4 Height and Bulk District (§§ 263.19, 270(i)).~~
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*
Group Housing Density	§208	1 bedroom per 275 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater. ~~Form-Based Density applies within the R-4 Height and Bulk District (§§ 263.19, 270(i)).~~
* * * *		
Senior Housing Density	§§102, 202.2(f), 207	P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of §

		202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location. ~~Form-Based Density applies within the R-4 Height and Bulk District (§§ 263.19, 270(i)).~~		
Loss of Dwelling Units*:* *Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C(2)*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C(2)*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS *AND USES*				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124*, 207.9*	3.6 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* * * *

(2) THIRD FLOOR RESIDENTIAL CONVERSION:

Boundaries: Applicable to NC-3 Districts.

Controls: A residential use may be converted to an Institutional Use, other than a Medical Cannabis Dispensary, as a Conditional Use on the third story and above if in addition to the criteria set forth in Section ~~*303*~~*317*, the Commission finds that:

(a) The structure in which the residential use is to be converted has been found eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places;

(b) The proposed use is to be operated by a nonprofit public benefit corporation; and

(c) No legally residing residential tenants will be displaced.

* * * *

SEC. 713. NC-S – NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL SHOPPING CENTER DISTRICT.

NC-S Districts are intended to serve as small shopping centers or supermarket sites which provide retail goods and services for primarily car-oriented shoppers. They commonly contain at least one anchor store or supermarket, and some districts also have small medical office buildings. The range of services offered at their retail outlets usually is intended to serve the immediate and nearby neighborhoods. These districts encompass some of the most recent (post-1945) retail development in San Francisco's neighborhoods and serve as an alternative to the linear shopping street.

Shopping centers and supermarket sites contain mostly one-story buildings which are removed from the street edge and set in a parking lot. Outdoor pedestrian activity consists primarily of trips between the parking lot and the stores on-site. Ground and second stories are devoted to retail sales and some personal services and offices.

The NC-S standards and use provisions allow for medium-size commercial uses ~~*in low-scale buildings*~~. ~~*Rear yards are not required for new development.*~~ Most neighborhood-serving retail businesses are permitted at the first and second stories.

Housing development in new buildings is permitted. ~~*Existing residential units are protected by limitations on demolitions and prohibitions of upper-story conversions.*~~ Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted ~~*within the District pursuant to Section 207.1 of this Code*~~.

Table 713. NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL SHOPPING CENTER DISTRICT NC-S

ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		NC-S
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
Height and Bulk Limits	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250–252, 260, *263.19,* 261.1, 270, *270.3,* 271. See also Height and Bulk District Maps	Varies~~*, but generally 40-X*~~. See Height and Bulk Map Sheets HT02-05, HT07, and HT10-13 for more information. Height sculpting required on Alleys per §261.1.
* * * *		
Rear Yard	§§ 130, 134, 134(a)(e), 136	~~*Not Required.*~~*Required at the Second Story and at each succeeding level or Story of the building, and at the First Story if it contains a Dwelling Unit: 25% of lot depth, but in no case less than 15 feet.*
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ *130,* 131, 132, 133	*Generally* ~~*N*~~*n*ot ~~*R*~~*r*equired~~.~~*; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the*

		existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
* * * *		

Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit ~~*Density*~~	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code ~~*Sections*~~*§§* 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Unit Density*, General*	§§ 102, 207	1 unit per 800 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is		

			greater. ~~Form-Based Density applies within the R-4 Height and Bulk District (§§ 263.19, 270(i)).~~
	Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*
	Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*
	Group Housing Density	§208	1 bedroom per 275 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater. ~~Form-Based Density applies within the R-4 Height and Bulk District (§§ 263.19, 270(i)).~~
	* * * *		
	Senior Housing Density	§§102, 202.2(f), 207	P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.

		~~Form-Based Density applies within the R-4 Height and Bulk District (§§ 263.19, 270(i)).~~		
Loss of Dwelling Units*:* *Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~	~~*NP*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS *AND USES*				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124*, 207.9*	1.8 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* * * *

SEC. 714. BROADWAY NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT.

* * * *

Table 714. BROADWAY NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT

ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Broadway NCD
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**

BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally* ~~*N*~~not ~~*R*~~required~~.~~*; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).*
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	~~*Subject to the*~~ Urban Design Guidelines*,* ~~*and*~~ *Citywide Design Standards,* historic resource consideration*, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission*. Properties in this District have been identified as potentially eligible for the National Register or California Register.
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
* * * *		

Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit ~~*Density*~~	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code ~~*Sections*~~*§§* 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Unit Density*, General*	§§ 102, 207	1 unit per 400 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		
Group Housing Density	§ 208	1 bedroom per 140 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.		
* * * *				
Loss of Dwelling Units*: Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~

~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124, *207.9*	2.5 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* * * *

SEC. 715. CASTRO STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT.

* * * *

(b) **Intent of Controls.** The Castro Street District controls are designed to *accommodate various scales of* ~~*maintain existing small-scale*~~ development and promote a balanced mix of uses. Building standards permit small- *and mid-*scale buildings and uses and protect rear yards above the ground story and at residential levels. In new buildings, most commercial uses are permitted at the ground and second stories. Special controls are necessary to preserve the existing equilibrium of neighborhood-serving convenience and specialty commercial uses. In order to maintain convenience stores and protect adjacent residential livability, controls authorize some additional drinking establishments with a conditional use, permit self-service specialty food establishments, and permit with certain limitations new late-night uses, adult and other entertainment, and financial service uses. The continuous retail frontage is maintained by prohibiting most automobile and drive-up uses. Housing development in new buildings is encouraged above the second story. ~~*Existing housing units are protected by limitations on demolitions and upper-story conversions.*~~ Accessory Dwelling Units are

permitted ~~*within the district pursuant to Section 207.1 of this Code*~~.

Table 715. CASTRO STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT

ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Castro Street NCD
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
Height and Bulk Limits	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250–252, ~~*253.1,*~~ 260, *263.19,* 261.1, 270, *270.3,* 271. See also Height and Bulk District Maps	~~*40-X, 65-B.*~~*Varies.* See Height and Bulk Map Sheet HT07 for more information. Height Sculpting on Alleys per § 261.1.
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally* ~~*N*~~*n*ot ~~*R*~~*r*equired~~.~~*; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan.*

		This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
* * * *		

Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit ~~*Density*~~	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code ~~*Sections*~~*§§* 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Unit Density*, General*	§§ 102, 207	~~*1 unit per 600 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~ ~~Form-Based Density.~~ 1 unit per 600 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.		

Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*
Group Housing Density	§208	~~*Up to 1 bedroom per 210 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~~~Form-Based Density.~~ Up to 1 bedroom per 210 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.
* * * *		
Senior Housing Density	§§102, 202.2(f), 207	~~*P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.*~~~~Form-Based Density.~~ P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in

		the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.		
Loss of Dwelling Units: *Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124, *207.9*	3.0 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* * * *

SEC. 716. INNER CLEMENT STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT.

The Inner Clement Street *Neighborhood* Commercial District is located on Clement Street between Arguello Boulevard and Funston Avenue in the eastern portion of the Richmond District of northwest San Francisco. The ~~d~~District provides a wide selection of convenience goods and services for the residents of the Inner Richmond neighborhood. Inner Clement Street has one of the greatest concentrations of restaurants of any commercial street

in San Francisco, drawing customers from throughout the City and region. There are also a significant number of professional, realty, and business offices as well as financial institutions. The pleasant pedestrian character of the district is derived directly from the intensely active retail frontage on Clement Street.

The ~~*Inner Clement Street*~~ District controls are designed to promote development that is consistent with its existing land use patterns and to maintain a harmony of uses that supports the ~~*d*~~*D*istrict's vitality. The building standards allow small-*to mid*-scale buildings and uses, protecting rear yards above the ground story and at residential levels. In new development, most commercial uses are permitted at the first two stories, although certain limitations apply to uses at the second story. Special controls are necessary to preserve the equilibrium of neighborhood-serving convenience and comparison shopping businesses and protect adjacent residential livability. These controls limit additional financial service uses, additional eating and drinking establishments, and late-night commercial uses. In order to maintain the street's active retail frontage, controls also prohibit most new automobile and drive-up uses.

Housing development is encouraged in new buildings above the ground story. ~~*Existing residential units are protected by prohibitions on upper-story conversions and limitations on demolitions.*~~ Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted ~~*within the district pursuant to Section 207.1 of this Code*~~.

Table 716. INNER CLEMENT STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Inner Clement Street
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		

Height and Bulk Limits	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250–252, 260, *263.19,* 261.1, 270, *270.3,* 271. See also Height and Bulk District Maps	~~*40-X.*~~ *Varies.* See Height and Bulk Map Sheet HT03 for more information. Height sculpting required on Alleys per § 261.1.
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally* ~~*N*~~*n*ot ~~*R*~~*r*equired~~.~~*; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).*
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning*

	Element	*Commission.*		
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*		
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
* * * *				
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit ~~*Density*~~	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code ~~*Sections*~~*§§* 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Unit Density*, General*	§§ 102, 207	~~*1 unit per 600 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. 1 unit per 600 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		
Group Housing Density	§208	~~*Up to 1 bedroom per 210 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever*~~		

		~~*is greater*~~.~~Form-Based Density~~. Up to 1 bedroom per 210 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.
* * * *		
Senior Housing Density	§§102, 202.2(f), 207	~~*P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.*~~Form-Based ~~Density~~. P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.
Loss of Dwelling Units*: Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*

		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~	~~*NP*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124, *207.9*	1.8 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* * * *

SEC. 717. OUTER CLEMENT STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT.

The Outer Clement Street Neighborhood Commercial District is located on Clement Street between 19th Avenue and 27th Avenue in the western portion of the Richmond District. The shopping area contains small-scale convenience businesses, as well as many restaurants and a movie theater. The ~~*d*~~*D*istrict's restaurants serve a neighborhood and Citywide clientele during the evening hours, while convenience shopping uses cater for the most part to daytime neighborhood shoppers. Outer Clement Street contains many mixed-use buildings with some fully commercial and fully residential buildings interspersed between them.

The Outer Clement Street District controls are designed to promote development that is in keeping with the ~~*d*~~*D*istrict's existing small-scale, mixed-use character. The building standards ~~*monitor*~~*guide* large-scale development and protect rear yards at all levels. Future commercial growth is directed to the ground story in order to promote more continuous and

active retail frontage. Additional eating and drinking establishments are regulated to prevent over-concentration, while ground-story entertainment and financial service uses are monitored in order to limit the problems of traffic, congestion, noise and late-night activity associated with such uses and to protect existing neighborhood-serving businesses. Other controls restricting late-night activity, hotels, automobile uses, and drive-up facilities are designed to preserve the low-intensity character of the district.

Housing development in new buildings is encouraged above the ground story. ~~*Existing residential units are protected by prohibitions of upper-story conversions and limitations on demolitions.*~~ Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted ~~*within the district pursuant to Section 207.1 of this Code*~~.

Table 717. OUTER CLEMENT STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Outer Clement Street
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
Height and Bulk Limits	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250–252, 260, *263.19,* 261.1, 270, *270.3,* 271. See also Height and	~~*40-X.*~~ *Varies.* See Height and Bulk Map Sheet HT03 and HT04 for more information. Height sculpting required on Alleys per § 261.1.

	Bulk District Maps	
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally ~~Nn~~*not *~~Rr~~*equired*~~.~~; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).*
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
* * * *		

Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit ~~*Density*~~	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code ~~*Sections*~~*§§* 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Unit Density*, General*	§§ 102, 207	~~*1 unit per 600 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. 1 unit per 600 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		
Group Housing Density	§208	~~*1 bedroom per 210 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. 1 bedroom per 210 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.		
* * * *				
Senior Housing Density	§§102, 202.2(f), 207	~~*P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to*~~		

			~~*twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.*~~ ~~Form-Based Density.~~ P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.		
Loss of Dwelling Units*: Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~	~~*NP*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124*, 207.9*	1.8 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		

* * * *

* * * *

SEC. 718. UPPER FILLMORE STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT.

The Upper Fillmore Street Neighborhood Commercial District is situated in the south-central portion of Pacific Heights. It runs north-south along Fillmore Street from Jackson to Bush and extends west one block along California and Pine Streets. This medium-scaled, multi-purpose commercial district provides convenience goods to its immediate neighborhood as well as comparison shopping goods and services on a specialized basis to a wider trade area. Commercial businesses are active during both day and evening and include a number of bars, restaurants, specialty groceries, and specialty clothing stores.

The Upper Fillmore District controls are designed to ~~*protect*~~ *reflect* the existing building scale and promote new mixed-use development which is in character with adjacent buildings. Building standards regulate large lot and use development and protect rear yards above the ground story and at residential levels. Most commercial uses are permitted at the first two stories of new buildings. Special controls are designed to preserve ~~*the existing*~~*an* equilibrium of neighborhood-serving convenience and specialty commercial uses. In order to maintain convenience stores and protect adjacent livability, additional bars (unless part of a restaurant) and formula retail establishments are prohibited, and financial service uses are limited. In order to promote continuous retail frontage, drive-up and most automobile uses are prohibited.

Housing development in new buildings is encouraged above the second story. ~~*Existing residential units are protected by limitations on demolitions and upper-story conversions.*~~ Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted ~~*within the district pursuant to Section 207.1 of this Code*~~.

Table 718. UPPER FILLMORE STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Upper Fillmore Street NCD
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
Height and Bulk Limits.	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250–252, 260, *263.19,* 261.1, 270, *270.3,* 271. See also Height and Bulk District Maps	~~*40-X.*~~ *Varies.* See Height and Bulk Map Sheet HT02 for more information. Height sculpting required on Alleys per § 261.1.
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally* ~~*N*~~*n*ot ~~*R*~~*r*equired~~.~~*; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan.*

		This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
* * * *		

Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit ~~*Density*~~	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code ~~*Sections*~~*§§* 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Unit Density*, General*	§§ 102, 207	~~*1 unit per 600 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. 1 unit per 600 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.		

Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*
Group Housing Density	§208	~~*Up to 1 bedroom per 210 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~~~Form-Based Density.~~Up to 1 bedroom per 210 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.
* * * *		
Senior Housing Density	§§102, 202.2(f), 207	~~*P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.*~~~~Form-Based Density.~~ P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in

		the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.		
Loss of Dwelling Units: *Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124, *207.9*	2.5 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* * * *

SEC. 719. HAIGHT STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT.

Northwest of the City's geographical center, the Haight Street Neighborhood Commercial District is located in the Haight-Ashbury neighborhood, extending along Haight Street between Stanyan and Central Avenue, including a portion of Stanyan Street between Haight and Beulah. The shopping area provides convenience goods and services to local Haight-Ashbury residents, as well as comparison shopping goods and services to a larger

market area. The commercial district is also frequented by users of Golden Gate Park on weekends and by City residents for its eating, drinking, and entertainment places. Numerous housing units establish the ~~*d*~~*D*istrict's mixed residential-commercial character.

The Haight Street District controls are designed to ~~*protect*~~ *reflect* the existing building scale and promote new mixed-use development which is in character with adjacent buildings. The building standards regulate large-lot and use development and protect rear yards above the ground story and at residential levels. To promote the prevailing mixed-use character, most commercial uses are directed primarily to the ground story with some upper-story restrictions in new buildings. In order to maintain the balanced mix and variety of neighborhood-serving commercial uses and regulate the more intensive commercial uses which can generate congestion and nuisance problems, special controls limit additional drinking uses and tourist hotels. Prohibitions of most automobile and drive-up uses protect the ~~*d*~~*D*istrict's continuous retail frontage.

Housing development in new buildings is encouraged above the ground story. ~~*Existing residential units are protected by prohibition of upper-story conversions and limitations on demolitions.*~~ Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted ~~*within the district pursuant to Section 207.1 of this Code*~~.

Table 719. HAIGHT STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT

ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Haight Street NCD
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
Height and Bulk Limits.	§§ 102, 105,	~~*40-X.*~~ *Varies.* See Height and Bulk Map Sheets

	106, 250–252, 260, *263.19,* 261.1, 270, *270.3,* 271. See also Height and Bulk District Maps	HT06 and HT07 for more information. Height sculpting required on Alleys per § 261.1.
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally* ~~N~~not ~~R~~required~~.~~*; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).*
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*

Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*		
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
* * * *				
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit ~~*Density*~~	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code ~~*Sections*~~*§§* 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Unit Density*, General*	§§ 102, 207	~~*1 unit per 600 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. 1 unit per 600 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		
Group Housing Density	§208	~~*1 bedroom per 210 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density 1 bedroom per 210		

		square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.			
* * * *					
Senior Housing Density	§§102, 202.2(f), 207	~~*P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.*~~Form Based Density. P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.			
Loss of Dwelling Units*: Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*			
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~	
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~	~~*NP*~~	

~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124, *207.9*	1.8 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* * * *

SEC. 720. EXCELSIOR OUTER MISSION NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT.

* * * *

Table 720. EXCELSIOR OUTER MISSION STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT

ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Excelsior Outer Mission NCD
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally* ~~*N*~~not ~~*R*~~required~~.~~*; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to*

		the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).			
* * * *					
Miscellaneous					
* * * *					
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*			
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES					
Development Standards					
* * * *					
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**			
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**	
Residential Uses	§102	P	P	P	
Accessory Dwelling Unit	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code ~~*Sections*~~*§§* 207.1 and 207.2.			
Dwelling Unit~~s~~ *Density, General*	§§ 102, 207	1 unit per 600 square foot lot area			
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*			
Maximum Dwelling Unit	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an*			

Size		*equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		
Group Housing Density	§ 208	1 bedroom per 210 square foot lot area.		
* * * *				
Loss of Dwelling Units*: Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124*, 207.9*	3.6 to 1*. For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* * * *

SEC. 721. JAPANTOWN NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT.

* * * *

Table 721. JAPANTOWN NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT

ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Japantown NCD
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally ~~N~~not ~~R~~required~~.~~; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).*
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
* * * *		
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**

		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code ~~*Sections*~~§§ 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Unit Density, *General*	§§ 102, 207	1 unit per 400 square foot lot area.		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		
Group Housing Density	§ 208	1 bedroom per 210 square foot lot area.		
* * * *				
Loss of Dwelling Units: *Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				

Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124, *207.9*	3.6 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*
* * * *		

* * * *

SEC. 722. NORTH BEACH NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT.

The North Beach Neighborhood Commercial District is a nonlinear district centered on Columbus Avenue, located in the valley between Telegraph Hill and Russian Hill north of Broadway. North Beach functions as a neighborhood-serving marketplace, ~~*c*~~*C*itywide specialty shopping, and dining district, and a tourist attraction, as well as an apartment and residential hotel zone. Traditionally, the ~~*d*~~*D*istrict has provided most convenience goods and services for residents of North Beach and portions of Telegraph and Russian Hills. North Beach's eating, drinking, and entertainment establishments remain open into the evening to serve a much wider trade area and attract many tourists. The balance between neighborhood-serving convenience stores and Citywide specialty businesses has shifted, as convenience stores have been replaced by restaurants and bars. The proliferation of financial services, limited financial services, and professional services has also upset the ~~*d*~~*D*istrict's balance of uses. The relocation of business and professional offices from downtown to North Beach threatens the loss of upper-story residential units.

* * * *

In keeping with the ~~*d*~~*D*istrict's existing mixed-use character, housing development in new buildings is encouraged above the ground floor. Existing residential units are protected by ~~*prohibitions*~~*limitations* of upper-story conversions, mergers, removals, and demolitions. ~~*Per Section 207.1 of this Code,*~~ Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted within the existing building envelope, but may not eliminate or reduce ground-story retail or commercial space.

Table 722. NORTH BEACH NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT

ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		North Beach NCD
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
Height and Bulk Limits.	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250–252, 260, *263.19,* 261.1, 270, *270.3,* 271. See also Height and Bulk District Maps	~~*40-X.*~~ *Varies.* See Height and Bulk Map Sheet HT01 for more information. Height sculpting required on Alleys per § 261.1.
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally* ~~*N*~~not ~~*R*~~required~~.~~*; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street*

		grade. See § 132(e).
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the ~~*General Plan's*~~ Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards,* ~~*and*~~ historic resource consideration*, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission*. Properties in this District have been identified as potentially eligible for National Register or California Register.
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
* * * *		

Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	NP(11)	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Units	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code ~~*Sections*~~*§§* 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Unit~~s~~ *Density, General*	§§ 102, 207	1 unit per 400 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.		

		~~Form-Based Density applies within the R-4 Height and Bulk District (§§ 263.19, 270(i)).~~
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*
Group Housing *Density*	§208	1 bedroom per 140 square foot lot area*, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater*. ~~Form-Based Density applies within the R-4 Height and Bulk District (§§ 263.19, 270(i)).~~
* * * *		
Senior Housing *Density*	§§102, 202.2(f), 207	P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.

		~~Form-Based Density applies within the R-4 Height and Bulk District (§§ 263.19, 270(i)).~~		
Loss of Dwelling Units*:* *Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§§ 317, 780.3(c)(4)*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~	~~*NP*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§§ 317, 780.3(c)(4)*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~	~~*NP*~~
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124*, 207.9*	1.8 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* Not listed below

(1) NORTH BEACH OFF-STREET PARKING, RESIDENTIAL (Section 155(t))

* * * *

(a) Installing a garage in an existing or proposed residential building of two or more units requires a mandatory Discretionary Review by the Planning Commission. In order to approve the installation of any garage in these districts, the City shall find that:

* * * *

(iv) the garage would not front on an Alley pursuant to Section 155(r)(~~2~~*21*) of this

Code or on a public right-of-way narrower than 41 feet, and

* * * *

SEC. 723. POLK STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT.

* * * *

(b) Controls.

(1) **Purposes.** The Polk Street District controls are designed to encourage and promote development that is compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. The building standards ~~*monitor*~~*guide* large-scale development and protect rear yards at residential levels. Consistent with Polk Street's existing mixed-use character, new buildings may contain most commercial uses at the First Story. The controls encourage neighborhood-serving businesses. They also prohibit new adult entertainment uses. Restrictions on drive-up and most automobile uses protect the district's continuous retail frontage and prevent further traffic congestion.

Housing developed in new buildings is encouraged above the First Story, especially in the less intensely developed portions of the district along Larkin Street and on large lots throughout the district. New housing development requires 40% or more two-bedroom plus units to encourage families to live in the district. Parking is limited in new developments given the ~~*d*~~*D*istrict's transit access and the proximity to bus rapid transit along Van Ness Avenue parallel to the district. ~~*Existing housing units are protected by on demolitions and upper-story conversions.*~~ Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted ~~*within the district pursuant to Section 207.1 of this Code*~~.

* * * *

~~*(4) **Loss of Residential Units.** To prevent the loss of existing Residential Units, the removal, demolition, merger, or conversion of Residential Units above the First Story are prohibited*~~

~~*even if such loss of Residential Units would otherwise be allowed pursuant to Section 317 of this Code.*~~

(~~5~~4) **Neighborhood Commercial Design Guidelines.** The construction of new buildings and alteration of existing buildings in the Polk Street NC District shall be consistent with the design policies and guidelines of the General Plan and with the "Polk/Pacific Special Area Design Guidelines" as adopted by the Planning Commission. The Planning Director may require modifications to the exterior of a proposed new building or proposed alteration of an existing residential building in order to bring it into conformity with the *Citywide Design Standards,* "Polk/Pacific Special Area Design Guidelines" and with the General Plan. These modifications may include, but are not limited to, changes in siting, building envelope, scale texture and detailing, openings, and landscaping.

Table 723. POLK STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Polk Street NCD
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
Height and Bulk Limits.	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250–252, 260, *263.19,* 261.1, 270, *270.3,* 271. See also Height and Bulk District	*Varies.* ~~*65-A, 80-A, and 130-E.*~~ See Height and Bulk Map Sheet HT02 for more information. Height sculpting required on Alleys per § 261.1.

	Maps	
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally ~~N~~not ~~R~~required~~.~~; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).*
~~*Streetscape and Pedestrian Improvements*~~	~~*§ 138.1*~~	~~*Required.*~~
Street Frontage and Public Realm		
Streetscape and Pedestrian Improvements	*§ 138.1*	*Required.*
Street Frontage Requirements	§ 145.1	Required; controls apply to above-grade parking setbacks, parking and loading entrances, active uses, ground floor ceiling height, street-facing ground-level spaces, transparency and fenestration, and gates, railings, and grillwork. Exceptions permitted for historic buildings.
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		

Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element and the Polk/Pacific Special Area Design Guidelines	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, ~~and~~* the Polk/Pacific Special Area Design Guidelines*, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission*.		
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*		
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
* * * *				
Dwelling Unit Mix	§ 207.6	Generally ~~*R*~~*r*equired for creation of five or more Dwelling Units. No less than 40% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least two bedrooms; or no less than 30% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least three bedrooms.		
* * * *				
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P	P	P

Accessory Dwelling Units	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code ~~*Sections*~~*§§* 207.1 and 207.2.
Dwelling Unit~~s~~ *Density, General*	§§ 102, 207	~~*1 unit per 400 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. 1 unit per 400 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*
~~*Residential Density,*~~ Group Housing *Density*	§208	~~*1 bedroom per 140 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. 1 bedroom per 140 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.
* * * *		
Senior Housing *Density*	§§102, 202.2(f), 207	~~*P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for §*~~

			~~202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.~~~~Form-Based Density.~~ P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.		
Loss ~~*and Division*~~ of Dwelling Units*:* *Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*NP*~~	~~*NP*~~	~~*NP*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*NP*~~	~~*NP*~~	~~*NP*~~
Division of Dwelling Units	§ 207.8	Division of existing Dwelling Units P per § 207.8.		
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES (7)				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124*, 207.9*	2.5 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		

* * * *

* * * *

SEC. 724. SACRAMENTO STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT.

Located in the Presidio Heights neighborhood in north-central San Francisco, the Sacramento Street Neighborhood Commercial District functions as a small-scale linear shopping area. It extends along Sacramento Street between Lyon and Spruce Streets. Interspersed among residential buildings and garages, the district's daytime-oriented retail stores provide a limited array of convenience goods to the immediate neighborhood. Sacramento Street also has many elegant clothing, accessory, and antique stores and services, such as hair salons, which attract customers from a wider trade area. Its numerous medical and business offices draw clients from throughout the City. Evening activity in the district is limited to one movie theater, a few restaurants, and some stores near Presidio Avenue.

The Sacramento Street District controls are designed to promote adequate growth opportunities for development that is compatible with the surrounding low-density residential neighborhood. The building standards ~~*monitor*~~*guide* large-scale development and protect rear yards at the grade level and above. Most new commercial development is permitted at the first story; *a conditional use authorization is required if a* general retail use~~*s are permitted at the second story only if such use*~~ would ~~*not*~~ involve conversion of any existing housing units. Special controls are designed to protect existing neighborhood-serving ground-story retail uses. Limits on financial service uses are intended to minimize the environmental impacts generated by the growth of such uses. The daytime orientation of the ~~*d*~~*D*istrict is encouraged by requiring

conditional use authorization for bars and restricting late-night commercial activity. New hotels and parking facilities are limited in scale and operation to minimize disruption to the neighborhood. Most new automobile and drive-up uses are prohibited to promote continuous retail frontage.

Housing development in new buildings is encouraged above the second story. ~~*Existing residential units are protected by limitations on demolitions and prohibitions of upper-story conversions.*~~ Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted ~~*within the district pursuant to Section 207.1 of this Code*~~.

Table 724. SACRAMENTO STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Sacramento Street NCD
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
Height and Bulk Limits.	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250–252, 260, *263.19,* 261.1, 270, *270.3,* 271. See also Height and Bulk District Maps	*Varies.* ~~*40-X.*~~ See Height and Bulk Map Sheets HT02 and HT03 for more information. Height sculpting required on Alleys per § 261.1.
* * * *		

Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally Nnot Rrequired.; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).*		
* * * *				
Miscellaneous				
* * * *				
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*		
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*		
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
* * * *				
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P	P	P

Accessory Dwelling Unit~~s~~	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code ~~*Sections*~~§§ 207.1 and 207.2.
Dwelling Unit~~s~~ *Density, General*	§§ 102, 207	~~*1 unit per 800 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. 1 unit per 800 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*
Group Housing *Density*	§208	~~*1 bedroom per 275 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. 1 bedroom per 275 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.
* * * *		
Senior Housing *Density*	§§102, 202.2(f), 207	~~*P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for §*~~

		~~*202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.*~~Form-Based ~~Density.~~ P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.		
Loss of Dwelling Units*:* *Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~	~~*NP*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124, *207.9*	1.8 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* * * *

SEC. 725. UNION STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT.

* * * *

The Union Street District controls are designed to provide sufficient growth opportunities for commercial development that is in keeping with the existing scale and character, promote continuous retail frontage, and protect adjacent residential livability. Small-*to mid*-scale buildings and neighborhood-serving uses are promoted, and rear yards above the ground story and at all residential levels are protected. Most commercial development is permitted at the first two stories of new buildings, while retail service uses are monitored at the third story and above. Controls are necessary to preserve the remaining convenience businesses and to reduce the cumulative impacts which the growth of certain uses have on neighborhood residents. Such controls require Conditional Use authorization for additional drinking establishments and limit additional entertainment, and financial service uses. Most automobile and drive-up uses are prohibited in order to maintain continuous retail frontage and minimize further traffic congestion.

Housing development in new buildings is encouraged above the second story. ~~*Existing residential units are protected by limitations on demolitions and upper-story conversions.*~~ Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted ~~*within the district pursuant to Section 207.1 of this Code*~~.

Table 725. UNION STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT

ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Union Street NCD
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		

Height and Bulk Limits.	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250–252, 260, *263.19,* 261.1, 270, *270.3,* 271. See also Height and Bulk District Maps	*Varies.* ~~*40-X.*~~ See Height and Bulk Map Sheet HT02 for more information. Height sculpting required on Alleys per § 261.1.
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally* ~~*N*~~not ~~*R*~~required~~.~~*; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).*
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning*

	Element	*Commission.*		
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*		
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
* * * *				
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit~~s~~ *Density*	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code ~~*Sections*~~*§§* 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Unit~~s~~ *Density, General*	§§ 102, 207	~~*1 unit per 600 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. 1 unit per 600 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		
Group Housing *Density*	§208	~~*1 bedroom per 210 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is*~~		

			greater.~~Form-Based Density.~~ 1 bedroom per 210 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.		
* * * *					
Senior Housing *Density*	§§102, 202.2(f), 207		~~*P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.*~~Form-Based ~~Density.~~ P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.		
Loss of Dwelling Units*: Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*		~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
			~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~

~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124, *207.9*	3.0 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* * * *

SEC. 726. PACIFIC AVENUE NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT.

* * * *

(b) **Controls.**

(1) **Purposes.** The Pacific Avenue Neighborhood Commercial District controls are designed to promote a small, neighborhood serving mixed-use commercial street that preserves the surrounding neighborhood residential character. These controls are intended to preserve livability in a largely low-rise development residential neighborhood, enhance solar access on a narrow street right-of-way, and protect residential rear yard patterns at the ground floor. Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted ~~*within the district pursuant to Section 207.1 of this Code*~~.

* * * *

~~*(3) **Loss of Residential Units.** To prevent the loss of existing Residential Units, the removal, demolition, merger, or conversion of Residential Units above the First Story are prohibited even if such loss of Residential Units would otherwise be allowed pursuant to Section 317 of this Code.*~~

(*~~4~~3*) **Neighborhood Commercial Design Guidelines.** The construction of new

buildings and alteration of existing buildings in the Pacific Avenue Neighborhood Commercial District shall be consistent with the design policies and guidelines of the General Plan*, the Citywide Design Standards, the Urban Design Guidelines* and with the "Polk/Pacific Special Area Design Guidelines" as adopted by the Planning Commission. The Planning Director may require modifications to the exterior of a proposed new building or proposed alteration of an existing residential building in order to bring it into conformity with the *Citywide Design Standards and the* "Polk/Pacific Special Area Design Guidelines" and with the General Plan. These modifications may include, but are not limited to, changes in siting, building envelope, scale texture and detailing, openings, and landscaping.

Table 726. PACIFIC AVENUE NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Pacific Avenue NCD
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
Height and Bulk Limits.	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250–252, 260, *263.19,* 261.1, 270, *270.3,* 271. See also Height and Bulk District Maps	*Varies.* ~~*40-X.*~~ See Height and Bulk Map Sheets HT01 and HT02 for more information. Height sculpting required on Alleys per § 261.1.

* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally* ~~*N*~~not ~~*R*~~required~~.~~*; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).*
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element and the Polk/Pacific Special Area Design Guidelines	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards,* ~~*and*~~ the Polk/Pacific Special Area Design Guidelines*, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission*.
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*

RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
* * * *				
Dwelling Unit Mix	§~~§~~ 207.6	Generally ~~*R*~~*r*equired for creation of five or more Dwelling Units. No less than 40% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least two bedrooms; or no less than 30% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least three bedrooms.		
* * * *				
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code ~~*Sections*~~§§ 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Unit~~s~~ *Density, General*	§§ 102, 207	~~*1 unit per 1,000 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~ ~~Form-Based Density.~~ 1 unit per 1,000 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that*		

			exceed the greater of those thresholds.
	Group Housing *Density*	§208	~~*1 bedroom per 275 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. 1 bedroom per 275 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.
	* * * *		
	Senior Housing *Density*	§§102, 202.2(f), 207	~~*P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.*~~Form-Based Density. P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.
	Loss ~~*and Division*~~ of Dwelling Units*:* *Conversion, Demolition,*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*

or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats				
		~~1st~~	*~~2nd~~*	*~~3rd+~~*
~~Residential Conversion~~	*~~§ 317~~*	*~~NP~~*	*~~NP~~*	*~~NP~~*
~~Residential Demolition~~	*~~§ 317~~*	*~~NP~~*	*~~NP~~*	*~~NP~~*
~~Residential Merger~~	*~~§ 317~~*	*~~NP~~*	*~~NP~~*	*~~NP~~*
Division of Dwelling Units	§ 207.8	Division of existing Dwelling Units P per § 207.8.		
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124, *207.9*	1.5 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* * * *

SEC. 727. LAKESIDE VILLAGE NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT.

The Lakeside Village Neighborhood Commercial District is located in the southwestern part of the City and stretches along Ocean Avenue from Junipero Serra Boulevard to 19th Avenue. It is a neighborhood serving shopping corridor nestled among single-family homes. Lakeside Village has small ground-floor retail, restaurant, and medical office space and is serviced by the M-line streetcar.

Building controls for the Lakeside Village Neighborhood Commercial District promote *~~low-intensity~~* *various scales of* development which *~~is~~are* compatible with the existing scale and character of the District. Commercial development is limited *~~to one story~~*, *with certain exceptions*.

Rear yard requirements at all levels preserve existing backyard space.

Commercial use provisions encourage the full range of neighborhood-serving convenience retail sales and services provided that the use size generally is limited to 3,000 square feet. However, commercial uses and features which could impact residential livability are prohibited, such as auto uses, financial services, general advertising signs, drive-up facilities, hotels, and late-night activity.

Housing development in new buildings is encouraged above the ground story. ~~*Existing residential units are protected by prohibitions of conversions above the ground story and limitations on demolitions.*~~ Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted within the District ~~*pursuant to Sections 207.1 and 207.2 of this Code*~~.

Table 727. LAKESIDE VILLAGE NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Lakeside Village NCD
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
Height and Bulk Limits.	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250–252, 260, *263.19,* 261.1, 270, *270.3,* 271. See also Height and Bulk District	Varies~~*, but generally 26-X*~~. See Height and Bulk Map Sheet HT12 for more information. Height sculpting required on Alleys per § 261.1.

	Maps	
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally* ~~*N*~~not ~~*R*~~required~~.~~*; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).*
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		
Canopy or Marquee	§ 136.1	NP*(5)*
* * * *		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		

* * * *				
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit ~~*Density*~~	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code ~~*Sections*~~§§ 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Unit Density, *General*	§§ 102, 207	~~*1 unit per 800 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. 1 unit per 800 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		
Group Housing Density	§208	~~*1 bedroom per 275 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. 1 bedroom per 275 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.		
* * * *				
Senior Housing Density	§§102, 202.2(f), 207	~~*P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and*~~		

			~~*meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.*~~ ~~Form Based Density.~~ P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.		
Loss of Dwelling Units*: Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~	~~*NP*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123,	1.8 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may*		

	124, *207.9*	*apply pursuant to § 207.9.*
* * * *		

* * * *

(5) Canopy is P if required as a wind mitigation feature.

SEC. 728. 24TH STREET – NOE VALLEY NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT.

The 24th Street – Noe Valley Neighborhood Commercial District is situated along 24th Street between Chattanooga and Diamond in the Noe Valley neighborhood of central San Francisco. This daytime-oriented, multi-purpose commercial district provides a mixture of convenience and comparison shopping goods and services to a predominantly local market area. It contains primarily retail sales and personal services at the street level, some office uses on the second story, and residential use almost exclusively on the third and upper stories.

The 24th Street – Noe Valley District controls are designed to allow for development that is compatible with the existing ~~*small-scale,*~~ mixed-use neighborhood commercial character and surrounding residential area. The small*- to mid-* scale of new buildings and neighborhood-serving uses is encouraged and rear yard open space corridors at all levels are protected. Most commercial uses are directed to the ground story and limited at the second story of new buildings. In order to maintain the variety and mix of retail sales and services along the commercial strip and to control the problems of traffic, congestion, noise and late-night activity, certain potentially troublesome commercial uses are regulated. Financial service uses are restricted to and at the ground story. Prohibitions on drive-up and most automobile uses help prevent additional traffic and parking congestion.

Housing development in new buildings is encouraged above the ground story. ~~*Existing*~~

~~*housing units are protected by prohibitions on upper-story conversions and limitations on demolitions.*~~

Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted~~ *within the district pursuant to Section 207.1 of this Code*~~.

Table 728. 24TH STREET – NOE VALLEY NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		24th Street – Noe Valley NCD
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
Height and Bulk Limits.	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250–252, 260, *263.19,* 261.1, 270, *270.3,* 271. See also Height and Bulk District Maps	Varies~~*, but generally 40-X*~~. See Height and Bulk Map Sheet HT07 for more information. Height sculpting required on Alleys per § 261.1.
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally* ~~*N*~*n*~~ot ~~*R*~*r*~~equired~~.~~*; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required*

		recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).		
* * * *				
Miscellaneous				
* * * *				
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*		
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*		
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
* * * *				
Dwelling Unit Mix	§ 207.7	Generally *~~R~~r*equired for creation of 10 or more Dwelling Units. No less than 25% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least two Bedrooms, and no less than 10% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least three Bedrooms.		
* * * *				
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**

Residential Uses	§102	P	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit ~~*Density*~~	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code ~~*Sections*~~*§§* 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Unit~~s~~ *Density, General*	§§ 102, 207	~~*1 unit per 600 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. 1 unit per 600 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		
Group Housing *Density*	§208	~~*1 bedroom per 210 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. 1 bedroom per 210 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.		
* * * *				
Senior Housing *Density*	§§102, 202.2(f), 207	~~*P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and*~~		

			~~*meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.*~~Form-Based ~~Density.~~ P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.		
Loss of Dwelling Units*: Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~	~~*NP*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124*, 207.9*	1.8 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* * * *

SEC. 729. WEST PORTAL AVENUE NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT.

Located in the southwestern part of the City, the West Portal Avenue Neighborhood Commercial District stretches for three long blocks along West Portal Avenue from Ulloa Street to 15th Avenue and extends one block east along Ulloa Street from the Twin Peaks Tunnel entrance to Claremont Boulevard. West Portal Avenue provides a selection of goods and services for customers coming mainly from the surrounding west of Twin Peaks and Sunset single-family residential neighborhoods. The lively, small-scale retail frontage is interrupted at several locations by large-scale financial institutions which take up a large amount of commercial ground-story frontage. More than half of the number of medical, professional and business offices are located at the ground level. ~~*Except for one three-movie theater complex, West Portal offers no entertainment uses and its restaurants are mainly family-oriented.*~~

The West Portal Avenue District controls are designed to preserve the existing family-oriented, village character of West Portal Avenue. ~~*The building standards limit building heights to 26 feet and two stories and maintain the existing pattern of rear yards at the ground level and above.*~~ The height, bulk and design of new development, especially on large lots, should respect the small-*to mid-*scale character of the district and its surrounding residential neighborhoods. Lot mergers creating large lots are discouraged. Individual nonresidential uses require conditional use permits above 2,500 square feet and are restricted to 4,000 square feet as an absolute limit to conform with the existing small use sizes in the district.

* * * *

Housing development ~~*is limited*~~*in new buildings is encouraged*. ~~*Existing residential units are protected by limitations on demolition and prohibition of upper-story conversions*~~; new construction ~~*is to be carefully reviewed to*~~ *should* ensure appropriate scale, design and compatibility with

adjacent development. Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted ~~*within the district pursuant to Section 207.1 of this Code*~~.

Table 729. WEST PORTAL AVENUE NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		West Portal Avenue NCD
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
Height and Bulk Limits.	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250–252, 260, *263.19,* 261.1, 270, *270.3,* 271. See also Height and Bulk District Maps	*Varies.* ~~*26-X.*~~ See Height and Bulk Map Sheets HT06 and HT12 for more information. Height sculpting required on Alleys per § 261.1.
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally* ~~*N*~~*n*ot ~~*R*~~*r*equired~~.~~*; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to*

		the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).		
* * * *				
Miscellaneous				
* * * *				
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*		
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*		
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
* * * *				
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P	P	~~*N*~~*P*
Accessory Dwelling Unit~~s~~ *Density*	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code ~~*Sections*~~*§§* 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Unit~~s~~ *Density, General*	§§ 102, 207	~~*1 unit per 800 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. 1 unit per 800		

			square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.
	Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*
	Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*
	Group Housing *Density*	§208	~~*1 bedroom per 275 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. 1 bedroom per 275 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.
	* * * *		
	Senior Housing *Density*	§§102, 202.2(f), 207	~~*P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.*~~Form-Based Density. P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling

		units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.		
Loss of Dwelling Units: *Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~	~~*NP*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124, *207.9*	1.8 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* * * *

SEC. 730. INNER SUNSET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT.

The Inner Sunset Neighborhood Commercial District is located in the Inner Sunset neighborhood~~, *consisting of the NC-2 district*~~ bounded by Lincoln Way on the north, Fifth Avenue on the east, Kirkham Street on the south, and Nineteenth Avenue on the west. The shopping area provides convenience goods and services to local Inner Sunset residents, as

well as comparison shopping goods and services to a larger market area. The commercial district is also frequented by users of Golden Gate Park on weekends and by City residents for its eating, drinking, and entertainment places. Numerous housing units establish the ~~*d*~~*D*istrict's mixed residential-commercial character.

* * * *

Housing development in new buildings is encouraged above the ground story. ~~*Existing residential units are protected by prohibition of upper-story conversions and limitations on demolitions.*~~ Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted ~~*within the district pursuant to Section 207.1 of this Code*~~.

Table 730. INNER SUNSET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Inner Sunset NCD
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
Height and Bulk Limits.	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250–252, 260, *263.19,* 261.1, 270, *270.3,* 271. See also Height and Bulk District Maps	Varies~~*, but generally 40-X*~~. See Height and Bulk Map Sheets HT05 and HT06 for more information. Height sculpting required on Alleys per § 261.1.

* * * *					
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally ~~N~~n*ot *~~R~~r*equired*~~.~~; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).*			
* * * *					
Miscellaneous					
* * * *					
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*			
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*			
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES					
Development Standards					
* * * *					
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**			
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**	

Residential Uses	*§ 102*	P	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit~~s~~ *Density*	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code ~~*Sections*~~*§§* 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Unit~~s~~ *Density, General*	§§ 102, 207	~~*1 unit per 800 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. 1 unit per 800 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		
Group Housing *Density*	§208	~~*1 bedroom per 275 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. 1 bedroom per 275 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.		
* * * *				
Senior Housing *Density*	§§102, 202.2(f), 207	~~*P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and*~~		

			~~*meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.*~~Form-Based ~~Density.~~ P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.		
Loss of Dwelling Units*: Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~	~~*NP*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124*, 207.9*	1.8 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* * * *

SEC. 731. NORIEGA STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT.

The Noriega Street Neighborhood Commercial District is located in the Outer Sunset neighborhood and includes ~~*the non-residential currently-zoned NC-2*~~ properties fronting both sides of Noriega Street between 19th and 27th and 30th through 33rd Avenues.

The District provides a selection of convenience goods and services for the residents of the Outer Sunset District. There are a high concentration of restaurants, drawing customers from throughout the City and the region. There are also a significant number of professional, realty, and business offices as well as financial institutions.

The Noriega Street Neighborhood Commercial District controls are designed to promote development that is consistent with its existing land use patterns and to maintain a harmony of uses that support the District's vitality. The building standards allow ~~*small-*~~*various* scale*s of* buildings and uses, protecting rear yards above the ground story and at residential levels. In new development, most commercial uses are permitted at the first two stories, although certain limitations apply to uses at the second story. Special controls are necessary to preserve the equilibrium of neighborhood-serving convenience and comparison shopping businesses and to protect adjacent residential livability. To protect continuous frontage, drive-up uses are prohibited and active, pedestrian-oriented ground floor uses generally must be provided, unless such uses are authorized by Conditional Use. These controls are designed to encourage the street's active retail frontage, and local fabrication and production of goods.

Housing development in new buildings is encouraged above the ground story. Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted.

//

//

//

Table 731. NORIEGA STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT

ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Noriega Street NCD
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
Height and Bulk Limits.	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250–252, 260, *263.19,* 261.1, 270, *270.3,* 271. See also Height and Bulk District Maps	Varies. See Height and Bulk Map Sheets HT05 and HT06 for more information. Height sculpting required on Alleys per § 261.1.
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally* ~~*N*~~not ~~*R*~~required~~.~~*; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).*

* * * *				
Miscellaneous				
* * * *				
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*		
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*		
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
* * * *				
Off-Street Parking Requirements	§§ 145.1, 150, 151, 153 - 156, 161, 166, 204.5	*No* car parking required. Maximum permitted per § 151. Bike parking required per § 155.2. If car parking is provided, car share spaces are required when a project has 50 units or more per § 166.		
* * * *				
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code ~~*Sections*~~*§§* 207.1 and 207.2.		

Dwelling Units ~~*Density, General*~~	§§ 102, 207	~~*1 unit per 800 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. 1 unit per 800 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*
Group Housing *Density*	§208	~~*1 bedroom per 275 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. 1 bedroom per 275 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.
* * * *		
Senior Housing *Density*	§§102, 202.2(f), 207	~~*P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.*~~Form-Based Density. P up to twice the number of dwelling

		units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.		
Loss of Dwelling Units: *Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124, *207.9*	2.5 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* * * *

SEC. 732. IRVING STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT.

The Irving Street Neighborhood Commercial District is located in the Outer Sunset

neighborhood and includes ~~*the non-residential currently-zoned NC-2*~~ properties fronting both sides of Irving Street between 19th and 27th Avenues. The District provides a selection of convenience goods and services for the residents of the Outer Sunset District. There are a high concentration of restaurants, drawing customers from throughout the City and the region. There are also a significant number of professional, realty, and business offices as well as financial institutions.

The Irving Street Neighborhood Commercial District controls are designed to promote development that is consistent with its existing land use patterns and to maintain a harmony of uses that support the District's vitality. The building standards allow small-*to mid*-scale buildings and uses, protecting rear yards above the ground story and at residential levels. In new development, most commercial uses are permitted at the first two stories, although certain limitations apply to uses at the second story. Special controls are necessary to preserve the equilibrium of neighborhood-serving convenience and comparison shopping businesses and to protect adjacent residential livability. These controls are designed to encourage the street's active retail frontage, and local fabrication and production of goods.

Housing development in new buildings is encouraged above the ground story. Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted.

Table 732. IRVING STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT

ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Irving Street NCD
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
Height and Bulk Limits.	§§ 102, 105,	Varies. See Height and Bulk Map Sheet HT05 for

	106, 250–252, 260, *263.19,* 261.1, 270, *270.3,* 271. See also Height and Bulk District Maps	more information. Height sculpting required on Alleys per § 261.1.
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally* ~~N~~not ~~R~~required~~.~~*; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).*
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*

Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*		
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
* * * *				
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code ~~*Sections*~~*§§* 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Unit~~s~~ *Density, General*	§§ 102, 207	~~*1 unit per 800 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. 1 unit per 800 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		
Group Housing *Density*	§208	~~*1 bedroom per 275 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. 1 bedroom per 275		

		square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.			
* * * *					
Senior Housing *Density*	§§102, 202.2(f), 207	~~*P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.*~~ ~~Form Based Density.~~ P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.			
Loss of Dwelling Units*: Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*			
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~	
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~	

~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124, *207.9*	2.5 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* * * *

SEC. 733. TARAVAL STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT.

The Taraval Street Neighborhood Commercial District is located in the Outer Sunset neighborhood and includes the ~~*non-residential currently-zoned NC-2*~~ properties fronting both sides of Taraval Street from 19th through 36th Avenues. The District provides a selection of convenience goods and services for the residents of the Outer Sunset District. There are a high concentration of restaurants, drawing customers from throughout the City and the region. There are also a significant number of professional, realty, and business offices as well as financial institutions.

The Taraval Street Neighborhood Commercial District controls are designed to promote development that is consistent with its existing land use patterns and to maintain a harmony of uses that support the District's vitality. The building standards allow small- *to mid-* scale buildings and uses, protecting rear yards above the ground story and at residential levels. In new development, most commercial uses are permitted at the first two stories, although certain limitations apply to uses at the second story. Special controls are necessary to preserve the equilibrium of neighborhood-serving convenience and comparison shopping businesses and to protect adjacent residential livability. These controls are designed to

encourage the street's active retail frontage, and local fabrication and production of goods.

Housing development in new buildings is encouraged above the ground story. Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted.

Table 733. TARAVAL STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Taraval Street NCD
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
Height and Bulk Limits.	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250–252, 260, *263.19,* 261.1, 270, *270.3,* 271. See also Height and Bulk District Maps.	Varies. See Height and Bulk Map Sheet HT05 for more information. Height sculpting required on Alleys per § 261.1.
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally* ~~N~~not ~~R~~required~~.~~*; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required*

		recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines, *Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
* * * *		

Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code ~~*Sections*~~*§§* 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Unit~~s~~ *Density, General*	§§ 102, 207	~~*1 unit per 800 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. 1 unit per 800 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in		

			the nearest R District, whichever is greater.
	Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*
	Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*
	Group Housing *Density*	§208	~~*1 bedroom per 275 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. 1 bedroom per 275 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.
	* * * *		
	Senior Housing *Density*	§§102, 202.2(f), 207	~~*P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.*~~Form-Based Density. P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in

		the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.		
Loss of Dwelling Units: *Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124, *207.9*	2.5 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* * * *

SEC. 734. JUDAH STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT.

The Judah Street Neighborhood Commercial District is located in the Outer Sunset neighborhood and includes the ~~*non-residential currently zoned NC-2*~~ properties fronting both sides of Judah Street from 29th through 33rd Avenues. The District provides a selection of convenience goods and services for the residents of the Outer Sunset District. There are a high concentration of restaurants, drawing customers from throughout the City and the region.

There are also a significant number of professional, realty, and business offices as well as financial institutions.

The Judah Street Neighborhood Commercial District controls are designed to promote development that is consistent with its existing land use patterns and to maintain a harmony of uses that support the District's vitality. The building standards allow small- *to mid*-scale buildings and uses, protecting rear yards above the ground story and at residential levels. In new development, most commercial uses are permitted at the first two stories, although certain limitations apply to uses at the second story. Special controls are necessary to preserve the equilibrium of neighborhood-serving convenience and comparison shopping businesses and to protect adjacent residential livability. These controls are designed to encourage the street's active retail frontage, and local fabrication and production of goods.

Housing development in new buildings is encouraged above the ground story. Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted.

Table 734. JUDAH STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Judah Street NCD
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
Height and Bulk Limits.	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250–252, 260, *263.19,* 261.1, 270, *270.3,* 271. See also	Varies. See Height and Bulk Map Sheet HT05 for more information. Height sculpting required on Alleys per § 261.1.

	Height and Bulk District Maps	
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally* ~~N~~not ~~R~~required~~.~~*; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).*
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		

* * * *				
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code ~~*Sections*~~*§§* 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Unit~~s~~ *Density, General*	§§ 102, 207	~~*1 unit per 800 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. 1 unit per 800 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		
Group Housing *Density*	§208	~~*1 bedroom per 275 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. 1 bedroom per 275 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.		
* * * *				
Senior Housing *Density*	§§102, 202.2(f), 207	~~*P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and*~~		

			~~*meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.*~~ ~~Form Based Density.~~ P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.		
Loss of Dwelling Units*: Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123,	2.5 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may*		

	124, *207.9*	*apply pursuant to § 207.9.*
* * * *		

* * * *

SEC. 735. INNER BALBOA STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT.

The Inner Balboa Street Neighborhood Commercial District is located along Balboa Street between 2nd Avenue and 8th Avenue in the Richmond District of San Francisco. The District is a small-scale linear shopping street which provides convenience goods and services to the surrounding neighborhood as well as limited comparison shopping goods for a wider market.

The Inner Balboa Street Neighborhood Commercial District controls provide for mixed-use buildings which approximate or slightly exceed the standard development pattern. Rear yard requirements above the ground story and at residential levels preserve open space corridors of interior blocks.

Most new commercial development is permitted at the ground and second stories. Neighborhood- serving businesses are strongly encouraged. The second story may be used by some retail stores, personal services, and medical, business and professional offices. Parking and hotels are monitored at all stories. Limits on late-night activity, drive-up facilities, and other automobile uses protect the livability within and around the District, and promote continuous retail frontage.

Housing development in new buildings is encouraged above the ground story. ~~*Existing residential units are protected by limitations on demolition and upper-story conversions.*~~ Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted ~~*within the District pursuant to Sections 207.1 and 207.2 of this Code*~~.

Table 735. INNER BALBOA STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT

ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Inner Balboa Street NCD
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
Height and Bulk Limits.	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250–252, 260, *263.19,* 261.1, 270, *270.3,* 271. See also Height and Bulk District Maps	Varies*, but generally 40-X*. See Height and Bulk Map Sheet HT03 for more information. Height sculpting required on Alleys per § 261.1.
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally Nn*ot *Rr*equired*.; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).*
* * * *		

Miscellaneous					
* * * *					
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*			
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*			
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES					
Development Standards					
* * * *					
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**			
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**	
Residential Uses	§102	P	P	P	
Accessory Dwelling Unit ~~*Density*~~	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code ~~*Sections*~~*§§* 207.1 and 207.2.			
Dwelling Unit Density*, General*	§§ 102, 207	~~*1 unit per 800 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. 1 unit per 800 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.			
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*			
Maximum Dwelling Unit	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an*			

Size		*equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*
Group Housing Density	§208	~~*1 bedroom per 275 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. 1 bedroom per 275 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.
* * * *		
Senior Housing Density	§§102, 202.2(f), 207	~~*P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.*~~Form-Based Density. P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.
Loss of Dwelling Units:	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~C

Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats				
		~~1st~~	*~~2nd~~*	*~~3rd+~~*
~~Residential Conversion~~	*~~§ 317~~*	*~~C~~*	*~~C~~*	*~~NP~~*
~~Residential Demolition and Merger~~	*~~§ 317~~*	*~~C~~*	*~~C~~*	*~~C~~*
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124, *207.9*	2.5 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* * * *

SEC. 736. OUTER BALBOA STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT.

The Outer Balboa Street Neighborhood Commercial District is located along Balboa Street between 32nd Avenue and 39th Avenue in the Richmond District of San Francisco. The District is a small-scale linear shopping street which provides convenience goods and services to the surrounding neighborhood as well as limited comparison shopping goods for a wider market.

The Outer Balboa Street Neighborhood Commercial District controls provide for mixed-use buildings which approximate or *~~slightly~~moderately* exceed the standard development pattern. Rear yard requirements above the ground story and at residential levels preserve open space corridors of interior blocks.

Most new commercial development is permitted at the ground and second stories. Neighborhood-serving businesses are strongly encouraged. The second story may be used by some retail stores, personal services, and medical, business and professional offices. Parking and hotels are monitored at all stories. Limits on late-night activity, drive-up facilities, and other automobile uses protect the livability within and around the District, and promote continuous retail frontage.

Housing development in new buildings is encouraged above the ground story. ~~*Existing residential units are protected by limitations on demolition and upper-story conversions.*~~ Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted ~~*within the District pursuant to Sections 207.1 and 207.2 of this Code*~~.

Table 736. OUTER BALBOA STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Outer Balboa Street NCD
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
Height and Bulk Limits.	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250–252, 260, *263.19,* 261.1, 270, *270.3,* 271. See also Height and Bulk District Maps	Varies~~*, but generally 40-X*~~. See Height and Bulk Map Sheet HT04 for more information. Height sculpting required on Alleys per § 261.1.

* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally* ~~*N*~~*n*ot ~~*R*~~*r*equired~~.~~*; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).*
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
* * * *		

Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**

Residential Uses	§102	P	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit ~~*Density*~~	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code ~~*Sections*~~*§§* 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Unit Density, *General*	§§ 102, 207	~~*1 unit per 800 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. 1 unit per 800 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		
Group Housing Density	§208	~~*1 bedroom per 275 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. 1 bedroom per 275 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.		
* * * *				
Senior Housing Density	§§102, 202.2(f), 207	~~*P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and*~~		

			~~*meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.*~~Form ~~Based Density.~~ P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.		
Loss of Dwelling Units*: Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124*, 207.9*	2.5 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* * * *

SEC. 737. BAYVIEW NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT.

* * * *

Table 737. BAYVIEW NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Bayview NCD
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ *130,* 131, 132, 133	*Generally* ~~*N*~~not ~~*R*~~required~~.~~*; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).*
*** * * ***		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning*

	Element	*Commission.*		
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
* * * *				
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit ~~*Density*~~	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code ~~*Sections*~~*§§* 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Unit Density*, General*	§§ 102, 207	1 unit per 600 square foot lot area.		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		
Group Housing Density	§ 208	1 bedroom per 210 square foot lot area.		
* * * *				
Loss of Dwelling Units*: Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C(1)*		

		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C(1)*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124, *207.9*	3.6 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* Not listed below

(1) THIRD FLOOR RESIDENTIAL CONVERSION:

Boundaries: Applicable to the Bayview NCD

Controls: A Residential Use may be converted to an Institutional Use, other than a Medical Cannabis Dispensary, as a Conditional Use on the third story and above if in addition to the criteria set forth in ~~*Section*~~*§* ~~*303*~~*317*, the Commission finds that:

(a) The structure in which the Residential Use is to be converted has been found eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places;

(b) The proposed use is to be operated by a nonprofit public benefit corporation; and

(c) No legally residing residential tenants will be displaced.

* * * *

SEC. 738. CORTLAND AVENUE NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT.

* * * *

Table 738. CORTLAND AVENUE NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT

ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Cortland Avenue NCD
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally ~~N~~not ~~R~~required~~.~~; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).*
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		

Development Standards				
* * * *				
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit ~~*Density*~~	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code ~~*Sections*~~*§§* 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Unit Density*, General*	§§ 102, 207	1 unit per 800 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		
Group Housing Density	§ 208	1 bedroom per 275 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.		
* * * *				
Loss of Dwelling Units*: Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		

		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124, *207.9*	2.5 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* * * *

SEC. 739. GEARY BOULEVARD NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT.

The Geary Boulevard Neighborhood Commercial District is located along Geary Boulevard between Masonic and 28th Avenues. It is a linear district located along a heavily trafficked thoroughfare which also serves as a major transit route. In addition to providing convenience goods and services to the surrounding neighborhood, the District offers a wide variety of comparison and specialty goods and services to a population greater than the immediate neighborhood.

The building standards permit moderately large commercial uses and buildings. Rear yards are protected at residential levels.

A diversified commercial environment is encouraged for the District, and a wide variety of uses are permitted with special emphasis on neighborhood-serving businesses. Financial service uses generally are permitted with certain limitations at the first and second stories. Other retail businesses, personal services, and offices are permitted at all stories of new

buildings. Limited storage and administrative service activities are permitted with some restrictions.

Housing development in new buildings is encouraged above the second story. ~~*Existing residential units are protected by limitations on demolitions and upper-story conversions.*~~ Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted ~~*within the District pursuant to Sections 207.1 and 207.2 of this Code*~~.

Table 739. GEARY BOULEVARD NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Geary Boulevard NCD
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
Height and Bulk Limits.	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250–252, 260, *263.19,* 261.1, 270, *270.3,* 271. See also Height and Bulk District Maps.	Varies~~*, but generally 40-X*~~. See Height and Bulk Map Sheets HT03-04 for more information. Height sculpting required on Alleys per § 261.1.
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ *130,* 131, 132, 133	*Generally* ~~*N*~~not ~~*R*~~required~~.~~*; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width*

		required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).		
* * * *				
Miscellaneous				
* * * *				
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*		
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*		
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
* * * *				
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P	P	P
Accessory Dwelling	§§102, 207.1,	P per Planning Code ~~*Sections*~~*§§* 207.1 and 207.2.		

Unit ~~*Density*~~	207.2	
Dwelling Unit Density, *General*	§§ 102, 207	~~*1 unit per 600 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. 1 unit per 600 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*
Group Housing Density	§208	~~*Up to 1 bedroom per 210 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. Up to 1 bedroom per 210 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.
* * * *		
Senior Housing Density	§§102, 202.2(f), 207	~~*P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for §*~~

		~~202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.~~~~Form-Based Density.~~ P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.		
Loss of Dwelling Units*:* *Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	*~~Controls by Story~~C(2)*		
		~~1st~~	*~~2nd~~*	*~~3rd+~~*
~~Residential Conversion~~	*~~§ 317~~*	*~~C~~*	*~~C~~*	*~~C(2)~~*
~~Residential Demolition and Merger~~	*~~§ 317~~*	*~~C~~*	*~~C~~*	*~~C~~*
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124, *207.9*	3.6 to 1*. For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* * * *

(2) THIRD FLOOR RESIDENTIAL CONVERSION:

Boundaries: Applicable to the Geary Boulevard NCD

Controls: A Residential Use may be converted to an Institutional Use, other than a Medical Cannabis Dispensary, as a Conditional Use on the third story and above if in addition to the criteria set forth in ~~*Section*~~*§ ~~303~~317*, the Commission finds that:

(a) The structure in which the Residential Use is to be converted has been found eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places;

(b) The proposed use is to be operated by a nonprofit public benefit corporation; and

(c) No legally residing residential tenants will be displaced.

* * * *

SEC. 740. MISSION BERNAL NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT.

* * * *

Table 740. MISSION BERNAL NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT

ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Mission Bernal NCD
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ *130,* 131, 132, 133	*Generally ~~N~~n*ot *~~R~~r*equired~~.~~*; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required*

		recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).		
* * * *				
Miscellaneous				
* * * *				
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*		
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
* * * *				
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit ~~*Density*~~	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code ~~*Sections*~~*§§* 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Unit Density*, General*	§§ 102, 207	1 unit per 600 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an*		

Size		*equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		
Group Housing Density	§ 208	1 bedroom per 210 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.		
* * * *				
Loss of Dwelling Units*: Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C(1)*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C(1)*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124*, 207.9*	3.6 to 1*. For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* Not listed below

(1) THIRD FLOOR RESIDENTIAL CONVERSION:

Boundaries: Applicable to the Mission Bernal NCD

Controls: A Residential Use may be converted to an Institutional Use, other than a

Medical Cannabis Dispensary, as a Conditional Use on the third story and above if in addition to the criteria set forth in ~~*Section*~~*§ ~~303~~317*, the Commission finds that:

(a) The structure in which the Residential Use is to be converted has been found eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places;

(b) The proposed use is to be operated by a nonprofit public benefit corporation; and

(c) No legally residing residential tenants will be displaced.

* * * *

SEC. 741. SAN BRUNO AVENUE NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT.

* * * *

Table 741. SAN BRUNO AVENUE NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT

ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		San Bruno Avenue NCD
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally ~~N~~n*ot ~~*R*~~*r*equired~~.~~*; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan.*

		This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
* * * *		

Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit ~~*Density*~~	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code ~~*Sections*~~*§§* 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Unit Density*, General*	§§ 102, 207	1 unit per 800 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual*		

		Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.		
Group Housing Density	§ 208	1 bedroom per 275 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.		
* * * *				
Loss of Dwelling Units*: Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124, *207.9*	2.5 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* * * *

SEC. 742. COLE VALLEY NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICTS.

The Cole Valley Neighborhood Commercial District is located along Cole Street from Frederick to Grattan Streets and includes some parcels north of Carl Street and south of

Parnassus. It is a local shopping district with a mix of retail uses in a residential neighborhood that is near a transit line.

Building controls for the Cole Valley Neighborhood Commercial District promote *small to mid-scale* ~~*low-intensity*~~ development which is compatible with the existing scale and character of the area. Commercial development is limited to one story *with some exceptions*. Rear yard requirements at all levels preserve existing backyard space.

Commercial use provisions encourage the full range of neighborhood-serving convenience retail sales and services at the first story provided that the use size generally is limited to 3,000 square feet. However, commercial uses and features which could impact residential livability are prohibited, such as auto uses, financial services, general advertising signs, drive-up facilities, hotels, and late-night activity.

Housing development in new buildings is encouraged above the ground story. ~~*Existing residential units are protected by prohibitions of conversions above the ground story and limitations on demolitions.*~~ Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted ~~*within the District pursuant to Sections 207.1 and 207.2 of this Code*~~.

Table 742. COLE VALLEY NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Cole Valley NCD
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
Height and Bulk Limits.	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250–252,	Varies~~*, but generally 40-X*~~. See Height and Bulk Map Sheet HT06 for more information. Height

	260, *263.19,* 261.1, 270, *270.3,* 271. See also Height and Bulk District Maps	sculpting required on Alleys per § 261.1.
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally* ~~N~~not ~~R~~required~~.~~*; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).*
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		
Canopy or Marquee	§ 136.1	NP*(5)*
* * * *		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning*

	Element	*Commission.*
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*

RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
* * * *				
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit ~~*Density*~~	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code ~~*Sections*~~*§§* 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Unit Density*, General*	§§ 102, 207	~~*1 unit per 800 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. 1 unit per 800 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		
Group Housing Density	§208	~~*1 bedroom per 275 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is*~~		

		greater.~~Form-Based Density.~~ 1 bedroom per 275 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.			
* * * *					
Senior Housing Density	§§102, 202.2(f), 207	~~*P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.*~~Form-Based Density.~~ P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.			
Loss of Dwelling Units*: Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*			
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~	

~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~	~~*NP*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124, *207.9*	1.8 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* * * *

(5) Canopy is P if required as a wind mitigation feature.

SEC. 743. LOWER HAIGHT STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT.

The Lower Haight Street Neighborhood Commercial District is located along Haight Street between Webster and Steiner Streets. The District is a small-scale linear shopping street which provides convenience goods and services to the surrounding neighborhood as well as limited comparison shopping goods for a wider market.

The District controls provide for mixed-use buildings which approximate or ~~*slightly*~~*moderately* exceed the standard development pattern. Rear yard requirements above the ground story and at residential levels preserve open space corridors of interior blocks.

Most new commercial development is permitted at the ground and second stories. Neighborhood-serving businesses are strongly encouraged. The second story may be used by some retail stores, personal services, and medical, business and professional offices. Parking and hotels are monitored at all stories. Limits on late-night activity, drive-up facilities, and other automobile uses protect the livability within and around the District, and promote continuous retail frontage.

Housing development in new buildings is encouraged above the ground story. ~~*Existing residential units are protected by limitations on demolition and upper-story conversions.*~~ Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted ~~*within the District pursuant to Sections 207.1 and 207.2 of this Code*~~.

Table 743. LOWER HAIGHT STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Lower Haight Street NCD
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
Height and Bulk Limits~~.~~	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250–252, 260, *263.19,* 261.1, 270, *270.3,* 271. See also Height and Bulk District Maps.	Varies~~*, but generally 40-X*~~. See Height and Bulk Map Sheet HT07 for more information. Height sculpting required on Alleys per § 261.1.
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally* ~~*N*~~*n*ot ~~*R*~~*r*equired~~.~~*; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to*

		the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).		
* * * *				
Miscellaneous				
* * * *				
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*		
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*		
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
* * * *				
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit ~~*Density*~~	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code ~~*Sections*~~*§§* 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Unit Density*, General*	§§ 102, 207	~~*1 unit per 800 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. 1 unit per 800		

		square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*
Group Housing Density	§208	~~*1 bedroom per 275 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. 1 bedroom per 275 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.
* * * *		
Senior Housing Density	§§102, 202.2(f), 207	~~*P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.*~~Form-Based Density. P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling

		units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.		
Loss of Dwelling Units*: Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124, *207.9*	2.5 to 1*. For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* * * *

SEC. 744. LOWER POLK STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT.

* * * *

Table 744. LOWER POLK STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Lower Polk Street NCD

Zoning Category	§ References	Controls		
BUILDING STANDARDS				
Massing and Setbacks				
* * * *				
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ *130,* 131, 132, 133	*Generally* ~~N~~not ~~R~~required~~.~~*; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).*		
* * * *				
Miscellaneous				
* * * *				
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*		
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
* * * *				
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**

Residential Uses	§102	P	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit ~~*Density*~~	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code ~~*Sections*~~*§§* 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Unit Density, *General*	§§ 102, 207	1 unit per 600 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		
Group Housing Density	§ 208	1 bedroom per 210 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.		
* * * *				
Loss of Dwelling Units*: Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C(1)*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C(1)*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~

NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124, *207.9*	3.6 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*
* * * *		

* Not listed below

(1) THIRD FLOOR RESIDENTIAL CONVERSION:

Boundaries: Applicable to the Lower Polk Street NCD

Controls: A Residential Use may be converted to an Institutional Use, other than a Medical Cannabis Dispensary, as a Conditional Use on the third story and above if in addition to the criteria set forth in ~~*Section*~~*§* ~~*303*~~*317*, the Commission finds that:

(a) The structure in which the Residential Use is to be converted has been found eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places;

(b) The proposed use is to be operated by a nonprofit public benefit corporation; and

(c) No legally residing residential tenants will be displaced.

* * * *

SEC. 745. INNER TARAVAL STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT.

The Inner Taraval Street Neighborhood Commercial District is located along Taraval Street between 19th and Forest Side Avenues in the Inner Sunset neighborhood. It is separated from the Taraval Street Neighborhood Commercial District by 19th Avenue. The District is a small-scale linear shopping street which provides convenience goods and services to the surrounding neighborhood as well as limited comparison shopping goods for a wider market.

The District controls provide for mixed-use buildings which approximate or ~~*slightly*~~*moderately* ~~exceed~~ the standard development pattern. Rear yard requirements above the ground story and at residential levels preserve open space corridors of interior blocks.

Most new commercial development is permitted at the ground and second stories. Neighborhood-serving businesses are strongly encouraged. The second story may be used by some retail stores, personal services, and medical, business and professional offices. Parking and hotels are monitored at all stories. Limits on late-night activity, drive-up facilities, and other automobile uses protect the livability within and around the District, and promote continuous retail frontage.

Housing development in new buildings is encouraged above the ground story. ~~*Existing residential units are protected by limitations on demolition and upper-story conversions.*~~ Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted ~~*within the District pursuant to Sections 207.1 and 207.2 of this Code*~~.

Table 745. INNER TARAVAL STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Inner Taraval Street NCD
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
Height and Bulk Limits.	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250–252, 260, *263.19,* 261.1, 270, *270.3,* 271. See also	Varies~~*, but generally 40-X*~~. See Height and Bulk Map Sheet~~s~~ HT06 for more information. Height sculpting required on Alleys per § 261.1.

	Height and Bulk District Maps.	
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally* ~~N~~not ~~R~~required~~.~~*; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).*
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		

* * * *				
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit ~~*Density*~~	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code ~~*Sections*~~§§ 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Unit Density, *General*	§§ 102, 207	~~*1 unit per 800 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. 1 unit per 800 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		
Group Housing Density	§208	~~*1 bedroom per 275 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~Form-Based Density. 1 bedroom per 275 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.		
* * * *				
Senior Housing Density	§§102, 202.2(f), 207	~~*P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and*~~		

		~~*meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.*~~ ~~Form Based Density.~~ P up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all the requirements of § 202.2(f)(1). C up to twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a Principal Use in the district and meeting all requirements of § 202.2(f)(1), except for § 202.2(f)(1)(D)(iv), related to location.		
Loss of Dwelling Units*: Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123,	2.5 to 1*. For Office Uses minimum intensities may*		

	124, *207.9*	*apply pursuant to § 207.9.*
* * * *		

* * * *

SEC. 746. LELAND AVENUE NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT.

* * * *

Table 746. LELAND AVENUE NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Leland Avenue NCD
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally ~~N~~not ~~R~~required~~.~~; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).*
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		

Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*		
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
* * * *				
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit ~~*Density*~~	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code ~~*Sections*~~*§§* 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Unit Density*, General*	§§ 102, 207	1 unit per 800 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		
Group Housing Density	§ 208	1 bedroom per 275 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.		
* * * *				

Loss of Dwelling Units*:* *Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124*, 207.9*	2.5 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* * * *

SEC. 750. NCT-1 – NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL TRANSIT CLUSTER DISTRICT.

NC*T*-1 Districts are intended to serve as local neighborhood shopping districts, providing convenience retail goods and services for the immediately surrounding neighborhoods primarily during daytime hours. NCT-1 Districts are located near major transit services. They are small mixed-use clusters, generally surrounded by residential districts, with small-scale neighborhood-serving commercial uses on lower floors and housing above. Housing density is limited not by lot area, but by the regulations on the built envelope of buildings, including height, bulk, setbacks, and lot coverage, and standards for residential

uses, including open space and exposure, and urban design guidelines. There are prohibitions on access (i.e. driveways, garage entries) to off-street parking and loading on critical stretches of commercial and transit street frontages to preserve and enhance the pedestrian-oriented character and transit function. Residential parking is not required and generally limited. Commercial establishments are discouraged from building excessive accessory off-street parking in order to preserve the pedestrian-oriented character of the district and prevent attracting auto traffic.

NCT-1 Districts are generally characterized by their location in residential neighborhoods. The commercial intensity of these districts varies. Many of these districts have the lowest intensity of commercial development in the City, generally consisting of small clusters with three or more commercial establishments, commonly grouped around a corner; and in some cases short linear commercial strips with low-scale, interspersed mixed-use (residential-commercial) development. Building controls for the NCT-1 District promote low-intensity development which is compatible with the existing scale and character of these neighborhood areas. Commercial development is limited to one story*, with certain exceptions*. Rear yard requirements at all levels preserve existing backyard space.

* * * *

~~*Existing residential units are protected by prohibitions of conversions above the ground story and limitations on demolitions.*~~

Table 750. NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL TRANSIT CLUSTER DISTRICT NCT-1 ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		NCT-1
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**

BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
Height and Bulk Limits.	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250–252, 260, *263.19,* 261.1, 270, *270.3,* 271. See also Height and Bulk District Maps.	Varies. See Height and Bulk Map Sheets HT11 and HT12 for more information. Height sculpting required on Alleys per § 261.1.
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally* ~~*N*~~*n*ot ~~*R*~~*r*equired~~.~~*; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).*
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		
Canopy or Marquee	§ 136.1	NP*(2)*

* * * *					
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*			
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*			
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES					
Development Standards					
* * * *					
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**			
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**	
Residential Uses	§102	P(1)	P	P	
Accessory Dwelling Unit	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code ~~*Sections*~~*§§* 207.1 and 207.2.			
Dwelling Units, Senior Housing, and Group Housing~~.~~*, Generally*	§ 102, 202.2(f), 207, 208	~~*No density limit by lot area. Density restricted by physical envelope controls of height, bulk, setbacks, open space, exposure and other applicable controls of this and other Codes, as well as by applicable design guidelines, applicable elements and area plans of the General Plan, and design review by the Planning Department.*~~*Form-Based Density.*			
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*			

Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		
* * * *				
Loss ~~*and Division*~~ of Dwelling Units*:* *Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~	~~*NP*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
Division of Dwelling Units	§ 207.8	Division of existing Dwelling Units P per § 207.8		
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124*, 207.9*	1.8 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* * * *

(1) C required for ground floor Residential Use when street frontage is listed in *Section* 145.4(b).

(2) ~~*[Note deleted.]*~~ *Canopy is P if required as a wind mitigation feature.*

* * * *

SEC. 751. NCT-2 – SMALL-SCALE NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL TRANSIT DISTRICT.

* * * *

Housing development in new buildings is encouraged above the ground story. ~~*Existing residential units are protected by limitations on demolition and upper-story conversions.*~~ *Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted.*

Table 751. SMALL-SCALE NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL TRANSIT DISTRICT NCT-2 ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		NCT-2
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
Height and Bulk Limits.	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250–252, 260, *263.19,* 261.1, 270, *270.3,* 271. See also Height and Bulk District	Varies. See Height and Bulk Map Sheets HT08, HT11, and HT12 for more information. Height sculpting required on Alleys per § 261.1.

	Maps	
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally ~~N~~not ~~R~~required~~.~~; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).*
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines, *Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
* * * *		
Dwelling Unit Mix	§ 207.6	Generally ~~R~~required for creation of five or more

		Dwelling Units. No less than 40% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least two bedrooms; or no less than 30% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least three bedrooms.		
* * * *				
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P(1)	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code Sections 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Units, Senior Housing, and Group Housing~~.~~*, Generally*	§ 102, 202.2(f), 207, 208	~~*No density limit by lot area. Density restricted by physical envelope controls of height, bulk, setbacks, open space, exposure and other applicable controls of this and other Codes, as well as by applicable design guidelines, applicable elements and area plans of the General Plan, and design review by the Planning Department.*~~*Form-Based Density.*		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		
* * * *				

Loss ~~*and Division*~~ of Dwelling Units*:* *Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
Division of Dwelling Units	§ 207.8	Division of existing Dwelling Units P per § 207.8		
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124*, 207.9*	2.5 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* * * *

(1) C required for ground floor Residential Use when street frontage is listed in *Section* 145.4(b).

* * * *

SEC. 752. NCT-3 – MODERATE-SCALE NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL TRANSIT DISTRICT.

* * * *

(e) Housing development in new buildings is encouraged above the second story. ~~*Existing Residential Units are protected by limitations on demolitions and upper-story conversions.*~~ Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted ~~*within the district pursuant to Sections 207.1 and 207.2 of this Code*~~.

Table 752. MODERATE-SCALE NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL TRANSIT DISTRICT

NCT-3

ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		NCT-3
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
Height and Bulk Limits.	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250–252, 260, *263.19,* 261.1, 270, *270.3,* 271. See also Height and Bulk District Maps.	Varies. See Height and Bulk Map Sheets HT02 and HT07 for more information. Height sculpting required on Alleys per § 261.1.
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally* ~~*N*~~*n*ot ~~*R*~~*r*equired~~.~~*; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback*

		shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines, *Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
* * * *		
Dwelling Unit Mix	§ 207.6	Generally ~~R~~*r*equired for creation of five or more Dwelling Units. No less than 40% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least two bedrooms; or no less than 30% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least three bedrooms.

* * * *				
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P(1)	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code Sections 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Units, Senior Housing, and Group Housing~~.~~*, Generally*	§ 102, 202.2(f), 207, 208	~~*No density limit by lot area. Density restricted by physical envelope controls of height, bulk, setbacks, open space, exposure and other applicable controls of this and other Codes, as well as by applicable design guidelines, applicable elements and area plans of the General Plan, and design review by the Planning Department.*~~*Form-Based Density.*		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		
* * * *				
Loss ~~*and Division*~~ of Dwelling Units*: Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		

Residential Flats				
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
Division of Dwelling Units	§ 207.8	Division of existing Dwelling Units P per § 207.8		
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124, *207.9*	3.6 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* * * *

(1) C required for ground floor Residential Use when street frontage is listed in *Section* 145.4(b).

* * * *

SEC. 753. SOMA NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL TRANSIT DISTRICT.

* * * *

Table 753. SOMA NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL TRANSIT DISTRICT

ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		SoMa NCT
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		

* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally ~~N~~n*ot *~~R~~r*equired*~~.~~; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).*
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	*~~Subject to the~~* Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
* * * *		

Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P(1)	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code Sections 207.1 and 207.2.		

Dwelling Units, Senior Housing, and Group Housing~~.~~*, Generally*	§ 102, 202.2(f), 207, 208	~~*No density limit by lot area. Density restricted by physical envelope controls of height, bulk, setbacks, open space, exposure and other applicable controls of this and other Codes, as well as by applicable design guidelines, applicable elements and area plans of the General Plan, and design review by the Planning Department.*~~*Form-Based Density.*		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		
* * * *				
Loss ~~*and Division*~~ of Dwelling Units*: Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
Division of Dwelling	§ 207.8	Division of existing Dwelling Units P per § 207.8		

Units		
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124, *207.9*	2.5 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*
* * * *		

* Not listed below

(1) C required for ground floor residential use when street frontage is listed in 145.4(b)

* * * *

SEC. 754. MISSION STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL TRANSIT DISTRICT.

* * * *

Table 754. MISSION STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL TRANSIT DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Mission Street NCT
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally* ~~N~~not ~~R~~required~~.~~*; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to*

		the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).		
* * * *				
Miscellaneous				
* * * *				
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*		
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
* * * *				
Dwelling Unit Mix	§§ 207.6	Generally ~~R~~required for creation of five or more Dwelling Units. No less than 40% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least two bedrooms; or no less than 30% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least three bedrooms.		
* * * *				
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P(1)	P	P
Accessory Dwelling	§§102, 207.1,	P per Planning Code Sections 207.1 and 207.2.		

Unit	207.2			
Dwelling Units, Senior Housing, and Group Housing*, Generally*	§ 102, 202.2(f), 207, 208	~~*No density limit by lot area. Density restricted by physical envelope controls of height, bulk, setbacks, open space, exposure and other applicable controls of this and other Codes, as well as by applicable design guidelines, applicable elements and area plans of the General Plan, and design review by the Planning Department.*~~*Form-Based Density.*		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		
* * * *				
Loss ~~*and Division*~~ of Dwelling Units*: Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~

Division of Dwelling Units	§ 207.8	Division of existing Dwelling Units P per § 207.8
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124, *207.9*	3.6 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*
* * * *		

* * * *

SEC. 755. OCEAN AVENUE NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL TRANSIT DISTRICT.

* * * *

Housing development in new buildings is encouraged above the ground story. Existing residential units are protected by limitations on demolition and upper-story conversions. Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted ~~*within the district pursuant to Section 207.1 of this Code*~~.

Table 755. OCEAN AVENUE NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL TRANSIT DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Ocean Avenue NCT
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
Height and Bulk Limits.	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250–252, 260, 261.1, *263.19,* 270,	Varies~~*, but generally 45-X*~~. See Height and Bulk Map Sheet HT12 for more information. Height sculpting required on Alleys per § 261.1.

	*270.3,*271. See also Height and Bulk District Maps.	
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally ~~N~~not ~~R~~required~~.~~; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).*
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		

Development Standards				
* * * *				
Dwelling Unit Mix	§ 207.6	Generally ~~R~~r equired for creation of five or more Dwelling Units. No less than 40% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least two bedrooms; or no less than 30% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least three bedrooms.		
* * * *				
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P(1)	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code Sections 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Units, Senior Housing, and Group Housing~~.~~*, Generally*	§ 102, 202.2(f), 207, 208	~~*No density limit by lot area. Density restricted by physical envelope controls of height, bulk, setbacks, open space, exposure and other applicable controls of this and other Codes, as well as by applicable design guidelines, applicable elements and area plans of the General Plan, and design review by the Planning Department.*~~*Form-Based Density.*		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual*		

		Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.		
* * * *				
Loss ~~*and Division*~~ of Dwelling Units*:* *Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
Division of Dwelling Units	§ 207.8	Division of existing Dwelling Units P per § 207.8.		
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124, *207.9*	3.6 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

SEC. 756. GLEN PARK NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL TRANSIT DISTRICT.

* * * *

Commercial uses are encouraged at the ground story. Retail frontages and pedestrian-oriented streets are protected by limiting curb cuts (i.e. driveways, garage entries) as well as

requiring ground floor commercial uses on portions of Diamond and Chenery Streets. Housing development is encouraged above the ground story. Housing density is not controlled by the size of the lot but by dwelling unit standards, physical envelope controls and unit mix requirements. Given the area's location and accessibility to the transit network, accessory parking for residential and commercial uses is not required. Any new parking is required to be set back to support a pedestrian friendly streetscape. Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted ~~*within the district pursuant to Section 207.1 of this Code*~~.

Table 756. GLEN PARK NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL TRANSIT DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Glen Park NCT
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
Height and Bulk Limits~~.~~	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250–252, 260, 261.1, *263.19,* 270, *270.3,* 271. See also Height and Bulk District Maps	~~*30-X and 40-X*~~*Varies*. See Height and Bulk Map Sheet HT11 for more information. Height sculpting required on Alleys per § 261.1.
* * * *		
Front Setback and	§§ 130, 131,	*Generally* ~~*N*~~*n*ot ~~*R*~~*r*equired~~.~~*; however, if the existing*

Side Yard	132, 133	*sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).*
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines, *Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
* * * *		
Dwelling Unit Mix	§ 207.6	Generally, *minimum percentages of two bedroom and three bedroom Dwelling Units* ~~*R*~~*r*equired for creation of five or more Dwelling Units~~. *No less than 40% of the total number of proposed Dwelling*~~

		~~*Units shall contain at least two bedrooms; or no less than 30% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least three bedrooms.*~~		
* * * *				
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P(1)	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code Sections 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Units, Senior Housing, and Group Housing*, Generally*	§ 102, 202.2(f), 207, 208	~~*No density limit by lot area. Density restricted by physical envelope controls of height, bulk, setbacks, open space, exposure and other applicable controls of this and other Codes, as well as by applicable design guidelines, applicable elements and area plans of the General Plan, and design review by the Planning Department.*~~*Form-Based Density*		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		
* * * *				
Loss ~~*and Division*~~ of Dwelling Units*:*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		

Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats				
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
Division of Dwelling Units	§ 207.8	Division of existing Dwelling Units P per § 207.8		
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124, *207.9*	2.5 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* * * *

SEC. 757. FOLSOM STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL TRANSIT DISTRICT.

* * * *

Table 757. FOLSOM STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL TRANSIT DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Folsom Street NCT
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		

Massing and Setbacks		
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally ~~N~~not ~~R~~required~~.~~; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).*
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	§ 823(b), and General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	WSoMa Design Standards, ~~*and the*~~ Urban Design Guidelines, *Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
* * * *		
Dwelling Unit Mix	§~~§~~ 207.6	Generally ~~R~~required for creation of five or more Dwelling Units. No less than 40% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain

		at least two bedrooms; or no less than 30% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least three bedrooms.		
* * * *				
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P(1)	P	P
Group Housing	§§ 102, 208	C(1)	C	C
Accessory Dwelling Unit	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code Sections 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Units, Senior Housing, and Group Housing*, Generally*	§ 102, 202.2(f), 207, 208	~~*No density limit by lot area. Density restricted by physical envelope controls of height, bulk, setbacks, open space, exposure and other applicable controls of this and other Codes, as well as by applicable design guidelines, applicable elements and area plans of the General Plan, and design review by the Planning Department.*~~*Form-Based Density*		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		
* * * *				
Loss ~~*and Division*~~ of	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		

Dwelling Units*:* *Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*				
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~
~~*Residential Demolition or Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
Division of Dwelling Units	§ 207.8	Division of existing Dwelling Units P per § 207.8		
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124*, 207.9*	2.5 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* * * *

SEC. 758. REGIONAL COMMERCIAL DISTRICT.

* * * *

Table 758. REGIONAL COMMERCIAL DISTRICT

ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Regional Commercial District
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**

BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally ~~N~~not ~~R~~required~~.~~; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).*
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	§ 823(b), and General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	WSoMa Design Standards, ~~*and the*~~ Urban Design Guidelines, *Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
* * * *		
Dwelling Unit Mix	§~~§~~ 207.6	Generally ~~R~~required for creation of five or more Dwelling Units. No less than 40% of the total

		number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least two bedrooms; or no less than 30% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least three bedrooms.		
* * * *				
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses (Except for Group Housing, see below)	§102	P	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code Sections 207.1 and 207.2.		
Group Housing	§§ 102, 208	C(1)	C	C
Dwelling Units, Group Housing, and Senior Housing*, Generally*	§ 102, 202.2(f), 207, 208	~~*No density limit by lot area. Density restricted by physical envelope controls of height, bulk, setbacks, open space, exposure and other applicable controls of this and other Codes, as well as by applicable design guidelines, applicable elements and area plans of the General Plan, and design review by the Planning Department.*~~*Form-Based Density*		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that*		

		exceed the greater of those thresholds.		
* * * *				
Loss ~~*and Division*~~ of Dwelling Units*:* *Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
Division of Dwelling Units	§ 207.8	Division of existing Dwelling Units P per § 207.8		
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124*, 207.9*	2.5 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* Not listed below

(1) NP on 1st floor on lots with more than 25 feet of street frontage.

* * * *

SEC. 759. DIVISADERO STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL TRANSIT DISTRICT.

The Divisadero Street Neighborhood Commercial Transit District ("Divisadero Street NCT") extends along Divisadero Street between Haight and O'Farrell Streets. Divisadero Street's dense mixed-use character consists of buildings with residential units above ground-story commercial use. ~~*Buildings typically range in height from two to four stories with occasional one-story commercial buildings.*~~ The ~~*d*~~*D*istrict has an active and continuous commercial frontage along Divisadero Street for most of its length. Divisadero Street is an important public transit corridor and throughway street. The commercial district provides convenience goods and services to the surrounding neighborhoods as well as limited comparison shopping goods for a wider market.

The Divisadero Street NCT controls are designed to encourage and promote development that enhances the walkable, mixed-use character of the corridor and surrounding neighborhoods. Rear yard requirements above the ground story and at residential levels preserve open space corridors of interior blocks. Housing development in new buildings is encouraged above the ground story. ~~*Existing residential units are protected by limitations on demolition and upper-story conversions.*~~ Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted ~~*within the district pursuant to Section 207.1 of this Code*~~.

Consistent with Divisadero Street's existing mixed-use character, new commercial development is permitted at the ground and second stories. Most neighborhood-serving businesses are strongly encouraged. Controls on new Formula Retail uses are consistent with Citywide policy for Neighborhood Commercial Districts~~;~~. The second story may be used by some retail stores, personal services, and medical, business and professional offices. Additional flexibility is offered for second-floor Eating and Drinking, Entertainment, and Trade Shop uses in existing non-residential buildings to encourage the preservation and reuse of such buildings. Hotels are monitored at all stories. Limits on late-night activity, drive-up facilities, and other automobile uses protect the livability within and around the district, and

promote continuous retail frontage.

If the Planning Department determines that any site proposed for residential development and located within the Divisadero Street NCT has received a 50% or greater increase in residential densities over prior zoning through the adoption of Ordinance No. 127-15, any development project that is subject to the Inclusionary Affordable Housing Program on such site shall pay the Affordable Housing Fee, or provide one of the Alternatives to Payment of the Affordable Housing Fee, set forth in Planning Code Sections 415 et seq., except that the amount of the Affordable Housing Fee or Alternatives to Payment of the Affordable Housing Fee shall be modified as set forth in Planning Code Sections 428 et seq.

Table 759. DIVISADERO STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL TRANSIT DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Divisadero St. NCT
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
Height and Bulk Limits~~.~~	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250–252, 260, 261.1, *263.19,* 270, *270.3,* 271. See also Height and Bulk District	~~*65-A, and 40-X south of Oak Street*~~*Varies*. See Height and Bulk Map Sheets HT02 and HT07 for more information. Height sculpting required on Alleys per § 261.1.

	Maps	
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally ~~N~~not ~~R~~required~~.~~; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).*
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines, *Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
* * * *		
Dwelling Unit Mix	§ 207.6	Generally ~~R~~required for creation of five or more

		Dwelling Units. No less than 40% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least two bedrooms; or no less than 30% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least three bedrooms.		
* * * *				
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P(1)	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code Sections 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Units, Senior Housing, and Group Housing*, Generally*	§ 102, 202.2(f), 207, 208	~~*No density limit by lot area. Density restricted by physical envelope controls of height, bulk, setbacks, open space, exposure and other applicable controls of this and other Codes, as well as by applicable design guidelines, applicable elements and area plans of the General Plan, and design review by the Planning Department.*~~*Form-Based Density*		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		
* * * *				

Loss ~~*and Division*~~ of Dwelling Units*:* *Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
Division of Dwelling Units	§ 207.8	Division of existing Dwelling Units P per § 207.8		
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124*, 207.9*	2.5 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* * * *

SEC. 760. FILLMORE STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL TRANSIT DISTRICT.

* * * *

The Fillmore Street NCT controls are designed to encourage and promote development that enhances the walkable, mixed-use character of the corridor and surrounding neighborhoods. Rear yard requirements at residential levels preserve open space

corridors of interior blocks. Housing development in new buildings is encouraged above the ground story. ~~*Existing residential units are protected by limitations on demolition and upper-story conversions.*~~ Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted ~~*within the district pursuant to Section 207.1 of this Code*~~.

* * * *

Table 760. FILLMORE STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL TRANSIT DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Fillmore St. NCT
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally* ~~*N*~~not ~~*R*~~required~~.~~*; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).*
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		

Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*	
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES			
Development Standards			
* * * *			
Dwelling Unit Mix	§ 207.6	Generally ~~R~~*r*equired for creation of five or more Dwelling Units. No less than 40% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least two bedrooms; or no less than 30% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least three bedrooms.	
* * * *			
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**	
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P(1)	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code Sections 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Units, Senior Housing, and Group Housing*, Generally*	§ 102, 202.2(f), 207, 208	~~*No density limit by lot area. Density restricted by physical envelope controls of height, bulk, setbacks, open space, exposure and other applicable controls of this and other Codes, as well as by applicable design guidelines, applicable elements and area plans of the General Plan, and design review by the Planning*~~		

		~~*Department.*~~*Form-Based Density*		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		
* * * *				
Loss ~~*and Division*~~ of Dwelling Units*:* *Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~	~~*NP*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
Division of Dwelling Units	§ 207.8	Division of existing Dwelling Units P per § 207.8		
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124*, 207.9*	3.6 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* * * *

SEC. 761. HAYES-GOUGH NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL TRANSIT DISTRICT.

* * * *

The Hayes-Gough District controls are designed to allow for growth and expansion that is compatible with the existing building and use scales. Building standards protect the moderate building and Use Size and require rear yards at residential levels. To maintain the mixed-use character of the district, most commercial uses are permitted at the first and second stories and housing is strongly encouraged ~~*at the third story and above*~~. Retail sales activity, especially neighborhood-serving businesses, is further promoted by restricting new ground-story medical, business and professional offices. To protect continuous frontage, drive-up and most automobile uses are prohibited, above-ground parking is required to be setback or below ground, and active, pedestrian-oriented ground floor uses are required on Hayes Street and portions of Octavia Boulevard.

Housing development in new buildings is encouraged ~~*above the second story*~~, and is controlled not by lot area but by physical envelope controls. ~~*Existing residential units are protected by limitations on demolitions, mergers, subdivisions, and upper-story conversions.*~~ Given the area's central location and accessibility to the downtown and to the City's transit network, accessory parking for Residential Uses is not required. The code controls for this district are supported and augmented by design guidelines and policies in the Market and Octavia Area Plan of the General Plan. *Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted.*

Table 761. HAYES-GOUGH NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL TRANSIT DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Hayes-Gough NCT

Zoning Category	§ References	Controls
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
Height and Bulk Limits~~.~~	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250–252, 260, 261.1, *263.19,* 270, *270.3,* 271. See also Height and Bulk District Maps	Varies. See Height and Bulk Map Sheets HT02 and HT07 for more information. Height sculpting required on Alleys per § 261.1.
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally* ~~*N*~~not ~~*R*~~*r*equired~~.~~*; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).*
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		

Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
* * * *		
Dwelling Unit Mix	§ 207.6	Generally ~~R~~*r*equired for creation of five or more Dwelling Units. No less than 40% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least two bedrooms; or no less than 30% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least three bedrooms.
* * * *		
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**
		1st / **2nd** / **3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P(1) / P / P
Accessory Dwelling Unit	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code Sections 207.1 and 207.2.
Dwelling Units, Senior Housing, and Group Housing*, Generally*	§ 102, 202.2(f), 207, 208	~~*No density limit by lot area. Density restricted by physical envelope controls of height, bulk, setbacks, open space, exposure and other applicable controls of*~~

			~~*this and other Codes, as well as by applicable design guidelines, applicable elements and area plans of the General Plan, and design review by the Planning Department.*~~*Form-Based Density*		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		
* * * *				
Loss ~~*and Division*~~ of Dwelling Units*:* *Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~
~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
Division of Dwelling Units	§ 207.8	Division of existing Dwelling Units P per § 207.8		
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				

Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124, *207.9*	3.0 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*
* * * *		

* * * *

SEC. 762. VALENCIA STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL TRANSIT DISTRICT.

* * * *

Table 762. VALENCIA STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL TRANSIT DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

* * * *

		Valencia Street NCT
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally ~~Nn~~*not *~~Rr~~*equired*~~.~~; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).*

* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
* * * *		
Dwelling Unit Mix	§~~§~~ 207.6	Generally ~~R~~*r*equired for creation of five or more Dwelling Units. No less than 40% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least two bedrooms; or no less than 30% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least three bedrooms.
* * * *		

Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P(1)	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Units	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code Sections 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Units, Senior Housing, and Group Housing*, Generally*	§ 102, 202.2(f), 207, 208	~~*No residential density limit by lot area. Density restricted by physical envelope controls of height, bulk, setbacks, open space, exposure and other*~~		

			~~*applicable controls of this and other Codes, as well as by applicable design guidelines, applicable elements and area plans of the General Plan, and design review by the Planning Department.*~~*Form-Based Density*		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		
* * * *				
Loss ~~*and Division*~~ of Dwelling Units*:* *Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~	~~*NP*~~
~~*Residential Demolition or Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
Division of Dwelling Units	§ 207.8	Division of existing Dwelling Units P per § 207.8		
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				

Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124, *207.9*	2.5 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*
* * * *		

* Not listed below

(1) C required for ground floor residential use when street frontage is listed in 145.4(b)

* * * *

SEC. 763. 24TH STREET – MISSION NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL TRANSIT DISTRICT.

* * * *

Table 763. 24TH STREET – MISSION NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL TRANSIT DISTRICT

ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		24th Street – Mission NCT
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally* ~~*N*~~*n*ot ~~*R*~~*r*equired~~.~~*; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required recommended width under the Better Streets Plan.*

		This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
* * * *		
Dwelling Unit Mix	§§ 207.6	Generally ~~R~~required for creation of five or more Dwelling Units. No less than 40% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least two bedrooms; or no less than 30% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least three bedrooms.
* * * *		

Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P(1)	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Units	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code Sections 207.1 and 207.2.		

Dwelling Units, Senior Housing, and Group Housing*, Generally*	§ 102, 202.2(f), 207, 208	~~*No residential density limit by lot area. Density restricted by physical envelope controls of height, bulk, setbacks, open space, exposure and other applicable controls of this and other Codes, as well as by applicable design guidelines, applicable elements and area plans of the General Plan, and design review by the Planning Department.*~~*Form-Based Density.*		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		
* * * *				
Loss ~~*and Division*~~ of Dwelling Units*: Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~	~~*NP*~~
~~*Residential Demolition or Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
Division of Dwelling	§ 207.8	Division of existing Dwelling Units P per § 207.8		

Units		
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124, *207.9*	2.5 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*
* * * *		

* * * *

SEC. 764. UPPER MARKET STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL TRANSIT DISTRICT.

* * * *

The Upper Market Street Transit District controls are designed to promote moderate-scale development which contributes to the definition of Market Street's design and character. They are also intended to preserve the existing mix of Commercial Uses and maintain the livability of the district and its surrounding residential areas. Large-lot and use development is reviewed for consistency with existing development patterns. Rear yards are protected at all levels. To promote mixed-use buildings, most Commercial Uses are permitted with some limitations above the second story. In order to maintain continuous retail frontage and preserve a balanced mix of Commercial Uses, ground-story neighborhood-serving uses are encouraged, and financial service uses are limited. Ground floor-commercial space is required along Market and Church Streets. Most Automotive Service and Drive-Up ~~*Faciility*~~*Facility* uses are prohibited or conditional.

Housing development in new buildings is encouraged ~~*above the Second Story*~~. ~~*Existing upper-story Residential Units are protected by limitations on demolitions and upper-story conversions.*~~ Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted ~~*within the district pursuant to Sections 207.1 and 207.2 of*~~

~~*this Code*~~.

Table 764. UPPER MARKET STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL TRANSIT DISTRICT

ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Upper Market Street NCT
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
Height and Bulk Limits~~.~~	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250–252, 260, 261.1, *263.19,* 270, *270.3,* 271. See also Height and Bulk District Maps.	Varies. See Height and Bulk Map Sheet HT07 for more information. Height sculpting required on Alleys per § 261.1.
* * * *		
Front Setback and Side Yard	§§ 130, 131, 132, 133	*Generally* ~~*N*~~not ~~*R*~~*r*equired~~.~~*; however, if the existing sidewalk does not meet the recommended width required by the Better Streets Plan, a front setback shall be provided so that, when combined with the existing sidewalk, the total distance from the curb to the building frontage meets or exceeds the required*

		recommended width under the Better Streets Plan. This setback is required only up to 15 feet above street grade. See § 132(e).		
* * * *				
Miscellaneous				
* * * *				
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines, *Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*		
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*		
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
* * * *				
Dwelling Unit Mix	§ 207.6	Generally ~~R~~*r*equired for creation of five or more Dwelling Units. No less than 40% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least two bedrooms; or no less than 30% of the total number of proposed Dwelling Units shall contain at least three bedrooms.		
* * * *				
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**

Residential Uses	§102	P(1)	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit	§§102, 207.1, 207.2	P per Planning Code Sections 207.1 and 207.2.		
Dwelling Units, Senior Housing, and Group Housing~~.~~*, Generally*	§ 102, 202.2(f), 207, 208	~~*No density limit by lot area. Density restricted by physical envelope controls of height, bulk, setbacks, open space, exposure and other applicable controls of this and other Codes, as well as by applicable design guidelines, applicable elements and area plans of the General Plan, and design review by the Planning Department.*~~*Form-Based Density*		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		
* * * *				
Loss ~~*and Division*~~ of Dwelling Units*: Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*NP*~~

~~*Residential Demolition and Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~C~~	~~C~~	~~C~~
Division of Dwelling Units	§ 207.8	Division of existing Dwelling Units P per § 207.8		
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124, *207.9*	3.0 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* * * *

SEC. 780.1. LAKESHORE PLAZA SPECIAL USE DISTRICT.

(a) Purpose and Findings. In addition to the purposes stated in Section 701 of this Code, the following purpose and findings form a basis for special regulations and provide guidance for their application in the Lakeshore Plaza Special Use District.

* * * *

(3) Housing development in new buildings is encouraged.

(b) **Controls.** The controls for the NC-S District, as set forth in Section 713 of this Code, shall apply to the Lakeshore Plaza Special Use District, except as provided below:

Zoning Category No.	**Controls**
.10	~~*The 26-40-X height district requires Conditional Use authorization for heights over 26 feet not exceeding 40 feet.*~~*Varies. See Height and Bulk District Maps.*
* * * *	

.90	*Residential uses are permitted at all stories.~~Residential uses are permitted as conditional uses at the first and second stories and not permitted above the second story.~~*
.91, .92, .93	*~~Residential density for dwelling units is one unit per 3,000 sq. ft. of lot area; group housing is not permitted; minimum usable open space per dwelling unit is 300 sq. ft. if private and 400 sq. ft. if common.~~Form-Based Density applies for all Residential Uses.*
* * * *	

SEC. 780.3. NORTH BEACH SPECIAL USE DISTRICT.

* * * *

(c) **Controls.** The following provisions shall apply within such District:

* * * *

(4) ***~~Loss of Residential Units.~~*** *~~To prevent the loss of existing Residential Units within the district, the removal, demolition, merger, or conversion of Residential Units above the First Story are prohibited.~~[Reserved]*

* * * *

SEC. 810. CHINATOWN COMMUNITY BUSINESS DISTRICT.

The Chinatown Community Business District, located in the northeast quadrant of San Francisco, extends along Broadway from the eastern portal of the Broadway Tunnel to Columbus Avenue and along Kearny Street from Columbus to Sacramento Street. This district

also includes portions of Commercial Street between Montgomery Street and Grant Avenue and portions of Grant Avenue between Bush and California Streets. It is part of the larger core area of Chinatown.

The portions of Broadway, Kearny, and Commercial Streets and Grant Avenue in this district are transitional edges or entries to Chinatown. North and east of the two blocks of Broadway contained in this district are North Beach and the Broadway Entertainment Districts. Kearny and Columbus Streets are close to intensive office development in the Downtown Financial District. Both Grant Avenue and Commercial Street provide important pedestrian entries to Chinatown. Generally, this district has more potential for added retail and commercial development than other parts of Chinatown.

This zoning district is intended to protect existing housing, encourage new housing and to accommodate modest expansion of Chinatown business activities as well as street-level retail uses. The size of individual professional or business office use is limited in order to prevent these areas from being used to accommodate larger office uses spilling over from the financial district.

Housing development in new buildings is encouraged at upper stories. ~~*Existing housing is protected by limitations on demolitions and upper-story conversions.*~~ Accessory dwelling units are permitted ~~*within the district pursuant to Subsection 207(c)(4) of this Code*~~.

Table 810

CHINATOWN COMMUNITY BUSINESS DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Chinatown Community Business District
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		

* * * *				
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*		
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
* * * *				
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit ~~*Density*~~	§§ 102, 207*.1(c)(4),* *207.2*	Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted to be constructed within an existing building zoned for residential use or within an existing and authorized auxiliary structure on the same lot, provided that it does not eliminate or reduce a ground-story retail or commercial space.		
Dwelling Unit Density	§ 207	Up to 1 unit per 200 sq. ft. lot area.		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		
Group Housing Density	§§ 208, 890.88(b)	1 bedroom per 140 sq. ft. lot area.		

* * * *				
Loss of Dwelling Units*: Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion, Demolition or Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
* * * *				
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124, *207.9*	1.8 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* * * *

SEC. 811. CHINATOWN VISITOR RETAIL DISTRICT.

* * * *

The height limit applicable to the district will accommodate two floors of housing or institutional use above two floors of retail use. ~~*Existing residential units are protected by prohibition of upper-story conversions and limitation on demolition.*~~ Accessory dwelling units are permitted ~~*within the district pursuant to Subsection 207(c)(4) of this Code*~~.

Table 811

CHINATOWN VISITOR RETAIL DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Chinatown Visitor Retail District		
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**		
BUILDING STANDARDS				
* * * *				
Miscellaneous				
* * * *				
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*		
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
* * * *				
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**		
		1st	**2nd**	**3rd +**
Residential Uses	§102	P	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit ~~*Density*~~	§§ 102, 207*.1(c)(4),* *207.2*	Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted to be constructed within an existing building zoned for residential use or within an existing and authorized auxiliary structure on the same lot, provided that it does not eliminate or reduce a ground-story retail or commercial space.		
Dwelling Unit Density	§ 207	Up to 1 unit per 200 sq. ft. lot area.		
Minimum Dwelling Unit	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally*		

Densities, if Applicable		*ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		
Group Housing Density	§§ 208, 890.88(b)	1 bedroom per 140 sq. ft. lot area.		
* * * *				
Loss of Dwelling Units*: Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion, Demolition or Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
* * * *				
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124*, 207.9*	2.0 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* * * *

SEC. 812. CHINATOWN RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL

DISTRICT.

* * * *

Housing development in new and existing buildings is encouraged above the ground floor. Institutional uses are also encouraged. ~~*Existing residential units are protected by limits on demolition and conversion.*~~ Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted ~~*within the district pursuant to subsection 207(c)(4) of this Code*~~.

Table 812

CHINATOWN RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT

ZONING CONTROL TABLE

		Chinatown Residential Neighborhood Commercial District
Zoning Category	**§ References**	**Controls**
BUILDING STANDARDS		
*** * * ***		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
* * * *		
Residential Uses		**Controls by Story**

		1st	2nd	3rd +
Residential Uses	§102	P	P	P
Accessory Dwelling Unit ~~*Density*~~	§§ 102, 207*.1(c)(4)*, *207.2*	Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted to be constructed within an existing building zoned for residential use or within an existing and authorized auxiliary structure on the same lot, provided that it does not eliminate or reduce a ground-story retail or commercial space.		
Dwelling Unit Density	§ 207	Up to 1 unit per 200 sq. ft. lot area.		
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*		
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*		
Group Housing Density	§§ 208, 890.88(b)	1 bedroom per 140 sq. ft. lot area.		
* * * *				
Loss of Dwelling Units*: Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		
		~~*1st*~~	~~*2nd*~~	~~*3rd+*~~
~~*Residential Conversion,*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~

~~*Demolition or Merger*~~				
* * * *				
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES				
Development Standards				
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124, *207.9*	1.0 to 1. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*		
* * * *				

* * * *

SEC. 825. DTR – DOWNTOWN RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS.

* * * *

(c) **Use.** A use is the specified purpose for which a property or building is used, occupied, maintained, or leased. Uses in Downtown Residential Districts are either permitted, conditional, accessory, temporary or are not permitted. If there are two or more uses in a structure, any use not classified in Section 825(c)(1)(C) below as accessory will be considered separately as an independent permitted, conditional, temporary or not permitted use.

* * * *

(2) **Residential Use Controls.** Unless otherwise specified in a Section governing an individual DTR District, the following residential use controls shall apply:

* * * *

(C) **Residential Density.** *Form-Based Density applies in the Downtown Residential Districts.*~~*There shall be no density limit for residential uses in Downtown Residential Districts. The provisions of Sections 207 through 208 related to residential density shall not apply.*~~

* * * *

SEC. 827. RINCON HILL DOWNTOWN RESIDENTIAL MIXED USE DISTRICT (RH-

DTR).

* * * *

No.	Zoning Category	§ References	Rincon Hill Downtown Residential Mixed Use District Zoning Controls
Building and Siting Standards			
* * * *			
.13	Setbacks	~~*Ground Floor Residential Design Guidelines*~~ *Urban Design Guidelines, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*	Building setback of 3 to 10 ft. for all buildings except towers on Spear, Main, Beale, Fremont, and First Streets. § 827(a)(2) and (6). Upper-story setback of 10 ft. required above a height of 65 feet on both sides of Spear, Main, Beale, Fremont, and First Streets. § 827(a)(5).

				Sun access plane setback of 50 degrees for all buildings 85' and lower on the south side of east-west mid-block pathways. § 827(a)(5).
	.14	Street-Facing Uses	§§ 145.1, 145.4, ~~*Ground Floor Residential Design Guidelines*~~ *Urban Design Guidelines, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*	Active uses required on all street frontages. See §§ 145.1, 825(b). Ground-level residential or commercial requirements based on location. See §§ 145.4 and 827(a)(2).
	* * * *			
	Non-Residential Standards and Uses			
	* * * *			
	.21	Use Size [*Non-Residential*]	§§ 890.130, 145.14, *207.9*	P for non-residential uses up to 25,000 sq. ft., C above. No

			individual ground floor tenant may occupy more than 75' of frontage for a depth of 25' from Folsom Street. §§ 145.14. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*
* * * *			
Residential Standards and Uses			
* * * *			
.47	Residential Density, ~~*Dwelling Units*~~*General*	§*§ 207.5(d), 207.6,* 890.88(a)	~~*No Limit. § 207.5(d) # Form-Based Density. Dwelling*~~ Unit Mix Required § 207.6
.47b	*Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable*	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*
.47c	*Maximum Dwelling Unit Size*	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent*

			Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.
.48	Residential Density, Group Housing	§*§ 207.5,* 890.88(b)	~~*No Limit.*~~ ~~*§ 207.5(d)*~~*Form-Based Density*
* * * *			

* * * *

SEC. 829. SOUTH BEACH DOWNTOWN RESIDENTIAL MIXED USE DISTRICT (SB-DTR).

* * * *

While lot coverage is limited for all levels with residential uses that do not face onto streets or alleys, traditional rear yard open spaces are not required. Specific height, bulk, and setback controls establish appropriate heights for both towers and mid-rise podium development and ensure adequate spacing between towers in order to establish a neighborhood scale and ensure light and air to streets and open spaces. Setbacks are required where necessary to provide transition space for ground floor residential uses and to ensure sunlight access to streets and open spaces. Off-street parking must be located below grade. Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted within the district ~~*pursuant to Section 207.1 of this Code*~~.

Table 829

SOUTH BEACH DOWNTOWN RESIDENTIAL MIXED USE DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

No.	Zoning Category	§ References	South Beach Downtown Residential Mixed Use District Zoning Controls
Building and Siting Standards			
Non-Residential Standards and Uses			
* * * *			
.21	Use Size [*Non-Residential*]	§§ 890.130, *207.9*	P for non-residential uses up to 25,000 sq. ft., C above. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*
* * * *			
Residential Standards and Uses			
* * * *			
.47	Residential Density, ~~*Dwelling Units*~~*General*	§§ *207.5(d), 207.6,* 890.88(a)	~~*No Limit. § 207.5(d) # Form-Based Density. Dwelling*~~ Unit Mix Required § 207.6
.47b	*Minimum Dwelling Unit*	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on*

	Densities, if Applicable		*project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*
.47c	*Maximum Dwelling Unit Size*	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*
.48	Residential Density, Group Housing	§*§ 207.5,* 890.88(b)	~~*No Limit.*~~ ~~*§ 207.5(d)*~~*Form-Based Density.*
* * * *			

* * * *

SEC. 830. CMUO – CENTRAL SOMA MIXED USE-OFFICE DISTRICT.

* * * *

Table 830

CMUO – CENTRAL SOMA MIXED USE-OFFICE DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

Central SoMa Mixed Use-Office Controls

Zoning Category	§ References	Controls
BUILDING STANDARDS		
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
* * * *		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element; Central SoMa Plan	Subject to the Citywide Urban Design Guidelines, *Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
* * * *		
* * * *		
Residential Uses		
Residential Uses	§102	P
Dwelling Units, Senior Housing, and Group Housing *Density, General*	§ 207	~~*No residential density limit by lot area. Density restricted by physical envelope controls of height, bulk, setbacks, open space, exposure and other applicable controls of this and other Codes, as well as by applicable design guidelines, applicable elements and area plans of the General Plan, and design review by the Planning Department.*~~*Form-Based Density.*
Minimum Dwelling Unit	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally*

Densities, if Applicable		*ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*
Group Housing	§§ 102, 249.78(c)(8)	NP, except Group Housing uses that are also defined as Student Housing or Senior Housing, ~~,~~ are designated for persons with disabilities, are designated for Transition Age Youth, or are contained in buildings that consist of 100% affordable units.
* * * *		
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124, 128.1, *207.9,* 249.78	In the Central SoMa SUD, ~~P~~*p*revailing Height and Density limits are determined by Section 249.78, subject to the requirements of Section 128. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*
* * * *		

SEC. 831. MUG – MIXED USE-GENERAL DISTRICT.

* * * *

Housing is encouraged over ground floor commercial and PDR uses. New residential or mixed use developments are encouraged to provide as much mixed-income family housing

as possible. Existing group housing and dwelling units would be protected from demolition or conversion to nonresidential use by requiring conditional use review. Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted ~~*within the district pursuant to Section 207.1 of this Code*~~.

* * * *

Table 831

MUG – MIXED USE-GENERAL DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

Zoning Category	§ References	Mixed Use-General Controls
BUILDING STANDARDS		
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element; Central SoMa Plan	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission*.~~.~~
* * * *		
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
* * * *		
Residential Conversion, Demolition, or Merger *of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	§ 317	C ~~*for Removal of one or more Residential Units or Unauthorized Units.*~~

* * * *		
Residential Uses		
* * * *		
Dwelling Unit and Group Housing Density, *General*	§ 207	~~*No density limit. Density is regulated by the permitted height and bulk, and required setbacks, exposure, and open space of each development lot.*~~*Form-Based Density.*
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 123, 124, *207.9*	FAR based on permitted height. See §124 for more information. (4) *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*
* * * *		

* * * *

(4) Within the Central SOMA SUD, see Planning Code Section 249.78 for specific controls.

* * * *

SEC. 832. MUO – MIXED USE-OFFICE DISTRICT.

The Mixed Use-Office (MUO) is designed to encourage office uses and housing, as well as small-scale light manufacturing and arts activities. Nighttime entertainment and small tourist hotels are permitted as a conditional use. Large tourist hotels are permitted as a conditional use in certain height districts. Dwelling units and group housing are permitted, while demolition or conversion of existing dwelling units or group housing requires conditional use authorization. Family-sized housing is encouraged. Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted ~~*within the district pursuant to Section 207.1 of this Code*~~.

* * * *

Table 832

MUO – MIXED USE-OFFICE DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

Zoning Category	§ References	Mixed Use-Office District Controls
BUILDING STANDARDS		
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission*.~~.~~
* * * *		
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
* * * *		
Residential Conversion, Demolition, or Merger *of Dwelling Units,*	§ 317	C ~~*for Removal of one or more Residential Units or Unauthorized Units.*~~

including Residential Flats		
* * * *		
Residential Uses		
* * * *		
Senior Housing	*§§ 102, 202.2(f)*	*P*
Homeless Shelters	§§ 102, 208	P
Dwelling Unit and Group Housing Density, *General*	§ 208	~~*No density limit. Density is regulated by the permitted height and bulk, and required setbacks, exposure, and open space of each development lot.*~~*Form-Based Density.*
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*
* * * *		
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 123, 124, *207.9*	Varies, depending on height, as set forth in § 124. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*
* * * *		

* * * *

SEC. 833. MUR – MIXED USE-RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT.

* * * *

Table 833

MUR – MIXED USE-RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

Zoning Category	§ References	Mixed Use-Residential District Controls
BUILDING STANDARDS		
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element; Central SoMa Plan	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission*.
* * * *		
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
* * * *		
Residential Conversion, Demolition, or Merger *of Dwelling Units, including Residential*	§ 317	C ~~*for Removal of one or more Residential Units or Unauthorized Units.*~~

Flats		
* * * *		
Residential Uses		
* * * *		
Senior Housing	*§§ 102, 202.2(f)*	*P*
Homeless Shelters	§*§ 102,* 208	P
Dwelling Unit and Group Housing Density*, General*	§ 208	~~*No density limit. Density is regulated by the permitted height and bulk, and required setbacks, exposure, and open space of each development lot.*~~*Form-Based Density.*
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*
* * * *		
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 123, 124, 128.1, 249.78*, 207.9*	FAR based on permitted height, see Section 124 for more information. (3) *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*
* * * *		

* * * *

(3) For projects within the Central SoMa SUD, see specific requirements in Section 249.78.

* * * *

SEC. 834. RED – RESIDENTIAL ENCLAVE DISTRICT.

* * * *

Dwelling units are permitted as a principal use. Nonresidential uses, except art related activities, are not permitted, except for certain uses in historic buildings. Existing commercial activities in nonresidential structures may continue as nonconforming uses subject to the termination requirements of Sections 185 and 186. Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted ~~*within the district pursuant to Section 207.1 of this Code*~~.

Table 834

RED – RESIDENTIAL ENCLAVE DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

Zoning Category	§ References	Residential Enclave District Controls
BUILDING STANDARDS		
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
Design Guidelines and Standards	*General Plan Commerce and Industry Element*	*Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*
Large Project Review	§ 329	As required by § 329.
* * * *		

Awnings, Canopy, or Marquee	§ 136	NP(6)
* * * *		
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
* * * *		
Residential Conversion, Demolition, or Merger *of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	§ 317	C ~~*for Removal of one or more Residential Units or Unauthorized Units.*~~
* * * *		
Residential Uses		
* * * *		
Senior Housing	*§§ 102, 202.2(f)*	*P*
Homeless Shelters	§ 102	C
Dwelling Unit Density, *General*	§§ 207, 208	~~*No density limit. Density is regulated by the permitted height and bulk, and required setbacks, exposure, and open space of each development lot.*~~*Form-Based Density.*
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual*

		Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.
* * * *		
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
* * * *		

* * * *

(6) *Awning or canopy is P if required as a wind mitigation feature.* Awnings are *also P permitted* ~~*only*~~ for Limited Commercial Uses, as described in Section 186 of this Code.

* * * *

SEC. 835. RED-MX – RESIDENTIAL ENCLAVE-MIXED DISTRICT.

* * * *

While residential uses are encouraged throughout these districts, group housing is limited, and student housing and single-room-occupancy units are prohibited. Small-scale retail, restaurants, arts activities, and other commercial uses are principally permitted to create the potential for more active, mixed use alleys. Some automobile-related and production, distribution, and repair uses are also permitted with limitations. Existing commercial activities in nonresidential structures may continue as nonconforming uses subject to the termination requirements of Article 1.7. Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted ~~*within the district pursuant to Section 207.1 of this Code*~~.

Table 835

RED-MX – RESIDENTIAL ENCLAVE-MIXED DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

Zoning Category	§ References	Residential Enclave-Mixed District Controls
BUILDING STANDARDS		

* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element.	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*
* * * *		
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
* * * *		
~~*Residential Conversion*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*NP(5)*~~
Residential *Conversion,* Demolition, *or* Merger *of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	§ 317	C ~~*for Removal of one or more Residential Units or Unauthorized Units.*~~
* * * *		
Residential Uses		
* * * *		
Senior Housing	*§§ 102, 202.2(f)*	*P*
Homeless Shelters	§ 102	C
Dwelling Unit and Group Housing Density*, General*	§§ 207	~~*No density limit. Density is regulated by the permitted height and bulk, and required setbacks, exposure, and open space of each development lot.*~~*Form-Based*

		Density.
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*
* * * *		
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
* * * *		

* * * *

(5) ~~*C in Article 10 Landmark Buildings*~~*[Reserved]*

* * * *

SEC. 836. SALI – SERVICE/ARTS/LIGHT INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT.

The Service/Arts/Light Industrial (SALI) District is largely comprised of low-scale buildings with production, distribution, and repair uses. The ~~*d*~~*D*istrict is designed to protect and facilitate the expansion of existing general commercial, manufacturing, home and business service, and light manufacturing activities, with an emphasis on preserving and expanding arts activities. Nighttime Entertainment is permitted although limited by buffers around RED and RED-MX districts. Residential Uses, Offices, Hotels, and Adult Entertainment uses are not permitted, except that certain Affordable Housing Projects are permitted within the district pursuant to Section 846.24 of this Code, and Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted ~~*within the district pursuant to Section 207.1 of this Code*~~.

Table 836

SALI – SERVICE/ARTS/LIGHT INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

Zoning Category	§ References	Service/Arts/Light Industrial District Controls
BUILDING STANDARDS		
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element.	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*
* * * *		
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
* * * *		
Residential Conversion, Demolition, or Merger *of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	§ 317	C ~~*for Removal of one or more Residential Units or Unauthorized Units.*~~
* * * *		
Residential Uses		
Dwelling Units	§ 102	NP(3)
* * * *		
Dwelling Unit and	§§ 207	~~*No density limit. Density is regulated by the permitted*~~

Group Housing Density, *General*		~~*height and bulk, and required setbacks, exposure, and open space of each development lot.*~~*Form-Based Density.*
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*
* * * *		
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
* * * *		

* * * *

(3) NP, Except Affordable Housing Projects meeting the requirements of Section 803.8.

* * * *

SEC. 837. SPD – SOUTH PARK DISTRICT.

South Park is an attractive affordable mixed-use neighborhood. The South Park District (SPD) is intended to preserve the scale~~*, density*~~ and mix of commercial and residential activities within this unique neighborhood. The district is characterized by small-scale, continuous-frontage warehouse, retail and residential structures built in a ring around an oval-shaped, grassy park. Retention of the existing structures is encouraged, as is a continued mix of uses, family-sized housing units, and in-fill development which contributes positively to the neighborhood scale and use mix. Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted within the ~~*d*~~*D*istrict

~~*pursuant to Section 207.1 of this Code*~~.

* * * *

Table 837

SPD – SOUTH PARK DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

Zoning Category	§ References	South Park District Controls
BUILDING STANDARDS		
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
Design Guidelines and Standards	*General Plan Commerce and Industry Element*	*Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*
Large Project Review	§ 329	As required by § 329.
* * * *		
Awning, Canopy, or Marquee	§ 136, 136.1	NP*(4)*
* * * *		
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
* * * *		
Residential Conversion, Demolition, or Merger *of Dwelling Units, including Residential*	§ 317	C ~~*for Removal of one or more Residential Units or Unauthorized Units.*~~

Flats		
* * * *		
Residential Uses		
* * * *		
Senior Housing	*§§ 102, 202.2(f)*	*P*
Homeless Shelters	§ 102	C
Dwelling Unit and Group Housing Density, *General*	§§ 207	~~*No density limit. Density is regulated by the permitted height and bulk, and required setbacks, exposure, and open space of each development lot.*~~*Form-Based Density.*
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*
* * * *		
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124, *207.9*	FAR based on permitted height. See Section 124. Childcare Facilities and Residential Care Facilities are exempt from FAR limits. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*

* * * *

* * * *

(4) ~~*[Note Deleted]*~~ *Awning or canopy is P if required as a wind mitigation feature.*

* * * *

SEC. 838. UMU – URBAN MIXED USE DISTRICT.

* * * *

Table 838

UMU – URBAN MIXED USE DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

Zoning Category	§ References	Urban Mixed Use District Controls
BUILDING STANDARDS		
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*
* * * *		
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
* * * *		
Residential Conversion, Demolition, or Merger *of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	§ 317	C ~~*for Removal of one or more Residential Units or Unauthorized Units.*~~

* * * *		
Residential Uses		
* * * *		
Senior Housing	*§§ 102, 202.2(f)*	*P*
Homeless Shelter*s*	§ 102	P
Dwelling Unit and Group Housing Density*, General*	§*§* 207	~~*No density limit. Density is regulated by the permitted height and bulk, and required setbacks, exposure, and open space of each development lot.*~~*Form-Based Density.*
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*
Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*
* * * *		
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 123, 124*, 207.9*	Section 124 sets forth Basic FAR based on height. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*
* * * *		

* * * *

SEC. 839. WMUG – WSOMA MIXED USE-GENERAL DISTRICT.

* * * *

Table 839

WMUG – WSOMA MIXED USE-GENERAL DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

Zoning Category	§ References	Western SoMa Mixed Use-General District Controls
BUILDING STANDARDS		
Massing and Setbacks		
Height and Bulk Limits	§§~~,~~ 261.1, *263.19,* 270, 270.1, 270.2, *270.3,* 271	Varies; see also Height and Bulk District Maps. Height sculpting required on Alleys as set forth in § 261.1. Horizontal mass reduction required as set forth in §270.1. Mid-block alleys required as set forth in §270.2.
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry Element.	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission.*
* * * *		
Signs	§ 607.2	As permitted by ~~*Section*~~ § 607.2
* * * *		
Housing Choice-SF	*§ 206.10*	*Form-based density, additional height, and other zoning modifications for eligible projects in the R-4 Height and Bulk District.*

RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
* * * *		
Residential Conversion, Demolition, or Merger *of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	§ 317	C ~~*for Removal of one or more Residential Units or Unauthorized Units.*~~
Dwelling Unit Mix	§ 207.6	*Generally required for creation of five or more Dwelling Units.* At least 40% of all Dwelling Units must contain two or more bedrooms or 30% of all Dwelling Units must contain three or more bedrooms.
* * * *		
Residential Uses		
* * * *		
Senior Housing	*§§ 102, 202.2(f)*	*P*
Homeless Shelters	§ 208	P
Dwelling Unit and Group Housing Density, *General*	§§ 207	~~*No density limit. Density is regulated by the permitted height and bulk, and required setbacks, exposure, and open space of each development lot.*~~*Form-Based Density.*
Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities, if Applicable	*§ 207.9*	*Varies depending on project location, but generally ranges between 50 and 100 dwelling units per acre.*

Maximum Dwelling Unit Size	*§§ 207.10, 317*	*P up to 4,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area or an equivalent Floor Area Ratio for any individual Dwelling Unit of 1.2:1. C for Dwelling Units that exceed the greater of those thresholds.*
* * * *		
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 123, 124, *207.9*	FAR based on permitted height, see Section 124 for more information. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*
* * * *		

* * * *

SEC. 840. WMUO – WSOMA MIXED USE-OFFICE DISTRICT.

* * * *

Table 840

WMUO – WSOMA MIXED USE-OFFICE DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

Zoning Category	§ References	Western SoMa Mixed Use-Office District Controls
BUILDING STANDARDS		
* * * *		
Miscellaneous		
Design Guidelines *and Standards*	General Plan Commerce and Industry	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines, *Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning*

	Element.	*Commission.*
* * * *		
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
* * * *		
Residential Conversion, Demolition, or Merger *of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	§ 317	C ~~*for Removal of one or more Residential Units or Unauthorized Units.*~~
~~*Dwelling Unit Mix*~~	~~*§ 207.6*~~	~~*At least 40% of all Dwelling Units must contain two or more bedrooms or 30% of all Dwelling Units must contain three or more bedrooms.*~~
* * * *		
NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES		
Development Standards		
Floor Area Ratio	§§ 102, 123, 124, *207.9*	Section 124 sets forth the Basic FAR based on height. *For Office Uses minimum intensities may apply pursuant to § 207.9.*
* * * *		

* * * *

Section 14. Article 1 of the Business and Tax Regulations Code is hereby amended to revise Section 8, as follows:

SEC. 8. METHOD OF APPEAL TO THE BOARD OF APPEALS.

(a) Except for variance decisions and permits issued by the Entertainment Commission or its Director, and as otherwise specified in this Section 8, appeals to the Board of Appeals shall be taken within 15 days from the making or entry of the order or decision from which the appeal is taken. Appeals of variance decisions shall be taken within 10 days.

(b) Appeals to the Board of Appeals of permit decisions made pursuant to *a Housing Sustainability District* ~~*Planning Code Section 343*~~ shall be taken within 10 days of the permit decision. This subsection (b) shall expire on the *latter of the* Sunset Date of Planning Code Section 343 *or Section 344*, as defined in ~~*that*~~ *those* Section*s*. Upon the expiration of this subsection, the City Attorney shall cause this subsection to be removed from the Business and Tax Regulations Code.

* * * *

Section 15. The Planning Code is hereby amended by replacing references to "Section 151" with "Section 151.1" in the following sections: 102, 153, 154, 204.5, 240.2, 209.1, 209.2, 209.3, 209.4, 210.1, 210.3, 210.4, 240.3, 249.13, 249.17, 249.24, 249.30, 249.35B, 249.42, 249.43, 249.54, 249.85, 249.89, 710, 711, 712, 713, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 723, 724, 725, 726, 727, 728, 729, 730, 731, 732, 733, 734, 735, 736, 737, 738, 739, 740, 741, 742, 743, 744, 745, 746, 750, 751, 763, 831, 832, 833, 834, 835, 836, 837, 838, 839, 840, 920, 960, 963, 964. In the event the Planning Code contains other references to "Section 151," the City Attorney shall direct the publisher of the Municipal Code to change such references to "Section 151.1."

Section 16. Local Coastal Program. This ordinance constitutes an amendment to the Implementation Plan ("IP") of the City's Local Coastal Program. In the event of an inconsistency between this ordinance and previously certified sections of the IP, this

ordinance shall prevail. The Local Coastal Program is hereby amended to:

(a) Add Planning Code Sections 206.10, 334, and 344, as set forth above in Section 3 of this ordinance ["Housing Choice – San Francisco Program"];

(b) Add Planning Code Section 270.3 and modify Planning Code Sections 260, 263.19, 263.20, and 270, as set forth above in Section 4 of this ordinance ["Height and Bulk Limits"];

(c) Modify Planning Code Sections 209, 209.1, and 209.2, as set forth above in Section 6 of this ordinance ["Residential Districts"]. For the purposes of certification by the Coastal Commission, Planning Code Tables 209.1 and 209.2 are reprinted in their entirety, which include the relevant use and development controls for RH, RM-1, and RM-2 properties in the Coastal Zone;

(d) Modify Planning Code Sections 124, 132, 134, 135, 144, 186, 186.3, 201, 207.6, 207.7, 208, 209.4, 231, 303, 304, 603, 606, and 607.1, as set forth above in Section 7 of this ordinance ["Residential, Transit Oriented (RTO) Districts"]. For the purposes of certification by the Coastal Commission, Planning Code Table 209.4 is reprinted in its entirety, which includes the relevant use and development controls for RTO-C properties in the Coastal Zone;

(e) Add Planning Code Sections 207.9 and 207.10 and modify Planning Code Sections 151.1, 153, 154, 155, 155.2, and 161, as set forth above in Section 8 of this ordinance ["Transit Oriented Communities and Parking"];

(f) Modify Planning Code Section 155, as set forth above in Section 9 of this ordinance ["Off-Street Parking and Curb Cuts"];

~~(g) Add Planning Code Section 249.11, as set forth above in Section 10 of this ordinance ["San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Special Use District"];~~

(~~h~~g) Add Planning Code Section 202.17, as set forth above in Section 11 of this ordinance ["Displaced Businesses"];

(~~i~~h) Modify Planning Code Sections 102, 202.2, 311, and 317, as set forth above in Section 12 of this ordinance ["Miscellaneous Amendments"]; and

(~~j~~i) Modify Planning Code Sections 710 and 711, as set forth above in Section 13 of this ordinance ["Conforming Changes to Zoning Tables"]. For the purposes of certification by the Coastal Commission, Planning Code Tables 710 and 711 are reprinted in their entirety, which include the relevant use and development controls for NC-1 and NC-2 properties in the Coastal Zone.

Section 17. Effective and Operative Dates Outside the Coastal Zone.

(a) In the portions of the City that are not located in the Coastal Zone Permit Area, as that permit area is designated on Section Maps CZ4, CZ5, and CZ13 of the Zoning Map, this ordinance shall become effective 30 days after enactment. Enactment occurs when the Mayor signs the ordinance, the Mayor returns the ordinance unsigned or does not sign the ordinance within ten days of receiving it, or the Board of Supervisors overrides the Mayor's veto of the ordinance.

(b) In the portions of the City that are not located in the Coastal Zone Permit Area, this ordinance shall become operative upon its effective date.

Section 18. Effective and Operative Dates in the Coastal Zone.

(a) In the portions of the City that are located in the Coastal Zone Permit Area, this ordinance shall become effective 30 days after enactment. Enactment occurs when the Mayor signs the ordinance, the Mayor returns the ordinance unsigned or does not sign the ordinance within ten days of receiving it, or the Board of Supervisors overrides the Mayor's veto of the ordinance.

(b) Upon enactment, the Director of the Planning Department shall submit this

ordinance to the California Coastal Commission for certification as a Local Coastal Program Amendment. This ordinance shall become operative in the Coastal Zone Permit Area upon final certification by the California Coastal Commission. If the California Coastal Commission certifies this ordinance subject to modifications, this ordinance, as so modified, shall become operative in the Coastal Zone Permit Area 30 days after enactment of the modifications.

(c) This ordinance satisfies the City's obligations pursuant to Government Code Section 65583(c). Any consideration of the Ordinance by the California Coastal Commission after the City's enactment is consistent with the Coastal Act, and permissible pursuant to Government Code Section 65583(f)(1). Certification of the Local Coastal Program Amendment shall proceed pursuant to the California Coastal Commissions regulations and procedures, including any public participation and scheduling requirements.

Section 19. Transmittal of Ordinance. To facilitate the Coastal Commission's review of the Local Coastal Program Amendment, the Director of the Planning Department is authorized to submit the amendment for certification in the form desired by the Coastal Commission, including making any necessary non-substantive changes (e.g., formatting or redlining), to show the changes to the text of the Local Coastal Program. Upon certification by the California Coastal Commission, the Director of the Planning Department shall transmit a copy of the certified Local Coastal Program Amendment to the Clerk of the Board for inclusion in File No. _____. The Planning Department shall also retain a copy of the certified Local Coastal Program Amendment in its Local Coastal Program files.

Section 20. The ordinance in Board File No. _____ would amend the Planning Code to make various clarifying and typographical changes. Some of the changes in the ordinance in Board File No. _____ would amend portions of the Code that overlap with this ordinance.

In particular, the ordinance in Board File No. _____ proposes to reorganize Section 303.1(e) and (f), which list the formula retail controls for various districts, including RTO-C and the other RTO districts. That reorganization overlaps with formula retail controls for the RTO-C District listed in Section 303.1 of this ordinance. In the event this ordinance is enacted before the ordinance in Board File No. _____, the City Attorney shall direct the publisher of the Municipal Code to integrate the changes in this ordinance into Section 303.1, as amended by the ordinance in Board File No. _____, to ensure that the substantive changes to the formula retail controls for the RTO-C district established in this ordinance are included in the reorganized Section 303.1, such that both (a) RTO-C, and (b) Limited Commercial Uses in RTO-1 and RTO-M Districts are listed in Section 303.1(e).

Section 21. Housing Choice San Francisco Policy. It shall be the policy of the City of San Francisco that the Housing Choice San Francisco Program, codified in Planning Code Section 206.10, shall be interpreted liberally in favor of producing more units. Consistent with Housing Element Implementing Policy 8.1.6, the City shall not adopt changes to the Housing Choice San Francisco Program that constitute new governmental constraints to the development of housing unless those increased constraints are offset by the removal or reduction of other constraints. The Planning Department shall evaluate, and the Board shall consider, any proposed substantive amendments to the Housing Choice San Francisco Program for consistency with California Government Code 65583(a)(3).Section 22. Scope of Ordinance. In enacting this ordinance, the Board of Supervisors intends to amend only those words, phrases, paragraphs, subsections, sections, articles, numbers, punctuation marks, charts, diagrams, or any other constituent parts of the Municipal Code that are explicitly shown in this ordinance as additions, deletions, Board amendment additions, and Board amendment deletions in accordance with the “Note” that appears under the official title of the

ordinance.

Section 23. If any section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, or word of this ordinance, or any application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held to be invalid or unconstitutional by a decision of a court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions or applications of the ordinance; provided that if either Planning Code Section 206.10 or Section 334 is in any respect held to be invalid or unconstitutional by decision of a court of competent jurisdiction, both sections shall become inoperative and have no legal effect. Except as stated in the proviso above, the Board of Supervisors hereby declares that it would have passed this ordinance and each and every section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, and word not declared invalid or unconstitutional without regard to whether any other portion of this ordinance or application thereof would be subsequently declared invalid or unconstitutional.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
DAVID CHIU, City Attorney

By: /s/
AUSTIN M. YANG
Deputy City Attorney

n:\legana\as2025\2500203\01877097.docx

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

San Francisco Family Zoning Program

HOUSING ELEMENT REZONING

San Francisco Planning

Lisa Chen
Principal Planner, Plan Manager

James Pappas
Principal Planner

LAND USE & TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

OCTOBER 20, 2025

TODAY'S PRESENTATION

- Background
- Legislation under Consideration
- Affordable Housing Sites Analysis & Strategy
- Informational Resources & Visuals

Image from Wikipedia

San Francisco's Pervasive Housing Crisis

- SF is 2nd most expensive rental market and 2025 rents grew fastest of any US city.
- Rental vacancies are down to 3.8% — on par with pre-pandemic levels.
- It takes more than 4 minimum wage jobs to afford average SF rent.
- In 2024, 81,200 people applied in the lottery for 512 affordable housing units.
- Evictions nearly doubled in 2024 and are at their highest rate since 2018.
- 1/3 of households are cost-burdened, both renters and owners.
- SF has more than 8,300 unsheltered individuals.

California needs 2.5 million housing units. San Francisco's fair share is 82,000 units.



The Family Zoning Plan fulfills state laws by planning for affordable and mixed-income housing to overcome historic patterns of exclusion.



Housing Opportunity Areas*



Housing Production (2005-2019)

90% of housing was built outside** "housing opportunity areas," even though they cover over **50% of the city.

*Areas designated "Highest Resource" and "High Resource" on the Opportunity Area Map (CA Dept of Housing & Community Development)

What's at stake if we don't rezone

BUILDERS REMEDY: Menlo Park 446' proposal; zoned for 70'

If San Francisco does not adopt compliant rezoning, we risk:

- **State seizure of local permitting power,** a.k.a. "builders remedy"
- **Loss of state funding,** including transportation & affordable housing
- **Fines and lawsuits**

Source: Menlo Park

Communities facing Builders Remedy

See factsheet:
What happens if we don't rezone?

PALO ALTO

MENLO PARK

MOUNTAIN VIEW

BEVERLY HILLS

SANTA MONICA

SANTA CRUZ COUNTY

REDONDO BEACH

LOS GATOS

The Kelsey: $30million AHSC award

SF received $110 million/year in funds requiring Housing Element compliance:

- CalTrans Sustainable Communities Grant
- One Bay Area Grant
- Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities
- Permanent Local Housing Allocation
- Community Development Block Grant Program
- Infill Infrastructure Grant Program
- Local Housing Trust Fund Program
- HOME Program
- Local Partnership Program
- Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program
- Active Transportation Program
- Solutions for Congested Corridors Program

… and more

San Francisco's obligations under state law

To maintain Housing Element certification, by January 2026 we must:

- Rezone for **realistic capacity** to meet our RHNA shortfall (36,200 units).
- Affirmatively Further Fair Housing by **zoning in high opportunity areas**.
- **Identify low-income housing sites** that will be eligible for ministerial approval.

NOTE:

Housing Element certification will not be revoked if planned units are not ultimately built.

Community Engagement 2023-2025

18 Public Hearings

70 Education Workshops
1200+ attendees

8 Focus Groups
85 attendees

Survey
2,382 respondents

90+ Community Conversations
2000+ attendees

4 Open Houses, 2 Housing Summits
800+ attendees

Photos: SF Planning, Wah Mei School

Proposed
Local Program Map (Sept 2025)

- **MEETS STATE REQUIREMENTS** and allows for at least 36,200 new homes.
- **KEEPS LOCAL CONTROL** by setting base heights lower and incentivizing projects to use a Local Program.
- **PUTS TALLER BUILDINGS NEAR TRANSIT AND SERVICES:** 6+ stories on main streets and near transit.
- **ALLOWS SMALL APARTMENTS ELSEWHERE:** keeps existing 40’ height (4 stories) while welcoming more homes.



Proposed
Base Height Map (Sept 2025)

- **ON CORRIDORS, PROJECTS CHOOSE LOCAL OR STATE PROGRAMS:** Projects can get to similar heights under either option.
- **IN RESIDENTIAL AREAS, PROJECTS MUST USE LOCAL PROGRAM.** Projects in program get form-based zoning and **may not use State Density bonus.**



40’ Gentle Density (4 stories)

77% of sites in the rezoning receive no height changes but will get to build more units within their 40’ height limit.

These projects **cannot use State Density Bonus** to increase heights further.

2-unit (left) and a 4-unit building (right) on Hermann Street.



50’ Commercial Transition (5 stories)

Commercial transition areas get an additional **1 story (10’)** through the Local Program.

These projects **cannot use State Density Bonus** to increase heights further.

5-story building on West Portal Avenue



65’ & 85’ Mid-Rise Corridors (6 and 8 stories)

Generally 2 to 4 stories above today’s height limit.

Projects can choose either Local Program or State Density Bonus to get to similar heights.

6- and 8-story building on Polk St



Select High Rise Area (Height varies)

Projects can choose either Local Program or State Density Bonus to get to similar heights.

16-story building in Mission Bay



State Law & Capacity Calculations

To meet state law and Housing Element Action 7.1.1: SF must demonstrate that rezoning adds at least 36,200 units of capacity on **sites that are suitable and available**, using **methods that reasonably account for development likelihood.**

HCD issued a preliminary approval of the Plan on September 9th, noting that SF must use **all three of these methods** in combination to demonstrate realistic capacity:

Method	Analysis	Capacity *(June & Sept ordinances)*
Citywide	Uses an annual pace of development relative to zoned capacity.	**39,000 units** *(meets target of 36,200 units)*
Soft Sites	Excludes or discounts parcels based on current uses and other characteristics.	**45,000 units** *(meets target of 36,200 units)*
Feasibility	Computational model testing financial feasibility and economic conditions on each parcel.	**19,000 units** *(meets target of 16,000 moderate & above-moderate units)*

Senate Bill 79 (SB 79): Applies after July 1, 2026

- **SETS MINIMUM HEIGHT & DENSITY: 5 to 9 stories,** ½-mile around BART, Caltrain, Muni Metro, and Major Bus Stops
- **VARIOUS EXEMPTIONS UNTIL 2032:** For lots with >50% SB79 density, low-resource census tracts, other conditions. ***Most SF parcels are exempt under these rules.***
- **ALLOWS LOCAL "ALTERNATIVE PLAN" IN-LIEU OF SB79:** provided that Alternative Plan has at least same cumulative housing capacity as SB79.



SB 79: Family Zoning Plan is Adequate as "Alternative Plan"

Preliminary analysis shows that **if the proposed rezoning is adopted, SF will likely have an adequate Alternative Plan**, though further analysis is needed.

HCD and MTC will issue additional guidance on SB79 implementation.



ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

ACTIONS UNDER CONSIDERATION

1. Adoption of General Plan Amendments Ordinance (File 250966)
2. Adoption of Map Ordinance (File 250700)
3. Adoption of Planning, Business, & Tax Regulations Code Ordinance (File 250701)
4. Adoption of Local Costal Plan Amendment Resolution (File 250985)

General Plan Amendments Ordinance (File 250966)

- **Goal:** Modernize the General Plan and bring it into **alignment with the Family Zoning Plan**.

- **Proposed Amendments:**
  - Remove **outdated height maps**
  - **Update language** about height limits, density limits, and building scale and character.



PROPOSED AREA PLAN AND ELEMENT UPDATES

Urban Design Element
Commerce and Industry Element
Transportation Element
Balboa Park Station Area Plan
Glen Park Community Plan
Market and Octavia Area Plan
Northeastern Waterfront Plan
Van Ness Avenue Area Plan
Western SoMa (South of Market) Area Plan
Western Shoreline Area Plan.
Land Use Index

Source: Glen Park Community Plan, Urban Design Element

Zoning Map Ordinance (File 250700)

- **ZONING DISTRICT CHANGES:** Reclassifies various parcels to other districts to **allow more housing**, including Mixed Use, NC, and new RTO-C zoning.
- **HEIGHT CHANGES:** Changes **height limits** on certain parcels,and sets a “Base” height and “Local Program” height.
- **NEW BULK DISTRICT:** Creates new **R-4 Height and Bulk District**, which establishes eligibility for optional Local Program (“Housing Choice SF Program”)
- **SFMTA SPECIAL USE DISTRICT (SUD):** Adds various properties to a SFMTA SUD to enable housing production. **Future development projects will need Board approval.**
- **LOCAL COASTAL PLAN:** Amends parcels in Local Coastal Plan to be **consistent with the changes above**.

Planning, Business & Tax Regulation Code Ordinance (File 250701)

Topic	Amendment	Sections
Local Program (Housing Choice SF Program)	**Offers Incentives and streamlined process** via Local Program (Housing Choice SF Program), a flexible alternative to the State Density Bonus that **ensures local control over height and design standards**	206.10; 344
New Residential Zoning District (RTO-C)	Sets rules for newly created Residential Transit Oriented – Commercial (RTO-C) district, a **form-based district which allows ground floor commercial**	209.4
SFMTA Special Use District	Sets rules for SFMTA Special Use District to **allow for future housing on sites** (future developments projects will still require Board approval)	249.11

Planning, Business & Tax Regulation Code Ordinance (File 250701)

Topic	Amendment	Sections
Senior Housing Flexibility	Makes it **easier to build senior housing** by adjusting open space, bike parking, and minimum unit requirements.	135 155.1 202.1(f)(1)(C)
Small Business Relocation & Early Notification	• Supports **relocation of displaced businesses** by exempting Conditional Use hearings and impact fees; • Requires **early notification** to the commercial tenant and Office of Small Business.	202.17; 311
Efficient Land Use Near Transit; Parking Management	• Establishes **minimum densities** for residential and office uses near transit. • Adjusts **maximum parking ratios** according to proximity to transit.	Various

Planning, Business & Tax Regulation Code Ordinance (File 250701)

Topic	Amendment	Sections
Housing Sustainability District (HSD)	Creates a Housing Sustainability District (HSD), **another ministerial pathway** for qualifying projects in the Local Program.	344
Height and bulk limits	Modifies height and bulk standards to be **consistent with Citywide Design Standards**.	260
Wind Review Standards	**Consolidates wind review standards** for projects 85' and above in some districts	148
Code Cleanup & Local Coastal Plan Consistency	• Conforming edits to **zoning control tables** • Referral of amendments in **Local Coastal Plan** to Coastal Commission • Clarifying edits to conform with **state law** and other **code cleanup**	Various

Local Program (206.10): Menu of Code Flexibility

Automatic Flexibility in Local Program

- **Density:** form-based density (if not already in base zoning)
- **Inclusionary Housing:** flexibility to use all affordable options; rent-control option for <25 units.
- **100% Affordable Projects** receive 2 extra stories (20') and other flexibility.
- **Waive Exposure and Usable Open Space** requirements
- **Waive Large Lot and Non-residential Use Size** Conditional Use hearing.
- **Rear Yard** reduction to the greater of 18% or 15'.
- **Ground Floor Height** waiver for projects in 85' height districts
- **"Catchall" Flexibility:** 15% additional relief on other topics.

Local Program (206.10): Development Bonuses

Projects can receive a **square footage bonus**, added via height or horizontal bonuses:

Height bonuses (Corridors Only)	Horizontal bonuses (Location varies)
Cumulative 2 stories (20') bonus for historic preservation: for adaptive reuse **Cumulative 1 story (10') bonus for various incentives:** • **Commercial:** Warm Shell, Micro-Retail, Legacy Business or displaced business • **Community-serving use:** nonprofits, grocery, community facilities, childcare • **Family-sized units:** 3+ bedrooms	• **Historic preservation (corridors only):** may reduce rear yard • **Family-sized unit incentives:** may reduce rear yard, side yard, and upper-story setbacks • **Family-friendly amenities (residential districts only):** may reduce rear yard, side yard, and upper-story setbacks

Local Costal Plan Amendment Resolution (File 250985)



- **CONSISTENCY WITH COASTAL ACT:** Certifies Local Coastal Plan (LCP) Amendment is **consistent with Coastal Act**
- **REFERRAL TO COASTAL COMMISSION:** Directs Planning Director to submit LCP Amendment to **CA Coastal Commission for public hearing and certification.**

Affordable Housing **Sites Analysis and Strategies**

Topics We'll Cover Today

- Project **Purpose and Context**
- Research and Analysis:
  - **Pipeline and Parcel Analysis**
  - **Policy and Financial Research**
- Recommended **Strategies**

Affordable Housing Sites Analysis & Strategies Purpose

Affordable Housing Sites Analysis and Strategies (AHSAS) informs how the City and affordable housing developers can **acquire and develop sites for 100% affordable housing,** focused on:

- **Effectively managing the existing pipeline** of affordable housing
- **Ensuring ongoing affordable housing production** along with equitable geographic distribution of affordable housing
- **Identifying and acquiring new sites for affordable housing development** using a range of approaches

Affordable Housing Funding as the Key Challenge

Funding and cost lowering are key to produce and preserve affordable housing.

Affordable Housing Leadership Council Report (Spring 2024) addresses **funding, financing,** and **costs**.

- **Increase Federal, State, and regional funding**.
- **Expand San Francisco's capacity and coordination to fund** affordable housing.
- **Innovation and alternative approaches** to delivering affordable housing.

Local Affordable Housing Funding 2018-2023



Property taxes and other revenue from new development provide majority of local funding

Affordable Housing Pipeline Analysis

Mapping and Analysis of Existing Affordable Housing Pipeline

- **Prospective sites & Pre-construction:** 12,600+ units (59 projects)
- **Under Construction:** 2,299 units (30 projects)
- **Inclusionary BMR Units:** 2,500+ units (124 projects)

Geography: Affordable Housing pipeline **mirrors the market-rate pipeline,** with most projects in equity geographies.

Significant funding gap holds back the completion of existing pipeline



Source: MOHCD July 2025

Site Suitability Analysis (pre-rezoning)

Purpose: Identify potential affordable housing sites based on:

- **Policy** (local/state law) and development potential
- **MOHCD and affordable developer criteria**: preference for 100+ units on 8,000+ sq ft for efficiency
- **Analysis excludes existing residential units** and various public sites

Draft Finding: Under today's rules (pre-rezoning), 1,200 parcels may be suitable for affordable housing with capacity for 148,000 units.

Assembling smaller adjacent lots yields additional 2,200 parcels with capacity for 98,000 units.

100% Affordable Sites: Relationship to Rezoning

FAMILY ZONING PLAN

REZONED SITES (overall)

- Required to meet Housing Element (e.g., **RHNA**) at all income levels.
- **Primarily located in Well-Resourced Neighborhoods**.

LOW-INCOME SITES

- Subset of rezoned sites to meet **low-income** RHNA requirement.
- Must meet **minimum size and density**.
- Future projects proposing >20% BMR are eligible for **ministerial approval**

100% AFFORDABLE SITES

- Sites meeting **suitability criteria** for MOHCD, state, and federal funding.
- **Located citywide**; overlaps with rezoning & low-income sites
- **Rezoning will enable additional parcels** to meet criteria.

Affordable Housing Financial and Policy Research

Financial Research: Trends in land and development costs

- **Construction costs are 60%+ of affordable housing development costs while land costs averaged about 10%** (ranging from 7-14%). Land holding can add cost as well
- **Land prices have been relatively stable averaging ~$121K per unit over the last decade**. Fewer land sales in down markets; prices fluctuating just 5%.
- **Rezoning has limited effect on land costs per unit**; effects are linked to economic conditions and financial feasibility. Recent land prices per unit for affordable housing sites were comparable in rezoned areas and areas with no zoning changes

Policy research: Best practices from other cities

- **Establishing stable funding and aligning pipeline growth with funding capacity** and building on **partnerships with public, nonprofit, & faith-based property owners**

Affordable Housing Sites Recommended Strategies

1. **Managing the pipeline** of housing development and site acquisition
2. **Expanding the geography** of affordable housing
3. **Public sites and faith- and nonprofit-owned sites** for affordable housing
4. **Strategic market practices** for site acquisition
5. **Expanding opportunities for "missing middle"** affordable housing types.

Updated Informational Resources

Resources providing factual information and addressing misinformation:

- What is the Family Zoning Plan?
- (NEW) Capacity Calculations
- Small Business
- Tenant Protections
- What Happens if We Don't Rezone?
- Example visualizations

Residential demolitions are extraordinarily rare and will remain so after rezoning.

235

Units demolished (2012 - 24)

18 units/year
(0.00004% of SF housing stock)

139 single family (11 units/yr)
(352 units built; 213 net new)

96 multifamily (7 units/yr)
(284 units built; 188 net new)

4%

of no - fault evictions are due to demolition (2015 - 2025)

96% of evictions are due to **owner move - in (44%), capital improvement (26%), and Ellis Act (24%)**



Source: Planning Department, Rent Board. Demolition data does not include HOPE SF, development agreements, or emergency demolitions.

Most housing developments are built on vacant and underutilized lots.

Case study: Market Street & Ocean Ave

2,800 new homes built since 2007

84% of new housing projects were on sites without storefront businesses

92% did not result in major impacts to historic resources



Source: SF Planning Land Use Database (2025)



Images: MidPen Housing, David Baker Architects

Rezoning will increase housing affordability & diversity.

- **100% AFFORDABLE HOUSING:** funded by **bonds, inclusionary fees, state & federal funds**.
- **MIXED-INCOME HOUSING:** Market-rate projects contribute at least **15-20% affordable** units.
- **SITES FOR AFFORDABLE:** Enabling **sufficient sites** for affordable housing
- **INCENTIVES FOR 100% AFFORDABLE:** through our **Local Program**.
- **DIVERSITY = AFFORDABILITY: Allowing more housing will increase affordability**, esp. for middle-income households.

What will change look like?

- **Spending at local businesses** ($5.6 billion over 8yr)
- **Housing diversity and affordability**
- **More housing choices & stability for employees**
- **Revenues for public services & infrastructure**
- **Climate & environmental benefits**

Images: David Baker Architects, Handel Architecture, HKS

Visualization: Geary Blvd at 3rd Ave
140'
85'
BUS
Credit: AECOM

Visualization: Noriega St @ 25th Ave

Credit: AECOM

Visualization: Lombard St @ Buchanan St
85'
85'
85'
85'
85'
Buchanan
Lombard
Credit: AECOM

Visualization: Lombard St at Richardson St

Credit: AECOM

Visualization: Ocean Ave and Lee Ave

Credit: AECOM

Visualization: Divisadero St and Bush St
140'
Credit: AECOM

Visualization: Residential District (composite; not an actual location)
40'
Credit: AECOM

Visualization: Lyon St Steps view

Credit: AECOM

Visualization: Francisco Park view
45
65
45
Credit: AECOM

Visualization: Francisco Park view

Credit: AECOM

Visualization: Coit Tower view
65'
65'
65'
85'
85'
65'
65'
85'
Credit: AECOM

Acknowledgements

Sarah Dennis-Phillips, Planning Director
Rich Hillis, former Planning Director
Rachael Tanner, Citywide Planning Director
AnMarie Rodgers, former Citywide Planning Director
Joshua Switzky, Deputy Citywide Planning Director
Lisa Gibson, Environmental Review Officer
Lisa Chen, Plan Manager

Anne Yalon
Carla de Mesa
David Garcia
Dylan Hamilton
Esmeralda Jardines
Malena Leon-Farrera
Mat Snyder
Reanna Tong
Sarah Richardson
Debra Dwyer
Ryan Shum
Elizabeth White
Liz Watty
Rich Sucre
Trent Greenan
David Winslow
James Pappas
Miriam Chion
Maggie Smith
Melanie Bishop
Alex Westhoff
Amnon Ben-Pazi
Diana La
Gary Chen
Melissa Wong
Candace Soohoo
Martin Thibodeau
Rachael Schuett
Kate Conner
Carly Grob
Corey Teague
Aaron Starr
Rebecca Salgado
Austin Yang (CAT)
Audrey Pearson (CAT)
Giulia Gualco-Nelson (CAT)
Andrea Ruiz-Esquide (CAT)
Jenine Marquez (CAT)

Special thanks: Office of Small Business, MOHCD, SFMTA, Century Urban, AECOM, Groundworks Consulting, ICF, RWDI, PreVision, CivicEdge

Art by ChatGPT with modifications by SF Planning

Thank you!

http://sfplanning.org/sf-family-zoning-plan

sf.housing.choice@sfgov.org

Member, Board of Supervisors
District 1

City and County of San Francisco

CONNIE CHAN
陳詩敏
第一區市參事

October 20, 2025

Chair Myrna Melgar
Vice Chair Chyanne Chen
Supervisor Bilal Mahmood
San Francisco Board of Supervisors Land Use and Transportation Committee
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Suite 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Chair Melgar, Vice Chair Chen, and Supervisor Mahmood:

I first want to thank Chair Melgar for your efforts in organizing the agenda for today's hearing and allowing us the opportunity for a robust policy discussion on the Mayor's proposed upzoning plan and our proposed amendments.

It is our full intention to meet the State's housing mandate and I believe that San Francisco can both meet this goal and develop without displacement.

Since this summer, I have not only been studying the Mayor's proposed upzoning plan, my team and I have also been in conversations with many stakeholders and community members in the Richmond and citywide. We have heard from many San Franciscans who are questioning whether they will be part of our City's future or whether they will be left in the past because of this proposed upzoning plan.

Together with stakeholders, we have gone to great lengths to study the Housing Element's Site Inventory and Rezoning Program previously submitted by the City and approved by California Department of Housing and Community Development (California HCD). We used the approved guidelines to evaluate the Mayor's proposed upzoning plan and have found that the Mayor's proposed plan is a significant departure from what was already approved, with a great increase of upzoning and density to sites that have existing dwelling units. This ignores the overarching principle already agreed upon by both our local and state governments, that "change that the city needs must not harm

people", as clearly stated on page 36 in the Site Inventory and Rezoning Program document.

As a result, the amendments we propose before the Land Use Committee today, will remarkably improve this Plan and add a balanced approach to encourage housing production and meet the state housing mandate, without incentivizing displacement.

Based on the model used for the Existing Sites Inventory in the Site Inventory and Rezoning Program, again a document approved by California HCD, there is a list of characteristics used to determine non-vacant sites to be excluded for rezoning unit potential. With this model determining site inventory and excluding specific non-vacant sites, the City can still meet the mandate of San Francisco's Regional Housing Needs Allocation and Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing laws to accommodate about 36,282 new units in Well-Resourced Neighborhoods.

In fact, as indicated in the very same document on page 42, "Sites with existing residential uses of any amount that have not otherwise been wholly excluded from the Rezoning capacity assessment were deemed to have very low reasonable likelihood of redevelopment and, as a result, had their net capacities reduced downward (generally by 98%, leaving only 2% of their theoretical capacity represented in the Rezoning capacity)."

With that in mind, we are proposing language ranging from:

- Furthering demolition controls to protect tenants;
- 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, and increased risk of tenant and small business displacement;
- 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;
- Limiting Form-Based Density to the Local Density Bonus Program to provide meaningful incentives to build family housing with 2-3 bedroom requirements; and
- Strengthening historic preservation to protect the unique characters of our neighborhoods and history of San Francisco;

In the end, when the proposed amendments are overlaid with each other, they meet one policy goal: that the displacement of tenants and small businesses should not be the

cost of doing business. Instead, we can meet our housing mandate and provide incentives for developers to drive housing developments at vacant sites.

We have been in discussion with Mayor Lurie and his team almost weekly since the end of summer. Our conversation has been productive and I want to especially thank the Mayor's Deputy Chief of Staff Aly Bonde for her efforts. We have been sharing with her our amendments and continuing our conversations.

As we all know, to build housing we need both land and money. And the housing San Francisco needs most is housing people can afford. In fact, it is my intention to request the drafting and introduction of an Affordable Housing Special Use District at a later date to identify all public land, including SF Municipal Transportation Authority owned land, private land of 8,000 square feet or larger and merger lots, as well as vacant and blighted lots, and rezone them specifically for housing with a different set of local density bonus. We also must identify funding to build, and to this end I will continue to push forward conversations for a Regional Housing Bond in 2028.

I appreciate all the months of dialogue and the incredible amount of work that has gone into this upzoning plan and I know that it is our intent as a City to meet our housing needs without harming San Franciscans. I believe the amendments I have before you today will do just that. We can develop without displacement.

So again thank you, Chair Melgar and the entire Land Use Committee, for doing your due diligence of evaluating the Plan accordingly and reviewing our proposed amendments. I look forward to having your support.

Sincerely,

Connie Chan
Supervisor, District 1

City Hall • 1 Dr.Carlton B. Goodlett Place • Room 244 • San Francisco, California 94102-4689
Office (415) 554-7410 • TDD/TTY (415) 554-5227 • E-mail: Connie.Chan@sfgov.org

BOARD of SUPERVISORS

City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689
Tel. No. (415) 554-5184
Fax No. (415) 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. (415) 554-5227

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco's Land Use and Transportation Committee will hold a public hearing to consider the following proposals and said public hearing will be held as follows, at which time all interested parties may attend and be heard:

Date: **Monday, October 20, 2025**

Time: **1:30 p.m.**

Location: **Legislative Chamber, Room 250, located at City Hall**
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102

Subject: **File No. 250700.** Ordinance amending the Zoning Map to implement the Family Zoning Plan by: amending the Zoning Use District Maps to: 1) reclassify certain properties currently zoned as various types of Residential to Residential Transit Oriented - Commercial (RTO-C); 2) reclassify properties currently zoned Residential Transit Oriented (RTO) to Residential Transit Oriented - 1 (RTO-1); 3) reclassify certain properties from Residential districts other than RTO to RTO-1; 4) reclassify certain properties currently zoned Neighborhood Commercial (NC) or Public (P) to Community Business (C-2); and 5) reclassify certain properties from Public to Mixed-Use or Neighborhood Commercial Districts; amending the Height and Bulk Map to: 1) reclassify properties in the Family Zoning Plan to R-4 Height and Bulk District; 2) change the height limits on certain lots in the R-4 Height and Bulk District; and 3) designating various parcels to be included in the Non-Contiguous San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Sites Special Use District (SFMTA SUD); amending the Local Coastal Program to: 1) reclassify all properties in the Coastal Zone to R-4 Height and Bulk District; 2) reclassify certain properties to RTO-C and Neighborhood Commercial District; 3) designate one parcel as part of the SFMTA SUD; and 4) directing the Planning Director to transmit the Ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of public necessity, convenience, and welfare under Planning Code, Section 302; making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and making findings under the City's Local Coastal Program and the California Coastal Act of 1976.

Subject: **File No. 250701.** Ordinance amending the Planning Code to: 1) create the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program to incent housing development through a local bonus program and by adopting a Housing Sustainability District, 2) modify height and bulk limits to provide for additional capacity in well-resourced neighborhoods, and to allow additional height and bulk for projects using the local bonus program, 3) require only buildings taller than 85 feet in certain Districts to reduce ground level wind currents, 4) make conforming changes to the RH (Residential, House), RM (Residential, Mixed), and RC (Residential-Commercial) District zoning tables to reflect the changes to density controls, and parking requirements made in this ordinance, 5) create the RTO-C (Residential Transit Oriented-Commercial) District, 6) implement the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's Transit-Oriented Communities Policy by making changes to parking requirements, minimum residential densities, and minimum office intensities, and requiring maximum dwelling unit sizes, 7) revise off-street parking and curb cut obligations citywide, 8) create the Non-contiguous San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Sites Special Use District, 9) permit businesses displaced by new construction to relocate without a conditional use authorization and waive development impact fees for those businesses, 10) make technical amendments to the Code to implement the above changes, 11) make conforming changes to zoning tables in various Districts, including the Neighborhood Commercial District and Mixed Use Districts, and 12) reduce usable open space and bicycle parking requirements for senior housing; amending the Business and Tax Regulations Code regarding the Board of Appeals' review of permits in the Housing Choice Program Housing Sustainability District; also, amending the Local Coastal Program to implement the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program and other associated changes in the City's Coastal Zone, and directing the Planning Director to transmit the ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment; 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 public necessity, convenience, and welfare findings under Planning Code, Section 302.

Subject: **File No. 250966.** Ordinance amending the General Plan to revise the Urban Design Element, Commerce and Industry Element, Transportation Element, Balboa Park Station Area Plan, Glen Park Community Plan, Market and Octavia Area Plan, Northeastern Waterfront Plan, Van Ness Avenue Area Plan, Western SoMa (South of Market) Area Plan, Western Shoreline Area Plan, Downtown Area Plan, and Land Use Index, to implement the Family Housing Zoning Program, including the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program, by adjusting guidelines regarding building heights, density, design, and other matters; amending the City's Local Coastal Program to implement the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program and other associated changes in the City's Coastal Zone, and directing the Planning Director to transmit the Ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment; 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 adopting findings of public necessity, convenience, and welfare under Planning Code, Section 340.

In accordance with Administrative Code, Section 67.7-1, persons who are unable to attend the hearing on these matters may submit written comments. These comments will be added to the official public record in these matters and shall be brought to the attention of the Board of Supervisors. Written comments should be addressed to Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board, City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA, 94102 or sent via email (bos@sfgov.org). Information relating to these matters are available with the Office of the Clerk of the Board or the Board of Supervisors' Legislative Research Center (https://sfbos.org/legislative-research-center-lrc). Agenda information relating to these matters will be available for public review on Friday, October 17, 2025.

For any questions about this hearing, please contact the Assistant Clerk for the Land Use and Transportation Committee:

John Carroll (john.carroll@sfgov.org ~ (415) 554-4445)

Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
City and County of San Francisco

jec:bjj:ams

DATED ~ POSTED~ MAILED ~ PRINTED: October 3, 2025

San Francisco Examiner

PUBLIC NOTICES

Qualified for San Francisco and San Mateo Counties
File & Publish New Business Name: Examiner.DBAstore.com
Other Legal Notices: Examiner.LegalAdStore.com

San Francisco Examiner • Daly City Independent • San Mateo Weekly • Redwood City Tribune • Enquirer - Bulletin • Foster City Progress • Millbrae - San Bruno Sun • Boutique & Villager • Examiner - So. San Francisco • Examiner - San Bruno

GOVERNMENT

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MONDAY OCTOBER 20, 2025 - 1:30 PM Legislative Chamber, Room 250, City Hall 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco. CA 94102

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco's Land Use and Transportation Committee will hold a public hearing to consider the following proposals and said public hearing will be held as follows, at which time all interested parties may attend and be heard:

File No. 250700. Ordinance amending the Zoning Map to implement the Family Zoning Plan by: amending the Zoning Use District Maps to: 1) reclassify certain properties currently zoned as various types of Residential to Residential Transit Oriented - Commercial (RTO-C); 2) reclassify properties currently zoned Residential Transit Oriented (RTO) to Residential Transit Oriented - 1 (RTO-1); 3) reclassify certain properties from Residential districts other than RTO to RTO-1; 4) reclassify certain properties currently zoned Neighborhood Commercial (NC) or Public (P) to Community Business (C-2); and 5) reclassify certain properties from Public to Mixed-Use or Neighborhood Commercial Districts; amending the Height and Bulk Map to: 1) reclassify properties in the Family Zoning Plan to R-4 Height and Bulk District; 2) change the height limits on certain lots in the R-4 Height and Bulk District; and 3) designating various parcels to be included in the Non-Contiguous San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Sites Special Use District (SFMTA SUD); amending the Local Coastal Program to: 1) reclassify all properties in the Coastal Zone to R-4 Height and Bulk District; 2) reclassify certain properties to RTO-C and Neighborhood Commercial District; 3) designate one parcel as part of the SFMTA SUD; and 4) directing the Planning Director to transmit the Ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of public necessity, convenience, and welfare under Planning Code, Section 302; making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and making findings under the City's Local Coastal Program and the California Coastal Act of 1976.

File No. 250701. Ordinance amending the Planning Code to: 1) create the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program to incent housing development through a local bonus program and by adopting a Housing Sustainability District, 2) modify height and bulk limits to provide for additional capacity in well-resourced neighborhoods, and to allow additional height and bulk for projects using the local bonus program, 3) require only buildings taller than 85 feet in certain Districts to reduce ground level wind currents, 4) make conforming changes to the RH (Residential, House), RM (Residential, Mixed), and RC (Residential-Commercial) District zoning tables to reflect the changes to density controls, and parking requirements made in this ordinance, 5) create the RTO-C (Residential Transit Oriented-Commercial) District, 6) implement the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's Transit-Oriented Communities Policy by making changes to parking requirements, minimum residential densities, and minimum office intensities, and requiring maximum dwelling unit sizes, 7) revise off-street parking and curb cut obligations citywide, 8) create the Non-contiguous San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Sites Special Use District, 9) permit businesses displaced by new construction to relocate without a conditional use authorization and waive development impact fees for those businesses, 10) make technical amendments to the Code to implement the above changes, 11) make conforming changes to zoning tables in various Districts, including the Neighborhood Commercial District and Mixed Use Districts, and 12) reduce usable open space and bicycle parking requirements for senior housing; amending the Business and Tax Regulations Code regarding the Board of Appeals' review of permits in the Housing Choice Program Housing Sustainability District; also, amending the Local Coastal Program to implement the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program and other associated changes in the City's Coastal Zone, and directing the Planning Director to transmit the ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment; 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 adopting findings of public necessity, convenience, and welfare under Planning Code, Section 340.

In accordance with Administrative Code, Section 67.7-1, persons who are unable to attend the hearing on these matters may submit written comments. These comments will be added to the official public record in these matters and shall be brought to the attention of the Board of Supervisors. Written comments should be addressed to Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board, City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA, 94102 or sent via email (bos@sfgov.org). Information relating to these matters are available with the Office of the Clerk of the Board or the Board of Supervisors' Legislative Research Center (https://sfbos.org/legislative-research-center-lrc). Agenda information relating to these matters will be available for public review on Friday, October 17, 2025.

For any questions about this hearing, please contact the Assistant Clerk for the Land Use and Transportation Committee: John Carroll (john.carroll@sfgov.org ~ (415) 554-4445)

EXM-3973931#

NOTICE OF REGULAR MEETING SAN FRANCISCO BOARD OF SUPERVISORS LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE CITY HALL, LEGISLATIVE CHAMBER, ROOM 250 1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT PLACE, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102 MONDAY, OCTOBER 6, 2025 - 1:30 PM

The agenda packet and legislative files are available for review at https://sfbos.org/legislative-research-center-lrc, in Room 244 at City Hall, or by calling (415) 554-5184.

EXM-3973907#

NOTICE OF REGULAR MEETING SAN FRANCISCO BOARD OF SUPERVISORS RULES COMMITTEE CITY HALL, LEGISLATIVE CHAMBER, ROOM 250 1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT PLACE, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102 October 6, 2025 – 10:00 AM

The agenda packet and legislative files are available for review at https://sfbos.org/legislative-research-center-lrc, in Room 244 at City Hall, or by calling (415) 554-5184.

EXM-3973812#

NOTICE OF SPECIAL MEETING SAN FRANCISCO BOARD OF SUPERVISORS GOVERNMENT AUDIT AND OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE CITY HALL, COMMITTEE ROOM 263 1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT PLACE SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102 October 6, 2025 - 12:00 PM

The agenda packet and legislative files are available for review at https://sfbos.org/legislative-research-center-lrc, in Room 244 at City Hall, or by calling (415) 554-5184.

EXM-3971474#

CIVIL

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME
Case No. 25CIV06662
Superior Court of California, County of SAN MATEO
Petition of: AI ZHEN XIAN AKA JANE AIZHEN XIAN AKA AIZHEN XIAN for Change of Name
TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS:
Petitioner AI ZHEN XIAN AKA JANE AIZHEN XIAN AKA AIZHEN XIAN filed a petition with this court for a decree changing names as follows:
AI ZHEN XIAN AKA JANE AIZHEN XIAN AKA AIZHEN XIAN to JANE AIZHEN XIAN
The Court orders that all persons interested in this matter appear before this court at the hearing indicated below to show cause, if any, why the petition for change of name should not be granted. Any person objecting to the name changes described above must file a written objection that includes the reasons for the objection at least two court days before the matter is scheduled to be heard and must appear at the hearing to show cause why the petition should not be granted. If no written objection is timely filed, the court may grant the petition without a hearing.
Notice of Hearing:
Date: 11/18/2025, Time: 9:00 A.M., Dept.: MC, Room: N/A
The address of the court is 400 COUNTY CENTER, REDWOOD CITY, CA 94063
(To appear remotely, check in advance of the hearing for information about how to do so on the court's website. To find your court's website, go to www.courts.ca.gov/find-my-court.htm.)
A copy of this Order to Show Cause must be published at least once each week for four successive weeks before the date set for hearing on the petition in a newspaper of general circulation, printed in this county: EXAMINER REDWOOD CITY TRIBUNE
Date: 9/15/2025

Judge of the Superior Court
9/26, 10/3, 10/10, 10/17/25
SPEN-3971404#
EXAMINER - REDWOOD CITY TRIBUNE

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME
Case No. CNC-25-56120
Superior Court of California, County of San Francisco
Petition of: Azar Saeidi for Change of Name
TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS:
Petitioner Azar Saeidi filed a petition with this court for a decree changing names as follows:
Azar Saeidi to Azar Sona Saeidi
The Court orders that all persons interested in this matter appear before this court at the hearing indicated below to show cause, if any, why the petition for change of name should not be granted. Any person objecting to the name changes described above must file a written objection that includes the reasons for the objection at least two court days before the matter is scheduled to be heard and must appear at the hearing to show cause why the petition should not be granted. If no written objection is timely filed, the court may grant the petition without a hearing.
Notice of Hearing:
Date: 11/04/2025, Time: 9 am, Dept.: 103, Room: 103
The address of the court is 400 McAllister Street San Francisco, CA-94102
A copy of this Order to Show Cause shall be published at least once each week for four successive weeks prior to the date set for hearing on the petition in the following newspaper of general circulation, printed in this county: - SAN FRANCISCO EXAMINER
Date: 09/18/2025
Michelle Tong
Judge of the Superior Court
9/26, 10/3, 10/10, 10/17/25
CNS-3971228#

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME
Case No. CNC-25-560132
Superior Court of California, County of SAN FRANCISCO
Petition of: JORDAN SUGAR-CARLSGAARD ON BEHALF OF MONROE MARGOT SUGAR-PICKLES, A MINOR for Change of Name
TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS:
Petitioner JORDAN SUGAR-CARLSGAARD filed a petition with this court for a decree changing names as follows:
MONROE MARGOT SUGAR-PICKLES to MONROE MARGOT SUGAR
The Court orders that all persons interested in this matter appear before this court at the hearing indicated below to show cause, if any, why the petition for change of name should not be granted. Any person objecting to the name changes described above must file a written objection that includes the reasons for the objection at least two court days before the matter is scheduled to be heard and must appear at the hearing to show cause why the petition should not be granted. If no written objection is timely filed, the court may grant the petition without a hearing.
Notice of Hearing:
Date: NOVEMBER 6, 2025, Time: 9:00 A.M., Dept.: 103, Room: 103
The address of the court is 400 MCALLISTER STREET, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102
(To appear remotely, check in advance of the hearing for information about how to do so on the court's website. To find your court's website, go to www.courts.ca.gov/find-my-court.htm.)
A copy of this Order to Show Cause must be published at least once each week for four successive weeks before the date set for hearing on the petition in a newspaper of general circulation, printed in this county: SAN FRANCISCO EXAMINER
Date: SEPTEMBER 23, 2025
MICHELLE TONG
Judge of the Superior Court
10/3, 10/10, 10/17, 10/24/25
CNS-3971201#
SAN FRANCISCO EXAMINER

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME
Case No. CNC-25-560088
Superior Court of California, County of SAN FRANCISCO
Petition of: MIA ROSE HAYNES for Change of Name
TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS:
Petitioner MIA ROSE HAYNES filed a petition with this court for a decree changing names as follows:
MIA ROSE HAYNES to MIA ROSE OUSSET
The Court orders that all persons interested in this matter appear before this court at the hearing indicated below to show cause, if any, why the petition for change of name should not be granted. Any person objecting to the name changes described above must file a written objection that includes the reasons for the objection at least two court days before the matter is scheduled to be heard and must appear at the hearing to show cause why the petition should not be granted. If no written objection is timely filed, the court may grant the petition without a hearing.
Notice of Hearing:
Date: OCTOBER 21, 2025, Time: 9:00 A.M., Dept.: 103N, Room: 103N
The address of the court is 400 MCALLISTER STREET, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102
(To appear remotely, check in advance of the hearing for information about how to do so on the court's website. To find your court's website, go to www.courts.ca.gov/find-my-court.htm.)
A copy of this Order to Show Cause must be published at least once each week for four successive weeks before the date set for hearing on the petition in a newspaper of general circulation, printed in this county: SAN FRANCISCO EXAMINER
Date: SEPTEMBER 5, 2025
MICHELLE TONG
Judge of the Superior Court
9/12, 9/19, 9/26, 10/3/25
CNS-3966299#
SAN FRANCISCO EXAMINER

FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAMES

FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT
File No. 2025-0407217
Fictitious Business Name(s)/Trade Name (DBA):
OMEN & AETHER, 1640 KIRKHAM ST APT 8, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94122
County of SAN FRANCISCO
Registered Owner(s):
MARIA KEEHN, 1640 KIRKHAM ST APT 8, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94122
This business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL
The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on 9/02/2025.
I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. (A registrant who declares as true any material matter pursuant to Section 17913 of the Business and Professions code that the registrant knows to be false is guilty of a misdemeanor punishable by a fine not to exceed one thousand dollars ($1,000).)
S/ MARIA KEEHN
This statement was filed with the County Clerk of San Francisco County on 09/02/2025.
NOTICE-In accordance with Subdivision (a) of Section 17920, a Fictitious Name Statement generally expires at the end of five years from the date on which it was filed in the office of the County Clerk, except, as provided in Subdivision (b) of Section 17920, where it expires 40 days after any change in the facts set forth in the statement pursuant to Section 17913 other than a change in the residence address of a registered owner. A new Fictitious Business Name Statement must be filed before the expiration. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a Fictitious Business Name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (See Section 14411 et seq., Business and Professions Code).
10/3, 10/10, 10/17, 10/24/25
CNS-3972840#
SAN FRANCISCO EXAMINER

FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT
File No. 2025-0407319
Fictitious Business Name(s)/Trade Name (DBA):
AFFIRM, 650 CALIFORNIA ST. 12TH FLOOR, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94108
County of SAN FRANCISCO
Registered Owner(s):
AFFIRM, INC, (DE) 650 CALIFORNIA ST., 12TH FLOOR, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94108
This business is conducted by: A CORPORATION
The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on 2/5/2013.
I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. (A registrant who declares as true any material matter pursuant to Section 17913 of the Business and Professions code that the registrant knows to be false is guilty of a misdemeanor punishable by a fine not to exceed one thousand dollars ($1,000).)
S/ KATHERINE ADKINS, SECRETARY
This statement was filed with the County Clerk of San Francisco County on 09/12/2025.
NOTICE-In accordance with Subdivision (a) of Section 17920, a Fictitious Name Statement generally expires at the end of five years from the date on which it was filed in the office of the County Clerk, except, as provided in Subdivision (b) of Section 17920, where it expires 40 days after any change in the facts set forth in the statement pursuant to Section 17913 other than a change in the residence address of a registered owner. A new Fictitious Business Name Statement must be filed before the expiration. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a Fictitious Business Name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (See Section 14411 et seq., Business and Professions Code).
10/3, 10/10, 10/17, 10/24/25
CNS-3972838#
SAN FRANCISCO EXAMINER

FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT
File No. M-301718
The following person(s) is (are) doing business as:
Garcia Home and Office Solutions, 1532 Day Ave, San Mateo, CA 94403 County of California
Sonia Maribel Garcia, 1532 Day Ave, San Mateo, CA 94403
This business is conducted by an Individual
The registrant(s) commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on 12/17/24.
I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. (A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime.)
S/ Sonia Garcia,
This statement was filed with the County Clerk of San Mateo County on 09/23/2025.
Mark Church, County Clerk
[Deputy], Deputy
Original
10/3, 10/10, 10/17, 10/24/25
NPEN-3972731#
EXAMINER - BOUTIQUE & VILLAGER

FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT
File No. 2025-0407333
Fictitious Business Name(s)/Trade Name (DBA):
FANCY MONKEYS PUBLISHING, 385 10TH STREET, APT 3, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94103
County of SAN FRANCISCO
Registered Owner(s):
ARIEL ONGOCO, 385 10TH STREET APT 3, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94103
This business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL
The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on 9/92025.
I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. (A registrant who declares as true any material matter pursuant to Section 17913 of the Business and Professions code that the registrant knows to be false is guilty of a misdemeanor punishable by a fine not to exceed one thousand dollars ($1,000).)
S/ ARIEL ONGOCO
This statement was filed with the County Clerk of San Francisco County on 09/16/2025.
NOTICE-In accordance with Subdivision (a) of Section 17920, a Fictitious Name Statement generally expires at the end of five years from the date on which it was filed in the office of the County Clerk, except, as provided in Subdivision (b) of Section 17920, where it expires 40 days after any change in the facts set forth in the statement pursuant to Section 17913 other than a change in the residence address of a registered owner. A new Fictitious Business Name Statement must be filed before the expiration. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a Fictitious Business Name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (See Section 14411 et seq., Business and Professions Code).
10/3, 10/10, 10/17, 10/24/25
CNS-3971878#
SAN FRANCISCO EXAMINER

FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT
File No. 2025-0407351
Fictitious Business Name(s)/Trade Name (DBA):
SHINE FACILITY SERVICES, 970 FOLSOM ST, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94107
County of SAN FRANCISCO
Registered Owner(s):
GREEN LIVING PLANET LLC, (CA), 970 FOLSOM ST,

CALIFORNIA NEWSPAPER SERVICE BUREAU

DAILY JOURNAL CORPORATION

Mailing Address : 915 E 1ST ST, LOS ANGELES, CA 90012
Telephone (800) 788-7840 / Fax (800) 464-2839
Visit us @ www.LegalAdstore.com

SF BOS (OFFICIAL) SF
CCSF BD OF SUPERVISORS (OFFICIAL NOTICES)
1 DR CARLTON B GOODLETT PL #244
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

EXM# 3973931

COPY OF NOTICE

Notice Type: GPN GOVT PUBLIC NOTICE

Ad Description
JEC - LUT HEARING - OCTOBER 20, 2025 - FILE NOS. 250700, 250701, and 250966

To the right is a copy of the notice you sent to us for publication in the SAN FRANCISCO EXAMINER. Thank you for using our newspaper. Please read this notice carefully and call us with ny corrections. The Proof of Publication will be filed with the County Clerk, if required, and mailed to you after the last date below. Publication date(s) for this notice is (are):

10/03/2025

The charge(s) for this order is as follows. An invoice will be sent after the last date of publication. If you prepaid this order in full, you will not receive an invoice.

Publication	$1719.90
Set aside for CCSF Outreach Fund	$191.10
Total	$1911.00

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MONDAY OCTOBER 20, 2025 - 1:30 PM Legislative Chamber, Room 250, City Hall 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco. CA 94102

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco's Land Use and Transportation Committee will hold a public hearing to consider the following proposals and said public hearing will be held as follows, at which time all interested parties may attend and be heard:

File No. 250700. Ordinance amending the Zoning Map to implement the Family Zoning Plan by: amending the Zoning Use District Maps to: 1) reclassify certain properties currently zoned as various types of Residential to Residential Transit Oriented - Commercial (RTO-C); 2) reclassify properties currently zoned Residential Transit Oriented (RTO) to Residential Transit Oriented - 1 (RTO-1); 3) reclassify certain properties from Residential districts other than RTO to RTO-1; 4) reclassify certain properties currently zoned Neighborhood Commercial (NC) or Public (P) to Community Business (C-2); and 5) reclassify certain properties from Public to Mixed-Use or Neighborhood Commercial Districts; amending the Height and Bulk Map to: 1) reclassify properties in the Family Zoning Plan to R-4 Height and Bulk District; 2) change the height limits on certain lots in the R-4 Height and Bulk District; and 3) designating various parcels to be included in the Non-Contiguous San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Sites Special Use District (SFMTA SUD); amending the Local Coastal Program to: 1) reclassify all properties in the Coastal Zone to R-4 Height and Bulk District; 2) reclassify certain properties to RTO-C and Neighborhood Commercial District; 3) designate one parcel as part of the SFMTA SUD; and 4) directing the Planning Director to transmit the Ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of public necessity, convenience, and welfare under Planning Code, Section 302; making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and making findings under the City's Local Coastal Program and the California Coastal Act of 1976.

File No. 250701. Ordinance amending the Planning Code to: 1) create the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program to incent housing development through a local bonus program and by adopting a Housing Sustainability District, 2) modify height and bulk limits to provide for additional capacity in well-resourced neighborhoods, and to allow additional height and bulk for projects using the local bonus program, 3) require only buildings taller than 85 feet in certain Districts to reduce ground level wind currents, 4) make conforming changes to the RH (Residential, House), RM (Residential, Mixed), and RC (Residential-Commercial) District zoning tables to reflect the changes to density controls, and parking requirements made in this ordinance, 5) create the RTO-C (Residential Transit Oriented-Commercial) District, 6) implement the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's Transit-Oriented Communities Policy by making changes to parking requirements, minimum residential densities, and minimum office intensities, and requiring maximum dwelling unit sizes, 7) revise off-street parking and curb cut obligations citywide, 8) create the Non-contiguous San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Sites Special Use District, 9) permit businesses displaced by new construction to relocate without a conditional use authorization and waive development impact fees for those businesses, 10) make technical amendments to the Code to implement the above changes, 11) make conforming changes to zoning tables in various Districts, including the Neighborhood Commercial District and Mixed Use Districts, and 12) reduce usable open space and bicycle parking requirements for senior housing; amending the Business and Tax Regulations Code regarding the Board of Appeals' review of permits in the Housing Choice Program Housing Sustainability District; also, amending the Local Coastal

* A 0 0 0 0 0 0 7 2 1 8 0 9 2 *

Program to implement the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program and other associated changes in the City's Coastal Zone, and directing the Planning Director to transmit the ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment; 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 public necessity, convenience, and welfare findings under Planning Code, Section 302.

File No. 250966. Ordinance amending the General Plan to revise the Urban Design Element, Commerce and Industry Element, Transportation Element, Balboa Park Station Area Plan, Glen Park Community Plan, Market and Octavia Area Plan, Northeastern Waterfront Plan, Van Ness Avenue Area Plan, Western SoMa (South of Market) Area Plan, Western Shoreline Area Plan, Downtown Area Plan, and Land Use Index, to implement the Family Housing Zoning Program, including the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program, by adjusting guidelines regarding building heights, density, design, and other matters; amending the City's Local Coastal Program to implement the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program and other associated changes in the City's Coastal Zone, and directing the Planning Director to transmit the Ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment; 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 adopting findings of public necessity, convenience, and welfare under Planning Code, Section 340.

In accordance with Administrative Code, Section 67.7-1, persons who are unable to attend the hearing on these matters may submit written comments. These comments will be added to the official public record in these matters and shall be brought to the attention of the Board of Supervisors. Written comments should be addressed to Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board, City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA, 94102 or sent via email (bos@sfgov.org). Information relating to these matters are available with the Office of the Clerk of the Board or the Board of Supervisors' Legislative Research Center (https://sfbos.org/legislative-research-center-lrc). Agenda information relating to these matters will be available for public review on Friday, October 17, 2025.

For any questions about this hearing, please contact the Assistant Clerk for the Land Use and Transportation Committee: John Carroll (john.carroll@sfgov.org ~ (415) 554-4445)

EXM-3973931#

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	BOS Legislation, (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); Calvillo, Angela (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Entezari, Mehran (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS)
Subject:	FW: Notice of Availability: Addendum to the Housing Element 2022 Update Environmental Impact Report (San Francisco Family Zoning Plan)
Date:	Wednesday, September 3, 2025 3:08:16 PM

Hello,

Please see below communication from the Planning Department (CPC) regarding an addendum to the Housing Element 2022 Updated Final Environmental Impact Report.

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: CPC.FamilyZoningCEQA <CPC.FamilyZoningCEQA@sfgov.org>
Sent: Wednesday, September 3, 2025 3:03 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; SherrillStaff <SherrillStaff@sfgov.org>; SauterStaff <SauterStaff@sfgov.org>; MahmoodStaff <MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org>; DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; MelgarStaff (BOS) <melgarstaff@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff (BOS) <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; FielderStaff <FielderStaff@sfgov.org>; Waltonstaff (BOS) <waltonstaff@sfgov.org>; EngardioStaff (BOS) <EngardioStaff@sfgov.org>; ChenStaff <ChenStaff@sfgov.org>
Subject: FW: Notice of Availability: Addendum to the Housing Element 2022 Update Environmental Impact Report (San Francisco Family Zoning Plan)

From: San Francisco Planning Department <CPC.FamilyZoningCEQA@sfgov.org>
Sent: Wednesday, September 03, 2025 2:06 PM
To: CPC.FamilyZoningCEQA <CPC.FamilyZoningCEQA@sfgov.org>
Subject: Notice of Availability: Addendum to the Housing Element 2022 Update Environmental Impact Report

This item is being forwarded to the San Francisco Board of Supervisors. The San Francisco Family Zoning Plan is anticipated to be before the Board in the coming months.

San Francisco Planning logo

Notice of Availability: Addendum to the Housing Element 2022 Update Final Environmental Impact Report

This email is to let you know that the San Francisco Planning Department has published an addendum to the Housing Element 2022 Update Final Environmental Impact Report. You are receiving this notice because you commented on the Environmental Impact Report for the Housing Element 2022 Update or previously expressed interest in the project's environmental review process.

The Planning Commission hearing for the San Francisco Family Zoning Plan will be held on September 11, 2025. The hearing is for the Planning Commission to consider the ordinances to implement the San Francisco Family Zoning Plan.

Neither the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) nor Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code requires a hearing specific to the addendum.

A hearing agenda will be posted on the Department webpage by Friday, September 5.

PLEASE DO NOT REPLY TO THIS AUTOMATED EMAIL.

中文詢問請電 (628) 652-7550.
Para información en Español llamar al (628) 652-7550.
Para sa impormasyon sa Tagalog tumawag sa (628) 652-7550.

Manage your preferences | Opt Out using TrueRemove™
Got this as a forward? Sign up to receive our future emails.
View this email online.

49 South Van Ness | San Francisco, CA 94103 US

This email was sent to cpc.familyzoningceqa@sfgov.org.
To continue receiving our emails, add us to your address book.

San Francisco Planning

49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400
San Francisco, CA 94103
628.652.7600
www.sfplanning.org

NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY

LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM AMENDMENT

(GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT, PLANNING CODE TEXT AMENDMENT, ZONING MAP AMENDMENT)

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT in accordance with the applicable provisions of the California Coastal Act and implementing regulations, drafts of the proposed amendments to the San Francisco General Plan, Zoning Map, Planning Code, and **Local Coastal Program** are available for public review and inspection for a six-week public review period beginning August 1, 2025.

Documents are available at the following locations and online:

San Francisco Planning Code, Zoning Map, and Local Coastal Program Implementation Plan Amendments:

- San Francisco Planning Department 49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103
- Office of the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA 94102
- https://sfbos.org/legislative-research-center-lrc (File Nos. 250700, 250701)
- City and County of San Francisco - File #: 250700
- City and County of San Francisco - File #: 250701

San Francisco General Plan and Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan Amendments:

- San Francisco Planning Department, 49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103
- https://citypln-m-extnl.sfgov.org/Commissions/CPC/7_17_2025/Commission Packet/2021-005878GPA.pdf

Ordinance and Local Coastal Program Amendment Description: Three Ordinances are proposed for adoption by the City. Because the Ordinances apply in part to property located in the Coastal Zone, enactment requires amending the Land Use Plan and Implementation Plan of the City's Local Coastal Program.

1) Board File No. 250700 - Ordinance amending the Zoning Map to implement the Family Zoning Plan by amending the Zoning Use District Maps to: 1) reclassify certain properties currently zoned as various types of Residential to Residential Transit Oriented - Commercial (RTO-C); 2) reclassify properties currently zoned Residential Transit Oriented (RTO) to Residential Transit Oriented - 1 (RTO-1); 3) reclassify certain properties from Residential districts other than RTO to RTO-1; 4) reclassify certain properties currently zoned Neighborhood Commercial (NC) or Public (P) to Community Business (C-2); and 5) reclassify certain properties from Public to Mixed-Use or Neighborhood Commercial Districts; amending the Height and Bulk Map to: 1) reclassify properties in the Family Zoning Plan to R-4 Height and Bulk District; 2) change the height limits on certain lots in the R-4 Height and Bulk District; and 3) designating various parcels to be included in the Non-Contiguous San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Special Use District (SFMTA SUD); **amending the Local Coastal Program to: 1) reclassify all properties in the Coastal Zone to R-4 Height and Bulk District; 2) reclassify certain properties to RTO-C and Neighborhood Commercial District; 3) designate one parcel as part of the SFMTA SUD; and 4) directing the Planning Director to transmit the Ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment;**

2) Board File No. 250701 - Ordinance amending the Planning Code to: 1) create the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program to incent housing development through a local bonus program and by adopting a Housing Sustainability District, 2) modify height and bulk limits to provide for additional capacity in well-resourced neighborhoods, and to allow additional height and bulk for projects using the local bonus program, 3) require only buildings taller than 85 feet in

certain Districts to reduce ground level wind currents, 4) make conforming changes to the RH (Residential, House), RM (Residential, Mixed), and RC (Residential-Commercial) District zoning tables to reflect the changes to density controls, and parking requirements made in this ordinance, 5) create the RTO-C (Residential Transit Oriented-Commercial) District, 6) implement the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's Transit-Oriented Communities Policy by making changes to parking requirements, minimum residential densities, and minimum office intensities, and requiring maximum dwelling unit sizes, 7) revise off-street parking and curb cut obligations citywide, 8) create the Non-contiguous San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Sites Special Use District, 9) permit certain Legacy Businesses to relocate without a conditional use authorization and waive development impact fees for those businesses, 10) make technical amendments to the Code to implement the above changes, and 11) make conforming changes to zoning tables in various Districts, including the Neighborhood Commercial District and Mixed Use Districts; amending the Business and Tax Regulations Code regarding the Board of Appeals' review of permits in the Housing Choice Program Housing Sustainability District; **amending the Local Coastal Program to implement the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program and other associated changes in the City's Coastal Zone, and directing the Planning Director to transmit the Ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment;**

3) Planning Commission Case Number 2021-005878GPA - Ordinance amending the General Plan to revise the Urban Design Element, Commerce and Industry Element, Transportation Element, Balboa Park Station Area Plan, Glen Park Community Plan, Market and Octavia Area Plan, Northeastern Waterfront Plan, Van Ness Avenue Area Plan, Western SoMa (South of Market) Area Plan, Western Shoreline Area Plan, Downtown Area Plan, and Land Use Index, to implement the Family Housing Zoning Program, including the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program, by adjusting guidelines regarding building heights, density, design, and other matters; **amending the City's Local Coastal Program to implement the Housing Choice- San Francisco Program and other associated changes in the City's Coastal Zone, and directing the Planning Director to transmit the ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment;**

The Planning Commission will consider these Amendments on or after September 11, 2025. The Planning Commission recommendation on these Amendments will be advisory to the Board of Supervisors, which has final approval authority over the San Francisco General Plan, Planning Code, Zoning Map, and Local Coastal Program Amendments.

The final decision by the Board of Supervisors will occur no sooner than six weeks after the date of this notice; after which the City shall submit the Local Coastal Program Amendments to the California Coastal Commission for certification. The Ordinances and Local Coastal Program Amendments are not operative within the Coastal Zone until final certification by the California Coastal Commission. If the California Coastal Commission certifies these Local Coastal Program Amendments, subject to modifications, the Local Coastal Program Amendments shall become effective 30 days after enactment of the modifications.

All interested persons are invited to comment on the draft amendment either in person at the scheduled public hearing, or in writing to the San Francisco Planning Department, 49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103 before September 11, 2025. If you wish to challenge the City's action on the above proceedings in court, you may be limited to addressing only those issues you or someone else have raised at the public hearing described in this notice or written in correspondence to the City at or before the public hearing.

For any questions about this Notice of Availability, please contact Amnon Ben-Pazi, Planning Department staff, at Amnon.Ben-Pazi@sfgov.org or call (628) 652-7428.

From:	Ben-Pazi, Amnon (CPC)
To:	Carroll, John (BOS)
Cc:	GUALCO, GIULIA (CAT)
Subject:	FW: Notice of Availability of Local Coastal Program Amendment
Date:	Monday, August 4, 2025 1:47:49 PM

John, FYI this is the email that went out 8/1.

Amnon Ben-Pazi, Senior Planner
Citywide Division
San Francisco Planning
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 628.652.7428 | www.sfplanning.org
San Francisco Property Information Map

From: San Francisco Planning Department <CPC.PlanningNews@sfgov.org>
Sent: Friday, August 01, 2025 12:00 PM
To: Ben-Pazi, Amnon (CPC) <amnon.ben-pazi@sfgov.org>
Subject: Notice of Availability of Local Coastal Program Amendment

San Francisco Planning logo

NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY: LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM AMENDMENT (GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT, PLANNING CODE TEXT AMENDMENT, ZONING MAP AMENDMENT)

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT in accordance with the applicable provisions of the California Coastal Act and implementing regulations, drafts of the proposed amendments to the San Francisco General Plan, Zoning Map, Planning Code, and **Local Coastal Program** are available for public review and inspection for a six-week public review period beginning August 1, 2025.

Documents are available at the following locations and online:

- **San Francisco Planning Code, Zoning Map, and Local Coastal Program Implementation Plan Amendments:**
  - San Francisco Planning Department 49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103
  - Office of the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA 94102
  - Board Of Supervisors File #250700

    - Board Of Supervisors File #250701

- **San Francisco General Plan and Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan Amendments:**
    - San Francisco Planning Department, 49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103
    - Planning Commission Case Number 2021-005878GPA

Ordinance and Local Coastal Program Amendment Description: Three Ordinances are proposed for adoption by the City. Because the Ordinances apply in part to property located in the Coastal Zone, enactment requires amending the Land Use Plan and Implementation Plan of the City's Local Coastal Program.

1. **Board File No. 250700 - Ordinance amending the Zoning Map** to implement the Family Zoning Plan by amending the Zoning Use District Maps to: 1) reclassify certain properties currently zoned as various types of Residential to Residential Transit Oriented - Commercial (RTO-C); 2) reclassify properties currently zoned Residential Transit Oriented (RTO) to Residential Transit Oriented - 1 (RTO-1); 3) reclassify certain properties from Residential districts other than RTO to RTO-1; 4) reclassify certain properties currently zoned Neighborhood Commercial (NC) or Public (P) to Community Business (C-2); and 5) reclassify certain properties from Public to Mixed-Use or Neighborhood Commercial Districts; amending the Height and Bulk Map to: 1) reclassify properties in the Family Zoning Plan to R-4 Height and Bulk District; 2) change the height limits on certain lots in the R-4 Height and Bulk District; and 3) designating various parcels to be included in the Non-Contiguous San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Special Use District (SFMTA SUD); **amending the Local Coastal Program to: 1) reclassify all properties in the Coastal Zone to R-4 Height and Bulk District; 2) reclassify certain properties to RTO-C and Neighborhood Commercial District; 3) designate one parcel as part of the SFMTA SUD; and 4) directing the Planning Director to transmit the Ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment;**
2. **Board File No. 250701 - Ordinance amending the Planning Code** to: 1) create the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program to incent housing development through a local bonus program and by adopting a Housing Sustainability District, 2) modify height and bulk limits to provide for additional capacity in well-resourced neighborhoods, and to allow additional height and bulk for projects using the local bonus program, 3) require only buildings taller than 85 feet in certain Districts to reduce ground level wind currents, 4) make conforming changes to the RH (Residential, House), RM (Residential, Mixed), and RC (Residential-Commercial) District zoning tables to reflect the changes to density controls, and parking requirements made in this ordinance, 5) create the RTO-C (Residential Transit Oriented-Commercial) District, 6) implement the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's Transit-Oriented Communities Policy by making changes to parking requirements, minimum residential densities, and minimum office intensities, and requiring maximum dwelling unit sizes, 7) revise off-street parking and curb cut obligations citywide, 8) create the Non-contiguous San Francisco Municipal

Transportation Agency Sites Special Use District, 9) permit certain Legacy Businesses to relocate without a conditional use authorization and waive development impact fees for those businesses, 10) make technical amendments to the Code to implement the above changes, and 11) make conforming changes to zoning tables in various Districts, including the Neighborhood Commercial District and Mixed Use Districts; amending the Business and Tax Regulations Code regarding the Board of Appeals' review of permits in the Housing Choice Program Housing Sustainability District; **amending the Local Coastal Program to implement the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program and other associated changes in the City's Coastal Zone, and directing the Planning Director to transmit the Ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment;**

3. **Planning Commission Case Number 2021-005878GPA - Ordinance amending the General Plan** to revise the Urban Design Element, Commerce and Industry Element, Transportation Element, Balboa Park Station Area Plan, Glen Park Community Plan, Market and Octavia Area Plan, Northeastern Waterfront Plan, Van Ness Avenue Area Plan, Western SoMa (South of Market) Area Plan, Western Shoreline Area Plan, Downtown Area Plan, and Land Use Index, to implement the Family Housing Zoning Program, including the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program, by adjusting guidelines regarding building heights, density, design, and other matters; **amending the City's Local Coastal Program to implement the Housing Choice- San Francisco Program and other associated changes in the City's Coastal Zone, and directing the Planning Director to transmit the ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment;**

The Planning Commission will consider these Amendments on or after September 11, 2025. The Planning Commission recommendation on these Amendments will be advisory to the Board of Supervisors, which has final approval authority over the San Francisco General Plan, Planning Code, Zoning Map, and Local Coastal Program Amendments.

The final decision by the Board of Supervisors will occur no sooner than six weeks after the date of this notice; after which the City shall submit the Local Coastal Program Amendments to the California Coastal Commission for certification. The Ordinances and Local Coastal Program Amendments are not operative within the Coastal Zone until final certification by the California Coastal Commission. If the California Coastal Commission certifies these Local Coastal Program Amendments, subject to modifications, the Local Coastal Program Amendments shall become effective 30 days after enactment of the modifications.

All interested persons are invited to comment on the draft amendment either in person at the scheduled public hearing, or in writing to the San Francisco Planning Department, 49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103 before September 11, 2025. If you wish to challenge the City's action on the above proceedings in court, you may be limited to addressing only those issues you or someone else have raised at the public hearing described in this notice or written in correspondence to the City at or before the public hearing.

For any questions about this Notice of Availability, please contact Amnon Ben-Pazi,

Planning Department staff, at Amnon.Ben-Pazi@sfgov.org or call (628) 652-7428.

PLEASE DO NOT REPLY TO THIS AUTOMATED EMAIL.

中文詢問請電 (628) 652-7550.
Para información en Español llamar al (628) 652-7550.
Para sa impormasyon sa Tagalog tumawag sa (628) 652-7550.

Manage your preferences | Opt Out using TrueRemove™
Got this as a forward? Sign up to receive our future emails.
View this email online.

49 South Van Ness | San Francisco, CA 94103 US

This email was sent to amnon.ben-pazi@sfgov.org.
To continue receiving our emails, add us to your address book.

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

From: ramon lazo
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 5:41:46 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,
R Lazo

ramon lazo
9guj0037j@hotmail.com
193 gladstone drive
san francisco, ca

From: Thomas Plagemann
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 5:31:16 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, Thomas Plagemann

Thomas Plagemann
thosplag@sbcglobal.net
762 Capp St
San Francisco , California 94110

From:	dj@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Diane Josephs
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Tuesday, October 28, 2025 4:48:42 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 hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Diane Josephs
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: Julia Diaz
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 3:18:53 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: David Alexander
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 2:33:00 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 am a parent of two SFUSD students. We badly need housing for families on the Westside and beyond. The current housing availability is untenable and needs to change.

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.

thank you,

Dave Alexander

David Alexander
alexanderdavid415@gmail.com
2806 Anza St
San Francisco, California 94121

From: msmarlomunoz@yahoo.com
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 2:31:31 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,
Marlo Dowell

msmarlomunoz@yahoo.com

San Francisco, California 94114

From: nieberding3@gmail.com
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 1:27:35 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.

nieberding3@gmail.com
18 10th St Apt 640
San Francisco, California 94103

From: Edward Sullivan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 12:14:23 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: Jim Chappell
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 9:38:29 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.

Jim Chappell
jimchappellsf@gmail.com
708 Guerrero St
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Francesca P
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 8:57:28 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,

Francesca P
ballets.lank_0z@icloud.com
Po Box 460703
San Francisco, California 94146

From: Ben Wessel
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: I support the family zoning plan
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 8:28:11 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,

Hi Board of Supervisors --

My name is Ben Wessel, I live in the Inner Sunset, and I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan. This year, my wife and I were fortunate enough to move out of our small rent-controlled apartment into a condo on Judah Street, an opportunity that made it easier for us to decide to have a child -- and our daughter Mika was born just two weeks ago! Unfortunately, for many of our friends who we've met in the neighborhood over the last ten years, the cost to move into a bigger place or even buy a place was too high for them to stay in the city. We've lost four different families from our friend crew who have all moved to Oakland to find more affordable places to live or more space. Each of these families told us they would have stayed in SF if they could have found a place like our condo.

I guess I write all this because I just wish San Francisco was a place that my friends could see themselves for years to come, the way that I do. I don't know if this plan will get that done, but it seems better than doing nothing. Let me know if you have better ideas.

Thanks,
Ben

PS: Here's the boilerplate language from the Housing Action Coalition that I think you've probably all read already: "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."

Ben Wessel
benkwessel@gmail.com

937 Judah Street
San Francisco, California 94122

From: Eric Baird
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 8:26:44 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.

Eric Baird
erichansb@gmail.com
141 Scott Street
San Francisco, California 94117

From: Meg Kammerud
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please Support Family Zoning Plan - SF Needs More Homes of All Sorts in Every Neighborhood
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 8:18:18 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. I am a long-time District 8 home owner and support bringing more housing to my neighborhood -- and every neighborhood across our city. We must not let individuals or individual neighborhoods dismantle a plan that will make all of San Francisco better and more livable, somewhere my children may be able to not only grow up but stay.

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.

I strongly oppose any proposal to exclude residential sites from rezoning or impose any restrictions that would undercut housing capacity and jeopardize our state housing obligations.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and the original 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.

Sincerely,
Meg Kammerud
Glen Park

Meg Kammerud
meg.kammerud@gmail.com
810 Congo St
San Francisco, California 94131

From: Ted Neranchi
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 8:01:05 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,

Ted Neranchi
tneranchi@gmail.com
296 Guttenberg St
San Francisco, California 94112

From: Tim Colen
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 7:18:40 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.

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.

Tim Colen
timcolen@gmail.com
1501 Greenwich St, Unit 502
San Francisco, California 94123

From: Alan Billingsley
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 2:54:35 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: leobilly69@gmail.com
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 2:07:54 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,

William T. Heaton

leobilly69@gmail.com
168 Hyde Street Apt 206
San Francisco, California 94102-3656

From: Megan Bute
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 1:12:22 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.

Megan Bute
wikis-scows.4t@icloud.com
273 29th St
San Francisco, California 94131

From: John Oda
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 12:43:19 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.

John Oda
jandjoda@aol.com
2000 post
San Francisco, California 94115

From: Jason Fischel
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Redevelopment Plan is too timid
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 12:21:37 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,

Hello,

The proposed redevelopment plan will not increase housing enough in SF. Look at Austin, we can bring down rents, but we need to greatly decrease the burden of regulations and make SF a city for all.

Cheers,
Jason

Jason Fischel
fischelj@udel.edu
227 Clinton park
San Francisco, ca, California 94103

From: Steven Susaña-Castillo
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 11:29:49 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.

Although I think the plan doesn't go far enough, I think this gets in the right direction of undoing wrongs. Historically, San Francisco's zoning (and downzoning in the mid 20th century) was used as a tool to keep neighborhoods exclusive and keep out low income folks, immigrants, and/or racial minorities. (Many wealthier neighborhoods like Forest Hill and Pac Heights have used their City Hall connections to keep out minorities like the Japanese in the 40s from their neighborhoods by ensuring that mixed used zoning was banned and that the newly arriving immigrants could not set up their businesses there). Its scars are still evident today.

The Environmental Impact Report and a Chronicle article back in 1978 rightfully pointed out what would happen if we doubled down on restrictive zoning. Both warned that such restrictive zoning would cause San Francisco to become an exclusive playground for the rich, would deny the ability of low income people to live (and stay) here, would skyrocket home prices, and would inevitably lead to a housing shortage. We are now living the consequences.

Personally, we cannot call ourselves a progressive and/or liberal city when we are actively defending keeping intact zoning that is a derived from redlining. When you revisit Chronicle articles, newspaper cartoons, speeches/public comments from past supervisors, etc, you begin to pick up that these zoning rules were initiated from a standpoint of xenophobia and racism. By attempting to undo these policies, we are declaring that we want a San Francisco that is for everyone and that we are not just giving lipservice to these ideals we say we have.

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

collaboration.

Steven Susaña-Castillo
coolsteven2@gmail.com
1075 Valencia St, Apt 4
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Jen Rosas
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 10:36:02 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. Especially as a resident of the Outter Richmond, we need more density, and more housing options.

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.

Jen Rosas
jenmrosas@yahoo.com
825 La Playa St #228
San Francisco, California 94121

From: Rachel Sheinbein
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 10:09:14 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.

Rachel

Rachel Sheinbein
rachel.sheinbein@gmail.com
2621 harrison st
San Francisco , California 94110

From: Laurie Dewan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 9:57:53 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. My grandparents came to San Francisco in the 1930s and raised four children on a working-class income. While I am proud to be raising my children here too, I see so many families who simply can't make it work - and I wonder how long my husband and I can continue to manage the high cost of housing.

To me, the Family Zoning plan means taking this city I love into a bright, diverse future where families and working people can thrive.

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.

Laurie Dewan
laurie.dewan@gmail.com
3362 Sacramento Street
San Francisco, California 94118

From: Lada Shchekleina
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 9:20:30 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.

Lada Shchekleina
ladannn@gmail.com
555 MISSION ROCK STR, APT # 630
SAN FRANCISCO, California 94158

From: Tyler Pullen
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 9:16:47 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, preferably without the amendment casually excluding the literal majority of rental buildings (that are rent-controlled) from the 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 and the work they need.

Part of me wants the state to take over a preempt our land use rules -- which, to be clear, are the very stakes we are playing with -- because of the seeming inability of our local government to competently and earnestly allow enough housing to meet demand. But I'd love to avoid tempting that outcome by enthusiastically supporting the functional upzoning reflected in the original plan (and even more than that, ideally). Market rate housing will not single-handedly solve our affordability crisis, but we have all the evidence in the world that restricting housing of all types only makes the entire situation worse, especially so for the low income households we purport to care so much about.

This barely meets the state-mandated Housing Element goals which represents the bare minimum of meeting our city's long-underserved housing obligations, and amendments like the exclusion of rent-controlled buildings nakedly undermine the spirit of the plan in a way that is performatively progressive but functionally regressive. Our city's low income households (of which I am a part) live daily the consequences of our housing crisis most severely, and plans that continue to resist the improvement and expansion of our housing stock worsen our outcomes in both relative and absolute terms.

I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan without the rent-controlled unit exemption, 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.

Tyler Pullen

tpullen28@gmail.com
3477 1/2 17th St
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Beth O"Leary
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 9:11:10 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.

Beth O'Leary
beth@oleary.con
445 Baden St
San Francisco, California 94131

From: Carlos Abela
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan need to be
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 8:34:26 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 change zoning in the Sunset District Leave zoning changes up to the people who live in that zone. Some, like the downtown area, would welcome it. Others, like in the Sunset District, do not want it. You can build plenty of housing by converting offices and building high rises where they already exist.
Sincerely,
Carlos Abela

Carlos Abela
abela@mac.com
1266 40th Avenue
San Francisco, California 94122

From: Charissa Schaefer
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 7:53:46 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,

I know how gentrification starts and this upzoning plan is not in service of the people who live here. Please choose us over the corporations who would like to change the face of these neighborhoods. This city is already hugely expensive to live in. Don't make it worse.

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,
Charissa Schaefer

Charissa Schaefer
cbs.music.news@gmail.com
1420 Turk St, Apt 1101
San Francisco, California 94115

From: Marty Cerles
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 7:41:23 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: George Ference
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 7:32:35 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.

George Ference
michael.ference@gmail.com
1386 31st Ave
San Francisco, California 94122

From: David Downs
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 7:28:44 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,

D11 voter in support of the Family Zoning Plan.

Build, baby, build.

David Downs
daviddownspresents@pm.me
251 Farallones St.
San Francisco, California 94112

From: Cora M. Shaw
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 7:24:33 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.

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.

Cora M. Shaw
daft-sniper-0e@icloud.com
451 Guerrero St
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Mark Macy
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 7:24:04 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.

Amendments 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.

Amendments I Oppose:

Proposals to exclude nearly all residential sites from rezoning or impose restrictions that would undercut housing capacity and jeopardize our state housing obligations.

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

Mark Macy
markm@macyarchitecture.com
241 10th Avenue #1
San Francisco, California 94118

From: Elliot Schwartz
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 7:21:36 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.

Elliot Schwartz
elliot.schwartz@gmail.com
2828 Bryant Street
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Heather Davies
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Real Affordability Housing in D4
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 6:56:05 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,

Heather Davies

Heather Davies
daviesva@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94116

From: Sharon Bradbury
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 6:32:11 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,

Sharon Bradbury
sharcrow@yahoo.com
839 Haight St, Apt 8
San Francisco, California 94117

From: Lynetta Oliver
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 1:00:05 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,

Lynetta Oliver
lynettaoliver@gmail.com
527 Balboa
San Francisco , California 94118

From: lunbeck@sbcglobal.net
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChenStaff
Cc: CPC.SF.Housing.Choice
Subject: Public Comment: Family Zoning Plan -- follow-up to 10/20 meeting of LUT Committee
Date: Thursday, October 30, 2025 12:40:26 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,
Please accept the following comment on the ongoing Family Zoning Plan (upzoning initiative) under consideration:

I live in Lakeside and have lived in San Francisco for over 35 years. I am deeply concerned about the density decontrol provision in the Family Zoning Plan.
Blanket density decontrol will irretrievably devastate West Side neighborhoods.
It's often remarked that SF is a city of neighborhoods. Many are low-density residential. Uncontrolled high-density development permitted virtually anywhere in low-density residential blocks will destroy local neighborhoods by tearing at the hard-won fabric of local community woven over the years.
It appears blanket density decontrol was introduced to reduce the plan's maximum building heights. Proponents disingenuously claim that preserving existing 40' limits on the West Side should allay concerns that neighborhoods will be dramatically transformed. This is misleading. Very few dwellings in the West Side now reach maximum heights, with the vast majority well under 30'. Newly permitted multifamily dwellings will certainly push toward the 40' maximum, towering over the other dwellings in their blocks, permanently destroying such blocks' longstanding character and architectural integrity.
Worse, density decontrol would enshrine – in perpetuity – this devastating threat to neighborhood integrity by allowing such out-of-place development anywhere and at any time. It's a permanent Sword of Damocles threatening virtually every West Side block, with no recourse once this predictable disaster begins to unfold.
Density decontrol will create a crazy quilt of inappropriate, out-of-place new development opportunistically scattered across the entire West Side. No block will be safe from ruination. Even one isolated large new multifamily dwelling will damage the surrounding neighborhood's character. Instead of unnecessarily putting every dwelling on every block in the West Side at risk, dense development should be concentrated in defined zones, as embodied in earlier iterations of upzoning maps.
Further, density decontrol could change every parcel's highest and best use to multifamily development. Single-family homes will turn into de facto teardowns, discouraging maintenance and improvements. This itself is a formula for widespread neighborhood deterioration – even if no new development has occurred in the vicinity.
The Planning Department contends that density decontrol is the only way to achieve State mandates. This claim appears dubious, as earlier versions of the proposed zoning map

achieved State mandates without incorporating blanket density decontrol.
Please remove the pernicious blanket density decontrol provision from the City's upzoning plan.

Thank you for your consideration.
Yours sincerely,
Robert Lunbeck
150 Junipero Serra Boulevard
San Francisco, CA 94127

From:	sfdavidbancroft@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of David Bancroft
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Thursday, October 30, 2025 11:53:34 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am a 54 year D2 resident.

Don't Do It!

The Mayor's upzoning plan for Lombard St. will create a canyon entrance to SF, cleave Cow Hollow from the Marina and Chestnut St., and make those neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors. Where's the affordable housing?

No competent city planner would ever choose this as part of a viable solution for SF's housing needs!

Don't Do It.

David Bancroft
San Francisco, CA 94109

Sincerely,
David Bancroft
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: jeannelu@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jeannette Luini
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 30, 2025 11:41:56 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,
Jeannette Luini
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: georgesery@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of George Sery
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 30, 2025 11:38:18 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):

Sincerely,
George Sery

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:	Thursday, October 30, 2025 11:34:01 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):You will destroy one of the world's most beautiful cities if you allow this zoning to pass. I WILL NEVER VOTE FOR, AND ACTIVELY CAMPAIGN AGAINST, ANY SF ELECTED OFFICIAL WHO SUPPORTS THIS MONSTROSITY. The San Francisco northern waterfront should be a UNESCO World Heritage site instead of a new Miami Beach or Manhattan. It is one of the most beautiful places in the world, thanks to its unique geography and views and the respect with which it has been developed up to now. Its beauty is dependent on the harmony of the city with its surroundings, and the human scale at which it is built. It is fully built up. There is no more room unless you want to destroy a beautiful community that has evolved in harmony with its environment. The neighborhood does not want more development. POLL US IF YOU HAVE ANY DOUBT. Notre Dame in Paris was exactly rebuilt as it was after the fire, because the French knew its importance. Where are the similar leaders here? Who will rebuild San Francisco after the aesthetically clueless, money-grabbing developers who can't tell a properly functioning neighborhood from a hole in ground are done defacing our magnificent neighborhood, a magical place that attracts visitors from all over the world?

Sincerely,
Sebastiano Scarampi
San Francisco, CA 94115

From: jandckehoe@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Christine Kehoe
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 30, 2025 10:17:46 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 lifelong 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.

While I know we need housing that working people can afford, this is not the answer. PLEASE OPPOSE THIS!

Sincerely,
Christine Kehoe
San Francisco, CA 94116

From:	evajfortune@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jay Altobelli
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Thursday, October 30, 2025 10:04:29 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.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): Affordable housing is necessary, luxury towers will not provide an answer. This looks hasty & a land grab which irreconcilablely destroy not only the scale of our city but the citizens that live work & have small businesses will be permanently displaced. . San Francisco is not a play ground for the rich , it's a city made up of people from all economic levels, that's what we should value & protect . There's always a way . Let's not hear our elected politicians say our hands are tied & we won't give our citizens a chance to disagree, comment or discuss. Don't shut the people & our city out . Don't turn San Francisco into a billionaire city , for the rich , for corporate businesses. No one wants that .

Sincerely,
Jay Altobelli
San Francisco, CA 94121

From:	jayelliott415@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jay Elliott
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Thursday, October 30, 2025 9:27:48 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

WE are the stewards of our beautiful city, not Sacramento. They are the ugly step sister hellbent on ruining Cinderella. San Francisco has made mistakes before (Fillmore), let's not do it again! Many brave San Franciscans have fought against development that would harm, and because of their sacrifices and subsequent wins, we have Mt. Davidson (my neighborhood) as open space and many other treasures (Tea and Cookies ladies saved the Bay when the Sierra Club couldn't be bothered!). We can do better than Sacramento and as a Charter city, we have the right to. Strategic growth is smart, mandates are not!

That';s why, as a native 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 (and haven't we seen how the billionaire class is ruining our country!) while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Jay Elliott
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: vandana1@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Vandana Di Scala
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 30, 2025 9:21:31 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.

The building at 2550 Irving is across the street from our apartment. This building is far too big for existing transit services and there is little to no parking. I strongly suggest repurposing existing commercial vacant buildings in/around downtown that are along multiple transit lines into affordable housing vs adding high density housing throughout SF before ensuring adequate transit lines and parking.

Sincerely,
Vandana Di Scala
San Francisco, CA 94122

From:	randymazzei@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Randall Mazzei
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Thursday, October 30, 2025 9:11:34 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,
Randall Mazzei
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: john.nulty@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Nulty
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 30, 2025 8:42:34 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.

Sincerely,
John Nulty
San Francisco, CA 94142

From: terence.y.chu@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Terence Chu
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 30, 2025 2:07:43 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 (optional):

Sincerely,
Terence Chu
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: jg1964chi@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Joan Albertson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 7:50:32 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,
Joan Albertson
San Francisco, CA 94109

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 00730173
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:	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, October 23, 2025 1:09:23 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: James Nelson
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Wednesday, October 22, 2025 11:02:33 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,
James Nelson

James Nelson
jimmie.nelson@gmail.com
3900 Adeline Street, Unit 309
Emeryville, California 94608

From: Michelle Santos
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Wednesday, October 22, 2025 11:19:14 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,

Michelle Santos
michelllesantoss@gmail.com
39 Sycamore st
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Anne Eunice
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Wednesday, October 22, 2025 12:05:19 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,

Anne Eunice
annemarieeunice1968@gmail.com
3850 18th Street Apt 203
SF, California 94114

From: Cassia Brill
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Wednesday, October 22, 2025 1:33:18 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,

Cassia Brill
cassiagbrill@gmail.com
695 John Muir Dr apt f102
SAN FRANCISCO, California 94132

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: Wednesday, October 22, 2025 2:32:02 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.

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps and just do the minimum to meet the State requirements. Further rezoning can wait while the voters weigh in.
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.

- Exempt all parcels with rent controlled buildings from the Plan.

-Require that any and all development on city-owned land must be 100% affordable for working families.

-Exempt the Coastal land from the Plan.

The Plan destroys the priceless treasure that is San Francisco, and will erase what attracts the world's tourists to this destination. People like it here because of its' human scale and trees. They are not coming to see luxury towers. Do not prioritize the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the citizens.

Sincerely,
Margaret Dietz
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: debra.riat@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of deborah riat
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Wednesday, October 22, 2025 4:27:16 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Your up zoning plan is NOT good for our neighborhood. It is ridiculous for you to propose 6 story buildings next to 1 story single family houses. It is especially bad to go west of 20th avenue on Geary, California, Clement, Fulton with this OVERKILL CRAZY ZONING PLAN designed to pay off developers for your campaign contributions. We all know that you launder these funds into your own personal accounts. Why do you attack us in this way? The housing shortage is diminishing rapidly. AI and robotics are eating jobs and will start to do so more rapidly in the near future. The border is closed to illegal immigration and illegal immigrants are being deported and encouraged to leave of their own volition. YOU ARE BEHIND THE TIMES! I am asking you to come to your senses and STOP making WAR on the people of San Francisco!!! This radical zoning plan is NOT necessary, and it is BAD for our city.

Also, why do you continue to let drug addicts RUIN SAN FRANCISCO? Frequently my friends tell me horror stories about riding MUNI. Yesterday the story was a drug addict was asleep on the bus and his pit bull was running up and down and sitting wherever it wanted. People were terrorized. PEOPLE ARE AFRAID TO RIDE MUNI. All these stabbing murders we have had in past months, where crazed drug addicts kill people for no reason. And this morning a video of a crazy woman stabbing a restaurant owner with a knife from his kitchen. THIS IS INSANITY AND IT IS ALL ON YOU!!!!! Drug addition is not a victimless crime. I live near Sutro Heights park. I have seen over 5 dead bodies pulled out of there in the last few years. This was not happening 10 years ago. Taking drugs is illegal and these people should be arrested and detoxed for their own good and for the good of our community.

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,

deborah riat
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: rosie447@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Rosie Gozali
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Wednesday, October 22, 2025 6:43:43 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,
Rosie Gozali

From: Nadya Williams
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Wednesday, October 22, 2025 7:03:56 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,

Nadya Williams
nadyanomad@gmail.com
1436 Grant Ave. # 10
San Francisco , California 94133

From: Sarah Kliban
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Wednesday, October 22, 2025 7:25:33 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,

There are many reasons that this plan does not work, which are listed below. But in addition to those ideas, let me present to you that a lot of the cities money comes from tourists who see the city through film and television and print. A lot of us work in the film, business. What this new legislation will do is change the landscape of the city. It will change the views of the city and the presentation of the city. This means that the city that people are coming to visit is not going to be the same, but especially, for my industry, it means that people who like to make films here to show off the views will not be as attracted to bringing their projects here. Especially in district 3, which is the most filmed section of San Francisco in the past several decades.
Additionally, 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,
Sarah Kliban
Casting Director
Fifth generation San Francisco resident

Sarah Kliban
casting27@gmail.com
250 Columbus Avenue
San Francisco, California 94133

From: Madison Wise
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Wednesday, October 22, 2025 9:01:37 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!

I want you have a future myself and others in the City of San Francisco. We need more adorable housing not less.

Sincerely,

Madison Wise
Internal Organizer, SEIU-USWW

Madison Wise
unlit_frame3x@icloud.com
930 Sutter Street, Apt. 104
San Francisco, California 94109

From: Afrodisia Cuevas
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Wednesday, October 22, 2025 9:05:14 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,
Afrodisia Cuevas

Afrodisia Cuevas
afrodisiacuevas@gmail.com
190 Alhambra St.
San Francisco, California 94123

From:	jim keith
To:	Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tanner, Rachael (CPC); SauterStaff; Mahmood, Bilal (BOS)
Cc:	Conner, Kate (CPC); Cityattorney; BOS Clerks Office (BOS); Mayor, MYR (MYR); Low, Jen (BOS); Farrah, Michael (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; cityattorney.legislative@sfgov.org; SFhousingInfo
Subject:	URGENT! Please Correct Exclusion of Property from Family Zoning Ordinance
Date:	Wednesday, October 22, 2025 9:40:39 PM

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

Dear Mayor Lurie, President Tanner, Supervisor Melgar, Supervisor Mahmood, Supervisor Sauter, Supervisor Dorsey,

My name is James Keith, Managing Member of Midtown Lands LLC. We are the owners of a **3-acre parcel (Block 2724, Lot 004),** also known as **402 Dellbrook Ave**. It has come to my attention that this property was **mistakenly excluded from the parcel list in the proposed Family Zoning Ordinance**. Upon reviewing the legislative parcel number list, I confirmed that our property is not included, which appears to be an error.

This parcel is located well within the boundaries of the proposed Family Zoning Ordinance and represents a prime opportunity to address the city's critical need for additional housing. The exclusion of our property undermines the ordinance's goal of expanding housing opportunities and must be rectified before the next reading of the legislation to ensure the integrity and effectiveness of the rezoning process.

I respectfully request **that all necessary steps** be taken to correct this oversight and include our property, Block 2724, Lot 004 (402 Dellbrook Ave), in the Family Zoning Ordinance. Please confirm receipt of this request and provide guidance on any further actions required to ensure our property is included in the rezoning.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this matter. I am available to discuss this further or provide additional documentation as needed.

Sincerely, James Keith

Managing Member, Midtown Lands
415-317-2039

From: Tricia Powell
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 10:36:19 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,

Tricia Powell
triciapowell@gmail.com
3270 21st St, 103
San Francisco, California 94110

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:	406 Letters Regarding File Nos. 250700, 250701 and 250966
Date:	Wednesday, October 22, 2025 12:43:02 PM
Attachments:	406 Letters Regarding File Nos. 250700, 250701 and 250966.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached 406 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

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: kaurmona35@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mona Kaur
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Wednesday, October 22, 2025 1:09:33 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Dear elected officials and planning committees,
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.

Destroying one neighborhood to give to another is not community building.

Sincerely,
Mona Kaur
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: Carolina Pistone
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Wednesday, October 22, 2025 8:52:21 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,
Carolina

Carolina Pistone
carolpistone2@gmail.com
1750 Mission Street
San Francisco, California 94103

From: Patrick Marks
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Wednesday, October 22, 2025 9:03:04 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, Patrick Marks

Patrick Marks
patrickjmarks@sbcglobal.net
4192 24th St
San Francisco, California 94114

From: Sarah Tang
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Wednesday, October 22, 2025 9:20:19 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,
Sarah

Sarah Tang
sarah.tang62@yahoo.com

San Francisco, California 94134

From: sharongadberry@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sharon Gadberry
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Wednesday, October 22, 2025 10:10:43 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 (optional):

Sincerely,
Sharon Gadberry
San Francisco, CA 94118

From: taylorjasper0@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of JASPER TAYLOR GAITHER
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 1:00:33 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,
JASPER TAYLOR GAITHER
San Francisco, CA 94102

From: Molly Hayden
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 3:28:10 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,
Molly Hayden

Molly Hayden
molly.hayden@me.com
144a Scott St
San Francisco, California 94117

From: Christina Gonzalez
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 3:34:00 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,
Christina Gonzalez

Christina Gonzalez
christygirl17@msn.com
150 Clinton Park
San Francisco, California 94103

From: sumnernicole@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Nicole Sumner
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 3:41:20 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,
Nicole Sumner
San Francisco, CA 94112

From: Dennis Moninger
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 4:00:06 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,

Dennis Moninger
democratic1948@gmail.com
1330 bush apt 4k
S.f., California 94109

From: ccwalk5ege@gmail.com
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 4:11:44 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,

ccwalk5ege@gmail.com
709 Frederick street
San Francisco , California 94117

From: jgburgess1936@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Janet Burgess
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 5:12:52 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,
Janet Burgess
San Francisco, CA 94117

From: stephanieteelmusic@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Stephanie Teel
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 6:00:31 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):I can see tearing down the old Motel6 on Lincoln but where else?

Sincerely,
Stephanie Teel

From: Amy Rathbone
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 6:34:54 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,

Amy Rathbone

Amy Rathbone
amyrathbone@gmail.com
499 Alabama St. #112
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Kevin Eisenstaedt
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 6:58:30 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,

Kevin Eisenstaedt
kevinonroscoe@hotmail.com
350 Turk Street
SF, California 94102

From: PENNY SULLIVAN
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 7:15:35 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!

I am in a wheelchair and must live near my daughter due to a stroke. I cannot find anything as it is. I live near my daughter and have for 5 yeas. Every year the rent goes up! What will happen to me?

Sincerely,
Penny Sullivan

PENNY SULLIVAN
prnnys479@gmail.com
965 Sutter #709
Sanfrancisco , 96081

From:	sfwendy@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Wendy Portnuff
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Tuesday, October 21, 2025 7:18:55 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,
Wendy Portnuff
San Francisco, CA 94127

From:	alejandragoldstar@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Alejandra Cisnero
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Tuesday, October 21, 2025 7:21:55 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,
Alejandra Cisnero
San Francisco, CA 94124

From: pugaykm@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Karen Pugay
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 8:03:15 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, 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,
Karen Pugay
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: Imme Staeffler
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 8:11:03 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,

Imme Staeffler
immestaeffler@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94109

From: jacqueline jones
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 8:14:32 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,

jacqueline jones
jackiej2242@gmail.com
91 Blue Creek Overlook
Carbondale, Colorado 81623

From: Katarina Kauftheil
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 8:28:41 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,

Katarina Kauftheil
kmkauftheil@gmail.com
620 Jones
San Francisco, California 94102

From: Gabriella Seatris
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 8:31:07 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,

San Francisco wouldn't be the creative, desirable place it is without affordable home and rent controlled units to protect artists, young entrepreneurs, small business owners, families and more from losing their homes.

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,

Gabriella Seatris
gseatris@gmail.com
2843 geary blvd
San francisco , California 94118

From: Michael Faklis
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 8:34:03 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 Faklis
michael_faklis@thelonelliberal.ud

San Francisco, California 94111

From: Melanie Mandich
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 8:35:22 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!

I am long-term renter and active volunteer in my City (NERT, DHIC). Displacement would force me to leave the City. I've rented my current apartment since 1982, have no living relatives and depend on my home for security. Having major XSF developers or hedge funds purchase buildings and convert them into condos is unconscionable. There are many more like me...and we all vote! Sincerely, Melanie Mandich

Melanie Mandich
mmandich@comcast.net
390 liberty street, Apt 7
San francisco, California 94114

From: Claudia Molina
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 8:39:34 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,

Claudia Molina
molinaclaudia21@gmail.com
439 Arlington Street
San Francisco, California 94131

From: betsy.eddy@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Betsy Eddy
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 8:48:42 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's Upzoning plan will lead to the destruction of many historic buildings and destroy the character of our neighborhoods so that developer's can make huge amounts of money.

Sincerely,
Betsy Eddy
San Francisco, CA 94131

From: sherrichard@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Daniel ONEill
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 8:48:44 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 and living in the Cow Hollow neighborhood for the past 29 years and previously 35 years in the Richmond district, 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 was a builder of maximum 4-story apartments and proud to provide housing while keeping the neighborhoods in tact.

I am asking 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.

Please listen to the people who live here and care about maintaining the homes and small businesses.

Sincerely,
Daniel ONEill
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: Rita Pisciotta
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 8:48:53 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,

Rita Pisciotta
rbinsf@earthlink.net
2048 Stockton st
san francisco, California 94133-2026

From: sherrichard61@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sherrie Richard
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 8:56:19 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 Cow Hollow. I am an owner of 2 rental cindos here. I care about the quality of life my rental units provide and the income it affords me to be retired and living in this great.neighborhood!

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.

Please listen to the people who live in these neighborhoods and have small businesses NOT to someone in an office in City Hall looking at pieces of PAPER!!

- 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.

We are real! The paper in the desks of these planners are not real!

Sincerely,
Sherrie Richard
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: Fiona Thao
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 8:58:21 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,

Fiona Thao
fionathao823@gmail.com
895 Pacific Ave
San Francisco, California 94133

From: neyce@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Janeyce Ouellette
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 9:46:16 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,
Janeyce Ouellette

From: Jane van Hoven
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 9:54:58 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,

Real San Franciscans, we who love this city and call it home, are sick of what's been happening to our city. We're sick of seeing our friends and neighbors forced to move and feeling that pressure ourselves while our neighborhoods lose what makes them our neighborhoods. This is a time to take a stand and protect Ssn Francisco.

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,

Jane van Hoven
darkrainbowkittens@gmail.com
1233 California St, Apt 312
San Francisco, California 94109

From: bestevenson1@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Bonnie Stevenson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 10:14:37 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,
Bonnie Stevenson
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: Sarah Bouldin
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 10:51:10 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,
Sarah Bouldin

Sarah Bouldin
sbouldin@rainbow.coop
39 Lapidge St
San Francisco , California 94110

From: Maggie Shiple
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 10:52:36 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,

Maggie Shiple
maggieshiple@gmail.com
1298 Funston Ave, Apt 2
San Francisco , California 94122

From: Evette Mercado
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 11:18:34 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, Evette Mercado

Evette Mercado
evettem26@gmail.com
801 Sutter St. 108
San Francisco , California 94109

From: steve.t@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Steve Taormina
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 11:40:22 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 small business owner for 23 years in San Francisco. I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, Dont sellout the city to with the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, by transforming our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

Keep the city clean and not more expensive to live in.

Steve

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

As a small business owner for 23 years in San Francisco. I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, Dont sellout the city to with the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, by transforming our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

Keep the city clean and not more expensive to live in.

Steve

Sincerely,
Steve Taormina
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: Heather Black
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 12:18:17 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,

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,

Heather Black
heathermoonblack@gmail.com
526 Taraval St
San Francisco, California 94116-2510

From: Douglas Freelon
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 12:36:41 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,

Douglas Freelon
dn.freelon13@gmail.com
1629 Golden Gate Ave
San Francisco, California 94115

From: Abigail Alderson
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 1:12:14 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,

Abigail Alderson
abagaillalderson@mac.com
1864 48Th Avenue , 4
San Francisco, California 94122

From: Erin Antunez
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 1:48:17 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,

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,

Erin Antunez
antunezacupuncture@gmail.com
5 Chilton ave
San Francisco , California 94131

From: Marc Bruno
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 1:48:26 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,

Marc Bruno
marcabruno2025@gmail.com
15 Nobles Alley, Apt. 3
San Francisco, California 94133

From: Jeremi Rebecca Hanson
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 1:49:28 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,

Jeremi Rebecca Hanson
jeremihanson@gmail.com
3460 16th st, Apt. 2
San Francisco, California 94114

From: Aaron Hopkins
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 2:09:26 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,

Aaron Hopkins
Ahopkins425@me.com
851 34th Ave
San Francisco, 94121

From: Virginia Barker
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 3:47:10 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,

Virginia Barker
v.barker@att.net
200 Alhambra St #17
San Francisco, California 94123

From:	juithrydell@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Judith Rydell
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Tuesday, October 21, 2025 4:14:32 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 I love my neighborhood and purchased a home in this area for a safe peaceful place to live. We are mostly single family homes and some units. It is not congested and I am able to park on my block when I return home. The value of the homes in this area will drop if it turns into a congested area and with no parking. I am an elderly person who would find it difficult if I had to walk up this hill. PLEASE LEAVE OUR AREA AS IS. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Judith Rydell
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: chue33333@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of ed chu
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 4:28:14 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): There are many members of our church who live all over San Francisco, many could use affordable housing. Your upzoning map would disrupt much needed housing for those who need affordable housing. Please keep those people in need when you make your plans. Please keep ALL San Franciscans in mind in your planning.

Sincerely,
ed chu
San Francisco, CA 94131

From: mesa797@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Douglas Gower
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 5:35:03 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.

These are the types of rushed changes that have been suggested and in some cases implemented in the past that are either regrettable in their implementation, or thankfully never realized. We don't need a city of stalled projects and vacant lots serving no positive use.

Sincerely,
Douglas Gower
San Francisco, CA 94107

From: Ginger Hamilton
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 5:48:49 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!
I am a stage 4 cancer patient who has been fighting my landlord of 27 years to not evict me.

I'm currently in treatment and can not afford to move. I need to remain in San Francisco to continue my medical treatment. My life depends on renter's right for affordable housing to maintain my housing and chemotherapy treatment. Please help long time residents such as myself to have affordable housing.

Sincerely,
Ginger Hamilton

Ginger Hamilton
gingerhami@earthlink.net
270 Pennsylvania Ave
San Francisco, California 94107

From: jdemeza@yahoo.com
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 7:50:25 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,

jdemeza@yahoo.com
160 EDDY STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, California 94102

From: pwchu99@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Patricia Chu
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 8:53:16 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 COMMENT: I live near West Portal and it is perfect the way it is. Don't change something that works and isn't broken. Don't make the it harder for the middle class to live in this city where I was born and raised.

Sincerely,
Patricia Chu
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: v.barker@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Virginia Barker
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 10:12:02 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):

And this is a betrayal of your duty to work in the best interests of your constituents.

Sincerely,
Virginia Barker
San Francisco, CA 94123

From:	ruthwwenzel@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Ruth W. Wenzel
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 6:01:36 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.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): We still need homes & jobs for the people already here! Don't take small businesses & the homes of those who work in these places!

Sincerely,
Ruth W. Wenzel
San Francisco, CA 94117

From: LaNiesha Pedroza
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:02:52 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,

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,

LaNiesha Pedroza
laniesha@icloud.com
1808 Fulton St, Apt 7
San Francisco, California 94117

From: McKenzie Campagna
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:02:55 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,

McKenzie Campagna
renkiyo7@gmail.com
350 Arballo Dr. Apt 9F
San Francisco, California 94132

From: Melanie Dorson
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:03:21 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,

Melanie Dorson
melanie.dorson@gmail.com
4930 Fulton St. #204
San Francisco, California 94121

From: Catherine Starr
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:04:01 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,
Catherine Starr

Catherine Starr
cstarr2017@gmail.com
711 Elizabeth St
San Francisco, California 94114

From: Kristin Gifford
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:04:46 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,

Kristin Gifford
kristingifford@gmail.com
434 8th ave apt 1
San Francisco , California 94118

From: Jennifer Mayugba
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:05:00 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,

Jennifer Mayugba
mugbug48@gmail.com
1278 Market St
San Francisco, California 94102-4801

From: Leah Hammond
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:05:19 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!

So many of my colleagues, friends, and neighbors have been priced out of the city. For many people, rent controlled housing is the only reason they are able to stay in the city that has been their home for decades. Please protect rent controlled housing and the people who rely on it.

Sincerely,
Leah Hammond, District 10

Leah Hammond
leaheve@indra.com

San Francisco, California 94110

From: Elise Fischer-Colbrie
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:06:57 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,

Elise Fischer-Colbrie
elise.fischercolbrie@gmail.com
1260 broadway
San francisco, California 94109

From: Carolyn Link
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:08:28 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 to you as a concerned San Francisco renter. Born and raised here, i always hoped to own a home but that is not possible and i can thankfully still afford to love here thanks to rent control. If the goal of upzoning is to make housing more affordable and more plentiful then existing tenants MUST be protected. Otherwise we risk displacing thousands of renters, only to end up with empty luxury apartments that existing renters can't afford, or worse, studio "tech dorms" without actually. Without strong protections for existing tenants, this easily becomes a handout to developers while making the affordability crisis worse.

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,

Carolyn Link
link.carolyn@gmail.com
735 11th ave, #3
SF, California 94118

From:	janice.bressler@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Janice Bressler
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 6:12:39 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,
Janice Bressler
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: Heather Dalrymple
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:13:00 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,

Heather Dalrymple
hcdalrymple55@gmail.com
2153 Sacramento St, #9
San Francisco, California 94109

From: elizabeth morello
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:14:13 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,

elizabeth morello
selizabethmorello@yahoo.com
green street
san francisco, California 94133

From: Christy Vong
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:14:25 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,

Christy Vong
vong.christy@gmail.com
268 25th Ave
San Francisco, California 94121

From: Lenaya Kimball
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:15:39 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,

Lenaya Kimball

Lenaya Kimball
lpongan@yahoo.com
2053 Sutter St, Apt 101
San Francisco, California 94115

From: Robert Hall
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:15:47 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,

Robert Hall
bilgepump100@sbcglobal.net

San Francisco, California 94117

From:	foxja24@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Judith Fox
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 6:16:01 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, 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 is not what our city needs- affordable housing is a critical unmet need.
ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Judith Fox
San Francisco, CA 94115

From: Devra Edelman
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:16:40 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,

Devra Edelman
devraimma1@gmail.com
200 Brannan St. #240
San Francisco, California 94107

From: Kathleen Tilt
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:17:01 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,

Kathleen Tilt
kathleentilt@icloud.com
2261, Market Street # 145
San Francisco, California 94114

From: Mary Menees
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:19:24 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.

Please protect tenants like me who have rent control and are over sixty. I've worked in non profits and for SF State my whole career never being able to buy a home. Please don't displace tenants like me. I've been here since 1985 and a tenant in my place for 35 years.

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,

Mary Menees

Mary Menees
marymenees@gmail.com
5132 Geary Blvd, APT 3
San Francisco, California 94118

From:	clarewafelbakker@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Clare Wafelbaker
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 6:21:36 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.

I live in the Outer Sunset district, I go to yoga in the Richmond area, eat out in the Marina frequently and have been a SF resident for the last 10 years. These plans will have a detrimental impact to the residents and small business owners that live and run their business in these iconic San Francisco neighborhoods. It is your responsibility to see that this does not happen. Thank you for reading.

Sincerely,
Clare Wafelbaker
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: Heather Weeks Sampior
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:21:39 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,
Heather Weeks Sampior
40+ year S.F. Renter

Heather Weeks Sampior
hkweeks@gmail.com
2050 29th Avenue
San Francisco, California 94116

From: thanehale@gmail.com
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:21:42 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,
Nathaniel Hale

thanehale@gmail.com
819 Judah St
San Francisco, California 94122

From: Anne morse
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:21:53 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,

Anne morse
morsemedia@att.net
1462 union st
san Francisco , California 94109

From: diannrose@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Diann Rose
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:22:14 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 transforms our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline so we have time to better understand the impact of the plan
- Host town halls in the affected areas to answer questions and inform the public
- Scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps if necessary to be sure the plan meets the city’s needs

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 potentially 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. We need to be certain that these decisions are not taken lightly and rushed through.

We need to be thorough. The City deserves this!

Sincerely,
Diann Rose
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: Nora Scally
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:23:32 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,

Nora Scally
norascally@gmail.com
2515 Clement St, 1
San Francisco, California 94121

From:	timinsf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Timothy Kirsch
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 6:24:20 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

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,
Timothy Kirsch
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: Krystal Mandel
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:25:59 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,

Krystal Mandel
pinonkrystal@yahoo.com

San Francisco, California 94121

From: Gregg Zywicke
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:26:34 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,

Gregg Zywicke
chloethewonderdog@hotmail.com
478 Warren
Sean Francisco, California 94131

From: Helen Gilbert
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:32:32 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,
Helen

Helen Gilbert
hgmelon@gmail.com
1207 32nd Ave
San Francisco , California 94122

From: Austin Willacy
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:35:36 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 disenfranchisement needs to stop here, now.

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,

Austin Willacy
akw@well.com
3240 King Street
Berkeley, California 94703-2448

From: salenaart@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Alessandra Valentini
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:36:38 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.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): don't sell your soul and the soul of the city to those corporate scums. Have the decency to slow down the taking over of humanity. AI will fall and the bubble burst. No need to run for the cliff too fast. Keep it human

Sincerely,
Alessandra Valentini
San Francisco, CA 94110

From: Sarah Mitrani
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:39:02 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,

Sarah Mitrani
smmitrani@gmail.com
20 El Sereno Ct., San Francisco CA 94127
San Francisco, California 94127

From: Megan Schneider
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:42:11 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,

Megan Schneider
meganjoyschneider@gmail.com
4646 Geary Blvd, apt 2
san francisco, California 94118

From: Sirinada Chanthachaiwat
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:43:03 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,

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,

Sirinada Chanthachaiwat
sirinada1@outlook.co.th

Berkeley, California 94703

From: Karen Langland
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:48:30 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,

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!
Please stop turning our city into a playground for the rich !!!

Sincerely,
Karen Langland

Karen Langland
klangland@earthlink.net
243 4th Ave
San Francisco, California 94118

From: Tiffany Pfeiffer
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:50:42 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,

Tiffany Pfeiffer
tiffany.pfeiffer@gmail.com
1650 47th Ave
San Francisco, California 94122

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, October 20, 2025 6:51:40 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,
John Lee
San Francisco, CA 94127

From:	mspunkie47@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Latishia Bess
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 6:52:06 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,
Latishia Bess
Emeryville, CA 94608

From: Elizabeth Loomis
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:52:46 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!

Please don’t ignore the needs of the common folk in San Francisco. We are what make this city so diverse and wonderful,

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Loomis

Elizabeth Loomis
iamapumpkin77@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94121

From: Alexis Lecach
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:54:14 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,

Alexis Lecach
ajl.diamond@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94114

From: Raymond Cachia
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:56:13 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!
All Rent Controlled Housing Must Be Carved Out Of Mayor's Plan

Sincerely,

Raymond Cachia
rcachiao1@gmail.com
1711 Washington Street
San Francisco, California 94109

From: Gina Hall
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:56:35 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,

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,

Gina Hall
ginahallg@gmail.com
584 Castro St Apt 325
San Francisco, California 94114

From: Edward Rittenhouse
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 7:02:35 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,

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,
Ed Rittenhouse

Edward Rittenhouse
Epr928@gmail.com
1105 Bush Street, APT 106
San Francisco, California 94109

From: K Harrar
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 7:08:10 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,
K Harrar

K Harrar
errigaleire@yahoo.com

San Francisco, California 94122

From: Courtney Veraldi
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 7:09:53 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,

Courtney Veraldi
courtneyveraldi@gmail.com
776 bush street
San francisco, California 94108

From:	swf1@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Steve Fukuda
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 7:11:14 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,
Steve Fukuda
San Francisco, CA 94132

From: Jennifer Locke
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 7:12:45 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,
Jennifer Locke

Jennifer Locke
jennifer.locke@sbcglobal.net
740 35TH AVE
SAN FRANCISCO, California 94121

From:	gford212@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Greg Blackford
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 7:14:40 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,
Greg Blackford
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: Allegra Kelly
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 7:16:39 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. As a rent control family it is disgraceful that you are trying to displace us more.

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,
Allegra Kelly

Allegra Kelly
allegradeva@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94117

From: Dale Riva
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 7:23:30 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,

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,

Dale Riva
daleriva@gmail.com
1001 Franklin 13-A
San Francisco, California 94109

From: bascomassociates@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of H Doris Su
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 7:27:39 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,
H Doris Su
San Francisco, CA 94132

From: Stephanie Sherman
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 7:36:30 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,

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,

Stephanie Sherman
stephaniesherma@gmail.com
25 Sharon st
Sf, California 94114

From: Olivia VanDamme
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 7:44:16 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 have been a renter in San Francisco for 8 years in the Outer Sunset and I greatly appreciate my landlord's affordable pricing on our unit and the rent-control that does not allow for a drastic increase in my rent. As a non-profit worker working at small non-profits and in a local museum in Golden Gate Park. My wages at these non-profits would not be able to afford rising costs of rent happening now or for proposed new market rate units. As other friends who are non-profit workers, coaches, educators all pouring into the future generations education and out of school time activities, we deserve affordable housing.

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 VanDamme
oliviavandamme14@gmail.com
189 Country Club Dr
San Francisco, California 94132

From: Robin Dekkers
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 7:45:44 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,
Robin

Robin Dekkers
radekkers@gmail.com
144 Grattan St Apt 3
San Francisco, California 94117

From: Banafsheh Jalali
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 7:48:50 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,

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,

Banafsheh Jalali
banafsheh.jalali@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94123

From: Maleeha Iftekhar
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 7:50:32 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!

Rent control was the only reason my family could live in SF. We were bought out and have to leave in November; and I will never be able to live in the place I grew up again.

Sincerely,
Maleeha

Maleeha Iftekhar
maleehaiftekhar@bennington.edu
751 48th Avenue
San Francisco, California 94121

From: John Hronowski
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 8:04:37 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,

John Hronowski
johnhronowski@mac.com
1539 Clay Street Apt 12
San Francisco, California 94109

From: Amy Perrone
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 8:11:10 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 city is already unaffordable. I've seen the fabric of the city change as musicians, artists, teachers and members of our community have been pushed out because of tech. It's been so sad to see the change from 'anybody can live here in some part of the city' to good luck finding anywhere to live that's affordable. That's no longer the case.We need more affordable options and affecting rent controlled units is not going to help.

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,
Amy (rent controlled apartment dweller)

Amy Perrone
amy_m_perrone@yahoo.com
2942 Franklin St
San Francisco , California 94123

From: Kamala Oldham
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 8:12:27 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,
Kamala Oldham
[Humble renter in Sunset & broke college student]

Kamala Oldham
kamalaoldham@gmail.com
3131 Quintara St
San Francisco, California 94116

From: Philippa Colborne
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 8:15:05 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,

Philippa Colborne
cal94111@gmail.com
405 Davis Court apt 407
San Francisco, Ca 94111

From: Jeannine Zenti
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 8:16:39 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. I absolutely disapprove of destroying existing rent controlled housing to build new units. Despite the promises, these are never affordable. We must preserve older structures and update them as necessary. Get creative! Developer driven housing solutions are a disaster. This should be obvious by now.

Sincerely,
Jeannine Zenti

Jeannine Zenti
jzenti@hotmail.com
1319 Florida
San Francisco , California 94110

From: Eckhart Beatty
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 8:16:39 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,

Dear Supervisor Chan,
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,

Eckhart Beatty

Eckhart Beatty
eckhart.c.beatty@gmail.com
110 6th Ave. San Francisco, CA 94118, Apt 3
San Francisco, California 94118

From: lorrainebustamante2@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lorraine Bustamante
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 8:29:13 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 am a native San Franciscan and I have seen the many changes to our city that have negatively impacted our communities.
Why don't you consider consulting our community residents and hear what we have to say—and give us an opportunity to speak not in the middle of the day when we're working; And not just one or two times give us a chance to survive this imposition. Please don't behave like Trump is behaving — where it's obvious he doesn't care about us regular hard-working people. Please reconsider.

Sincerely,
Lorraine Bustamante
San Francisco, CA 94112

From: Mahara Espinoza
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 8:36:24 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,

Mahara Espinoza
maharae@yahoo.com
2210 Stockton St
San Francisco, California 94133

From: erikatargaryen@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Erika Tomlinson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 8:41:53 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 small business owner, Franciscan, and 4th generation Californian, 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):

Billionaire developers will never create homes for San Franciscans. I love this city and do not wish it to become another New York or LA. I want it to prosper, but not at the expense of its unique culture and undeniable beauty which are comprised of the multicultural and dynamic residents and striking land and architecture. Embrace what smaller cities like Boston have learned - build 4- story, 10-20 unit buildings with mixed size units, small businesses on the bottom floor, and a residential feel.

Sincerely,
Erika Tomlinson

From: Caroline Ayres
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 8:46:50 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,

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,

Caroline Ayres
carolineayres6@gmail.com
87 Dolores Street , APT 105
San Francisco , California 94103

From: Darlene Roberts
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 8:50:57 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,

Darlene Roberts
drob3438@gmail.com
555 Pierce Street
San Francisco, California 94117

From: Ildiko Polony
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 9:01:46 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,

Ildiko Polony
ildiko.polony@gamil.com
1322 4th ave apt 4
San Francisco, California 94122

From: Chris Moore
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 9:17:21 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,
Chris Moore

Chris Moore
we3sf@sbcglobal.net
1255 Taylor St, Apt 6
San Francisco, California 94108

From: Rozanna Dyan Garza
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 9:17:34 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,

Rozanna Dyan Garza
dyangarza60@gmail.com
855 Waller St. apt 5
San Francisco, California 94117

From: Mary Martin
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 9:19:04 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,

Mary Martin
foreleg.annular.7d@icloud.com
159 Hearst Ave
San Francisco, California 94131

From: Elaine Walker
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 9:25:06 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,

Dear 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,

Elaine Walker (born and raised and still living and renting and teaching and being a therapist to SF - still barely affording it here)

Elaine Walker
eeewalker@gmail.com
273 Filbert St
San Francisco, California 94133

From: leon_goncharov@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Leonid Goncharov
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 9:30:13 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,
Leonid Goncharov
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: Sheryl Leaf
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 9:37:12 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,

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,

Sheryl Leaf
leaflet7@yahoo.com
1395 Golden Gate Ave
San Francisco, California 94115

From:	nyeta@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Richard Charney
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 9:42:07 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,
Richard Charney
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: Tamila Wong
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 9:48:51 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,

Tamila Wong
tamilawong@yahoo.com
106 Byxbee St
San Francisco , California 94132

From: Mohua Ibrahim
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 10:12:02 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,

Mohua Ibrahim
tarot-warble-06@icloud.com
680 Mission Street, #27K
San Francisco, California 94105

From: toluene_gigabit.5l@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Melinda Costello
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 10:19:23 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,
Melinda Costello
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: Sam Khozindar
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 10:48:15 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,

Sam Khozindar
samkhozindar@yahoo.com
2697mission street
San Francisco , California 94110

From: jeanine.l.mahl@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jeanine Laman Mahl
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 10:53:15 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. Upzoning will result in more cars, congestion, & put unacceptable pressure on schools, emergency services, etc. Upzoning will change the character of the neighborhoods. I'm 81 years old and have lived in SF since I was a year old. I have seen it go from always being able to park in front of the house that a normal, working class family could afford to buy, to families being taxed out of their homes (my parents) and to a place where parking is getting harder and harder. It has become a place too expensive for working class families (And I don't mean tech folks) to rent let alone buy. The zoo, the Academy of Sciences, the deYoung, the Tea Garden, etc., were all free. Now they are out of reach for many families. Upzoning will make the affordability crisis worse. Stop trying to change the character of our single family neighborhoods! We don't need more people, cars, traffic, and competition for parking. STOP UPZONING.

Sincerely,
Jeanine Laman Mahl
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: Oksana Clem
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:56:39 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,

Oksana Clem
oksanakc01@gmail.com
1275 Buchanan St Apt 4
San Francisco, California 94115

From: Geoffrey McNally
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:56:45 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!

This is a personal issue for me. I've lived in a rent controlled apartment for the past 19 years. Without rent control I would have to leave my beloved city. Please support rent control!

Sincerely,
Geoffrey McNally

Geoffrey McNally
glmcnally@hotmail.com
1700 Broadway Apt 301
San Francisco , California 94109

From: Judith Stein
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:59:17 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,

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!

I urge you to not destroy rent control in this beautiful city of ours. Plans for high-rises in the Richmond and other districts will destroy the neighborhood qualities of these areas. Working class people will be priced out of being able to live in the city. This will affect all the businesses in the city. I urge you to not destroy rent control.

Sincerely,

Judith Stein
judithastein@gmail.com
46 Arlington
San Francisco , California 94131

From: Laura Kerimova
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:59:33 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,

Laura Kerimova
laurasimone6@gmail.com
1275 Buchanan St Apt 4
San Francisco, California 94115

From: Stephen Torres
To: Carroll, John (BOS)
Cc: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: 2025.10.20 Letter Re: Family Zoning Plan
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:55:49 PM
Attachments: 2025.10.20%20Letter%20to%20Land%20Use%20&%20Transportation%20Re-%20Family%20Zoni.pdf

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

Dear Clerk Carroll,

Please see attached my comments from today's hearing.

Thanks so much,

Stephen Torres

Stephen Torres
Mission-Bernal
San Francisco, California

October 20, 2025

The Land Use & Transportation Committee of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 250
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, California 94102

Chairperson Melgar and Committee Members,

Before you is the disingenuously named *Family Zoning Plan.* The name is disingenuous because, as countless public testimonies and data have detailed, this plan does nothing to actually ensure housing for families. It does little but ensure that developers can now access thousands of residential and commercial parcels with almost no regulation and property owners can sell their property for several times its current value. It is also likely to make thousands of San Franciscans homeless, hundreds of small businesses close, and irrevocably change our city all without adequate funding or infrastructure in the face of serious challenges ranging from transportation to natural disasters to climate change.

Chairperson Melgar, Supervisors Chan, Chen and other supervisors have introduced amendments to mitigate the egregious impacts of this plan, such as the loss of rent controlled housing. I appreciate this work and encourage this committee to pursue those that which ensures that the total of all existing housing stock is protected from demolition, that small businesses are preserved, & that our neighbourhoods and city are preserved, even it requires sending this legislation back.

One recurring claim is that nothing can be done as our elected representatives in Sacramento are holding a gun to our heads with punitive measures and defunding as threats against San Franciscans. I caution against this messaging as it may signal unintended complicity and lack of fortitude. If our local leaders claim to be powerless to stop this kind of deregulation and removal of protections for the people of San Francisco, what can we expect as even more edicts imperiling San Franciscans are handed down from Sacramento or even Washington? To dismiss this, and imply that housing deregulation is hardly the same as the other ways in which San Francisco is being endangered , I would ask that our leaders consider what it is like to be evicted, to be an elder who will die on the street, to have a family business close and lose one's livelihood, or to be displaced from your generational community. The silencing and removal of our City's most vulnerable have historically come in many forms.

To imply that compliance with law, srate or otherwise, regardless of how it targets our most vulnerable sets a dangerous precedent. I implore us to use the same bravery and conviction we do when we decry other bullying and threats made toward San Francisco and apply it to the

legislative coercion being employed by leadership in Sacramento, people who purport to represent us just as you do.

Sincerely,

Stephen Torres
District 8 & 9 Worker
District 9 Resident

From: Elma Caplin
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:59:31 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,

Elma Caplin
elmacaplin@gmail.com
101 Polk Street Apt 1111, San Francisco CA 94102
San Francisco, California 94102

From: Laura Booth
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:00:14 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,
Laura Booth

Renter in the Richmond district

Laura Booth
laurasbooth@gmail.com
1900 Cabrillo St., Apt. 2
San Francisco, California 94121

From: Lauren Carara
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:00:26 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,

Lauren Carara
lcarara@gmail.com
486 Funston Ave, Apt 3
San Francisco, California 94118

From: Cassondra Curiel
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Amend Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Significantly - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:01:02 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,

Cassondra Curiel
ccuriel@uesf.org
87 Grand View Ave.
San Francisco, California 94114

From: Lauren Mogannam
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:02:06 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,

Lauren Mogannam
lmogannam@gmail.com
1535 Taraval St, 401
San Francisco, California 94116

From: Luz Mery Betancur Londoño
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:03:29 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,

Luz Mery Betancur Londoño
betancur1216@icloud.com
474 Natoma 6 street # 207
San Francisco cal , California 94103

From: melissa boyd
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:03:44 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, Melissa Boyd

melissa boyd
girlwhocandoboth@gmail.com
1538 42nd avenue
San Francisco, California 94122

From: Chagua Camacho-Olguín
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:03:52 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,

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,

Chagua Camacho-Olguín
chaguis68@gmail.com
182 Granville Way
Sanfrancisco, California 94127

From: Stephen Albair
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:04:15 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,

Stephen Albair
stephenalbair@gmail.com
150 Page St. #47 Unit #47
San Francisco, California 94102-5837

From: mir49@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Miranda Claggette
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:04:24 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 family has been living in San Francisco for five generations in the same house since the 1930s. I live on Dewey Boulevard and own another property on Connecticut. If this proposition passes, developers will be able to build an 80 foot high, four story building next-door to my home. As stated above, I am opposed to this plan as it will affect my family in unfavorable ways.

Sincerely,
Miranda Claggette
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: Kirill Mogilev
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:04:33 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,

Subject: Amend or Reject Blanket Upzoning – Protect Renters and Real Affordability

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission,

As the 150 Font Blvd Tenant Association, we represent renters living in one of San Francisco's largest multifamily communities. We are deeply concerned that the Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will worsen, not solve, the housing crisis by displacing existing renters and encouraging luxury development over affordable homes.

San Francisco's rental market is already at a breaking point — available homes for working people are nearly nonexistent. Without meaningful protections, upzoning will accelerate the loss of rent-controlled housing and push long-term tenants out of the city.

We urge you to adopt amendments that:
Exclude all rent-controlled homes from upzoning.
Require at least 50 % affordable housing on large opportunity parcels.
Raise inclusionary requirements to 20 % on-site BMR.
Protect small and legacy businesses from displacement.
Guarantee local prevailing wages for construction workers.

San Francisco cannot rely on speculative private markets to create affordability. The City must take leadership in protecting renters and ensuring that new housing serves those who already live and work here.

Sincerely,
150 Font Blvd Tenant Association
(With support from WSTA, TANC, and allied community partners)

Kirill Mogilev
kirill.mogilev@gmail.com
150 Font Blvd, 10-L
San Francisco, California 94132

From: Maggie Rummel
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:04:43 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,

Maggie Rummel
Maggierummel@mac.com

San Francisco, California 94118

From: kelly.l.krause@gmail.com
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:04:45 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,

kelly.l.krause@gmail.com
522 Hyde Street
San Francisco, California 94109

From: Jamie Pearlstein
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:05:06 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,

I have rented in SF for about 15 years. I work, volunteer, and donate time and resources in SF. Please don't make me or other rent controlled residents lose our homes. Put yourself in our shoes.

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,

Jamie Pearlstein
jhpearlstein@hotmail.com
Diamond St #7
San Francisco, California 94114

From: capozzialex@gmail.com
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:06:40 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,

capozzialex@gmail.com
4150 Cesar Chavez , Apt 3
San Francisco , California 94131

From: Shanti Zinzi
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:07:56 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,

Shanti Zinzi
thenatureofthebeast@yahoo.com
Park st
Sf, California 94110

From: Erika Frick
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:08:15 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,

Dear Supervisors,

As a 25-year resident of Nob Hill, I implore you to take action to stop the reckless building of housing that jeopardizes rent controlled tenants and fails to meet the needs of San Francisco citizens.

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis. Without significant amendments, it will make the crisis worse by displacing renters and small businesses and prioritizing luxury development over the affordable housing our communities actually need.

There is a better path forward. We can meet state housing requirements without displacing people and ensure that new housing is truly affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include the following priorities in any upzoning plan:

1. Protect all rent-controlled housing.
The proposal must explicitly carve out ALL of the city's 100,000 rent-controlled homes, which house over 200,000 residents. These homes are the backbone of San Francisco's affordability and must not be upzoned or put at risk. Our local Housing Element prioritizes preserving existing affordable housing, and that commitment must be upheld.

2. Require more affordable housing in all new development.
We must increase affordability requirements, not reduce them. Proposals to swap below-market-rate (BMR) units for market-rate ones should be rejected. Inclusionary zoning should be strengthened to require at least 20 percent affordable units on-site. On large opportunity parcels, at least 50 percent of new housing should be affordable, through the creation of an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD).

3. Phase in new development based on actual need.
New condos and market-rate housing should be introduced gradually, with regular review to ensure they match community needs. Large-scale construction of luxury units without affordability guarantees will only accelerate gentrification and displacement.

4. Protect small businesses.
Preserve San Francisco's certified Legacy Businesses and prohibit their demolition. Developers should be required to provide relocation assistance starting at $150,000, along with turn-key "warm shell" improvements for displaced small businesses.

5. Defend the public waterfront and other legacy areas
Public access and environmental protections must remain in place. Do not support efforts to privatize or develop our protected coastal waterfront.

6. Stop with the out of sync high rises
Do not approve height restrictions that will ruin our legacy neighborhoods from Nob Hill to Fisherman's Wharf to Telegraph Hill to Chinatown. There is no market for these expensive condos and no reason to ruin the beauty of our City.

Our neighborhoods and small businesses cannot afford more displacement. We need development that supports the people who already live here. I urge you to show bold leadership and protect the future of a diverse and affordable San Francisco.

Sincerely,
Erika Frick

Erika Frick
erika.awakening@gmail.com
845 California St., Apt 801
San Francisco, California 94108

From: Samia Afra
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:08:50 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,

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,

Samia Afra
samurai_10@hotmail.com
525 LEAVENWORTH ST, APT 21
San Francisco, California 94109

From: Carolyn Anderson
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:08:50 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,

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!

If this were to happen, my husband and I would be evicted and would have to move out of SF. I would lose my community, neighbors and favorite place in the world. Please don’t let that happen.

Sincerely,
Carolyn Anderson

Carolyn Anderson
zomgitsbear@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94121

From: marcia pourfarrokh
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:09:10 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,

marcia pourfarrokh
marci8054@gmail.com
357 4th Avenue
San Francisco , California 94118

From: Sandra Juri
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:10:05 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,
Sandra Juri (disabled and would be greatly affected by this change)

Sandra Juri
jurisa@sbcglobal.net
2210 Stockton St apt 4061
San Francisco, 94133

From: Stephanie Darling
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:10:41 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,

Stephanie Darling
irismoonchild0@gmail.com
1226 Grant Ave. #30
San Francisco, California 94133

From: Brandi Valenza
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:10:55 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,

Brandi Valenza
brandi@thedevilsdesigns.com
167 Dolores Street, Apt 7
San Francisco, California 94103

From: phnxextant2.0@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Owl
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:11:13 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 Owl
San Francisco, CA 94102

From: spuleta71@gmail.com
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:12:21 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,

spuleta71@gmail.com
2690 Great Hwy
San Francisco, California 94116

From: Anja Bircher
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:17:28 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,

Anja Bircher
anjabircher@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94110

From: Laura Carroll
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:17:35 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,

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!

I’m totally sick of working class people, teachers etc being priced out.

Sincerely,

Laura Carroll
Lauramclouds@gmail.com
262 EVELYN WAY
SAN FRANCISCO, California 94127

From: Michelina Matarrese
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:18:39 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 ALL 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. The private market will NEVER do the job our local government should in ensuring San Francisco builds much-needed housing for all. We need your moral integrity and creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Michelina Matarrese
rckstrgrl@me.com
1032 Steiner St
San Francisco , California 94115

From: Melanie Malinas
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:18:47 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 non-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,

Melanie Malinas
melaniemalinas@gmail.com
4022 Mission Street
San Francisco, California 94112-1017

From: Eileen Cronin
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:19:13 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,

Eileen Cronin
ekcronin@earthlink.net
1950 Franklin St #10
San Francisco , California 94109

From: DEMIAN QUESNEL
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:20:21 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,
Demian Quesnel
Longtime Castro resident [over 50 years].

DEMIAN QUESNEL
dquesnel@usa.net
4084 17Th St, Apt 4
San Francisco, California 94114-1944

From: Susan Mallon
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:21:26 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,

Susan Mallon
Long-time SF Renter!

Susan Mallon
sfmallon@gmail.com
909 PAGE ST APT 2
SAN FRANCISCO, California 94117

From: Loretta Chavac Ortiz
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:22:48 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,

Loretta Chavac Ortiz
lchavacortiz77@yahoo.com
821 Jackson St, Apt 2
San Francisco, California 94133

From: David Perry
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:24:28 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,

David Perry
perryd1@mac.com
1700 Octavia St. #301
San Francisco, California 94109

From: Michele Simmerer
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:24:34 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,

Michele Simmerer
colorboxsalon@gmail.com
2777 Bryant Street SF CA 94110
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Michele Simmerer
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:25:02 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,

Michele Simmerer
colorboxsalon@gmail.com
2777 Bryant Street SF CA 94110
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Allison Sparkuhl
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:26:03 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,

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,
Allison

Allison Sparkuhl
amsparkuhl@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94118

From: LeLeon Kizine
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:26:40 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,

LeLeon Kizine
Kizinel@gmail.com
150 Berry St. #422
San francisco, California 94107

From: Joan Osato
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:26:42 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,

Joan Osato
joan.osato@gmail.com
743 grove street
San francisco, 994102

From: Taraneh Hemami
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:26:42 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,

Taraneh Hemami
taraneh.hemami@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94121

From: vanessabrown0316@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of V. Brown
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:26:45 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):

We live in the Inner richmond & there is not enough affordable housing nor infrastructure for residents as is. Do not sell us to the highest bidder! Counting on you to fight for us!!

Sincerely,
V. Brown
San Francisco, CA 94118

From:	meganwithpapa@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Megan Adams
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 5:27:28 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,
Megan Adams
San Francisco, CA 94122

From:	chavetch@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Susan Hughes
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 5:28:43 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,

I met you in a neighborhood meeting (Outer Richmond, 45th Avenue).

Please protect our neighborhood from this plan. If it goes through it will ruin it. Also, when the plan says it will add so many affordable units - it's like a joke. Affordable to whom? No person I know can pay for this "affordable" housing. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Susan Hughes
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: lroddan@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lea Ann Roddan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:29:24 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,
Lea Ann Roddan
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: Hannah Cardenas
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:29:45 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!

With gratitude,
Hannah Cardenas, Western Addition resident

Hannah Cardenas
hannah.a.cardenas@gmail.com
1729 Golden Gate Ave
San Francisco, California 94115

From: Randa Talbott
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:30:49 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,

Randa Talbott
RANDATALBOTT@YAHOO.COM
3030 Turk Blvd
San Francisco, California 94118

From: Sophia Tarantino
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:33:20 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,

Sophia Tarantino
sophialenschmidt@gmail.com
291 27th Avenue
San Francisco, California 94121

From: Joann Ricci
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:34:18 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,

Joann Ricci
gravity_helmet_9f@icloud.com
1145 Church St
San Francisco , California 94114

From: Pamela Uberti
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:35:05 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,

Pamela Uberti
pamelauberti@me.com
2290 Stockton Street, 2108
San Francisco, California 94133-1526

From: Rita Rodriguez
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:35:06 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,

Rita Rodriguez
ritarodriguez5353@yahoo.com
118 San Jose Ave #A
San Francisco , California 94110

From: adrian101x@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Adrian Truong
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:36:58 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,
Adrian Truong
San Francisco, CA 94112

From: Ian Blei
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:37:11 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,

Displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need, won't solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments.

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,

Ian Blei

Ian Blei
funk.metalman@yahoo.com

San Francisco, California 94114

From: Angela M. Griffiths
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:37:31 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,

Angela M. Griffiths
ax3heart@icloud.com
600 Silliman street, Unit A
San Francisco, California 94134

From: Lani Asher
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:38:42 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,

Lani Asher
laniasher8@gmail.com
1806 church st
San Francisco , California 94131

From: Lorena Lopez
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:38:52 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,

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,

Lorena Lopez
lo_losart@yahoo.com
768 9th Ave, 16
San Francisco, California 94118

From: dimaseg526@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Dimas Gonzalez
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:39:57 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,
Dimas Gonzalez
San Francisco, CA 94110

From: Terry Ayyad
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:40:20 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,

Terry Ayyad
tariq3699@gmail.com
159 23rd avenue 1
San Francisco , California 94121

From: Robert Rowntree
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: public comments - Family zoning plan
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:41:18 PM

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

i tried to sustain the line on monday , to give my comments. After in line 1 hour i had to go. My district 9 staff suggested corresponding w this "bos" address to submit my comment

robert rowntree 2889 24th St, San Francisco, CA 94110

On the zoning plan under consideration -

San Francisco is legally required to permit 82,000 new homes by 2031, and Mayor Lurie's "family zoning" plan—36,000 homes on the north and west sides—is a critical step forward. Without it, the state could take control of our housing approvals.

Up-zoning alone won't solve the problem. Construction costs need to stay in line with the rents tied to Area Median Income. AMI has grown about 4% a year, but construction costs in San Francisco have been rising at twice that rate - a mismatch jeopardizing affordable financially solvent projects over the longer term.

The contrast is stark: public projects like Potrero Block B or 730 Stanyan cost over $1.1 million per unit, while private projects such as 300 DeHaro deliver homes for under $400,000 per unit. High fees, long permitting timelines, and "everything-bagel" regulations are driving California home construction costs through the roof. A 2025 Rand study comparing costs among similar projects in CA, CO & TX focused on the reasons per sq. foot construction in CA is double or more the cost in Colorado and Texas.

Up-zoning and good finance must go hand in hand. That means cutting red tape, speeding approvals, reducing fees, and protecting small businesses and tenants as new housing comes online. If we can cut production costs even partway toward Texas levels, new CA rents could fall by 15%.

I urge you: approve the family zoning plan, weave in Melgar's eviction limitations, pair it with cost containment, and give San Francisco the abundant, affordable housing we desperately need

From: 321dina@gmail.com
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:41:32 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.

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,

321dina@gmail.com
76 Deming St, Apt D
San Francisco, California 94114

From: Francis Broome
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:42:12 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,

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,
Francis Broome
District 5

Francis Broome
Fjbinsf@gmail.com
615 Fillmore street
San Francisco, California 94117

From: Irma Arias-Greedy
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:42:37 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,
Irma

Irma Arias-Greedy
irmitarias@gmail.com
1361 Broadway
San Francisco , California 94109

From: calihenson@earthlink.net
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:43:36 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,

calihenson@earthlink.net
3300 Scott St
San Francisco, California 94123

From: Katherine wells
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:45:48 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,
Katherine

Katherine wells
kathwwells@yahoo.com

San Francisco, California 94109

From: Patty Cardona
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:48:07 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 continues to create an elist system that serves the ultra rich in this city. While dismantling and displacing the working class.

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. Stand with all social economic communities. Stop privatizing our access housing.

We need bold and common-sense leadership.

Sincerely,
Patty + Family

Patty Cardona
patty_cardona@mac.com
531 Silver Ave
San Francisco, California 94112

From: Jenny Jerez
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:49:43 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,

Jenny Jerez
jenluv@gmail.com
391 Oak Street
San Francisco, California 94102

From: stacy thompson
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:50:54 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,

stacy thompson
stacyt.thompson@gmail.com
120 webster #8
San Francisco, California 94117

From: Rhea Srivats
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:51:33 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,
Rhea

Rhea Srivats
rhea.srivats@gmail.com
801 Fillmore Street
San Francisco, California 94117

From: Beth Middleworth
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:52:35 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,

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, Beth Middleworth

Beth Middleworth
bats4bones@gmail.com
4115 , Lincoln Way #12
San Francisco, California 94122

From: Leslie Brand
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:33:52 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,

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,
Leslie Brand

Leslie Brand
lbrand@me.com
2655 Polk Street, #201
San Francisco, California 94109

From: lygia.stewart@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lygia Stewart
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:34:08 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 destroy the great city you represent-
Try to remember WHY we all live here and LOVE San Francusc

Sincerely,
Lygia Stewart
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: Brittany Newell
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:34:17 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,

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,

Brittany Newell
ratty.writes@gmail.com
770 California St, Apt 504
San Francisco, California 94108

From: Paige Reillt
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:34:41 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,
Paige Reilly

Paige Reillt
1paigereilly@gmail.com
3090 Vicente Street
San Francisco, California 94116

From: hue_khuu@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Hue Khuu
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:35:06 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,
Hue Khuu
San Francisco, CA 94121

From:	dorit7@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Dorit Grunberger
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 4:35:18 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,
Dorit Grunberger

From: Camille Blomgren
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:35:58 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,
Camille Blomgren

Camille Blomgren
camilleblomgren@gmail.com
2047 Turk Blvd. Apt 3
SAN FRANCISCO, California 94115

From: Madelyn Moseley
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:36:26 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,

Madelyn Moseley

Madelyn Moseley
madelynmoseley@gmail.com
1454 Taylor St., Apt. 5
San Francisco, California 94133

From: Diana Lacson
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:37:36 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,

Diana Lacson
dianayak@icloud.con
2396 Pine Street
San Francisco, California 94115

From: fhochschild@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Frances Hochschild
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:38:19 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.

Please also create building standards which don't seem to be in the current plan. I'm most interested in understanding how the plan will ensure that there is consideration to the patterns and rhythms of our neighborhood will continue - stucco, shingles, craftsmen, Mediterranean, etc.

Sincerely,
Frances Hochschild
San Francisco, CA 94115

From: Jacqueline Ali Cordoba
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:38:22 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,

Jacqueline Ali Cordoba
jackiealicordoba@gmail.com
1585 Waller Street, Apt. 2
San Francisco, California 94117

From: Laurie Shanaman
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:39:30 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,

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,

Laurie Shanaman
lshanaman@yahoo.com
78 sycamore
San Francisco , California 94110

From: Ferdinando Penn
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:39:42 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,

Ferdinando Penn
colors2dream@prodigy.net
1996 Chestnut St
San Francisco , California 94123

From: Karin Parks
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:39:58 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,

Karin Parks
ksp_designs@hotmail.com
737 Post Street
San Francisco , 9410@

From: Andie Sanchez
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:40:31 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,
Andie Sanchez

Andie Sanchez
andilyn111@yahoo.com
917 Cole Street
San Francisco , California 94117

From: Erin Gillespie
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:41:08 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,
Erin Gillespie

Erin Gillespie
gillesee@gmail.com
754 Fell St, A
San Francisco, California 94117

From: Berry Minott
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:41:13 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,

Berry Minott
b.minott@me.com

San Francisco, California 94107

From: Erin Nederbo
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:41:13 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,

Erin Nederbo
erinanederbo@gmail.com
669 29th Street
San Francisco, California 94118

From: Linda Blackaby
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:42:07 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,

Linda Blackaby
lindablacksby@me.com

San Francisco, California 94131

From: Kathleen Smith
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:42:14 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,

Kathleen Smith
ludasmith@icloud.com
1499 California street
San Francisco , California 94109

From: Wendi Raw
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:42:14 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've been in San Francisco for many decades and we've seen this before. We've seen the problems that it creates and the lives that are broken. Our city has not gotten better over these decades because of this type of development. In fact, for those of us who have been here long, it has clearly made things worse. 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,

Wendi Raw
wendiraw@gmail.com
3460 16th St
San Francisco, California 94114

From: Mary Bugarin
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:42:17 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,

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,
Mary Bugarin

Mary Bugarin
maria.bugarin7@gmail.com
1130 Filbert Street
San Francisco , California 94109

From: Erika Shershun
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:42:26 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,

Erika Shershun
erikashe@me.com
2028 Hyde St Apt 2
San Francisco , California 94109

From: Samantha Bellach
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:42:40 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,

Samantha Bellach

Samantha Bellach
sambellach@gmail.com
2332 15th St
San Francisco, California 94114

From: VICTOR Antonetti
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:43:09 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,

Victor

VICTOR Antonetti
cinch_steeple_55@icloud.com

San Francisco, California 94114

From: Karen Schanche
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:43:12 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,

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! We do not need more greed to be supported in Laurie's plan. Enough already! Think more creatively for the well being of the communities that make up SF, not just the

wealthy but those that are tenants that also contribute… it would be so much more powerful if we can support the collective in a shared common humanity, not just the wealthy few that are lucky enough to be owners.

Thank you

Sincerely,
Karen Schanche

Karen Schanche
karen.schanche2@ucsf.edu
614 Funston ave
SF, California 94118

From: Teresa Shelly
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:43:32 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,
Teresa

Teresa Shelly
tshelly@gmail.com
65 Sanchez St., Apt. 3
San Francisco, California 94114

From: Michelle Graney
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:43:35 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,

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!

I am unemployed. Controlling my rent is all I have. Please do not do this.

Sincerely,
A girl who loves this city
Michelle Graney

Michelle Graney
michelle94109@gmail.com
480 Warren Dr Apt A
SAN FRANCISCO, California 94131

From: Walter Lenci
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:44:09 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!

SincerelyWalter Lenci,

Walter Lenci
wlenci@gmail.com
1576 Clay Street
San Francisco , California 94109

From: liz lawton
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:45:38 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,

liz lawton
elizabethlawton98@gmail.com
654 castro st apt 1
san francisco , California 94114

From: tika hall
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Stop the evictions- Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:45:55 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,
Tika Hall

tika hall
tikaelhall@gmail.com
24 Kingston St
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Maya Threadgill
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:46:28 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,

Maya Threadgill
threadgillmaya@gmail.com
11 Dedman Court
San Francisco , California 94124

From: Christy Smith
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:46:44 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,

Christy Smith
theivyfox1@gmail.com
7630 Geary Blvd., Apt. 205
San Francisco, California 94121

From:	luigianni@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Andrew Kraft
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 4:46:54 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 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,
Andrew Kraft
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: Jennifer Rey
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:47:06 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,

Jennifer Rey
jennifer.rey@me.com
336 Sanchez Street
San Francisco, California 94114

From: Theresa Schmitter
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:47:11 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,

Theresa Schmitter
theresaschmitter@hotmail.com
785 Brannan Street apt 508
San Francisco , CA 94103

From: Samantha Zylberman
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:47:13 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,
Samantha Zylberman

Samantha Zylberman
szylberman@gmail.com
3130 Webster St, #2
San Francisco, California 94123

From: Cathy Asmus
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:47:24 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,

Cathy Asmus
cathyasmus@gmail.com
1287 Arguello Blvd
San Francisco, California 94122

From: Leonor Melara
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:47:27 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,

Leonor Melara
leonormelara@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94131

From: Gina Sciarrillo
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:47:29 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,
Gina Sciarrillo

Gina Sciarrillo
pop_sickle_star@yahoo.com
545 Birch St
San Francisco, California 94102

From: Gioia Everywhere
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:47:31 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,
Gioia

Gioia Everywhere
abieverywhere@gmail.com
1556 Great Highway, #204
San Francisco, California 94122-2858

From: Paul McCarthy
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:47:44 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 live in a one bedroom studio apartment in your district. I'm 75 years old. Under present San Francisco law I can stay in the apartment so long as I pay the rent. I don't want the city to ok tearing down my apartment building and replacing it with a luxury condo with huge rents.

Paul McCarthy
p_mccarthy@sbcglobal.net
2023 folsom #6
Oakland, California 94612

From: Jennifer Pacheco
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:48:08 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,

Jennifer Pacheco
minajen@yahoo.com
3330 Cesar Chavez St
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Tara Stroud
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:48:13 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,

Tara Stroud
taraloo@hotmail.com
2744 Sacramento
Sf, California 94115

From: Beatrix Jones
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:48:38 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!

Our vibrant city suffers when we prioritize luxury apartments that end up sitting empty over truly affordable housing that enables residents from all walks of life to call San Francisco home.

Sincerely,
Beatrix, a resident of SF district 5

Beatrix Jones
beanotbeah@gmail.com
701 Fell St
San Francisco , California 94117

From: Remyah Nguyen
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:48:44 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,

Remyah Nguyen
r.liam.nguyen@gmail.com
2238 Hyde Street
San Francisco, California 94109

From: Kelsey Moon
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:48:55 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,

Kelsey Moon

Kelsey Moon
kcmoon4347@gmail.com

San Francisco , California 94121

From: Joanna Pablo
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:48:57 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,

Joanna Pablo
joannajpablo@gmail.com
3500 Market St, Apt 102
San Francisco, California 94131

From: Laura Martin
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:49:34 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,

Laura Martin
a.martin.montero@gmail.com
3256 21st street
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Carla Naylor
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:49:37 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,

Carla Naylor
carla2naylor@gmail.com
11 Madrid Ct
Novato, California 94949

From: Lina Lucana
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:49:58 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,

Lina Lucana
ample.87.volleys@icloud.com
750 bacon street
San Francisco, California 94134

From: Sara Brown
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:50:21 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,

Sara Brown
bsara0896@gmail.com
3929 Mission Street
San Francisco, California 94112

From: Korri Piper
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:50:45 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,

Korri Piper

Korri Piper
korripiper@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94121

From: mojodugan@comcast.net
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:50:56 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,
Maureen Dugan RN
California Nurses Association

mojodugan@comcast.net
1454 10th Ave
San Francisco, California 94122

From: Kira Papineau
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:50:57 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,

Kira Papineau
kirapap@yahoo.com
880 Franklin St
San Francisco, California 94102

From: Amy Petrine
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:51:22 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!

SF doesn't need more new market-rate buildings for housing. We need more affordable housing and programs to support our most vulnerable community members. Please remember the true spirit of San Francisco when you vote on this matter. All communities work better when we look out for everyone. Please stay strong for ALL your constituents, not just those who can afford to pour money into your special projects & re-election campaigns. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Amy Petrine
amy.k.petrine@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94121

From: Kathryn Reffell
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:51:37 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. Do your jobs.

Sincerely,

Kathryn.

Kathryn Reffell
LadyActinium@protonmail.com
878 39th Ave, Fulton
San Francisco, California 94121

From: Emily Gifford
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:51:47 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 San Francisco renter I am absolutely appalled by the mayor's plan to indiscriminately allow upzoning without protections for renters and small businesses or stronger carve outs for affordable housing. I know that 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,

Emily Gifford
emily.elisabeth127@gmail.con
2515 Clement St. , APT 1
San Francisco, California 94121

From: JOHN CERVANTES
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:51:57 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,

JOHN CERVANTES
city10s@pacbell.net
532-28th Avenue , 4
San Francisco , California 94121

From: Lynette Betancur
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:51:58 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,

Lynette Betancur
lynette.betancur@yahoo.com
67 Lapidge St
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Frishtah Afifi
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:52:01 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,

Frishtah Afifi
msybi@yahoo.com
78 Johnson Street Apt 518
San Francisco, California 94130

From: stephenzking@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Stephen King
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:52:13 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):please do not implement this plan.

Sincerely,
Stephen King
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: Billie Ferrell
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:52:14 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,

Billie Ferrell
bhferrell91@gmail.com
1650 Jones Street, Apt 115
San Francisco, California 94109

From: Yuka Kanpuri
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:52:24 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,

Yuka Kanpuri
Magicways7@yahoo.com
320 Turk
San Francisco , California 94102

From: winds129@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Nelly Soncuya
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:52:54 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 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,
Nelly Soncuya

From: Sarah Weidman
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:53:25 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,

Sarah Weidman
(sf resident for 20 years, full time student that could not afford to live in San Francisco without rent control).

Sarah Weidman
sarahrweidman@ail.com
1618 Polk Street 17
San Francisco , California 94109

From: Julie Dearborn
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:53:39 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,

Julie Dearborn

Julie Dearborn
juliedearborn@comcast.net
435 22nd Avenue, #3
San Francisco, CA 94131

From: Natalie Waugh
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:53:40 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,

Natalie Waugh
nataliewaugh@gmail.com
1564 Waller St.
San Francisco, California 94117

From: Karen Khouri-Haddad
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:54:03 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,

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,

Karen Khouri-Haddad
karehaddad@aol.com
1388 California St, #306A
san Francisco, California 94109

From: Bronwyn Galloway
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:54:16 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,

Bronwyn Galloway
bkg@awesf.com
601 OFarrell Street , 302
San Francisco , California 94109

From: Abby Van Kirk
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:54:35 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,

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,

Abby Van Kirk
abbyvk2014@yahoo.com
633 , Grand View Ave
San Francisco , California 94114

From: Danielle Hoang
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:55:17 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,

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,

Danielle Hoang
brokenpebblejewelry@gmail.com
129 bache street
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Sarah Mehl
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:55:17 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,

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,

Sarah Mehl
sarahb.mehl@gmail.com
3416 Taraval Street apt 3
San Francisco , California 94116

From: Ellie Vanderlip
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:56:05 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!

Thank you for taking this seriously.
Sincerely,
Ellie Vanderlip

Ellie Vanderlip
ellie.vanderlip@gmail.com
229 21st Avenue unit 5
San Francisco, California 94121

From: Moira DeNike
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:56:33 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,
Moira

Moira DeNike
moiradenike@yahoo.com
2 Mizpah St
San Francisco, California 94131

From: priscilla@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Priscilla Marquis
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:56:42 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,
Priscilla Marquis
San Francisco, CA 94112

From: Brenda Bryant
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:57:21 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,

Brenda Bryant
brenda-leigh@sbcglobal.net
895 34th Avenue , Apt 1
San Francisco, California 94121

From: Tania Campos
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:57:24 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,

Tania Campos
tcampos10@yahoo.com
744 Goettingen Street
San Francisco, California 94134

From: Scarlett Bush
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:57:44 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,

Scarlett Bush
scraffyscarlett@gmail.com
3110 Clay St, Apt 8
San Francisco, California 94115

From: Leah Kennedy
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:57:48 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:
1- Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
2- 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.
3- 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.
4- 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.
5- Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
5- 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 Kennedy

Leah Kennedy
leahelizabethk@gmail.com
844 Baker Street #2
San Francisco, California 94115

From: Tricia Gillespie
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:58:12 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,

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,

Tricia Gillespie
Chesty.gillespie@gmail.com
227 Sanchez Street, 7
San Francisco, California 94114

From: lananramadan@gmail.com
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:58:26 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,

lananramadan@gmail.com
1111 pine st
San Francisco , California 94109

From: Catherine McGinty
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:58:34 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,

Catherine McGinty
catherinemcginty1@fmail.com
2516 Sacramento st
San Francisco , California 94115

From: okneprak@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Susan Karpenko
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 3:55:53 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.

Please do not destroy the integrity of our single family homes in family focused neighborhoods. Consider height of dense housing not more than 40ft, parking and not displacing small businesses. There is already a trending of grocery stores being removed from neighborhoods. Geary Street stiires in outer Richmond district are closing and are in accessible due to lack of parking. Taraval has a similar problem 19th ave to Sunset blvd.. San Francisco is a city and County, it is not fair to impose the same housing mandate that the state might impose on Sacramento/ Yolo County or Los Angeles. Scott Weiner who is the Architect of this plan is not trusted. Please consider more nuanced and reasonable dense housing solutions.

Sincerely,
Susan Karpenko
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: lindadellangelica@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Linda Dell"Angelica
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 3:56:01 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, 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,
Linda Dell'Angelica
San Francisco, CA 94121

From:	foggydawg@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Terrie Gigliotti
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 3:56:36 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.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Terrie Gigliotti
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: djbabe3@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Diana Tam
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 3:56:36 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.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Diana Tam

From: emilydlr50@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Emily De La Rosa
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 3:56:38 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.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Emily De La Rosa
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: emilydlr50@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Emily De La Rosa
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 3:57:20 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):

Sincerely,
Emily De La Rosa
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: momo@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Morris Shooer
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 3:58:00 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,
Morris Shooer
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: Christina Rey
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 3:58:03 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,

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!

Protect all diversity of all renters on this city benefits all districts.

Sincerely,
Christina Rey

Christina Rey
cvanonselen49@gmail.com
1926 Anza Street, Apt 2
San Francisco, California 94119

From: johnkok@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Kok
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 3:58:05 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 Kok
San Francisco, CA 94124

From: mkiss52967@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Margaret Kiss
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 3:58:29 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,
Margaret Kiss
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: LDawydiak@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Leanna Dawydiak
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 3:59:06 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Dear Connie Chan, my supervisor;

As a native born and raised 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):

This is pretty much a "canned" message but it displays my sentiments. I want you to know since this started I've been getting calls from people wanting to buy my house as it's on one of the corridors. I have no intention of selling and resent this which is only happening because of this upzoning crap!

Sincerely,
Leanna Dawydiak
San Francisco, CA 94118

From: lisaikeda@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lisa Ikeda
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 3:59:08 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,
Lisa Ikeda
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: texeira@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lela Texeira
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:01:26 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):

Sincerely,
Lela Texeira
San Francisco, CA 94112

From:	mustang77@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Andrew Cohen
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 4:01:27 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 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,
Andrew Cohen
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: stacylgin@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Stacy Gin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:01:47 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,
Stacy Gin
Daly City, CA 94014

From:	sbraa@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sonia Sherard Braa
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 4:01:54 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 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):
Why do state legislators have the right to change the liveability and character of entire neighborhoods? What about the desires of the current occupants of those neighborhoods who may not want to live in a dense, dark, concrete jungle? Why are the actual homeowners and residents disenfranchised of their right to say how their neighborhoods will be going forward? It's just wrong and it's unhealthy both for people and wildlife to increase density.

Sincerely,
Sonia Sherard Braa
San Francisco, CA 94110

From:	waterwirt@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Wirt Lewis
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 4:01:57 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,
Wirt Lewis
San Francisco, CA 94116

From:	johnkok@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Kok
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 4:02:15 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, (5th generation)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.

Bring back common sense & quit destroying our city.

Sincerely,
John Kok
San Francisco, CA 94124

From: k_kern@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kevin Kern
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:03:29 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.

Additionally this plan decimates the character of the sunset. Furthermore why are we even entertaining this plan knowing we have a population decline not only in the usa but specifically San Francisco. It makes zero sense. The argument that if we don't do this the state will take it over is hyperbole. We the people should have the final say of what happens in our neighborhoods. Stop this political madness.

Sincerely,
Kevin Kern
San Francisco, CA 94116

From:	tomchen99@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Tom Chen
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 4:03:41 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,
Tom Chen

From: dfeifer@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Donald Feifer
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:03:42 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,
Donald Feifer

From: aliciaberberich@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Alicia Berberich
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:04:08 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):
We will lose the flavors of the neighborhoods and all that makes San Francisco so special. This is short sighted.

Sincerely,
Alicia Berberich
San Francisco, CA 94123

From:	raggarwa_1@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Rahul Aggarwal
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 4:04:28 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,
Rahul Aggarwal
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: paula@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Paula Lynch
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:05:27 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 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,
Paula Lynch
San Francisco, CA 94131

From: 5695ant@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Anthony Regala
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:06:51 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):

SF is already unaffordable for so many people who make the city what it is.

Sincerely,
Anthony Regala

From: moorelevander@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of LeVander Brown
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:06:53 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,
LeVander Brown
San Francisco, CA 94103

From:	zizivaga@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Vivian Imperiale
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 4:07:20 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):The City should be proud to have several neighborhoods that were built as residential parks. They have such a history and such charm. Don't alter them and destroy part of S.F. history.

parks like Ingleside Terraces

Sincerely,
Vivian Imperiale
San Francisco, CA 94127

From:	lg88sf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lise Gutelius
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 4:07:51 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

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 grew up in the Sunset, it's more than just a neighborhood to me, it's home. My parents still live in the home they bought decades ago there, and I've seen firsthand how much this community gives to the people who live in it. This upzoning plan isn't about housing people — it's about profit. Tearing down rent-controlled and affordable homes, displacing longtime residents and small businesses, and handing billions to developers without real investment in infrastructure, transit, schools, or services is not progress — it's destruction. We need thoughtful, community-led planning that protects what makes San Francisco livable and equitable — not luxury towers that push out working families and raise our taxes. Please do not sell out our neighborhoods.

Mayor Laurie is doing a great job in all aspects (for far too long we had a lazy useless mayor whose terms were a complete failure. It was disgusting to know she was an S.F. native), except this.

Sincerely,
Lise Gutelius
San Francisco, CA 94108

From: fpazouki@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Fatemah Pazouki
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:08:55 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,
Fatemah Pazouki
San Francisco, CA 94131

From:	thomas@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Thomas Spielbauer
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 4:09:20 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):

Sincerely,
Thomas Spielbauer
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: lvngbdy@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lucia Delgado
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:09:57 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,
Lucia Delgado
San Francisco, CA 94116

From:	alburdulis@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Albert Birsulis
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 4:10:35 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):

Sincerely,
Albert Birsulis
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: soong.sharon@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sharon Soong
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:11:55 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):
We live on Gough at Vallejo. So many beautiful historic homes in this area. This Upzoning will destroy the fabric of this historic neighborhood and others like it. And when does a city become 'saturated'. When is enough, enough? We barely have the necessary infrastructure to support all the residents of SF now. How will it handle thousands more people?

Sincerely,
Sharon Soong
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: juliedearborn@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Julie Dearborn
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:12:42 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 hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

I am a senior citizen living in a rent-controlled apartment near Geary Blvd. I am terrified of losing it. Rent control is what has allowed me to stay in San Francisco. I am skeptical about MayorLurie's assurances that rent controlled buildings will not be demolished. When money is involved, politicians tend to forget about their promises.

Sincerely,
Julie Dearborn
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: judywadesf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Judy Wade
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:12:55 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 fully Mayor Lurie's plan, which will build much needed housing and allow San Francisco to grow to a size that will improve our tax base, support our small businesses, and allow our public schools to thrive as they will be at scale. All neighborhoods will have to sacrifice somewhat to ensure we create a thriving city. San Francisco shops and restaurants used to rely heavily on visitors from the East, North, and South Bay but these areas are now where the destination Shopping malls and economic growth are happening as these regions are of sufficient scale to have a Saks, Eataly and the like.
So let’s build housing — affordable, middle income, 8-10 stories and duplexes. Otherwise we risk becoming a shrinking economic base and population.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):
We u

Sincerely,
Judy Wade
San Francisco, CA 94121

From:	mjeshia@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Margaret Eshia
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 4:15:35 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):

Sincerely,
Margaret Eshia
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: alaskadino@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Dennis Thurston
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:19:18 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,
Dennis Thurston
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: sherrill.foster@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sherrill Foster
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:20:28 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 have lived in this beautiful city for 68 years (born and raised) and developers and billionaire investors need to do more to help with the homelessness problem for real not just to line their pockets and move on!

Maybe the problem is a billionaire mayor who sees the wrong kind of dollar signs for my city!

Sincerely,
Sherrill Foster
San Francisco, CA 94132

From:	Terribel329@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Theresa Belcher
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 4:22:15 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 native San afranciscan, who lives in the sunset District, 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,
Theresa Belcher
San Francisco, CA 94122

From:	eobintalmadge010101@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Robin Talmadge
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 4:25:29 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,
Robin Talmadge
San Francisco, CA 94110

From:	beaubarlotte@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Charlotte Worcester
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 4:27:10 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,
Charlotte Worcester
San Francisco, CA 94131

From: gbirsinl@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Laura Birsinger
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:28:18 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 a second generation San Franciscan and I am very concerned about the impact of the proposed up zoning plan.

We are caving in to Sacramento to pass a 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.

The requirements for SF are based on outdated population/housing estimates. The affordable housing aspect is not a certainty.

There are tens of thousands units within the city which are in the pipeline for development, but they haven't been counted. How about Candlestick? What's happening there?

Please reconsider. We will remember who represented the people and stood up against the unreasonable mandates from Sacramento.

Sincerely,
Laura Birsinger
San Francisco, CA 94132

From:	charleer6@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Charlee Moore
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 4:28:32 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,
Charlee Moore
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: sabaseifu93@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Saba Seifu
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:30:12 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,
Saba Seifu
Schenectady, NY 12345

From: residue.wooden0h@icloud.com
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:30:28 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,

residue.wooden0h@icloud.com

San Francisco, California 94102

From:	sagaris55@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Laura Short
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 4:30:32 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,
Laura Short
San Francisco, CA 94110

From: Kathryn Obertik
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:31:03 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,

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,

Kathryn Obertik
421 Cornwall St 4
SF CA 94118

Kathryn Obertik
supernova771@gmail.com
421 Cornwall St 4
San Francisco, California 94118

From: Jackie Martell
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:31:08 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,

Jackie Martell
jmartell095@gmail.com
1335 pacific ave
San Francisco , California 94109

From: Krista Gustaveson
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:31:23 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,

Krista Gustaveson
kristagustaveson@gmail.com
2460 Chestnut St, Apt 102
San Francisco, California 94123

From: Kelly Sullivan
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:32:53 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,

Kelly Sullivan
msg_kelly@yahoo.com

San Francisco, California 94109

From: Nicole Seguin-Morris
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:33:21 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,

Nicole Seguin-Morris
nicosemo@gmail.com
1605 Cabrillo at
San Francisco, California 94121

From:	dorit7@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Dorit Grunberger
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 4:33:47 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,
Dorit Grunberger

From:	maryanntittle@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of MaryAnn Tittle
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 12:08:42 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 hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
MaryAnn Tittle

From: maryanntittle@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of MaryAnn Tittle
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 12:09:27 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 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,
MaryAnn Tittle

From: Regina Islas
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 12:12:08 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,

We DO CARE. There is no such thing as trickle down affordable housing, and it's well over time that we hit the bullseye directly. See below for instructions, and follow.

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,

Regina Islas
regina.islas@gmail.com
105 Lake St, Apt 12
San Francisco, California 94118

From:	maury.raycroft@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Maurice Raycroft
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 12:28:29 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 hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Sincerely,
Maurice Raycroft
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: Vivienne Hay
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 1:02:59 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:	dadaray2002@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Linda Ray
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 1:27:39 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision. I feel this whole process is rushed and without adequate public comment and discussion. These zoning changes are the most complex and far reaching and many San Franciscans don't even know they are happening. We should be an example of democratic principals here in San Francisco and not cram things through as is being done at the federal level right now. We can do better. I have lived in San Francisco for 52 years in a number of different neighborhoods and I know that city planning can be done in an intelligent manner or we can go back to the mistakes of the "urban renewal" period of the 50's to early 70's when vibrant communities were destroyed in a discriminatory manner now judged to have been a mistake.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Linda Ray
San Francisco, CA 94133

From:	nmorcom@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Neville Morcom
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 1:28:41 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 hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Any limitation of public comment can only be seen by voters as a deliberate attempt to stifle the opinion of residents and to push a decision down our throats.

Sincerely,
Neville Morcom
San Francisco, CA 94111

From:	nmorcom@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Neville Morcom
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 1:28:41 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 hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Any limitation of public comment can only be seen by voters as a deliberate attempt to stifle the opinion of residents and to push a decision down our throats.

Sincerely,
Neville Morcom
San Francisco, CA 94111

From:	dadaray2002@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Linda Ray
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 1:39:07 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.

I have lived in San Francisco for 52 years and feel that this whole process is being rushed so that is can be approved before the residents have a chance to know about it's full implications and have a democratic decision making process. The interests of the super wealthy are now what drives the federal government's priorities, I don't want to see that happen here in San Francisco. We can and must do better for the regular residents that call this city home.

Sincerely,
Linda Ray
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: Scarlett Bush
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 1:43:53 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,

Scarlett Bush
scarlett.rachel14@gmail.com
3110 Clay Street, Apt 8
San Francisco, California 94115

From:	nlfederico@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Nancy Federico
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 2:17:20 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Nancy Federico
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: broazen@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Bernard Roazen
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 3:25:36 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.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Bernard Roazen
San Francisco, CA 94116

From:	sewbig1@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of tracy weiss
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 3:42:41 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,
tracy weiss
San Francisco, CA 94107

From: freyason@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of David Corbett
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 3:43:32 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,
David Corbett
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: Maykuwatani@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of May Yanagi
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 3:43:48 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,
May Yanagi
San Francisco, CA 94118

From:	amillerknight@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Alyssa Miller
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 3:43:53 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,
Alyssa Miller
San Francisco, CA 94121

From:	sophia.woodley@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sophia Katherine Woodley-Von Rothschild
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 3:46:24 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,
Sophia Katherine Woodley-Von Rothschild
San Francisco, CA 94122

From:	bruceolitzky@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Bruce Olitzky
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 3:47:00 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I object to this planned legislation. 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,
Bruce Olitzky
San Francisco, CA 94116

From:	mlogger50@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mary Logger
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 3:47:33 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,
Mary Logger

From:	jeski@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of mike andrewjeski
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 3:47:37 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, 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,
mike andrewjeski
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: edmundsrose@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Roselyn Edmunds
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 3:47:55 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):
As a native San Francisco, I love to travel to our distinct and beautiful neighborhoods and support small businesses in those neighborhoods. They create life, blood vitality community and offer the opportunity for small businesses to thrive and help families. To destroy this continues to destroy the fabric of San Francisco in the name of luxury homes That the average San Francisco cannot afford. I urge you with all my heart to keep the integrity and fiber of San Francisco live through small neighborhoods.

Sincerely,
Roselyn Edmunds
San Francisco, CA 94127

From:	mrd211@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Michael Dryden
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 3:48:00 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,
Michael Dryden
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: hjrezvani@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Huda Rezvani
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 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,

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):

we do not need more useless buildings in sf. please stop building unnecessary infrastructure and potentially causing a worsening housing crisis in sf

Sincerely,
Huda Rezvani
San Francisco, CA 94103

From:	mleontyeva@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mariya Leontyeva
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 3:49:00 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,
Mariya Leontyeva
San Francisco, CA 94118

From:	rosenewton@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Rosemary Newton
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 3:49:54 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 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,
Rosemary Newton

From: theharveysofsf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sarah Harvey
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 3:49:55 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): changing the height of buildings to six and eight stories along transit lines is too high. In addition maps showed a working lot on Taraval between 12th/Forest Side and Funston as allowing six story buildings up to 65'. No transit line is in this area. That lot should be removed from proposal. At least.

Sincerely,
Sarah Harvey
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: wertheimlj@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Linda Wertheim
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 3:50:04 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.

I support additional and fair priced housing but I don't think the existing plan is a good way to go about it.

Sincerely,
Linda Wertheim
San Francisco, CA 94127

From:	kwidoy@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Phyllis Lim
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 3:50:55 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,
Phyllis Lim
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: dmshea@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Debbie Shea Fox
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 3:51:12 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,
Debbie Shea Fox
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: sanlyg@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sanly Guan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 3:54:00 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,
Sanly Guan

From: halog@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Constance Halog
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 3:54:08 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:
Redevelopment has never resulted in more affordable homes, it has gentrified and made unaffordable homes and properties in San Francisco and many other cities. We don't need more luxury condos, we need the neighbourhoods we have now. Stop corporations and developers from buying and destroying existing homes and businesses, and reduce/ eliminate AirBnB short term rentals.

Sincerely,
Constance Halog
San Francisco, CA 94118

From: czyarrow@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Linda Maher
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 3:55:19 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,
Linda Maher
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: guymbarbaro@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Guy Barbaro
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 3:55:26 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):

Sincerely,
Guy Barbaro
San Francisco, CA 94110

From: Corey Smith
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Wednesday, September 10, 2025 7:55:50 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Corey
California

From: Andrea Yeager
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Wednesday, September 10, 2025 10:23:28 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, and a city employee I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,
Andrea Yeager
Children's Librarian

Andrea
California

From: Sherri Samu
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Sunday, September 21, 2025 5:50:37 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,
Sherri Samu
San Francisco tenant

Sherri
California

From: Jennifer Kroot
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Wednesday, October 1, 2025 8:19:16 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

I'm a bay area native and an SF resident since 1989. I will do everything in my power to stop extreme upzoning. I voted for Lurie because I thought he cared about SF and wanted to try to solve affordability and homelessness. Instead it's the same Developer/Airbnb/billionaire priorities as with Breed.
STOP PRETENDING THAT UPZONING WILL HELP ANYONE EXCEPT THE DEVELOPERS AND THE POLITICIANS THAT THEY SUPPORT.

Sincerely, Jennifer Kroot

Jennifer

California

From: Robin Phillips
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 2:13:58 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Robin Phillips
District 8

Oh, and let Scott Weiner know I'm not going to vote for him against Nancy Pelosi. I met him once in person and he couldn't make eye contact with me.

Robin
California

From: Cathy Asmus
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 2:16:51 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Cathy
California

From: Carolyn Mitsi Hanrahan
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 2:17:11 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,

Please help us tenants! No displacement of any tenants!

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,
Carolyn MITSI Hanrahan

Carolyn Mitsi
California

From: Courtney Fedorchek
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 3:01:15 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,
Courtney

Courtney
California

From: Calder Lorenz
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 3:11:02 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Calder
California

From: Catherine Butler
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 3:28:16 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,
Catherine Butler

Catherine
California

From: Lauren Kush
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 3:44:18 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Lauren
California

From: Nikolas McConnie-Saad
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 3:55:44 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

The YIMBY/NIMBY characterization of development misrepresents opposition to development under one giant umbrella. It's a bad faith dichotomy cooked up by pro-development at any cost opportunists. San Francisco, like many cities in the USA has a shameful (racist, and classist) history of displacing marginalized and low-income communities under the saccharine guise of "neighborhood renewal/improvement." The Fillmore, SOMA, and Hayes Valley are just a few prime examples of culturally rich neighborhoods with long-standing vibrant communities that were uprooted and kicked out of the city, never to return.

Lurie's plan promises to do the same thing unless tenant protections are baked into the process. You think the homelessness crisis is bad now, just wait until all the aunties and uncles, grandparents, and young(ish) people in non-tech, non-corporate jobs are kicked out of their rent controlled units and are left to fend for themselves. Thinking that just building a bunch of housing will magically ease the housing situation in SF is akin to believing in trickle down economics. This logic sounds sort of plausible at face value, but it's the same load of crap that has led this country to have gilded age levels of wealth inequality.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-

one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including “warm shells”), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Nikolas
California

From: Frania Feldstein
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 4:17:54 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Frania
California

From: lgpetty
To: Carroll, John (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff
Cc: Chan, Connie (BOS); SherrillStaff; ChanStaff (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Engardio Staff; BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Supervisors: Time to Write Your Own Zoning Plan to Achieve State AND Public Approval.
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 4:56:03 PM

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

Re: the Mayor's Family Zoning Plan -
Oct. 20, 2025 Land Use Agenda
Items 1-4, Files 250966, 250700, 250701 & 250785

Dear Land Use Chair Melgar, Vice Chair Chen and Supervisor Mahmood,

This Mayor's Zoning Plan comes to you after many years in the making at the Planning Dept.

It comes in the name of Compliance with State Law, under threat of "something worse."

But is it really compliance? Or is it simply an unpopular mass of severe concessions and capitulations thrown to an insatiably aggressive State Government?

The Mayor's Plan is overstuffed and bloated with all the things we COULD do, rather than what we NEED to do.

We are delivering to U.S. and foreign investors, global corporate developers & speculators -- everything they could ever wish for -- a deregulated hugely desirable ocean-urban landscape to use for a free-for-all no rules game of demolition, buying, selling, and reselling.

It does not have to
be this way.

This is the time for Supervisors to step up-- to shape a Zoning Plan with moderation and common sense -- listening to those most affected, rather than those who will profit from it. And merely offering a few amendments to the Mayor's Plan is not going to transform it into something that fits San Francisco, or wins public support.

The Mayor's Plan plan is controversial, not because it proposes Change. It is opposed by an unusually large and broad coalition of San Franciscans -- renters, homeowners, seniors and young residents, businesspeople, tenant and environmental protectors.

Why? Because they are opposed to Change? No. It is because they are opposed to

Overcompliance. To Overkill. To overly massive unnecessary upheavals with little reward for them or their children, and few protections from exploitation.

It's not too late to fix this; to achieve Compliant Change AND win widespread approval. It's up to you now to create a better way:

Confine upzoning to vacant land, unused or very little-used nearly empty parcels. Dedicate public lands (including Muni properties) to 100 percent affordable housing, with concrete instructions for funding and infrastructure. Limit construction to eight stories for major boulevards. Limit heights on neighborhood commercial streets and other thru-streets to six-story maximums on corner lots only, with no height increases on surrounding streets. Require a minimum of 25 per cent affordable units and 30 per cent family-size units (3 & 4 & 5 bedrooms) in all market rate residential or mixed-use projects.
Ban demolition of rent-controlled units, and remove all of them from upzoning. Prohibit demolition of historical, cultural & landmarked properties, and legacy busineses. Disallow mergers and conversions. Provide tenant protections per Sup. Chen and small business protections per Sups. Melgar and Chan, and make them <u>stronger</u> than they are now.

This "**Board of Supervisors Zoning Plan"** (together with the Pipeline and 4-6-plex legislation) would be sufficient to comply with RHNA building requirements, especially incentivizing affordable housing.

Supervisors, it's up to you, our elected representatives, to write a reasonable, Compliant Zoning plan that responds to State requirements AND the needs of San Franciscans.

We are counting on you to do this.

A good faith first step would be to hold a Full Board hearing on the Mayor's Plan open to public comment.

Thanks for consideration,

Lorraine Petty

D2/5 Senior voter
Affordable housing Advocate
Seniors and Tenants Advocate
Member, SFTU & SDA

From: Karen Grayson
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 5:05:05 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Karen
California

From: Iris Biblowitz
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: All tenants need protection and real affordable housing that"s secure (not threatened with demolition
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 5:09:50 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, an elder, a retired nurse, a long-time renter, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Iris
California

From: Mart Deans
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 5:19:30 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

Please do not let this become another developer money grab like so many housing projects are. We have plenty of luxury and high end real estate in San Francisco. We need housing to support the vibrant communities of all incomes that make this city great.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Mart
California

From: Marquita Wills
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 5:28:19 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,Ms Wills

Marquita
California

From: Greg Cummings
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 5:41:43 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need. This is big bank and billionaires trying to further reduce fair housing options and eliminate rent control.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.

Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.

Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"). Create a vacancy tax for unoccupied properties being held for investment purposes. Create a speculation tax for high dollar property flipping. Protect & strengthen rent control.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,
Greg Cummings
RICHMOND District

Greg
California

From: Lee Heller
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 6:05:41 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Lee
California

From: Laurel Scotland-Stewart
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 6:28:41 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,
Laurel Scotland-Stewart

Laurel
California

From: Alice Polesky
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 7:00:33 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Alice
California

From: Anandi Worden
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 9:00:11 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,

District 9 and I vote! Protect tenants rights, we are still here and we still vote

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Anandi
California

From: jgracelewis@gmail.com
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 9:54:32 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,

I will be devastated and forced to the streets if Laurie's upzoning proposal goes through.

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,
Jeannine Lewis

California

From: Farshid Fakhraei
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 10:33:27 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Farshid
California

From: Tiffany Konyen
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability! Make SF work for Workers!
Date: Saturday, October 18, 2025 10:06:52 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Tiffany
California

From: Neil Meerani
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Saturday, October 18, 2025 10:32:38 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Neil
California

From: mrothe@ccsf.edu
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Sunday, October 19, 2025 1:30:18 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely, Marianne Rothe

California

From: Sasha Gala
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Sunday, October 19, 2025 9:48:32 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan won't fix San Francisco's affordability crisis — it will accelerate displacement of renters and small businesses while incentivizing luxury development over homes our communities actually need.
The Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods — tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates — urges you to support a better path forward.
As a constituent, I ask that any upzoning include:
• Build without displacement — Use creative financing and local union labor to build the already-approved housing pipeline while protecting existing residents.
• Landbank public and soft sites — Reserve them for workforce, senior, family, and community housing.
• Guarantee real affordability — Strengthen inclusionary requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom — including releasing voter-approved housing funds.
• Protect families — Require both minimum and maximum family-size units in "family zones" and eliminate permanent density giveaways.
• Protect small businesses and rent-controlled homes — No demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation at real cost ("warm shells"), and enforce the vacancy tax.
San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-led planning — not rushed deregulation that repeats past mistakes. Please work with us to deliver real housing for families, seniors, and workers.
Sincerely,
Sasha Gala

Sasha
California

From: Eleanor Cox
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Sunday, October 19, 2025 10:31:21 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

-Close the SB 330 loopholes:
+Require 1:1 replacement of rental with rental units (not condos)
+Give all tenants a right to return at their existing rent regardless of their income levels
-Ask the City to identify an office tasked with overseeing and enforcing the tenant protection provisions coming from the new Tenant Protections Ordinance
-Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
-Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
-Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
-Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Eleanor
California

From: Robyn Miles
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Sunday, October 19, 2025 11:17:41 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Robyn
California

From:	Sam Woodworth
To:	Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS)
Cc:	Chan, Connie (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Tanner, Rachael (CPC)
Subject:	Family Zoning Plan Renderings
Date:	Wednesday, October 22, 2025 10:22:19 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I discovered that the renderings -- critical to illustrate my hearing comments on Monday -- did not come through. These are now below. I'm confident you'll agree the result is **horrifying**.

VALPARAISO


VALPARAISO


Fisherman's Wharf Today
Four Stories
Under Proposed "Family" Zoning Plan
6 & 8 Stories

Indeed, I consider the upzoning of the waterfront to be the most irresponsible -- even grotesque -- urban planning proposal of my lifetime. Worse even than building freeways into our downtowns and neighborhoods. It is simply unconscionable.

Justifying this action by reference to the State Density Bonus is a huge mistake. As you may be aware, there is a ballot initiative that will be in qualification over the next year to override all of Sacramento's appallingly undemocratic usurpations of local land use authority. Through incremental and little-noticed changes in state law, the fate of neighborhoods is now almost entirely in the hands of unaccountable bureaucrats far removed from the lives of the people most affected. Those laws can and I'm confident will be erased by the voters through direct democracy. In contrast, this legislation would be very hard to undo, and the most iconic part of San Francisco -- the single most visited and beloved part of the city, which not surprisingly features as your committee's own website backdrop -- would suffer severe and irreparable harm.

This up-zoning of the waterfront, if allowed to proceed, will remain infamous long into the future, and the rapidly expanding number of San Franciscans who know what is happening -- who *will* know what was stolen from the people of San Francisco for the greed of developers -- will never allow this to be forgotten. Do not let this be your legacy.

Sincerely,
Sam Woodworth

On Monday, October 20, 2025 at 09:36:26 AM PDT, Sam Woodworth <samuelwoodworth@yahoo.com> wrote:

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors Land Use and Transportation Committee,

I'm writing to oppose moving the so-called Family Zoning Plan to the full Board. The plan fails to address the affordability crisis. Instead, it hands windfalls to wealthy property owners and turns San Francisco over to developers and speculators. Moreover, from canvasing neighborhoods, appears that less than 10% of residents are even aware of this plan – the most radical and permanent reshaping of San Francisco in its history. This plan will have serious negative effects on San Francisco neighborhoods and commercial streetscapes. Below I've also included renderings of some of the effects on our waterfront. But first I offer thoughts on why this plan is unwarranted and fails to meet its own putative objectives.

1. <u>A flawed premise</u>

The housing numbers driving this plan are based on fiction. According to the State Department of Finance, San Francisco's population is projected to grow by only 16,937 people by 2050. Yet the State's housing mandate requires the City to plan for 82,000 new

units by 2031—enough to house roughly 172,000 new residents.

That's a tenfold mismatch between reality and mandate. No credible economic model supports the idea that private developers will build housing far beyond market demand. The assumption that "supply alone" will bring down prices ignores the data: unaffordability is driven by wealth concentration, not zoning. The "Family" Zoning Plan is founded on the same trickle-down logic that has repeatedly failed in practice.

2. This is not a plan

What's before the public is not a planning document. Even Planning Commissioners have acknowledged that it lacks the essential components of a genuine plan: there's no implementation timeline or construction sequencing; no infrastructure, transportation, or open-space analysis; no comprehensive three-dimensional visualization or urban design framework (indeed the renderings from Planning Commission Staff are quite deceptive, mostly omitting the waterfront towers that the plan calls for – even from views clearly encompassing the relevant areas – while presenting a rosy and largely unchanged view).

This "plan" is a glorified spreadsheet, not a vision. The absence of physical or fiscal planning means this "plan" cannot claim to manage growth responsibly, especially in neighborhoods that already struggle with congestion, outdated utilities, and limited public space.

3. The Inclusion of the Northeast Waterfront and Historic North Beach Commercial Districts Was Improper and Unjustified

The decision to include District 3—and particularly the Northeast Waterfront—was made secretively this spring, without public process or prior technical study. Fisherman's Wharf, Telegraph Hill, and North Beach were never identified as housing opportunity areas in any prior plan. Yet the new maps show widespread height and density increases across some of the City's most visited and historically sensitive areas.

The result is a massive, unvetted upzoning that invites speculative development with no assurance or even likelihood of affordability or infrastructure support. This is not responsible planning—it's a political maneuver that places irreversible pressure on the city's most visible and beloved waterfront.

4. Overcapacity issues

Even if one accepts the State's inflated targets, the City already meets and exceeds them. Under 2023 legislation signed by Mayor Breed, fourplexes and sixplexes are now permitted citywide, creating zoned capacity for roughly 400,000 new homes. Another 70,000 units are already entitled or under construction.

That's six times more than the state's assigned goal. Meanwhile, nearly 46,000 of the required 82,000 units must be affordable—at an estimated cost of $19 billion. The barrier to meeting that goal is financing, not zoning. The Family Zoning Plan does nothing to fund or deliver affordability.

5. The waterfront wall

The proposed upzoning of the Northeast Waterfront is one of the most unwarranted elements of the plan. At Fisherman's Wharf, height limits would rise to 65 feet across at least 11 blocks,

and to 85 feet—eight+ stories—on roughly 17 more. Along Columbus Avenue, height increases would extend for many blocks.

These changes would create a continuous wall of high-rises, three blocks deep and ten blocks wide, severing the city's defining visual and cultural connection to the Bay. Public vistas from the sloping streets of Telegraph and Russian Hills—views that have inspired painters, filmmakers, and millions of residents—would be erased.

Renderings below illustrate the scale of this damage. The claim that these height increases would be "barely visible" is simply a lie. The loss would be permanent and profound.

City officials have at times noted that the State Density Bonus law already allows 8-story buildings, and that this plan is meant as an "off-ramp" to design within City-imposed constraints. This is true in certain circumstances, but the density bonus law presents developers with considerable uncertainty and requires a series of special requirements, whereas the current plan simply puts the City's stamp of approval on walling off the waterfront.





6. Displacement

City staff often insist that rent-controlled buildings are protected and that demolitions are rare. Yet recent legislation has loosened demolition and redevelopment restrictions, and history consistently shows that upzoning accelerates speculation. Higher land values attract luxury developers, not affordable builders, leading to small business closures and tenant displacement.

To frame this community concern as "obstruction" is offensive. Residents are not opposing housing—they are defending the right to build responsibly, with equity and infrastructure in mind.

7. Manufactured "abundance"

Recent events surrounding the Mayor's Sept. 11 rally made clear that this plan lacks public legitimacy. The vast majority of attendees were there to protest, not celebrate. The reality is that the so-called "Family Zoning Plan" allows 75% of new units to be studios or one-bedrooms, while marketing itself as "family housing."

Calling that "family-friendly" is a branding exercise, not a policy. The rhetoric of "abundance" serves as cover for deregulation that benefits a narrow group of developers and investors, not San Franciscans in need of affordable homes.

Mayor Lurie is doing a great job in so many areas, as are you, the Board. We all know that this plan is essentially the handiwork of one person: Scott Wiener. Don't let his seeming nihilistic vendetta against the thriving neighborhoods of San Francisco destroy your legacy.

8. What real solutions look like

San Francisco already has models of what works. North Beach Place, a two-block, 341-unit, 100% affordable community serving families and seniors, is one such example. It integrates mixed incomes, local retail, and livability and enhances neighborhood character.

If the City truly wants to advance affordability, it should invest in projects like these—for example, replacing facilities such as the Pier 39 parking structure with mixed-use affordable housing, rather than upzoning historic neighborhoods for speculative towers.

9. We need leadership

This plan passed the Planning Commission on a 4–3 vote, carried only by the Mayor's recent appointees. That narrow margin speaks volumes about the plan's quality and legitimacy.

The Family Zoning Plan is not a strategy for affordability; it is a developer-driven land giveaway that undermines democratic oversight and jeopardizes the character of San Francisco's most iconic neighborhoods.

I respectfully urge you to:

A. Reject the plan in its current form;

B. Remove Fisherman's Wharf and Columbus Avenue from the upzoning map; and
C. Commit to a genuine housing strategy focused on affordability, infrastructure, and environmental integrity.

San Francisco deserves a plan grounded in real data and public trust—not another political slogan masquerading as policy.

Thank you,

Sam Woodworth

From: Sam Woodworth
To: Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject: Opposition to Current Form of Family Zoning Plan
Date: Wednesday, October 22, 2025 1:32:40 AM

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

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors Land Use and Transportation Committee,

I'm writing to oppose moving the so-called Family Zoning Plan to the full Board. The plan fails to address the affordability crisis. Instead, it hands windfalls to wealthy property owners and turns San Francisco over to developers and speculators. Moreover, from canvasing neighborhoods, appears that less than 10% of residents are even aware of this plan – the most radical and permanent reshaping of San Francisco in its history. This plan will have serious negative effects on San Francisco neighborhoods and commercial streetscapes. Below I've also included renderings of some of the effects on our waterfront. But first I offer thoughts on why this plan is unwarranted and fails to meet its own putative objectives.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->1. <!--[endif]-->A flawed premise

The housing numbers driving this plan are based on fiction. According to the State Department of Finance, San Francisco's population is projected to grow by only 16,937 people by 2050. Yet the State's housing mandate requires the City to plan for 82,000 new units by 2031—enough to house roughly 172,000 new residents.

That's a tenfold mismatch between reality and mandate. No credible economic model supports the idea that private developers will build housing far beyond market demand. The assumption that "supply alone" will bring down prices ignores the data: unaffordability is driven by wealth concentration, not zoning. The "Family" Zoning Plan is founded on the same trickle-down logic that has repeatedly failed in practice.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->2. <!--[endif]--> This is not a plan

What's before the public is not a planning document. Even Planning Commissioners have acknowledged that it lacks the essential components of a genuine plan: there's no implementation timeline or construction sequencing; no infrastructure, transportation, or open-space analysis; no comprehensive three-dimensional visualization or urban design framework (indeed the renderings from Planning Commission Staff are quite deceptive, mostly omitting the waterfront towers that the plan calls for – even from views clearly encompassing the relevant areas – while presenting a rosy and largely unchanged view).

This "plan" is a glorified spreadsheet, not a vision. The absence of physical or fiscal planning means this "plan" cannot claim to manage growth responsibly, especially in neighborhoods that already struggle with congestion, outdated utilities, and limited public space.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->3. <!--[endif]-->The Inclusion of the Northeast Waterfront and Historic North Beach Commercial Districts Was Improper and Unjustified

The decision to include District 3—and particularly the Northeast Waterfront—was made

secretively this spring, without public process or prior technical study. Fisherman's Wharf, Telegraph Hill, and North Beach were never identified as housing opportunity areas in any prior plan. Yet the new maps show widespread height and density increases across some of the City's most visited and historically sensitive areas.

The result is a massive, unvetted upzoning that invites speculative development with no assurance or even likelihood of affordability or infrastructure support. This is not responsible planning—it's a political maneuver that places irreversible pressure on the city's most visible and beloved waterfront.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->4. <!--[endif]-->Overcapacity issues

Even if one accepts the State's inflated targets, the City already meets and exceeds them. Under 2023 legislation signed by Mayor Breed, fourplexes and sixplexes are now permitted citywide, creating zoned capacity for roughly 400,000 new homes. Another 70,000 units are already entitled or under construction.

That's six times more than the state's assigned goal. Meanwhile, nearly 46,000 of the required 82,000 units must be affordable—at an estimated cost of $19 billion. The barrier to meeting that goal is financing, not zoning. The Family Zoning Plan does nothing to fund or deliver affordability.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->5. <!--[endif]-->The waterfront wall

The proposed upzoning of the Northeast Waterfront is one of the most unwarranted elements of the plan. At Fisherman's Wharf, height limits would rise to 65 feet across at least 11 blocks, and to 85 feet—eight+ stories—on roughly 17 more. Along Columbus Avenue, height increases would extend for many blocks.

These changes would create a continuous wall of high-rises, three blocks deep and ten blocks wide, severing the city's defining visual and cultural connection to the Bay. Public vistas from the sloping streets of Telegraph and Russian Hills—views that have inspired painters, filmmakers, and millions of residents—would be erased.

Renderings below illustrate the scale of this damage. The claim that these height increases would be "barely visible" is simply a lie. The loss would be permanent and profound.

City officials have at times noted that the State Density Bonus law already allows 8-story buildings, and that this plan is meant as an "off-ramp" to design within City-imposed constraints. This is true in certain circumstances, but the density bonus law presents developers with considerable uncertainty and requires a series of special requirements, whereas the current plan simply puts the City's stamp of approval on walling off the waterfront.





<!--[if !supportLists]-->6. <!--[endif]-->Displacement

City staff often insist that rent-controlled buildings are protected and that demolitions are rare. Yet recent legislation has loosened demolition and redevelopment restrictions, and history consistently shows that upzoning accelerates speculation. Higher land values attract luxury developers, not affordable builders, leading to small business closures and tenant displacement.

To frame this community concern as "obstruction" is offensive. Residents are not opposing housing—they are defending the right to build responsibly, with equity and infrastructure in mind.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->7. <!--[endif]-->Manufactured "abundance"

Recent events surrounding the Mayor's Sept. 11 rally made clear that this plan lacks public legitimacy. The vast majority of attendees were there to protest, not celebrate. The reality is that the so-called "Family Zoning Plan" allows 75% of new units to be studios or one-bedrooms, while marketing itself as "family housing."

Calling that "family-friendly" is a branding exercise, not a policy. The rhetoric of "abundance" serves as cover for deregulation that benefits a narrow group of developers and investors, not San Franciscans in need of affordable homes.

Mayor Lurie is doing a great job in so many areas, as are you, the Board. We all know that this plan is essentially the handiwork of one person: Scott Wiener. Don't let his seeming nihilistic vendetta against the thriving neighborhoods of San Francisco destroy your legacy.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->8. <!--[endif]-->What real solutions look like

San Francisco already has models of what works. North Beach Place, a two-block, 341-unit, 100% affordable community serving families and seniors, is one such example. It integrates mixed incomes, local retail, and livability and enhances neighborhood character.

If the City truly wants to advance affordability, it should invest in projects like these—for example, replacing facilities such as the Pier 39 parking structure with mixed-use affordable housing, rather than upzoning historic neighborhoods for speculative towers.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->9. <!--[endif]-->We need leadership

This plan passed the Planning Commission on a 4–3 vote, carried only by the Mayor's recent appointees. That narrow margin speaks volumes about the plan's quality and legitimacy.

The Family Zoning Plan is not a strategy for affordability; it is a developer-driven land giveaway that undermines democratic oversight and jeopardizes the character of San Francisco's most iconic neighborhoods.

I respectfully urge you to:

<!--[if !supportLists]-->A. <!--[endif]-->Reject the plan in its current form;

B. Remove Fisherman's Wharf and Columbus Avenue from the upzoning map; and
C. Commit to a genuine housing strategy focused on affordability, infrastructure, and

environmental integrity.

San Francisco deserves a plan grounded in real data and public trust—not another political slogan masquerading as policy.

Thank you,

Sam Woodworth

From: John Crabtree
To: Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Sciammas, Charlie (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Cooper, Raynell (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject: PUBLIC COMMENT 10/20 LUTC hearing)-Don"t Upzone the Coastal Zone
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 6:13:41 PM

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

I am submitting this as PUBLIC COMMENT for the four agenda items regarding the Family Upzoning Plan, to which I am expressing opposition because the Upzoning Plan makes the crucial error of upzoning in the Coastal Zone. There are many other issuess with this Upzoning Plan, however, I believe that this is the worst and if it is not addressed then no amount of winnowing at the edges will make this upzoning palletable.

Put the Coastal Zone before Upzoning... put infrastrucutre before density... put tenants before developers... put labor unions before developers... c'mon, put people before profits/developers/billionaires for a change... John Crabtree

Don't Upzone the Coastal Zone

A lot of bad ideas in the SF Upzoning Plan, but this one is the worst IMO.

JOHN CRABTREE
OCT 21

I provided an abbreviated version of the following testimony (in-person) to the SF Board of Supervisors Land Use & Transportation Committee at the hearing on these matters on Monday, October 20th. I also provided it today as public comment before the DCCC by electronically submitting it there and I will attend the meeting on 10/22 and do my best to deliver these comments in person. Lastly, I am submitting the comments herewith to the BOS LUTC members and staff.

John Crabtree
1375 35th Ave
The Sunset
San Francisco CA
94122
563-581-2867

City and County of San Francisco

Board of Supervisors

Land Use and Transportation Committee

Re: LUTC 10/20/25 — Genera Plan Amendments – Family Zoning Plan -- Local Coastal Program Amendments – Family Zoning Plan

Position(s): OPPOSE

Supervisors,

My name is John Crabtree; I am a resident of District 4. I am here today to provide comments in opposition to the Family Zoning Plan provisions currently on your agenda – particularly regarding General Plan Amendments to the Western Shoreline Plan and Local Coastal Program Amendments to the Zoning Map and legislation established in the Family Zoning Plan.

Much ado has been made in the media and the debate around the so-called "Family Zoning Plan" — points and counterpoints about whether, or not, the Upzoning Plan will turn the Western Shoreline Coastal Zone into "Miami Beach."

Unfortunately, that debate has become little more than accusation and denial. But there are issues here that cannot be denied. There are General Plan amendments to the Western Shoreline Plan and amendments to create a new Local Coastal Program in the Family Zoning Plan that is being considered here today for submission to the California Coastal Commission.

Whether or not you believe any of these matters have anything to do with turning the Western Shoreline into Miami Beach or Waikiki Beach, it simply cannot be denied that the Family Zoning Plan ***intent*** is to bring upzoning into the Coastal Zone, to create a local coastal zoning program to enhance development in the coastal zone, to create a precedent for upzoning in the coastal zone and create opportunities to develop and increase upzoning in the coastal zone in the future.

The California Coastal Act – was established in 1976 and will turn 50 next year, in 2026. The Coastal Act has, for very nearly half a century, served as a comprehensive policy framework that safeguards California's coastline. The Coastal Act was, in 1976, as it is today a pivotal policy commitment to stewardship of the coast. The Act itself states that the coast is, "a distinct and valuable resource of vital and enduring interest to all the people" and that it must be preserved for future generations.

Fortunately, the existence of the Coastal Zone and Coastal Commission jurisdiction delineates all of the embedded changes within the Family Zoning Plan with a bright line. General Plan changes (e.g. Western Shoreline Plan amendments), Zoning Map changes and the creation of a new Local Coastal (zoning) Program must all be submitted to and approved by the Coastal Commission. I urge you to oppose all such amendments embedded within the Family Zoning Plan.

There is no compelling argument to alter the Western Shoreline Plan nor to upzone in the Coastal Zone. Senator Wiener, at a recent meeting in The Sunset, said that the Coastal Zone needs to be diminished to allow for more development. But his arguments are decidedly NOT compelling.

Supervisors, there is a clear pathway to support the Coastal Zone and the Coastal Act, to defend the Western Shoreline and to preserve and protect, arguably, the greatest natural resource that we have here in San Francisco — Ocean Beach and the Coastal Zone and Western Shoreline.

I urge you to oppose all of the provisions embedded in the Family Zoning Plan that extend upzoning into the Coastal Zone.

Thank you.

Though the Heavens Fall... by John Crabtree is a reader-supported publication. To support my work, consider becoming a subscriber.

From:	Jesse Rawlins
To:	Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject:	Public comment letter for Family Upzoning Plan
Date:	Tuesday, October 21, 2025 4:42:50 PM
Attachments:	Outlook-tndc_logo_.png TNDC Public Comment - Family Upzoning Plan.pdf

---

Hi John,

I am hoping to submit a public comment letter as part of the official record for the Land Use and Transportation Committee's deliberations on the Family Upzoning Plan. I know the first committee meeting was yesterday, but by sending now, would that allow our letter to be for future committee meetings?

Best,

Jesse Rawlins, MSW, Policy and Administration Practice
Policy Manager
email: jrawlins@tndc.org
mobile: (415) 361-0967

Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation (TNDC)
210 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102
www.tndc.org

At TNDC, we believe that everyone deserves to thrive. We support tenants and community members in building transformative communities through Homes, Health, and Voice. Together, we can build a future with economic and racial equity. Join us at tndc.org!

Jesse Rawlins, Policy Manager
Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation
201 Eddy Street
San Francisco, CA 94102

October 20, 2025

Supervisor Myrna Melgar, Chair
Supervisor Chyanne Chen, Vice-Chair
Supervisor Bilal Mahmood, Member
City of San Francisco Board of Supervisors Land Use and Transportation Committee
1 Dr Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

RE: Amendment for Family Upzoning Plan and Future Considerations

Supervisors Melgar, Chen, and Mahmood:

The Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation (TNDC) seeks to provide public comment for the Family Upzoning Plan and urges support for the Affordable Housing Special Use District (AHSUD) proposal and considerations for a future dedicated revenue stream and more equitable housing planning. These recommendations will help achieve affordability in the Family Upzoning Plan and progress local housing policy.

Recommendation No. 1: Affordable Housing Special Use District (AHSUD)

The AHSUD proposal is one tool to better ensure affordability in housing as part of the Family Upzoning Plan. Quite simply, the affordable sector cannot compete with the private housing market with increased zoning. By supporting this amendment, prioritizing and reserving viable parcels of land will allow for affordable housing development to be competitive and possible. Without this provision, the plan's goal of benefitting San Franciscans that face affordability challenges will not be readily achieved.

Recommendation No. 2: New, dedicated revenue stream

While developing a new revenue stream is outside of the Family Upzoning Plan, developing a long-term funding source in the future will be critical to support affordability through increased zoning and more. Previous measures have been piecemeal approaches focused on units in the development pipeline while a long-term, sustainable revenue stream should increase resources to address the larger affordability challenge. A recent National Low Income Housing Coalition (NLIHC) report identified a lack of 169,558 affordable homes locally, and new revenue should be developed to solve that problem and increase affordable housing overall.

Recommendation No. 3: Equitable housing planning

Planning future needs of housing mainly relies on economic factors including income levels. In San Francisco, the largest population increase is for those with the highest incomes, which is used to determine the need for housing. In doing so, a de-facto unaffordable housing system is created. In addition, housing planning does not consider displacement to determine need. Housing planning should not uniquely rely on population increases by income level but should aim to ensure housing allows for diverse income levels and account for displacement.

TNDC requests support to amend the Family Upzoning Plan to incorporate the AHSUD provision and requests future considerations for developing a new revenue stream and ensuring housing planning is equitable. Through these efforts, San Francisco can meet the local housing need that is affordable to all.

Thank you,

Jesse Rawlins, Policy Manager
Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation

From:	Carroll, John (BOS)
To:	"Stephen Torres"
Cc:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Sciammas, Charlie (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Cooper, Raynell (BOS)
Subject:	RE: 2025.10.20 Letter Re: Family Zoning Plan
Date:	Tuesday, October 21, 2025 12:08:00 PM
Attachments:	image001.png 2025.10.20%20Letter%20to%20Land%20Use%20&%20Transportation%20Re-%20Family%20Zoni.pdf

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. 250700
- Board of Supervisors File No. 250701
- Board of Supervisors File No. 250966

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: Stephen Torres <stephenjontorres@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:55 PM
To: Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>
Cc: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>

Subject: 2025.10.20 Letter Re: Family Zoning Plan

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

Dear Clerk Carroll,

Please see attached my comments from today's hearing.

Thanks so much,

Stephen Torres

Stephen Torres
Mission-Bernal
San Francisco, California

October 20, 2025

The Land Use & Transportation Committee of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 250
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, California 94102

Chairperson Melgar and Committee Members,

Before you is the disingenuously named *Family Zoning Plan.* The name is disingenuous because, as countless public testimonies and data have detailed, this plan does nothing to actually ensure housing for families. It does little but ensure that developers can now access thousands of residential and commercial parcels with almost no regulation and property owners can sell their property for several times its current value. It is also likely to make thousands of San Franciscans homeless, hundreds of small businesses close, and irrevocably change our city all without adequate funding or infrastructure in the face of serious challenges ranging from transportation to natural disasters to climate change.

Chairperson Melgar, Supervisors Chan, Chen and other supervisors have introduced amendments to mitigate the egregious impacts of this plan, such as the loss of rent controlled housing. I appreciate this work and encourage this committee to pursue those that which ensures that the total of all existing housing stock is protected from demolition, that small businesses are preserved, & that our neighbourhoods and city are preserved, even it requires sending this legislation back.

One recurring claim is that nothing can be done as our elected representatives in Sacramento are holding a gun to our heads with punitive measures and defunding as threats against San Franciscans. I caution against this messaging as it may signal unintended complicity and lack of fortitude. If our local leaders claim to be powerless to stop this kind of deregulation and removal of protections for the people of San Francisco, what can we expect as even more edicts imperiling San Franciscans are handed down from Sacramento or even Washington? To dismiss this, and imply that housing deregulation is hardly the same as the other ways in which San Francisco is being endangered , I would ask that our leaders consider what it is like to be evicted, to be an elder who will die on the street, to have a family business close and lose one's livelihood, or to be displaced from your generational community. The silencing and removal of our City's most vulnerable have historically come in many forms.

To imply that compliance with law, srate or otherwise, regardless of how it targets our most vulnerable sets a dangerous precedent. I implore us to use the same bravery and conviction we do when we decry other bullying and threats made toward San Francisco and apply it to the

legislative coercion being employed by leadership in Sacramento, people who purport to represent us just as you do.

Sincerely,

Stephen Torres
District 8 & 9 Worker
District 9 Resident

From:	Carroll, John (BOS)
To:	Joe Chmielewdki
Cc:	Marie; Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Sciammas, Charlie (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Cooper, Raynell (BOS)
Subject:	RE: Amend 250966 To Include REAL Tenant Protections
Date:	Tuesday, October 21, 2025 12:08:00 PM
Attachments:	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. 250700
- Board of Supervisors File No. 250701
- Board of Supervisors File No. 250966

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: Joe Chmielewdki <jcin506@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, October 20, 2025 12:04 PM
To: Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>
Cc: Joe Chmielewski <jcin506@yahoo.com>; Marie <marieamelie@sbcglobal.net>
Subject: Amend 250966 To Include REAL Tenant Protections

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

To: Clerk John Carroll
Land Use and Transportation Committee

From: Joseph Chmielewski
50 Golden Gate Ave, #506
SF, CA 94102
(mobile): 415.756-2913

Subject: Amend 250966 To Include REAL Tenant Protections

Good Afternoon,

I have lived and voted in San Francisco as a tenant for over 44 years and I am asking that you amend the Mayor's "Family Zoning Plan" (250966) so it brings affordability and real tenant protections to the people of San Francisco:

• Amend the plan to remove all rent controlled parcels.
•Create a Tenant Protection Ordinance that protects all rent controlled housing citywide from demolition and "major alterations" by creating stricter Objective Criteria.

Close the SB 330 loopholes:
•Require 1:1 replacement of rental with rental units (not condos).
•Give all tenants a right to return at their existing rent regardless of their income levels.
•Identity or create an office tasked with overseeing and enforcing the tenant protection provisions coming from the new Tenant Protections Ordinance.
•Show us a concrete plan for affordable housing and back it with ACTUAL FUNDING and expand rent control to new construction.

Mayor Lurie must stand up for our city against Scott Wiener's overreach. his hands are not tied, he can stand up to the State's overreach like many other cities in California have.

The Mayor must engage state representatives Haney, Stefani, Weiner to amend SB 330 to include protections for tenants of all incomes and a lookback period for tenant occupancy longer than 5 years. Stop hiding behind state laws while doing nothing to

change them!

Tell Matt Haney to Repeal Costa Hawkins, Reform the Ellis Act, and Amend the Housing Crisis Act to all protect rent controlled units which he never attempted to do.

Add amendments to the Mayor's "Family Zoning Plan" so it brings affordability and real tenant protections to the people of San Francisco!

Thank you.

Regards,

Joseph Chmielewski

From:	Carroll, John (BOS)
To:	Noah Garcia
Cc:	Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Sciammas, Charlie (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Cooper, Raynell (BOS)
Subject:	RE: Family Zoning Plan public comment
Date:	Tuesday, October 21, 2025 12:08:00 PM
Attachments:	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. 250700
- Board of Supervisors File No. 250701
- Board of Supervisors File No. 250966

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: Noah Garcia <noahgarcia80@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 20, 2025 3:12 PM
To: Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>
Subject: Family Zoning Plan public comment

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

Hi Clerk Carroll,

Please find attached my public comments for the record on the Family Zoning Plan items before the Land Use and Transportation Committee today:

To the members of the committee, thank you for the opportunity to provide comment today. I'm Noah Garcia, I'm a renter in D5, and I respectfully urge a clean approval of a state-compliant Family Zoning Plan before you today.

I really enjoy living in San Francisco, and for that reason, I recognize that the city has to evolve and adapt to change. Average rent is now spiraling upwards over $3,300 a month, which is plainly unaffordable for so many residents that want to keep living here, let alone families that want to find a 2- or 3-bedroom home in the city.

The Family Zoning Plan lays the groundwork to create much needed homes that play to the city's strengths and alleviate the dearth of affordable housing here. By continuing to build near essential services and world-class amenities, we give San Franciscans more choices, not less. By building near some of the best transit systems in the country, we give San Franciscans more opportunities, not less. So let's do more to keep SF within reach for current and future residents by moving forward with a clean approval of the Family Zoning Plan – thank you.

Noah Garcia

From:	Carroll, John (BOS)
To:	Samantha Davis
Cc:	Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Sciammas, Charlie (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Cooper, Raynell (BOS)
Subject:	RE: Land Use Question
Date:	Tuesday, October 21, 2025 12:08:00 PM
Attachments:	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. 250700
- Board of Supervisors File No. 250701
- Board of Supervisors File No. 250966

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: Samantha Davis <davissa.sf@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 20, 2025 2:20 PM
To: Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>
Subject: Land Use Question

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

Question: Can anyone who has been part of this plan name a development in Hayes Valley or in the Mission that has led to a lower-priced housing effect in those areas? It seems by in large those well meaning new buildings never have the trickle down impact they are advertised to have and only lead to increased price in the housing stock.

Samantha A. Davis
davissa.sf@gmail.com
415.269.5355

From:	Carroll, John (BOS)
To:	Maggie Kuo
Cc:	Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Sciammas, Charlie (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Cooper, Raynell (BOS)
Subject:	RE: Support for the Family Zoning Plan
Date:	Tuesday, October 21, 2025 12:08:00 PM
Attachments:	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. 250700
- Board of Supervisors File No. 250701
- Board of Supervisors File No. 250966

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: Maggie Kuo <maggie.kuo761@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 20, 2025 10:57 PM
To: Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>
Subject: Support for the Family Zoning Plan

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

sources.

Hello Mr. Carroll and Supervisor Melgar,

I'm writing to express my support of the family zoning plan. It will go a long way to alleviate the housing affordability crisis we have in the city! My partner and I currently live in the Sunset, both make a six-figure salary, and yet, a median-priced home in San Francisco is out of our reach. We could buy one in Pleasant Hill, but we'd be looking at a two-hour commute each way during rush hour. We love living in the city and all the vibrant culture it has to offer, more than a life lived in cars for a house in the suburbs, so here we are! After reading the plan and attending the public comment session, I came away convinced that this plan was designed with utmost care to minimize the impact to all stakeholders involved, (not an easy task!) and will meaningfully increase the housing supply and help bring prices down.

Another benefit that most of the residents who are opposed haven't really thought about is -- the ability to keep their children and grandchildren in the city and give them property. Under the new zoning plan, they could build an additional unit in their backyards and have their family stay. I know that keeping family close by is an important value to Asian American families, an ethnic and cultural group that I belong to.

As for fears that the zoning plan will lead to Hong Kong style buildings, considering the average residential building in Hong Kong is 30 stories, I'm not worried. Because it's not realistic. What we're proposing is just the right height and density for the Sunset, and where they make sense -- along transit lines.

Another thing the city might want to consider to help open the housing stock even further - consider taxing overseas investors who buy up property and just let them sit empty! And use that money for tenant assistance who are affected by the relocation. Thank you!

Sincerely,
Maggie Kuo

From:	Carroll, John (BOS)
To:	"Prodan Statev"
Cc:	Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Sciammas, Charlie (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Cooper, Raynell (BOS)
Subject:	RE: Support Mayor Lurie"s Family Zoning Plan for Families
Date:	Tuesday, October 21, 2025 12:08:00 PM
Attachments:	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. 250700
- Board of Supervisors File No. 250701
- Board of Supervisors File No. 250966

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: Prodan Statev <pstatev94@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 20, 2025 1:38 PM
To: Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>
Subject: Support Mayor Lurie's Family Zoning Plan for Families

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

Dear Board of Supervisors Land Use Committee,

As a 41-year-old renter who has called San Francisco home for 17 years, I've witnessed firsthand the struggles that families face in our city. I currently live in a multi-generational household, caring for both my children and elderly family members. The housing crisis has pushed many families like mine to the brink, and I believe that Mayor Lurie's Family Zoning Plan offers a glimmer of hope.

Opening single-family zones to duplexes, triplexes, and small apartments is a crucial step toward keeping working families in San Francisco. This plan not only promotes affordability but also embraces the diversity that makes our community vibrant.

And yet, the plan **doesn't go far enough**. I wished to see a more ambitious rezoning in the Western parts of the city, along with a significant and substantial permitting reform. I urge you to advocate for an amendment which will make building housing in San Francisco faster, cheaper and more predictable.

Let's work together to create an inclusive and equitable city where families can flourish.

Sincerely,
Prodan
District 1 Resident, 94121

From:	Andy Katz
To:	Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Andy Katz
Subject:	Family Zoning Legislation Needs Much More Work To Be Acceptable
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 4:05:53 PM

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

Dear Supervisors:

My name is Andy Katz and I am a lifetime native of North Beach. I am here to support our small scale village community and to oppose the developer and real estate speculator driven Lurie, Weiner, Sauter so called “family plan”. This plan will cause great harm to our neighborhoods despite the various proposed amendments to date.

First of all, remove all of the rent-controlled buildings from the up zoning plan. The proposed amendment does not exempt all rent-controlled buildings as it should. This is vital to support workers and the elderly in our City and address their fear that they won’t be able to stay in their homes. The plan does not focus on affordable housing but instead on market rate development which we need more of like a hole in the head. The required affordable housing percentages are too low. House our SF workers hanging on by their fingernails rather than building still more housing for the rich and investors. Many already built existing luxury units sit empty as we speak.

Preserve our history and protect our neighborhoods by forcing Mayor Lurie and the state to recognize the North Beach Historic District. Some of us have been working lovingly on these efforts for more than 20 years. Development should be created to scale in the neighborhoods it which it is placed with respect for our rich history, architectural context and our existing small businesses. Many of these are legacy businesses.

The production of this plan is forcing extremely complex and far ranging proposals and consequences through an expedited process which is the equivalent of putting a gun to everyone’s collective head. Only developers and realtors win this way. San Franciscans must be heard and truly valued.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Andy Katz
andywkatz@gmail.com
SF, CA 94133

From: Robin Phillips
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 2:13:58 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Robin Phillips
District 8

Oh, and let Scott Weiner know I'm not going to vote for him against Nancy Pelosi. I met him once in person and he couldn't make eye contact with me.

Robin
California

From: Cathy Asmus
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 2:16:51 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Cathy
California

From: Carolyn Mitsi Hanrahan
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 2:17:11 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,

Please help us tenants! No displacement of any tenants!

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,
Carolyn MITSI Hanrahan

Carolyn Mitsi
California

From: Courtney Fedorchek
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 3:01:15 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,
Courtney

Courtney
California

From: Calder Lorenz
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 3:11:02 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Calder
California

From: Catherine Butler
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 3:28:16 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,
Catherine Butler

Catherine
California

From: Lauren Kush
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 3:44:18 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Lauren
California

From: Nikolas McConnie-Saad
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 3:55:44 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

The YIMBY/NIMBY characterization of development misrepresents opposition to development under one giant umbrella. It's a bad faith dichotomy cooked up by pro-development at any cost opportunists. San Francisco, like many cities in the USA has a shameful (racist, and classist) history of displacing marginalized and low-income communities under the saccharine guise of "neighborhood renewal/improvement." The Fillmore, SOMA, and Hayes Valley are just a few prime examples of culturally rich neighborhoods with long-standing vibrant communities that were uprooted and kicked out of the city, never to return.

Lurie's plan promises to do the same thing unless tenant protections are baked into the process. You think the homelessness crisis is bad now, just wait until all the aunties and uncles, grandparents, and young(ish) people in non-tech, non-corporate jobs are kicked out of their rent controlled units and are left to fend for themselves. Thinking that just building a bunch of housing will magically ease the housing situation in SF is akin to believing in trickle down economics. This logic sounds sort of plausible at face value, but it's the same load of crap that has led this country to have gilded age levels of wealth inequality.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-

one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including “warm shells”), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Nikolas
California

From: Frania Feldstein
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 4:17:54 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Frania
California

From: lgpetty
To: Carroll, John (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff
Cc: Chan, Connie (BOS); SherrillStaff; ChanStaff (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Engardio Staff; BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Supervisors: Time to Write Your Own Zoning Plan to Achieve State AND Public Approval.
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 4:56:03 PM

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

Re: the Mayor's Family Zoning Plan -
Oct. 20, 2025 Land Use Agenda
Items 1-4, Files 250966, 250700, 250701 & 250785

Dear Land Use Chair Melgar, Vice Chair Chen and Supervisor Mahmood,

This Mayor's Zoning Plan comes to you after many years in the making at the Planning Dept.

It comes in the name of Compliance with State Law, under threat of "something worse."

But is it really compliance? Or is it simply an unpopular mass of severe concessions and capitulations thrown to an insatiably aggressive State Government?

The Mayor's Plan is overstuffed and bloated with all the things we COULD do, rather than what we NEED to do.

We are delivering to U.S. and foreign investors, global corporate developers & speculators -- everything they could ever wish for -- a deregulated hugely desirable ocean-urban landscape to use for a free-for-all no rules game of demolition, buying, selling, and reselling.

It does not have to
be this way.

This is the time for Supervisors to step up-- to shape a Zoning Plan with moderation and common sense -- listening to those most affected, rather than those who will profit from it. And merely offering a few amendments to the Mayor's Plan is not going to transform it into something that fits San Francisco, or wins public support.

The Mayor's Plan plan is controversial, not because it proposes Change. It is opposed by an unusually large and broad coalition of San Franciscans -- renters, homeowners, seniors and young residents, businesspeople, tenant and environmental protectors.

Why? Because they are opposed to Change? No. It is because they are opposed to

Overcompliance. To Overkill. To overly massive unnecessary upheavals with little reward for them or their children, and few protections from exploitation.

It's not too late to fix this; to achieve Compliant Change AND win widespread approval. It's up to you now to create a better way:

Confine upzoning to vacant land, unused or very little-used nearly empty parcels. Dedicate public lands (including Muni properties) to 100 percent affordable housing, with concrete instructions for funding and infrastructure. Limit construction to eight stories for major boulevards. Limit heights on neighborhood commercial streets and other thru-streets to six-story maximums on corner lots only, with no height increases on surrounding streets. Require a minimum of 25 per cent affordable units and 30 per cent family-size units (3 & 4 & 5 bedrooms) in all market rate residential or mixed-use projects.
Ban demolition of rent-controlled units, and remove all of them from upzoning. Prohibit demolition of historical, cultural & landmarked properties, and legacy busineses. Disallow mergers and conversions. Provide tenant protections per Sup. Chen and small business protections per Sups. Melgar and Chan, and make them <u>stronger</u> than they are now.

This "**Board of Supervisors Zoning Plan"** (together with the Pipeline and 4-6-plex legislation) would be sufficient to comply with RHNA building requirements, especially incentivizing affordable housing.

Supervisors, it's up to you, our elected representatives, to write a reasonable, Compliant Zoning plan that responds to State requirements AND the needs of San Franciscans.

We are counting on you to do this.

A good faith first step would be to hold a Full Board hearing on the Mayor's Plan open to public comment.

Thanks for consideration,

Lorraine Petty

D2/5 Senior voter
Affordable housing Advocate
Seniors and Tenants Advocate
Member, SFTU & SDA

From: Karen Grayson
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 5:05:05 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Karen
California

From: Mart Deans
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 5:19:30 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

Please do not let this become another developer money grab like so many housing projects are. We have plenty of luxury and high end real estate in San Francisco. We need housing to support the vibrant communities of all incomes that make this city great.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Mart
California

From: Greg Cummings
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 5:41:43 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need. This is big bank and billionaires trying to further reduce fair housing options and eliminate rent control.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.

Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.

Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"). Create a vacancy tax for unoccupied properties being held for investment purposes. Create a speculation tax for high dollar property flipping. Protect & strengthen rent control.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,
Greg Cummings
RICHMOND District

Greg
California

From: Lee Heller
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 6:05:41 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Lee
California

From: Laurel Scotland-Stewart
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 6:28:41 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,
Laurel Scotland-Stewart

Laurel
California

From: Alice Polesky
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 7:00:33 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Alice
California

From: Anandi Worden
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 9:00:11 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,

District 9 and I vote! Protect tenants rights, we are still here and we still vote

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Anandi
California

From: jgracelewis@gmail.com
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 9:54:32 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,

I will be devastated and forced to the streets if Laurie's upzoning proposal goes through.

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,
Jeannine Lewis

California

From: Farshid Fakhraei
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 10:33:27 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Farshid
California

From: Tiffany Konyen
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability! Make SF work for Workers!
Date: Saturday, October 18, 2025 10:06:52 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Tiffany
California

From: Neil Meerani
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Saturday, October 18, 2025 10:32:38 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Neil
California

From: mrothe@ccsf.edu
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Sunday, October 19, 2025 1:30:18 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely, Marianne Rothe

California

From: Sasha Gala
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Sunday, October 19, 2025 9:48:32 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan won't fix San Francisco's affordability crisis — it will accelerate displacement of renters and small businesses while incentivizing luxury development over homes our communities actually need.
The Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods — tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates — urges you to support a better path forward.
As a constituent, I ask that any upzoning include:
• Build without displacement — Use creative financing and local union labor to build the already-approved housing pipeline while protecting existing residents.
• Landbank public and soft sites — Reserve them for workforce, senior, family, and community housing.
• Guarantee real affordability — Strengthen inclusionary requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom — including releasing voter-approved housing funds.
• Protect families — Require both minimum and maximum family-size units in "family zones" and eliminate permanent density giveaways.
• Protect small businesses and rent-controlled homes — No demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation at real cost ("warm shells"), and enforce the vacancy tax.
San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-led planning — not rushed deregulation that repeats past mistakes. Please work with us to deliver real housing for families, seniors, and workers.
Sincerely,
Sasha Gala

Sasha
California

From: Eleanor Cox
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Sunday, October 19, 2025 10:31:21 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

-Close the SB 330 loopholes:
+Require 1:1 replacement of rental with rental units (not condos)
+Give all tenants a right to return at their existing rent regardless of their income levels
-Ask the City to identify an office tasked with overseeing and enforcing the tenant protection provisions coming from the new Tenant Protections Ordinance
-Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
-Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
-Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
-Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Eleanor
California

From: Robyn Miles
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Sunday, October 19, 2025 11:17:41 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Robyn
California

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	BOS-Operations; Carroll, John (BOS); Calvillo, Angela (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Entezari, Mehran (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS)
Subject:	RE: 97 Letters Regarding File Nos. 250700, 250701 and 250966
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 12:10:50 PM
Attachments:	97 Letters Regarding File Nos. 250700_701_966.pdf

Hello,

Please disregard previous attachment. Correct 97 letters attached.

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: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Sent: Monday, October 20, 2025 12:07 PM
To: BOS-Supervisors <bos-supervisors@sfgov.org>; BOS-Legislative Aides <bos-legislative_aides@sfgov.org>
Cc: BOS-Operations <bos-operations@sfgov.org>; Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>; Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; De Asis, Edward (BOS) <edward.deasis@sfgov.org>; Entezari, Mehran (BOS) <Mehran.Entezari@sfgov.org>; Mchugh, Eileen (BOS) <eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org>; Ng, Wilson (BOS) <wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org>; Somera, Alisa (BOS) <alisa.somera@sfgov.org>
Subject: 97 Letters Regarding File Nos. 250700, 250701 and 250966

Hello,

Please see attached 40 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

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:	Christopher Pederson
To:	Melgar, Myrna (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; Carroll, John (BOS)
Cc:	Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC); Tanner, Rachael (CPC); Chen, Lisa (CPC); Andrews, Michelle (BOS)
Subject:	Support the Family Zoning Plan - Land Use & Transportation Committee Agenda Items 1-4 (Oct. 20, 2025)
Date:	Friday, October 17, 2025 8:19:49 AM
Attachments:	Letter to BoS Land Use Comm re Family Zoning Plan.pdf

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

Attached is the comment letter of the San Francisco League of Conservation Voters in support of the Family Zoning Plan.
Sincerely,
Christopher Pederson
President
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters

San Francisco League of Conservation Voters

October 17, 2025

Re: Support the Family Zoning Plan, Agenda Items 1-4

Dear Chair Melgar, Vice Chair Chen, and Supervisor Mahmood:

The San Francisco League of Conservation Voters urges the Land Use and Transportation Committee to recommend that the Board of Supervisors pass the proposed ordinances to implement Mayor Lurie's Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco and California as a whole face a climate crisis and a housing crisis. Transportation is the largest source of greenhouse gas emissions from both the city and the state. The scarcity and high price of housing in coastal cities such as San Francisco, however, are forcing families to locate on the fringes of metropolitan areas where the automobile is the primary and, too often, the only viable mode of transportation.Those inland suburban and exurban areas have more extreme climates, encroach on threatened natural habitat and agricultural lands, and face high wildland fire hazards. To address the state's climate and housing crises, then, coastal cities and the state must promote much more multi-family housing located near major transit lines, employment centers, and commercial districts and in walkable, transit-oriented neighborhoods.

By virtue of San Francisco's mild climate, its extensive public transit network, its concentration of major employment centers, its walkability, and its density, San Francisco is among the most environmentally appropriate locations in the entire state for new multi-family housing. On a per capita basis, San Franciscans drive less, use less energy and water, and occupy less land than other Californians. Providing more multifamily housing for people to live in San Francisco is therefore a crucial step for addressing the state's and city's climate and housing crises.

The Mayor's Family Zoning Plan, by allowing more multifamily housing along major transit lines and close to commercial districts does exactly this. Given that the city has previously rezoned much of the eastern half of the city to allow more multifamily housing, it is appropriate for the Family Zoning Plan to concentrate on western and northern neighborhoods that have provided little new multifamily housing in recent decades. Those northern and western

neighborhoods are also mostly higher resource neighborhoods where potential concerns about displacement and gentrification are minimal.

The SFLCV understands that upzoning can raise concerns about the displacement of small businesses and rent-controlled housing. The SFLCV supports addressing those concerns, but any such measures should not undercut the Family Zoning Plan's strategy of promoting significantly more multifamily housing close to major transit lines, employment centers, and commercial districts.

Sincerely,

Christopher Pederson
President
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters

From:	bridget.maley@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Bridget Maley
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Friday, October 17, 2025 8:04:51 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

This is a series of confusing maps...not a plan. We need thoughtful urban planning that responds to the unique neighborhoods that make San Francisco vibrant. Further, issuing an Addendum to the EIR is not adequate environmental review under CEQA. A full EIR, recirculated for public review, is required for intervention of this magnitude in our city.

Sincerely,
Bridget Maley
San Francisco, CA 94123

From:	lori.ottolini.geno@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Margaret Geno
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Friday, October 17, 2025 8:11:06 AM

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 hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:
Please zone smartly, insure accountability, understand the real needs facing the City and County of San Francisco, this requires the full Board of Supervisors and San Francisco residents to fully understand what the "Family Zoning Plan" would mean to the future of San Francisco.

Sincerely,
Margaret Geno
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: donna.howe@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Donna Howe
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 8:32:15 AM

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 hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments: Thoughtful changes to zoning require not just mandates but also constituent support. Constituents want their city representatives to honor historic elements already recognized. Historic eligible buildings and neighborhoods should be celebrated and the proposed zoning changes must both protect them and encourage only new builds that are culturally and architecturally compatible with existing buildings in those neighborhoods. It's of vital importance that the Board of Supervisors recognize this and be willing to hear in public comment the views of all their constituents. Five generations if my family, beginning with my Sicilian immigrant grandparents, have lived in Ingleside Terraces. They have all valued and appreciated the street design, the architecture, and the historic context that created its layout. They want assurances that it will be preserved beyond the current zoning discussion so that future generations will see it, appreciate it, and maintain it.

Sincerely,
Donna Howe
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: byobwcrew@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Frog Gilmore
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 8:36:26 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Please please please hold a Committee of The Whole hearing for this upzoning proposal.

Hey ya'll. Frog here. Yep, that's my name. You may have heard about an event I help with called Bring Your Own Big Wheel. That's not to brag but I'm proud to say I'm here to help keep SF creative, the city of possibilities that used to be for *all*. I've lived in SF for 26 sometimes nerve-wracking years. I say that because through these years I've been subject to an illegal owner eviction and I've watched friends and beloved artists pushed out of the city and bay area altogether through the waves of the dot com boom and bust and the current tech tide of startups and AI gold panning.

We must plan for responsible growth here, we must must must have protections for our renters and artists and non traditional earners in our city, we must keep the flavor in our beautiful Rice O Roni town.

What these upzoning plans DON'T have is clear protections for our most vulnerable renters, for our mom and pop business, and they don't have plans for infrastructure to support the increase in humans and their pets to certain areas. And why are we not discussing developing the empty spaces downtown in FiDi, that are already tall heights and near public transportation?

Thanks if you've read this far. I really want responsible growth in our city.

The formal wording is below:

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie’s “Family Zoning Plan”.

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco’s history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Frog Gilmore
San Francisco, CA 94110

From: juliedearborn@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Julie Dearborn
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 9:25:51 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Do more to protect tenants and small businesses. ALL rent-controlled buildings should be safe from developers.

Sincerely,
Julie Dearborn
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: cyerge@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of colleen yerge
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 9:32:56 AM

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 hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
colleen yerge
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: Jeff Kline
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Support a functional city, protect families, keep SF moving!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 9:46:22 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent Jeff Kline

Email kline.jb@gmail.com

Support a functional city, protect families, keep SF moving!

Message:

Dear Supervisor,

I'm disappointed that you did not incorporate critical balancing amendments to the "Street Safety Act," or, more commonly known as Vision Zero 2.0. Please bring these ideas to the table as a separate resolution.

As written the Street Safety Act is not about safety and will not achieve that goal. It is also onerous and oppressive to the majority of San Franciscans.

Proposed RECITALS:

WHEREAS, The streets of San Francisco are used by all San Franciscans for all modes of transportation, including but not limited to, walking, scootering, bicycling, motorcycling, driving, and public transit; and

WHEREAS The use of city streets inevitably involves some unavoidable risk; and

WHEREAS All users of city streets share in the responsibility for their own safety, as well as for conducting themselves in a manner safe for themselves and others; and

WHEREAS Street design involves unavoidable tradeoffs that should balance the efficacy of the

various transportation modes; and

WHEREAS All users of San Francisco streets have a legitimate expectation that their use will be facilitated, including drivers of motor vehicles, and not unreasonably impeded, complicated, or disadvantaged; and

WHEREAS More than half of the pedestrian, bicycle, and personal conveyance deaths on San Francisco streets in the last three years were preventable by the deceased by following existing traffic laws; and

WHEREAS San Francisco's surface street traffic moved at the second slowest average speed in the country in 2024 at 14 mph; and

Proposed RESOLUTIONS:

Be it RESOLVED, That all decisions involving street design shall be made with balanced consideration to the needs of all transportation modes; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That all street redesign projects that are significant, including but not limited to, speed limit reductions, speed hump installations, removal of a traffic lane, removal of parking spaces, and significant reconfiguration of traffic flow, shall require a cost/benefit review and report from an outside firm nationally recognized to be a non-partisan engineering expert in such matters, retained and managed by the San Francisco Controller's office; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED That the SFMTA shall identify the core motor vehicle traffic corridors throughout the city, shall prioritize these corridors for motor vehicle traffic, and shall publish a report by December 2026 outlining prioritized projects to increase traffic throughput on these corridors with the goal of average motor vehicle speeds of no less than 5mph lower than currently posted speeds; this report and project shall be given no less prominence, time, attention, budget, and priority than the Biking and Rolling Plan, the Northstar Network, and Vision Zero (and related programs) plans, reports, and activities.

Sincerely,

From:	georgesery@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of George Sery
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Friday, October 17, 2025 10:57:03 AM

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 hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
George Sery
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: jeanettetraverso@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jeanette Traverso
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 11:59:07 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

My family & I have lived in North Beach for decades. We own a three-unit residential building. We support affordable housing. Upzoning is misguided--it will not create affordabel housing & it will destroy the character of SF neighborhoods. We should be making use of the existing buildings for affordable housing. I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Thanks for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Jeanette Traverso
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: jeanettetraverso@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jeanette Traverso
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 12:06:54 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Upzoning would be an irreversible disaster. Upzoning will not create affordable housing. Upzoning will destroy the cherished character of our San Francisco neighborhoods. Let's use existing buildings to create affordable housing.

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 taking into account the views of the people who have lived in SF for decades.

Sincerely,
Jeanette Traverso
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: clivy@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Tom McG
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 5:35:10 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Property tax payers should be able to have a say on changes in their neighborhoods.

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Tom McG

From: mwais@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Michael Wais
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 11:24:00 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 hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments: my wife and I live and have raised our son in an area that will be impacted significantly if this plan proceeds and urge the full committee to take part in considering the consequences of these changes for future families in San Francisco.

Sincerely,
Michael Wais
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: pmulholl@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Patrice Mulholland
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Saturday, October 18, 2025 10:10:15 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, 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. Do not give in to wealthy developers. Listen to the citizens of San Francisco before you act.

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.

San Francisco needs real low-income housing, not expensive buildings that have only a small portion set aside for affordable rents which are not really affordable to the majority of the workers in San Francisco.

Please not go blindly forward and ruin a beautiful city.

Sincerely,
Patrice Mulholland
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: kenvogg@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Ken Vokenski
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Saturday, October 18, 2025 3:37:51 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): SF is good the way it is, stop trying to ruin it. There are many different ways of virtue signaling that don't disrupt people's lives.

Sincerely,
Ken Vokenski
San Francisco, CA 94118

From:	samuelwoodworth@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Samuel Woodworth
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Sunday, October 19, 2025 7:50:37 AM

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 hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential, and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. In time in will make many beloved and iconic parts of the city almost unrecognizable, yet most of the public is just finding out about it or still doesn't know.

This drastic plan should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is totally unacceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote.

Sincerely,
Samuel Woodworth
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: jscattini@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of JANICE SCATTINI
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Sunday, October 19, 2025 8:12:55 AM

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 hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
JANICE SCATTINI
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: sf.lorna@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lorna Walker
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Sunday, October 19, 2025 11:23:29 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.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): Please protect San Francisco from speculative development that doesn't lower housing costs.

Sincerely,
Lorna Walker
San Francisco, CA 94115

From:	mary.pickering@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of mary pickering
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Sunday, October 19, 2025 12:24:03 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 hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

I'm a fourth generation San Franciscan. This policy will damage our city, destroying its uniqueness and making it less attractive to both residents and tourists. The unsheltered will never be able to afford living in North Beach or Pacific Heights. This is an excuse to enable developers to grow richer.

Sincerely,
mary pickering
San Francisco, CA 94123

From:	amontuori@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Alfonso Montuori
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Sunday, October 19, 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,

The Embarcadero Freeway is widely considered the ugliest thing San Francisco ever built and a huge mistake. What is being planned today, essentially throwing out everything we learnt from that horror and from the Fontana Complex debacle, will be even more disastrous and promises to drastically change the way San Francisco looks. And remember, San Francisco is a city renowned for its beauty all over the world. Tourists come here from all over the world to be in and look at our beautiful city.

Do we really want to drastically change San Francisco? Of course not. Do we really believe this effort will provide affordable or family housing in any substantive way? Of course not. Do we believe other locations in the City with much more open land were skipped because they are not that appealing to the developers? Of course. Do we believe San Francisco's leadership is kowtowing to developers? Of course.

Furthermore, over the last months it's become apparent that the areas included in the “Family Zoning Plan” keep changing and growing, and nobody is willing to give citizens an idea of what this will actually look like and how it will impact neighborhoods. In other words, we are in the dark about what this will do to our neighborhoods, and given the way the leadership has communicated, and based on its actions, we can only imagine that it will be the worst case scenario.

Do you really want to be remembered as the Mayor and Board of Supervisors that sold our beautiful city to the developers?

I hope not.

Push back against developers. Push back against the State.

Insist on alternative scenarios!

San Francisco is a world-renowned city. Let's act like one and show some self-respect.

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie’s “Family Zoning Plan”.

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco’s history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Sincerely,
Alfonso Montuori

San Francisco, CA 94133

From: amontuori@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Alfonso Montuori
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Sunday, October 19, 2025 1:28:14 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

The Embarcadero Freeway is widely considered the ugliest thing San Francisco ever built and a huge mistake. What is being planned today, essentially throwing out everything we learnt from that horror and from the Fontana Complex debacle, will be even more disastrous and promises to drastically change the way San Francisco looks. And remember, San Francisco is a city renowned for its beauty all over the world. Tourists come here from all over the world to be in and look at our beautiful city.

Do we really want to drastically change San Francisco? Of course not. Do we really believe this effort will provide affordable or family housing in any substantive way? Of course not. Do we believe other locations in the City with much more open land were skipped because they are not that appealing to the developers? Of course. Do we believe San Francisco's leadership is kowtowing to developers? Of course.

Furthermore, over the last months it's become apparent that the areas included in the “Family Zoning Plan” keep changing and growing, and nobody is willing to give citizens an idea of what this will actually look like and how it will impact neighborhoods. In other words, we are in the dark about what this will do to our neighborhoods, and given the way the leadership has communicated, and based on its actions, we can only imagine that it will be the worst case scenario.

Do you really want to be remembered as the Mayor and Board of Supervisors that sold our beautiful city to the developers?

I hope not.

Push back against developers. Push back against the State.

Insist on alternative scenarios!

San Francisco is a world-renowned city. Let's act like one and show some self-respect.

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,
Alfonso Montuori
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: tomacruz@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Frances Tomacruz
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Sunday, October 19, 2025 3:52:35 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.

Sincerely,
Frances Tomacruz
San Francisco, CA 94109

From:	kathyhoward@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Katherine Howard
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Sunday, October 19, 2025 7:07:57 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

This is probably the most important vote you will take during your term of office. This will decide your legacy. Do you represent protecting and preserving San Francisco or do you represent the bulldozers that will show up if our City if not protected?

PLEASE hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Sincerely,
Katherine Howard
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: kathyhoward@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Katherine Howard
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Sunday, October 19, 2025 7:12:27 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, the destruction of the historic character of San Francisco, and transformation of our neighborhoods into cookie-cutter, 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
- Protect Category A historic properties and our cultural heritage.

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,
Katherine Howard
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: gmsunset@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Greg Miller
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Sunday, October 19, 2025 7:12:55 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,
Greg Miller
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: bklynbrn1826@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Rosemary Bell
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Sunday, October 19, 2025 7:18:58 PM

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 Emerson St, a quiet dead-end street behind Public Storage. Building a 240 ft. housing unit at the end of this street will create a major headache not just for the residents, but small businesses such as Davita Dialysis Center, Sagebrook Assisted Living, and the American Terrazzo works that has been on Wood street for over 100 years.

Please, we, the residents of Emerson and Wood Street 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.

Contact me at my email address if you want to visit the neighborhood to discuss our concerns.

Sincerely,
Rosemary Bell
San Francisco, CA 94118

From: gek555sf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Gretchen Tallon
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Sunday, October 19, 2025 7:54:57 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 citizen of the Outer Sunset, we are directly affected by the upzoning in both positive and negative manners.

The Westerly is a huge screw you to that neighborhood. The community fought this project and with good reason. There is NO retail in any of the space to date, it looks in disrepair and has yet to be full. The project at 3945 Judah is another screw you to us. According to the owner of the building, this project has been going on for 13 years! Its still a mess. Slowly nearing completion. Due to the nature of the construction there is no mechanical shaft allowing for a restaurant. And where the 2600 sq ft of shared open space will be located is anyone guess. This adds to the detractions of this upzoning project. It stinks.

A project seemingly successful is the Shirley Chisholm Village. This project met with the neighborhood, listened to the neighborhood and then created a project that both adds much needed housing for our teachers (I am a parent of a SFUSD student) and adds beauty to the neighborhood. They kept their promise to keep the essense of Playland with the shared opens pace, the building height does not overpower the neighbors and the buildings blend with our current architecture.

Additionally, in 2024 voters failed to pass Prop L to support MUNI. MUNI is in trouble, yet we are building like gangbusters near transit?

And truly who are we building for? This really will not reach the people they believe it will. If you read Bay Area Business Times, there is not growth truly happening here. I do not want to cater to AI after we allowed Google, Facebook, Salesforce, Twitter, etc to come here and fail to pay their fair share in taxes - where are these companies now?

Why don't you work with Park Merced? There is a huge amount of housing which is crumbling and because its private land, it can just sit there? What about the abysmal zoo? Close it, send the animals to zoo's who can actually care for them (its well documented, the issues with the SF Zoo) and build like crazy there. You have ocean front views, parking and very few neighbors.

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Sincerely,
Gretchen Tallon
San Francisco, CA 94122

From:	don.ayers@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Don Ayers
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Sunday, October 19, 2025 8:19:34 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Governance is about people, not about numbers.

When I look at the continued expansion of Outside Lands, I hear politicians crowing the dollars that are supposedly flowing in, and not talking or thinking about how San Franciscans are now locked out of a public park, a public resource, for longer and longer times each year, and pounded with volume that would never be tolerated from a business or citizen.

Likewise, this issue is about the public quality of life that we have to chosen this city for. Those that benefit will be contractors and folks who already most likely have more money than they will ever need, and the quality of life here will deteriorate from this plan.

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Sincerely,
Don Ayers
San Francisco, CA 94118

From:	kaurmona35@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mona Kaur
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 9:14:48 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 and elected officials, I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Sincerely,
Mona Kaur
San Francisco, CA 94109

From:	peterboothlee@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Peter Lee
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 9:20:31 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Peter Lee
San Francisco, CA 94118

From:	cyerge@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of colleen yerge
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 9:40:15 AM

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 hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
colleen yerge
San Francisco, CA 94133

From:	janesmalley1@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jane E Smalley
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 9:41:42 AM

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 hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments: I love San Francisco. Please don't obliterate the beauty of the existing architecture and neighborhoods.

Sincerely,
Jane E Smalley
San Francisco, CA 94118

From:	sjgorskilaw@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Stephen Gorski
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 9:47:33 AM

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 hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

I have lived in D4 for over 45 years and an active community member who has voted in all local elections. D4 is not a place for the proposed upzoning. We urge you to allow full public comment at a Board of Supervisors' meeting to afford all residents to have full accountability.

Sincerely,
Stephen Gorski
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: gb_andrews@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Gandhia Andrews
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 9:55:49 AM

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 hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Gandhia Andrews
San Francisco, CA 94132

From:	info@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of SON-SF - SAVE OUR NEIGHBORHOODS SF
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 10:02:42 AM

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 hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
SON-SF - SAVE OUR NEIGHBORHOODS SF
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: linda@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of linda howell
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 10:05:12 AM

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 hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history.

Additional comments:
I live in Jordan Park and right next to Clement Street--we would be greatly effected because we are between 2 transit corridors. These historic neighborhoods of San Francisco are the "soul " of our City and need to be protected. More affordable housing is needed but this plan does not do it properly. The Devil is in the Details and those haven't been worked out!

This upzoning proposal has been presented by the Mayor's office as the best of all possible alternatives for San Francisco. IF, in fact, he state will impose the state plan if we don't submit this before the January 2026 deadline, I understand it is in our best interest, Is there still a possibility it can be revised either before or after the deadline? Most citizens were not aware of this proposal until way too late. It's a mess and all supervisors need to put their heads together on such an important issue for our CIty.

Sincerely,
linda howell
San Francisco, CA 94118

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, October 20, 2025 10:06:16 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 lifetime resident of the North Beach District and the proposed EXTREME upzoning is a real threat to my continuing to live here. In the last 10 years I have known renters (without fault) who have literately died from the stress of being forced to move from where they had lived for most of their lives. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

This proposal will also remove the charm and livability for residents and tourists who support our small businesses that are a life line of San Francisco's economy So, 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.

Mayor Lurie' is imposing permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

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

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.

Sincerely,
janis kaempfe
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: Jason Wright
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 10:14:59 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 the 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!

I've been in my rent controlled apartment for a long time, located on Church Street above Dolores Park in District 8. Although it's listed as being in a "transit corridor" on Church Street, it's located where the J Church MUNI cuts through the middle of the block (the right of way between 20th and 22nd Streets) and does not pass directly in front of my building. My building sold to a developer a year ago, and it's a 2-unit building, so I'm very concerned...even scared...of being vulnerable and losing my apartment. Even with some of the proposed amendments already, I think people like me (and my roommate) would fall through the cracks. If I lost my apartment, I'm afraid I'd be forced to move out of San Francisco. Please protect all rent-controlled units in these proposed zones.

Sincerely,
Jason Wright
Resident of District 8

Jason Wright
jasonkennethwright@gmail.com
851 Church Street
San Francisco, California 94114

From: cdmccoy@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Casey McCoy
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 10:17:37 AM

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 hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Zoning laws are unique: If other laws prove undesirable, they can be removed without enduring impact on a community, but once a high-rise is installed among single-family homes, there's no undoing it. When Nordic countries need new housing, they build out new infrastructure and transit, and then build up in the new areas to whatever heights they need, so they're not betraying existing residents of established neighborhoods. If they can do things the right way, then we can do things the right way.

Sincerely,
Casey McCoy

From:	asmeyer13@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Amy Meyer
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 10:18:50 AM

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 hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Please keep the 40 foot limit so all of us can continue to enjoy the vistas that make San Francisco beautiful! Our neighborhoods are the best all over the city.

Sincerely,
Amy Meyer
San Francisco, CA 94123

From:	ccwrite1@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Carolyn Constantino
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 10:25:58 AM

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 hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

It is APPALLING and DISAPPOINTING that you are trying to ram this through like Donald Trump forces his will on the people. Shame on you! I will not vote for anyone who supports this unnecessary "plan." We need more AFFORDABLE housing, not more millionaires.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Carolyn Constantino
San Francisco, CA 94117

From:	noguera@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Hatun Noguera
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 10:27:58 AM

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 hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Hatun Noguera
San Francisco, CA 94127

From:	jeanbbarish@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jean Barish
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 10:28:58 AM

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 hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Jean Barish
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: pete@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Peter Solvik
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 10:32:48 AM

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 hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

The upzoning will affect historic neighborhoods in San Francisco and is being moved forward without serious consideration of alternatives that would spread out lower height zoning increases more broadly along more transit corridors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Peter Solvik
San Francisco, CA 94123

From:	tinamcgovern3@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Christina McGovern
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 10:33:00 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Christina McGovern
San Francisco, CA 94127

From:	ferrante.lynn@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lynn Ferrante
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 10:38:46 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 on Union Street close to Van Ness Ave. on the Russian Hill side. I am deeply disturbed by the proposed height, increases not only on Van Ness, but that go up along the adjacent blocks of Van Ness. These cross streets are currently almost entirely small residential with duplexes, triplexes and some six plexes. This is a significant and irreversible land use change without precedent. Hear your constituents please! There are other ways to address housing.

I have many concerns:
- The scale of buildings proposed will radically change neighborhoods that do not have the infrastructure to support them, cause the loss of existing businesses along Polk Street, add traffic and noise to residential neighborhoods already overwhelmed by diversion of traffic to streets like Union St during the bus lane on Van Ness construction period
- Van Ness is only just recovering from the multi years of construction of a median bus lane. This decimated many businesses. Additional construction on Van Ness, with multiple cement trucks and heavy cranes, will discourage people from frequenting Van Ness businesses and cause traffic fiascos and deterioration of the roadway
-Why is the no affordable housing included?
- Why not allow residential units on the ground floor of larger buildings which would increase the number of housing units? We do not need any more Pilates businesses.
- yes, developers want to build big, and get prime $ for multiple high floor units with Bay views. However, you are just catering to developers and taking away from your existing constituents by lowering the value of smaller buildings with existing views without compensation. You say “views do not count in land use squabbles” but you are forgetting the financial component which is a big + for developers and a big minus for others

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie’s plan. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Do not turn San Francisco into Miami.

Sincerely,
Lynn Ferrante
San Francisco, CA 94109

From:	audreycrls@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Audrey Carlson
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 10:43:59 AM

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 hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments: I am very concerned that any plan will simply be overridden by our very own State Senator Weiner's legislation. We need a guarantee from Weiner that he won't overturn this.

Sincerely,
Audrey Carlson
San Francisco, CA 94123

From:	knbnknk@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Barbara Hori
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 10:45:28 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history.
I was born and raised in San Francisco, so I am disturbed and upset by these proposed changes to my neighborhood, my city.

It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Sincerely,
Barbara Hori
San Francisco, CA 94132

From: mpegdietz@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Margaret Dietz
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 10:46:44 AM

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 hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:
I want to know why, if this is about AFFORDABLE HOUSING, the Upzoning Plan targets parcels that are currently RENT CONTROLLED BUILDINGS, (ie, Affordable Housing), for heights that double the current buildings' height, thereby incentivizing the demolition of rent-controlled housing. Rent controlled buildings must be zoned at their current height to remove this perverse incentive.

Second, this Upzone Plan offers the same old remedy for achieving more Affordable Housing - a fund that developers pay into in lieu of actuallyproviding Affordable units for sale or rent. Where is that money? How much money has been paid in? How much money has been spent, and where and how?

Third, does the Upzoning Plan plan for the maximum number of units that can be sustained in a drought?

Sincerely,
Margaret Dietz
San Francisco, CA 94109

From:	bapresta@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Barbara Presta
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 10:47:58 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.

Other solutions exist that are not this drastic. San Francisco is currently a unique beautiful city. This will not longer be true if high rises
pop up in our neighborhoods.

Sincerely,
Barbara Presta
San Francisco, CA 94123

From:	kielygomes@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Karen Schwartz
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 10:49:44 AM

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 hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:
In my neighborhood (D8, Market Street and Noe) we have about 500 new units in several big new buildings. We have done our part for density increase already! Preservation keeps our city intact, beautiful and attractive.

Sincerely,
Karen Schwartz
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: shoshod5623@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of shoshanah dobry
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 10:49:57 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 & Supervisors:

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Living in D10 I have witnesses the major disuse & abuse of one district due to a lack of political pull & monied interests. We & the rest of the City don't need this real estate & building power grab by Mayor Lurie & Scott Weiner. It doesn't work & we need a more measured approach to our housing issues. This being said I am in no way advocating for less housing/building. I would ask that a more district by district approach with the burden being spread equally across the City.

Sincerely,
shoshanah dobry
San Francisco, CA 94124

From:	judydoanesf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Judy Doane
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 10:52:09 AM

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 hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Judy Doane
San Francisco, CA 94115

From:	esens123@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Erik Sens
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 10:52:36 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Erik Sens
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: mail@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Josie Brown
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 10:54:24 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I strongly urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It certainly should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors. All elected officials who are responsible for the loss of affordable housing should be on record so that we may vote them out.

Ergo, limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is NOT acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments: Your standing in this issue will be noted for the record as will any subsequent remuneration you receive.

Sincerely,
Josie Brown
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: disp006@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Terrence McKenna
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 10:55:51 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:I don't understand why developed neighborhoods are being targeted. At the foot of Geneva at Bayshore there is hundreds of acres of undeveloped land which would provide room for several new neighborhoods yet this area isn't even being discussed

Sincerely,
Terrence McKenna
San Francisco, CA 94112

From: erika.awakening@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Erika Frick
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 10:56:12 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,

As a 25-year resident of Nob Hill, I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan," which I vehemently oppose. The stated reasons for these radical changes to our beautiful City do not hold water, as exemplified by the struggle 875 California St has had in selling even a limited number of condos since they blotted out views six and a half years ago!

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

- These condos will uglify our beautiful city for no reason!

- San Francisco's population growth does not justify this radical increase in housing.

- Very few affordable units are included. There is nobody to buy these mostly very expensive condos.

- As I understand it, the proposed housing is way beyond anything the state requires.

- All over social media, we see the real people of SF opposing this reckless building, yet Supervisors do not appear to be listening to the will of the People.

- Building should occur gradually with continuous reassessment of impact and actual needs. 875 California's difficulty selling units for YEARS already shows that our opposition years ago was well founded.

Please put a halt to this madness.

Sincerely,
Erika Frick
San Francisco, CA 94108

From: karenannbash@gmail.com
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 10:57:01 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,
Karen Bash

California

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, October 20, 2025 11:01:47 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,
Peter Lee
San Francisco, CA 94118

From: schuttishtr@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Georgia Schuttish
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 11:03:49 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Dear President Mandelman, Chair Melgar, Members of the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Lurie:

As a resident of San Francisco since 1979 and as someone who has attended every meeting on the Rezoning at the Planning Commission and the one on June 16th at the LUT, I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This is a complicated piece of legislation that will determine the direction of San Francisco for the next 50 years.

Now there are going to be new amendments to the FZP.

The public needs to learn about these new amendments and be able to digest them and then comment on them.

Many people are just becoming aware of the Rezoning or have only become aware of the Rezoning in the past year.

Please schedule a Committee of the Whole Hearing prior to the Thanksgiving and all the end of the year holidays.

Thank you.

Georgia Schuttish

Sincerely,
Georgia Schuttish
San Francisco, CA 94131

From: nuptial.51.boxes@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of stephanie de maria
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 11:04:32 AM

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 hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

We need community input and the chance to state our concerns to the full board before the vote. Preserve all the historical neighborhoods in SF

Sincerely,
stephanie de maria
San Francisco, CA 94133

From:	jmhurabiell1@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Judi Hurabiell
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 11:07:56 AM

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 hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Judi Hurabiell

From:	kumasong@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Karen Kirschling
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 11:10:32 AM

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 hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Karen Kirschling

From:	bilgepump100@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Robert Hall
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 11:13:08 AM

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 hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Robert Hall
San Francisco, CA 94117

From: redpl@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Renee Lazear
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 11:15:01 AM

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 hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Renee Lazear
San Francisco, CA 94116

From:	benjamin.kuslits@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Ben Kuslits
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 11:18:20 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Hello,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

I have lived in the city for 12 years, and cherish the character and identity of its unique neighborhoods. The mayor's plan will irreparably damage neighborhoods, does little to remediate constituent concerns or demonstrate how the plan would actually create affordable housing, and will primarily benefit private developers.

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Sincerely,
Ben Kuslits
San Francisco, CA 94117

From:	elemjw@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lin Joe
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 11:18:56 AM

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 hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

We love our City and feel you do too. Listen to your constituents! Hear our voices and concerns!

In my humble opinion, Our Shared Vision of San Francisco's Future Development will in most instances result in a better outcome for all.

Sincerely,
Lin Joe
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: glish.lauren@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lauren Glish
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 11:19:39 AM

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 hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:
Everything I have read about SB 79 and this new SF zoning plan has led me to conclude that the plan is irresponsible, would cause grave, irreversible harm to the city and is not what your residents, including myself, actually want.

Earlier this summer I sent an email expressing how devastated I would be to see this zoning plan go through. I've leased an apartment in the Marina district for over a decade — and the additional zoning plans along Lombard, Chestnut, Fillmore, and in Pacific Heights will permanently destroy the views and non-high rise charm of this beautiful area that I love. And the same holds true for almost all other neighborhoods impacted by the proposed zoning map.

All of the other San Francisco residents I have spoken to about this are in agreement that they would not want to stay in San Francisco either during the construction, or after the construction of all these new high-rise buildings.

As our elected officials, it is unacceptable to move this forward without all 11 supervisors hearing all public concerns. And I believe that failing to do this will cause many of Lurie's current supporters to turn against him.

Sincerely,
Lauren Glish
San Francisco, CA 94123

From:	guybristow@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Guy Bristow
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 11:19:53 AM

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 hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Guy Bristow
San Francisco, CA 94123

From:	stevenaflamm@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Steven Flamm
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 11:20:23 AM

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 hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Steven Flamm
San Francisco, CA 94123

From:	kathygee606@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kathleen Gee
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 11:20:25 AM

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 hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Kathleen Gee
San Francisco, CA 94118

From:	eliseravel3@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Elise Ravel
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 11:20:28 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Elise Ravel
San Francisco, CA 94131

From:	lbkerester@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Laurie Berk
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 11:20:31 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

The existing proposed upzoning plan is flawed in many ways and feels like a developer's give-away. Views from the north toward the City will be negatively impacted with high rise buildings in the Marina, affecting the beauty of this City admired by residents and visitors alike. The north side of the City may not have seen the most recent density development, but it is one of the most densely populated parts of the City - it is just that building took place years ago. There are many high rises in Pacific Heights in particular, especially east of Fillmore along Vallejo, Broadway, Pacific, Jackson and more. More citizen input needs to considered before this proposed plan is approved.

Sincerely,
Laurie Berk
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: brainz_ca@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Karin Hu
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 11:21:34 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

I have lived in SF for decades. I plan to stay in SF forever and am alarmed at how new money, trendy Tech culture, and real estate development companies aim to change our neighborhoods from family homes to studios & small 1 BD apartments.

Families want homes with at least 2-3 BR bedrooms and yard space. Don't support the destruction of these homes in SF, making families move to suburbs and other cities.

I want to hold ALL Supervisors accountable for their vision of San Francisco and how they represent the goals of their constituents.

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Sincerely,
Karin Hu

From:	Sandra Monk
To:	BOS-Supervisors
Subject:	Please Amend the Mayor"s Redevelopment Plan-- It does nothing for housing affordabilty for so many San Franciscans.
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 11:23:30 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 "one size fits all" 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 basic housing construction we need throughout the city.

Here is a better plan, designed by real housing advocates
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 provide CCSF services and build 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,

Sandra Monk
sandra.monk@ucsf.edu
2425 MISSION ST APT C
San Francisco, California 94110-2414

From:	kathygrogan@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kathy Grogan
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 11:23:32 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Kathy Grogan
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: dahlems@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Monica Dahlem
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 11:23:33 AM

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 hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Please do not strip away our local voices.
The current plan has a lack of safeguards in our communities and is proceeding without public comment, thoughts, votes.
There are no guardrails for this, which may result in unintended consequences.
What makes SF so vibrant and wonderful is the ability to be seen and heard, and this current plan as it stands, is taking away that ability with one swoop.

Sincerely,
Monica Dahlem
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: bilgepump100@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Robert Hall
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 11:24:39 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 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,
Robert Hall
San Francisco, CA 94117

From: ckutler2@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Caroline Kutler
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 11:25:40 AM

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 hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

My family and I live in Jordan Park and the lack of nuance and detail in this plan is astounding. We have two massive developments already approved in our neighborhood (the CPMC Hospital on California and 3333 California - BOTH by the Pardo Group). These developments together are slated to add nearly 1300 units to our neighborhood. That is a massive increase in a small historic community without any consideration of how that impacts local infrastructure. The current upzoning plans do not take these existing and APPROVED developments into consideration when allowing for massive height increases in development. This is a thoughtless and reckless plan that is being shoved down our throats without any consideration for impact on communities. I completely agree that we need to increase housing in SF but a one size fits all blanket approach is not the way to do it.

Sincerely,
Caroline Kutler
San Francisco, CA 94118

From:	sharon_purewal@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sharon Purewal
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 11:26:29 AM

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 hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Sincerely,
Sharon Purewal
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: judydoanesf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Judy Doane
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 11:27:38 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,
Judy Doane
San Francisco, CA 94115

From:	madrider317@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Thomas Jordan
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 11:28:05 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Thomas Jordan
North Hollywood, CA 91605

From:	bapresta@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Barbara Presta
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 11:28:39 AM

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 hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments: Other solutions are possible to increase affordable housing. Solutions that do not destroy our neighborhoods.
I believe this can be accomplshed within the current 40 foot height limit in neighborhoods, with increased height buildings in the downtown area where buildings of these heights already exist.

Sincerely,
Barbara Presta
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: Jacqueline Rios
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 11:29:08 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,
Jacqueline Rios SF tenant

Jacqueline
California

From: gfpedler@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Gary Pedler
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 11:30:26 AM

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 hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Sincerely,
Gary Pedler
San Francisco, CA 94114

From:	ericajoykatrak@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Erica Katrak
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 11:30:27 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Please hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on the Family Zoning Plan. Isn't this a government that cares about its residents' voices? A model for the rest of the country on how to build smart, resilient cities that address actual needs because their residents are actively involved in shaping it?

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors. It should not steamroll others into implementation because a handful of people with power are willing it to be so. It needs to be nuanced and shaped by the people who call this place home and hope to for a very very long time.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable, nor wise. It doesn't help San Francisco continue to meet the needs of its people, it overrides their voices. Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Erica

Sincerely,
Erica Katrak
San Francisco, CA 94114

From:	elaine@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Elaine Katzenberger
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 11:31:37 AM

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 hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Elaine Katzenberger
San Francisco, CA 94112

From:	ehirst1603@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Eileen Hirst
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 11:31:38 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 50+ year resident of San Francisco and have lived on Russian Hill for more than 30 years. At the D3 Democratic Club meeting where Planning staff presented this plan, there was a fair amount of pushback. Planning staff sought to reassure the crowd by saying that almost none of this housing will ever be built, and that this is a 50-year plan.

In other words, this plan is not going to produce the workforce, family-appropriate housing needed right now. And, the Planning Department knows it.

Mayor Lurie, you are so proud of the 40-person SFPD recruitment class, but you can look forward to those new members leaving San Francisco as soon as they advance in ranks, couple up and start families. They will buy affordable houses on the edges of the Bay Area and put up with a punishing commute until they transfer to a public safety agency close to their home. Your plan expects them to wait until private developers build lots and lots of luxury housing, so many that all housing will go down in price. By that time, if it ever happens at all, that recruit class will be ready for retirement.

This plan needs to go back to Planning with a directive to identify parcels ripe for development, with no displacement of tenants or businesses. Then, the City should partner with developers to acquire financing and streamline permitting, and get housing built in time for that recruit class to move into it.

Supervisors, I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan". The entire Board needs to hear that there is a better way to meet the state mandate, one that will actually produce housing.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Eileen Hirst
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: sm4art2@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Suzanne Martin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 11:33:29 AM

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 hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments: please protect all rent controlled apartments. Please do not demolish all rent controlled apartments. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Suzanne Martin
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: maureen@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Maureen Holt
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 11:37:32 AM

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 hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

We live in D2, one of the districts that, at least in its historical intent, speaks to the uniqueness and quirkiness of what SF has always represented - to those of us who live here and those who choose to come visit here. This is why our neighborhoods are desired tourist destinations. People do not come to SF to see Manhattan sized buildings. People do not choose to live in SF for Manhattan height apartments. The entire premise of "needing" multi-tier high rises in traditional/historical family neighborhoods reeks of disingenuousness. Creating canyons of unnecessary high rises not only diminish light, one of the key variables which affect both quality of life and perceived happiness but also flies in the face of the purported objective of creating "affordable housing". A 16th floor apartment on Lombard with unadulterated views will NEVER be "affordable housing" - neither will a 2nd floor apartment in the same building. We all know that and it is insulting for communications to keep delivering that message. Meanwhile, we have plenty of unused space all over downtown that we are all supposed to believe cannot be adapted for housing, if that is indeed what we are after. Residents are seriously disappointed in the direction that BOS/Planning Dept/Committees are taking that show little respect for this city we all love.

Sincerely,
Maureen Holt
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: mmshea03@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Maureen Mullane
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 11:37:53 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We implore you to take this slowly and thoughtfully.

Do not rush into legislation that you can not reverse.

You represent the people of San Francisco so listen to us.

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Think this through.

Sincerely,
Maureen Mullane
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: info@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Renee Lazear
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 11:42:09 AM

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 hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

October 20, 2025

To: Board of Supervisors' Land Use and Transportation Committee
Re: Upzoning Plan - Oppose

I am Renee Lazear, a longtime/multi-generation resident of District 4 (D4) and Outer Parkside, a 5th generation Californian, a co-founder of SON-SF (Save Our Neighborhoods SF) and a member of NUSF. I am opposed to the current Map proposals for Upzoning for the multiple reasons that have been shared at several meeting and/or hearings that will ruin our Communities & Neighborhoods.

In D4, we have already begun to feel the consequences of these reckless plans.

Though not directly associated with Upzoning, the closure of Great Highway has increased traffic on our streets along with the associated risks and if this plan passes the traffic will only increase even more without another proper traffic management plan.

Those of us who are opposed to this upzoning plans have been called "NIMBY" and unaccepting of change by certain people, but my family has been in the same home for half this City's history. We've lived through significant change & not shied from it but learned to differentiate progress from dumping. We aren't about nothing in our back yards but: what is to be placed there, what purpose it serves, what benefit it brings for the costs it extorts, in short, we're reasonable.

There are many other options currently available to provide Housing, such as revitalizing Downtown and converting offices into residential, to name a few options.

This City's not the sum of its monuments but the layers fashioned by generations into neighborhoods and the working communities that are inseparable from them.

Modern history has many examples of someone else's idea of the future that lasted barely two decades but destroyed permanently, many functioning neighborhoods.

Upzoning as proposed is a reactionary political expediency, no different than the Urban Renewal that plowed working communities into towering failures. I ask that the current Upzoning Map proposal be rejected and that going forward a real effort is made to engage the local public in reasonable discussions for reasonable plans.

Thank you,
Renee Lazear, Co-founder
SON-SF ~ Save Our Neighborhoods SF

Sincerely,
Renee Lazear
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: lareinatitania@gmail.com
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 11:49:28 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!
Most of us are not millionaires, cannot afford to buy new housing that is "affordable" and will

end up homeless and dead too soon if this continues as planned.
Thank you.

Sincerely,
Marsha Henderson

lareinatitania@gmail.com
4304 18th St.
San Francisco, California 94114

From: Joe Chmielewski
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 11:50:36 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,
Joseph Chmielewski

Joe Chmielewski
jcin506@yahoo.com
50 Golden Gate Ave #506
San Francisco , California 94102

From: ribeiromarie@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Marie Ribeiro
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 11:52:15 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Here in Glen Park we are ALREADY OVERLOADED as a transportation hub. Oursmall street infrastructure DOES NOT support 6 story housing in CENTRAL DOWNTOWN GLEN PARK . (Chenery @ Diamond and Kern St specifically.)

Doing so puts PEDESTRIANS and BIKE RIDERS. ALREADY AT RISK into MORE DANGEROUS RISK.

OUR SMALL STREET INFRASTRUCTURE demands a more individualized look at each specific neighborhood into affordable housing projects. ONE SIZE FIT ALL DOES NOT SERVE ANYONE.

Trying to fix the mistakes of the past with the same kind of blanket /sweeping regulations WILL NOT WORK. WE SHOULD NOT HAVE TO PAY FOR THE MISTAKES OF THOSE IN CHARGE.

PLEASE VOTE AGAINST THIS

Sincerely,
Marie Ribeiro

From: carole.glosenger@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of carole glosenger
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 11:52:57 AM

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 hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments: the upzoning plan is theworst idea for San Francisco. large apartment buildings in low height neighborhoods will be ugly and disruptive. If this plan goes through in the future people will say "who the hell let that happen" it looks like the "projects". They will say " That was Mayor Lurie".

Sincerely,
carole glosenger
San Francisco, CA 94117

From: Doug Woods
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 11:55:48 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,

Doug Woods
dwoods999@comcast.net
999 Fell St.
San Francisco, California 94117

From:	Carroll, John (BOS)
To:	"Elizabeth Madrigal"
Cc:	Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Sciammas, Charlie (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Cooper, Raynell (BOS)
Subject:	RE: 10/20 San Francisco Land Use and Transportation Committee - MidPen Housing Letter in Support of Family Zoning Plan - BOS File Nos. 250700 250701 250966
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 11:44:00 AM
Attachments:	MidPen Housing Letter on Family Zoning Plan, Land Use Committee.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 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. 250700
- Board of Supervisors File No. 250701
- Board of Supervisors File No. 250966

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: Elizabeth Madrigal <elizabeth.madrigal@midpen-housing.org>
Sent: Monday, October 20, 2025 10:52 AM

To: Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>
Subject: 10/20 San Francisco Land Use and Transportation Committee - MidPen Housing Letter in Support of Family Zoning Plan

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

Good morning,

Attached you will find MidPen's Housing's letter in support of the Family Zoning Plan, regarding item #2 at today's Land Use and Transportation committee meeting.

Please confirm receipt.

Best,

Elizabeth Madrigal | Policy Manager
MidPen Housing Corp.
275 Main Street, Suite 204, Watsonville, CA 95076
c. 831.240.8853
She | *Her* | *Hers*

MidPen HOUSING
Building Communities. Changing Lives.

October 20, 2025

Land Use and Transportation Committee
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Subject: Letter of Support for Family Zoning Plan

Dear Supervisors Melgar, Chen and Mahmood,

MidPen Housing is pleased to write to you in support of the Family Zoning Plan. We appreciate the time and care that has gone into developing this rezoning program with the intent of it leading to the production of desperately needed multifamily affordable housing in all neighborhoods throughout San Francisco.

MidPen Housing is one of the nation's leading nonprofit developers, owners, and managers of high-quality, affordable housing and onsite resident services. Since MidPen was founded in 1970, we have developed 139 communities and over 10,000 homes for low-income families, seniors and those with supportive housing needs throughout Northern California. In San Francisco, our team recently developed Shirley Chisholm Village which includes 135 affordable homes with a preference for SFUSD educators. Shirley Chisholm Village was the first 100% affordable housing development to break ground in the Sunset District in the last decade. Of the three affordable housing projects in the pipeline for District 2, two of them are developments of ours which will add 167 new affordable homes to the area.

The City and County of San Francisco's Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) sets a goal of 82,069 new homes by 2031. Over half of these homes have a target of being affordable to residents making 80% of the Area Median Income (AMI) and below. In order to meet these goals, San Francisco must utilize all tools at its disposal to increase multifamily housing development and ensure that production benefits everyone across the income spectrum. Drawing from deep experience working with jurisdictions across the Bay Area on housing element policy, our team published a guide on best practices.

The Family Zoning Plan is an important step toward remedying historic patterns of segregation by dismantling hallmarks of exclusionary zoning and by allowing denser multifamily housing in northern and western neighborhoods. These well-resourced neighborhoods represent more than 50% of the city's total land but only 10% of all new housing built in the last 15 years. Our team is glad to be actively contributing towards building affordable housing in Housing Opportunity Areas to meet the city's mandate of Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing.

Thank you for your leadership and ongoing commitment to the production of affordable housing. Please feel free to contact Nevada V. Merriman, Vice President of Policy & Advocacy, with any questions at 650-477-6195 or nmerriman@midpen-housing.org.

Best Regards,

Nevada V. Merriman
Vice President of Policy and Advocacy

CC: Matthew O. Franklin, President and CEO, MidPen Housing
Elizabeth Madrigal, Policy Manager, MidPen Housing

From:	Carroll, John (BOS)
To:	George Wooding
Cc:	Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Sciammas, Charlie (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Cooper, Raynell (BOS)
Subject:	RE: 250966, 250700, 250701
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 11:44:00 AM
Attachments:	Housing Alert v2.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. 250700
- Board of Supervisors File No. 250701
- Board of Supervisors File No. 250966

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, October 19, 2025 9:41 PM

To: Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>; George Wooding <gswooding@gmail.com>
Subject: 250966, 250700, 250701

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

October 19, 2025

Dear Mr Carroll,

Please submit the attached letter, regarding the San Francisco Land Use October 20 Land Use Committee as written testimony.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,

Housing Alert

Notice of potential rezoning of height and or density in San Francisco. Please stop this bad zoning law by attending the September 11 Planning Commission meeting, testifying against this zoning proposal, and/or writing a letter.

Why didn't the San Francisco Land Use and Transportation Committee's District seven (D7) Committee Chair, Myrna Melgar want to notify San Francisco residents of the massive rezoning changes to the planning code that would impact their neighborhoods? The Committee was counting on an uninformed public. Public ignorance is political bliss.

In opposition, Sup. Connie Chan (D1) introduced legislation that would require the Planning Department to send a notice by US mail to every residential or commercial tenant and every property owner within 300 feet of a proposed zoning change. Chan's legislation won at the Board of Supervisors on an eight to three vote. The three votes against the legislation were Myrna Melgar (D7), Bilal Mahmood(D11) and Matt Dorsey (D6).

Melgar said that the rezoning notification to the public is "not necessary." Why would Melgar be worried about 300,000 notifications? Well, maybe 200,000 residents might be concerned and another 50,000 residents might be angry. For the D7 supervisor who represents a moderate district with the most residential housing, Melgar is starting to act more like a YIMBY (Yes In My Back Yard) every day. It might be time for her to have lunch with Scott Wiener and Joel Engardio to discuss strategy.

"In the neighborhoods I represent, many have a lot of concerns and doubts about displacement," Chan said. "Not just tenants, but small businesses and aging homeowners, are worried they could fall victim to speculative real estate investors and be displaced."

Replacement of Demolished Units: For rent-controlled units in areas targeted for increased density and potential demolition under the plan, there are stipulations requiring that any demolished rent-controlled unit be replaced with another rent-controlled unit, and that the displaced tenants have the right to return to the new building. Residents cannot afford to wait while their housing is torn down and rebuilt.

Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning" plan in San Francisco is a subject of intense debate, with concerns raised about its potential impact on existing tenants. While the plan aims to increase housing availability and affordability, opponents argue that it will lead to displacement.

Lurie's plan will only succeed in making developers rich, while diminishing the quality of life in San Francisco. Rent and housing prices will increase—not decrease because of the scarcity of land, less affordable housing will be built and fewer small businesses will remain open. There will be less affordable housing—not more.

In 48 Hills, August 3 article, titled "Small Business Commission rejects (for now) Lurie's upzoning plan" Calvin Welsh states, "This isn't an affordable housing program. This is a real-estate development plan, a plan for speculators. … Haight Street will see the displacement of roughly 50 percent of neighborhood businesses. There is nothing in this plan to preserve neighborhood serving retail.

Further, "If you want it in this plan, this commission [Planning Commission] must come up with the language. … You should amend the plan to require preservation of neighborhood businesses and neighborhood shopping districts." Calvin Welsh is right.

The upzoning plan is difficult to understand. So…this provides the simplest explanation of Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning plan. Developers and billionaires run San Francisco (Lurie is a billionaire). Billionaires and developers donate to local politicians and this gives them immense power over City Planning---ask former Planning Director Rich Hillis who stated on his May 3rd resignation letter, "I'm looking forward to taking some time off and thinking about what is next for me."

The Family Zoning plan was never about affordability. The Planning Department was ordered to create as much height and square footage as possible for developers. The plan was designed to demolish huge chunks of residential housing and Neighborhood Districts (NCDs). The demolision zones are permanent. Now that most of Planning's permit and CEQA and building guidelines have been removed or reduced, developers can do just about anything that they want to.

Developers can also get rid of affordable housing by paying an inclusionary housing fee or In Lieu fees to the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD). By paying these fees, Developers can now purchase the Planning Departments permission to build much more profitable Market-Rate structures. Developers will make a fortune as they carve-up San Francisco's NCDs and residential housing.

The Mayor's "Family Zoning Plan" should be renamed "The Developer's Demolition and Displacement of NCDs and Residential Neighborhoods" plan

Over 50% of San Francisco's storefronts have already closed: A San Francisco Chamber of Commerce study from August 2020 revealed that 54% of storefront businesses in San Francisco had closed due to COVID-19, with approximately 1,300 closures.

Data from the city planning department suggests that a significant number of small businesses in neighborhood commercial districts (NCDs) could face displacement under Mayor Lurie's plan to allow more housing density. Developers might be encouraged to demolish existing small buildings, which often house small businesses, to build larger residential structures. San Francisco's small business community may start to face extinction.

No small business can survive waiting for four years to have its location rebuilt. Some San Francisco Supervisors are discussing creating a small business relocation fund. Where will the business go and what will it cost to relocate. How much money would a developer be charged? Supervisor Myrna Melgar is trying to create legislation to develop this fund.0}

It's important to note that the Mayor's plans are multifaceted, and some aspects can potentially displace existing residents. Where will these residents go?

Under San Francisco's 2022 housing element and state law, the city must expand housing affordability and availability. This proposed citywide rezoning may increase the height and/or density limits of your neighborhood or others in your neighborhood.

The main purpose of this massive rezoning was to build more affordable housing. The only affordable housing that will be built will be subsidized by the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD). The MOHCD is broke. Developers will not want to build new affordable housing because it will not be profitable.

Under existing planning guidelines, developers can pay the city extra money (inclusionary housing fees and/or in lieu fees) to not build affordable housing. Thus, the city makes money on projects that do not abide by affordable housing guidelines, and developers sell residential units at market-rate prices.

Sadly, San Franciscans with an average median Income (AMI) of $150,000 or less could not afford to purchase any affordable housing without being subsidized. Yimby's members will still be living in their parent's basement.

Delete44444/Dlete[**The Family Zoning Plan is only partially about height and density; the real purpose is to create permanent demolition zones throughout San Francisco—especially on the Westside.** }

"This rezoning legislation is a key step toward meeting our state housing goals. We are laying the foundation for small and midsize housing projects in areas of the city where we have seen little housing production, allowing us to welcome new residents while supporting long-term tenants and small businesses," said **Sarah Dennis Philips, Director of San Francisco Planning Department**. "The mayor's Family Zoning plan effectively balances the preservation of our city's character with the necessary flexibility to ensure San Franciscans across all income levels can continue to call this great city home." Phillips was appointed by Lurie to be the new planning director in June.

Phillips statements regarding the Mayor's Family Zoning Plan is puffery The Family Zoning Plan is only partially about height ////density and affordability; the real purpose is to create permanent demolition zones throughout San Francisco—especially on the Westside.

DeleteThe Planning Department's demolition maps and guidelines will be designed to make as much money for developers as possible. These developers, in turn, will make contributions to local politicians.}

Ninety percent of the Planning Department's revenue comes from issuing permits.

The endgame is ////////"Density Decontrol" in San Francisco. Density Decontrol is a zoning policy being proposed in San Francisco that would remove unit limits on properties, allowing developers to build as many or as few residential units as possible within a building's height and space limitations. This proposal is a key part of San Francisco's efforts to address its housing crisis and meet state-mandated housing targets.

Residents should certainly be aware of Mayor Lurie's Family Zoning Plan, especially if they wish to save San Francisco's small businesses, residential housing, and special character of our neighborhoods, and be allowed to respond before the legislation becomes law.

If you love San Francisco, please don't support Mayor Lurie's housing plan. Neighborhood character will be destroyed as 40-foot-high housing will be allowed in residential mid-block streets and 55+ foot residential housing will be built on corner lots. NCD's will be built at 65', -140'+.

Every homeowner and renter should attend these two meetings:

-The D4/D7 Town Hall on Sep 4th is to ensure west side residents are aware of what's happening with the rezoning, and energize them, ***after*** they receive the public notices (week of Aug 11) and ***ahead*** of the Sept 11 Planning Commission Vote & Sept 16 D4 Recall Election of Joel Engardio. There will be press coverage and potentially a live stream, to ensure reach.
Location: Irish Cultural Center (Thursday, Sept 4, 6 pm)

For questions or to request a meeting with the planning department on the family zoning plan email: sf.housing.choice@sfgov.org

PLANNING COMMISSION HEARING DATE:

Thursday, September 11, 2025

Place:

City Hall, 1 Dr. Carleton B. Goodlett Place, Room 400, 12:00pm (noon)

CASE TYPE:

Planning Code and zoning map amendment

San Francisco Planning Commission

Project Name:

San Francisco zoning plan (Housing Element Rezoning program)

Case# 20021-00587CWP

QR Code Link: https://sfplanning.org/sf-family-zoning-plan

Board File Nos: 250700 and 25076

George Wooding

From:	Carroll, John (BOS)
To:	Quintin Mecke; Lurie, Daniel (MYR)
Cc:	Segal, Ned (MYR); Chen, Lisa (CPC); Tanner, Rachael (CPC); Bonde, Aly (MYR); White, Ben (MYR); Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Sciammas, Charlie (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Cooper, Raynell (BOS)
Subject:	RE: Affordability in the Proposed Family Zoning Plan - BOS File Nos. 250700 250701 250966
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 11:44:00 AM
Attachments:	CCHO Letter, Affordability in Family Zoning Plan.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 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. 250700
- Board of Supervisors File No. 250701
- Board of Supervisors File No. 250966

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: Quintin Mecke <quintin@sfccho.org>
Sent: Monday, October 20, 2025 11:24 AM

To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>
Cc: Segal, Ned (MYR) <ned.segal@sfgov.org>; Chen, Lisa (CPC) <lisa.chen@sfgov.org>; Tanner, Rachael (CPC) <rachael.tanner@sfgov.org>; Bonde, Aly (MYR) <aly.bonde@sfgov.org>; White, Ben (MYR) <ben.white1@sfgov.org>; Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC) <sarah.dennis-phillips@sfgov.org>
Subject: Affordability in the Proposed Family Zoning Plan

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

Dear Mayor Lurie,

On behalf of the Council of Community Housing Organizations (CCHO) and our member agencies, we write to express deep concern that the proposed Family Zoning Plan, while well-intentioned, lacks a clear and realistic pathway to producing affordable housing in San Francisco.

Our coalition has decades of collective experience developing, financing, and building affordable housing across the city. Based on that experience, we think it's critical to provide a plausible pathway for achieving the affordability outcomes our city desperately needs.

We recognize the importance of submitting a zoning-compliant map to the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) that demonstrates theoretical capacity.

However, as currently drafted, the Family Zoning Plan offers no meaningful mechanism for actually delivering the affordable homes required to meet San Francisco's Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) goals.

The private market is simply not designed or fiscally equipped to produce deeply affordable units, and there are no provisions that enable affordable housing developers to acquire land, access financing, or build at the scale required.

Affordability Is San Francisco's Defining Challenge

Affordability is the single most urgent issue facing San Franciscans today. Yet the Family Zoning Plan—like many initiatives before it—relies heavily on the private market to deliver affordability. This approach has failed. No scale of market-rate development will generate the deeply affordable housing needed, and inclusionary Below Market Rate (BMR) requirements or in-lieu fees, while important, produce only a fraction of the housing needed and cannot meet the deep affordability mandates set by the state.

In fact, 57% of the rezoning capacity still needed under RHNA—20,300 of the remaining 36,200 units—must serve low-income households. Market-rate development priced at $3,400 for a one-bedroom unit will not meet the needs of San Francisco's low-income families. More than half of family-household residents in the

city are low- or very low-income, including approximately 36% who earn less than 50% of Area Median Income (AMI).

The adopted Housing Element offers a rare opportunity to create a bold, proactive citywide vision for affordable housing—one that the private market cannot and will not deliver. Affordable housing solutions must be implemented citywide and west-side rezoning should prioritize affordable housing, especially in areas that are vulnerable to displacement.

Our Recommendations

To ensure the Family Zoning Plan becomes a meaningful tool for affordability—not simply a symbolic gesture to satisfy state requirements—we urge the following:

1. Amend the legislation to include an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD).

Establish a clear framework to incentivize and prioritize 100% affordable housing, including additional height, density, or streamlined approvals for nonprofit and community developers.

Mapping and reserving feasible parcels now will ensure that affordable housing remains a viable and competitive land use even as property values rise. Without targeted site identification, the benefits of upzoning will accrue primarily to private market developers, undermining the Plan's stated intent to support families and low-income residents.

2. Prioritize publicly owned sites for 100% affordable housing.

Designate feasible public parcels—such as **Kirkland Yard**—for 100% affordable projects to ensure that upzoning results in equitable development, not speculative private gain.

3. Commit to a 2026 Affordable Housing Funding Measure.

Pair zoning reforms with public investment. A voter-approved 2026 housing bond or equivalent funding measure is essential to unlock the 17,675 affordable units currently in the development pipeline. These projects are ready to build, but they cannot move forward without financing.

A Call for Leadership

San Franciscans expect real solutions to the affordability crisis. We need a plan that reflects how housing actually gets built, not just where it could be built.

We urge your administration to work closely with us to deliver that plan—one that strengthens communities, stabilizes families, and keeps San Francisco a city for everyone.

We appreciate your leadership and stand ready to collaborate in refining the Family Zoning Plan so it truly delivers on its promise of affordability and equity.

Sincerely,

The member agencies of the Council of Community Housing Organizations (CCHO):

-
-
- Bernal Heights Neighborhood Center
-
-
-
- Bill Sorro Housing Program
-
-
-
- Chinatown Community Development Center
-
-
-
- Episcopal Community Services
-
-
-
- Homeownership SF
-
-
-
- HomeRise
-
-
-
- One Treasure Island
-
-
-
- People Organized to Demand Environmental and Economic Rights (PODER)
-
-
-

- Progress Foundation
- San Francisco Community Land Trust
- San Francisco Housing Development Corporation
- Self-Help for the Elderly
- Senior and Disability Action
- South of Market Community Action Network (SOMCAN)
- Swords to Plowshares
- Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation (TNDC)
- Young Community Developers

Quintin Mecke (he/him)

Executive Director
Council of Community Housing Organizations
quintin@sfccho.org

CCHO COUNCIL OF COMMUNITY HOUSING ORGANIZATIONS

October 20, 2025

Mayor Daniel Lurie
San Francisco City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

CC: San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Re: Ensuring Affordability in the Proposed Family Zoning Plan

Dear Mayor Lurie,

On behalf of the Council of Community Housing Organizations (CCHO) and our member agencies, we write to express deep concern that the proposed Family Zoning Plan, while well-intentioned, lacks a clear and realistic pathway to producing affordable housing in San Francisco.

Our coalition has decades of collective experience developing, financing, and building affordable housing across the city. Based on that experience, we think it's critical to provide a plausible pathway for achieving the affordability outcomes our city desperately needs.

We recognize the importance of submitting a zoning-compliant map to the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) that demonstrates theoretical capacity. However, as currently drafted, the Family Zoning Plan offers no meaningful mechanism for actually delivering the affordable homes required to meet San Francisco's Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) goals.

The private market is simply not designed or fiscally equipped to produce deeply affordable units, and there are no provisions that enable affordable housing developers to acquire land, access financing, or build at the scale required.

Affordability Is San Francisco's Defining Challenge

Affordability is the single most urgent issue facing San Franciscans today. Yet the Family Zoning Plan—like many initiatives before it—relies heavily on the private market to deliver affordability. This approach has failed. No scale of market-rate development will generate the deeply affordable housing needed, and inclusionary Below Market Rate (BMR) requirements or in-lieu fees, while important, produce only a fraction of the housing needed and cannot meet the deep affordability mandates set by the state.

In fact, 57% of the rezoning capacity still needed under RHNA—20,300 of the remaining 36,200 units—must serve low-income households. Market-rate development priced at $3,400 for a one-bedroom unit will not meet the needs of San Francisco's low-income families. More than half of family-household residents in the city are low- or very low-income, including approximately 36% who earn less than 50% of Area Median Income (AMI).

The adopted Housing Element offers a rare opportunity to create a bold, proactive citywide vision for affordable housing—one that the private market cannot and will not deliver. Affordable housing solutions must be implemented citywide and west-side rezoning should prioritize affordable housing, especially in areas that are vulnerable to displacement.

Our Recommendations

To ensure the Family Zoning Plan becomes a meaningful tool for affordability—not simply a symbolic gesture to satisfy state requirements—we urge the following:

1. Amend the legislation to include an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD).

Establish a clear framework to incentivize and prioritize 100% affordable housing, including additional height, density, or streamlined approvals for nonprofit and community developers.

Mapping and reserving feasible parcels now will ensure that affordable housing remains a viable and competitive land use even as property values rise. Without targeted site identification, the benefits of upzoning will accrue primarily to private market developers, undermining the Plan's stated intent to support families and low-income residents.

2. Prioritize publicly owned sites for 100% affordable housing.

Designate feasible public parcels—such as **Kirkland Yard**—for 100% affordable projects to ensure that upzoning results in equitable development, not speculative private gain.

3. Commit to a 2026 Affordable Housing Funding Measure.

Pair zoning reforms with public investment. A voter-approved 2026 housing bond or equivalent funding measure is essential to unlock the 17,675 affordable units currently in the development pipeline. These projects are ready to build, but they cannot move forward without financing.

A Call for Leadership

San Franciscans expect real solutions to the affordability crisis. We need a plan that reflects how housing actually gets built, not just where it could be built.

Council of Community Housing Organizations
325 Clementina St. San Francisco, CA • ccho@sfccho.org

We urge your administration to work closely with us to deliver that plan—one that strengthens communities, stabilizes families, and keeps San Francisco a city for everyone.

We appreciate your leadership and stand ready to collaborate in refining the Family Zoning Plan so it truly delivers on its promise of affordability and equity.

Sincerely,

The member agencies of the Council of Community Housing Organizations (CCHO):

- Bernal Heights Neighborhood Center
- Bill Sorro Housing Program
- Chinatown Community Development Center
- Episcopal Community Services
- Homeownership SF
- HomeRise
- One Treasure Island
- People Organized to Demand Environmental and Economic Rights (PODER)
- Progress Foundation
- San Francisco Community Land Trust
- San Francisco Housing Development Corporation
- Self-Help for the Elderly
- Senior and Disability Action
- South of Market Community Action Network (SOMCAN)
- Swords to Plowshares
- Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation (TNDC)
- Young Community Developers

From:	Carroll, John (BOS)
To:	"Kelly Groth"
Cc:	Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Sciammas, Charlie (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Cooper, Raynell (BOS)
Subject:	RE: Letters for File No. 250701 - BOS File Nos. 250700 250701 250966
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 11:44:00 AM
Attachments:	LUT Committee File No. 250701 Letters 10.20.25.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 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. 250700
- Board of Supervisors File No. 250701
- Board of Supervisors File No. 250966

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: Kelly Groth <kelly@sfccho.org>
Sent: Monday, October 20, 2025 10:59 AM

To: Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>
Subject: Letters for File No. 250701

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

Good morning Clerk Carroll,

Please see attached letters to be included in File No. 250701 - Family Zoning Plan.

Thank you,
Kelly

Kelly Groth (she/her)
Policy & Communications Director

October 17, 2025

Please support Supervisor Chan's Affordable Housing SUD amendments

Chair Melgar and Land Use Committee Members,

On behalf of the Council of Community Housing Organizations (CCHO), I urge your support for Supervisor Chan's proposed amendment to the Family Zoning Plan, to create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD).

This amendment keeps public land working for the public: it prioritizes city-owned parcels for 100% affordable housing, maps and reserves feasible sites, and gives nonprofit/community builders a viable path with modest height/density and expedited approvals. Without these guardrails, broad upzoning will invite speculation, drive up land costs, and make it financially impossible for affordable developers to compete, especially on sites like Kirkland Yard. The SUD aligns rezoning with our regional housing affordability needs and focuses production where deep affordability is actually achievable.

Without an Affordable Housing SUD, the plan won't deliver deeply affordable homes.

Thank you for ensuring the Family Zoning Plan results in actual affordable homes, not just theoretical capacity.

Signed,
F. Joseph Butler, AIA Emeritus
San Francisco, CA 94133

October 17, 2025

Support affordable housing amendment to the Mayors plan

Dear Supervisors:

The Mayors family rezoning plan does not protect affordable housing units. Please vote to amend the plan with Supervisor Chan's affordable housing amendments. These proposals are critical to actually achieving the affordable housing needs of the city.

Thank you.

Regina Sneed
San Francisco, CA 94109

October 17, 2025

Keep affordable housing in Family Zoning Plan

Please add anti-displacement clauses, and provide affordability clauses in the final draft of the Family Zoning Plan or delay this measure until there is enough protections to keep all San Franciscans to be able to live in the future of our great city.

-Michael Nulty
Writing on behalf of Tenants Associations Coalition of San Francisco

San Francisco, CA 94142

October 20, 2025

Include Affordable Housing in Family Zoning

Honorable members of the Land Use and Transportation Committee,

I write to you today in support of 3 amendments to the Family Zoning plan proposed by the Council of Community Housing Organizations:

1) Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD): Give nonprofit/community developers the height, density, and fast-track approvals needed to build 100% affordable homes
2) Prioritize public land for public good: Prioritize publicly owned sites (including places like Kirkland Yard) for 100% affordable projects
3) Pair Zoning with Public Investment: Commit to a 2026 Affordable Housing Funding Measure to unlock 17,000+ affordable homes already in the pipeline.

57% of the rezoning capacity still needed under RHNA, 20,300 of the remaining 36,200 units, must serve low-income households. These 3 strategies provide us a realistic roadmap to meet that goal.

Thank you for your work on this important issue.

Mitch Mankin
San Francisco Housing Development Corporation

From:	Carroll, John (BOS)
To:	"Dian Blomquist"
Cc:	Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Sciammas, Charlie (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Cooper, Raynell (BOS)
Subject:	RE: NO to Destructive Zoning on Fisherman's Wharf - BOS File Nos. 250700 250701 250966
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 11:44:00 AM
Attachments:	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. 250700
- Board of Supervisors File No. 250701
- Board of Supervisors File No. 250966

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: Dian Blomquist <blomquist.dian@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 20, 2025 8:27 AM
To: Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>

Subject: Fwd: NO to Destructive Zoning on Fisherman's Wharf

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

Begin forwarded message:

From: Dian Blomquist <blomquist.dian@gmail.com>
Subject: NO to Destructive Zoning on Fisherman's Wharf
Date: October 20, 2025 at 8:13:39 AM PDT

Please vote NO today on the upzoning plans. Please don't let specious promises destroy our beautiful city! Promoted by the unworkable demands put through the California legislature by the same people in the name of greed and not affordable housing!

Thank you,

Dian Blomquist
1632 Taylor Street
San Francisco 94133

From: Liam Hennessy
To: Sauter, Danny (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; Carroll, John (BOS)
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 11:17:28 AM

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

October 20, 2025

Good morning,
My name is Liam Hennesy and I am a native San Franciscan who has taught Special Education in SFUSD for 32 years. I am writing to you from my 1907 flat in North Beach asking you to not include North Beach in the Up Zoning plan.

This little flat of mine has lots of history to it as did many of the other places that I occupied in North Beach before finding this "forever home". I have had a long love affair with North Beach ever since I was a little boy. My grandfather was a waiter at The Tivoli, an Italian family restaurant which now is called Savoy Tivoli. I remember going to St. Francis church(the Irish Church in a mostly Italian neighborhood) and then going to meet my grandfather at the restaurant. He was also the head waiter at Julius Castle which hangs on the side of Montgomery Street overlooking the bay; as if it really was a castle and royalty lived there. The walk up the hill to reach it was an adventure for me as a child (still is) with all the hidden gardens, incredible architecture, magnificent views and Coit tower haunting me as I climbed. I still marvel at the beautiful area that we call North Beach.

Each and every day I walk and rediscover the beauty of North Beach. I love to look at the architecture of buildings that Willis Polk, Pflüger, Mabeck, Julian Morgan and others built in North Beach. Not only do I see these beautiful buildings but I get to appreciate the memories of my youth with going to grab coffee at Cafe Trieste each and every day.
The history of the Italians, the Irish, the Chinese make North Beach a beautiful melting pot of which people from all over the world come to visit.

I have swum in the San Francisco bay for more years than I would like to express but I have been a Dolphin Club member for over 40 years. The club's history was passed on to me from the "old timers" who were mostly Italian and Irish. They also passed on the rich history of North Beach and why they felt it was the "Crown Jewel" of San Francisco.
Every day I am grateful to live in "Our City" but most grateful to live in the part that is the Crown Jewel.

Increasing the height limit will ruin the iconic neighborhood that so many people from around the world come to see. They come for all the reasons I mentioned above as well as many not listed.

Please keep it the Crown Jewel of San Francisco by not increasing the height limit. San Franciscans and others deserve to keep the beauty of North Beach intact.

Sincerely,

Liam Francis Hennessy
169 Pfeiffer Street,
San Francisco CA 94133

From:	Liam Hennessy
To:	Melgar, Myrna (BOS); ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; Carroll, John (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS)
Subject:	No Up Zoning in North Beach
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 10:59:43 AM

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

October 20,2025

Good Morning,

My name is Liam Hennessy and I have lived in North Beach since 1985. I reside in a flat on Pfeiffer and Stockton streets. My neighborhood was not originally included in any upzoning plan until our Supervisor Danny Sauter decided to add it. Why? He has never answered this question or many others that neighbors such as myself have tried to get him to answer.

I am very upset that without so much as a public meeting or notification, North Beach was put into this reckless plan even though the neighborhood is already one of the densest in our beautiful city. The creators and backers of this plan never took into account any of the concerns of the neighborhood's residents! Mayor Lurie and Supervisor Sauter even postponed the voting on North Beach becoming a Historic Neighborhood, in hopes I am sure, that it would not get in the way of his "Family Zoning Plan" proposal being adopted.

There has not been enough collaboration with the people who are going to be most affected by this proposal. This Family Zoning plan was not created to enrich the lives of individuals who want to live in North Beach or for those that already do or for those that will be pushed out because of it. This is not an easy fix to our housing crisis. We need to be more creative with our approach to our housing needs. However, those approaches Should Not Come from the Big Developers trying to get a HUGE WINFALL or POLITICIANS WHO ARE BOUGHT in order to climb the political ladder BUT by the people of North Beach. We have a huge stake in this and this decision will change the neighborhood forever. Once it is done there is no going back. Remember the Redevelopment Era?

The plan to include North Beach into Lurie's Upzoning proposal was a blatant lie to all of the residences and businesses in North Beach by politicians that used their power to hide the fact that their ambition for power/money is more important than the community that elected them.

Making decisions about the fate of a person's neighborhood behind a facade of wanting to create more housing for the working people is disingenuous, especially since it was all hidden from the constituents. High Rise Condominiums all along the Wharf, splattered around North Beach, Telegraph Hill, etc will not be affordable to the individuals that this proposal is trying to house. It will only be affordable to the rich, It will ruin the neighborhood and it will create another redevelopment nightmare with horrible consequences.

Danny Sauter and his YIMBY lobbyists along with the Planning Department have not involved the neighborhood residents, businesses etc. in the decision to replace our incredible neighborhood, which tourists travel the world to see, with a Miami Beach one instead. This plan was not done with the constituents' needs in mind, but rather with those of developers and Mr. Sauter’s donors instead(and in secret). It is not what is best for North Beach or the City at large.

Please make significant changes to the Up Zoning map because it will destroy North Beach. As a native, as a retired San Francisco Unified School teacher I plead that you really take a hard look at what is being proposed, how it will impact North Beach and the City at large, maybe even go to St. Peters and Paul's and pray on it… you never know.

Onwards,
Liam Hennessy
169 Pfeiffer Street
San Francisco Ca 94133

From: Romalyn Schmaltz
To: Sauter, Danny (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject: General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan — BOS File No. 250966
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 9:57:32 AM

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

October 20, 2025

From: Romalyn Schmaltz, North Beach resident

To: myrna.melgar@sfgov.org, chyanne.chen@sfgov.org, bilal.mahmood@sfgov.org, daniel.lurie@sfgov.org, danny.sauter@sfgov.org, john.carroll@sfgov.org

Chair Myrna Melgar
Supervisors Chyanne Chen, Bilal Mahmood,
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Land Use and Transportation Committee
c/o Clerk John Carroll
Cc: Mayor Daniel Lurie, D3 Supervisor Danny Sauter

Subject: General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan — BOS File No. 250966

Dear Chair Melgar and Supervisors Chen and Mahmood:

Thank you Supervisors, especially Supervisors Chen and Chan for offering meaningful amendments to a “Family Zoning Plan” that isn’t at all about families and, as Commissioner Moore stated at the Planning Commission hearing on 9/11, isn’t even a plan by any Planning standards. It’s more of a press release turned policy. And that’s consistent with the personalities pushing this non-plan: marketers-turned-legislators, billionaires who use money like a carpenter uses caulk, and luxury real-estate lobbyists.

I’m Romalyn Schmaltz, 20-year resident of North Beach and working artist, and I like quoting Leonard Cohen. *Everybody Knows* this deal is rotten, and our D3 constituency is bereaved and furious that our D3 Representative sworn to protect us straightaway began selling our most precious public assets to private developers while lining up our lives to be demo’d and displaced. Anyone who’s done any time in land use policy knows this is true. The working class and artists will not survive this degree of upzoning. Families will not find housing. And many small businesses will

definitely be gone with the construction dust. All while our waterfront is walled off from residents and visitors.

So please adopt all of Chen and Chan's salient amendments today including:

ZERO evictions from rent-controlled apartments. Tens of thousands of vulnerable people live in duplexes too.

The Housing Element implementation must focus on affordable housing first. Create Chan's Affordable Housing Special Use District.

Serious protections for our small businesses, like one-to-one replacement.

And please, for the love of your own legacies, land on the right side of history and protect our waterfront from mid-rise development. Fisherman's Wharf is a great location for much-needed housing, but this non-plan will absolutely crush our public waterfront vistas—the reason so many people visit us in the first place. Everybody Knows the scene will be dead without them, and it would be forever named after those who made it so.

Thank you,

Romalyn Schmaltz
North Beach Resident

From:	paul erickson
To:	Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject:	General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan — BOS File No. 250966
Date:	Sunday, October 19, 2025 10:07:08 PM
Attachments:	Apollo Land Use letter - Google Docs.pdf

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

Dear Chair Melgar and Supervisors Chen and Mahmood:
I'm Apollo, a working musician living in North Beach. I'm that guy developers sound so excited about—a new San Franciscan! Before that, I lived in Los Angeles, New York City, and Minneapolis. I love them all, but nothing compares to the human scale, community, open-air sunshine, and free public views of the water from everywhere in my new neighborhood. I can't believe anyone would voluntarily destroy it for any amount of money.
I've also lived in and toured in enough cities to know upzoning kills creative communities. It's true in Austin, which became unaffordable for artists and the working class. Same with Vancouver BC and Portland. In fact, there's no example of a city where upzoning did anything but displace thousands, raise rents, and flatten culture. Nothing in the proposed "Family Zoning Plan" will make it easier for actual working families or artists like me to live in my neighborhood. It's mostly luxury or market-rate studios and 1-bedrooms.
So please approve all of Supervisors Chen's and Chan's amendments, especially the protection of all rent-controlled units. I'm in a Victorian triplex, so I get to stay under the mayor's amendment, but our neighbors — actual families — in the rent-controlled duplexes nearby can get evicted???

That's wrong, and that alone will displace thousands. Please protect them and the last of the rent-controlled housing that keeps communities together. And please honor all their amendments for real affordable housing and small business protections.
And please seize this opportunity to be remembered as a heroic legacy legislator — PLEASE SPARE OUR WATERFRONT FROM UPZONING. Walling it off is a disgrace no one wants, but everyone will remember.
Thank you,
Paul Erickson
North Beach Resident

October 6, 2025

From: Paul Erickson, North Beach renter

To: myrna.melgar@sfgov.org, chyanne.chen@sfgov.org, bilal.mahmood@sfgov.org, daniel.lurie@sfgov.org, danny.sauter@sfgov.org, john.carroll@sfgov.org

Chair Myrna Melgar
Supervisors Chyanne Chen, Bilal Mahmood,
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Land Use and Transportation Committee
c/o Clerk John Carroll
Cc: Mayor Daniel Lurie, D3 Supervisor Danny Sauter

Subject: General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan — BOS File No. 250966

Dear Chair Melgar and Supervisors Chen and Mahmood:

I'm Apollo, a working musician living in North Beach. I'm that guy developers sound so excited about—*a new San Franciscan!* Before that, I lived in Los Angeles, New York City, and Minneapolis. I love them all, but nothing compares to the human scale, community, open-air sunshine, and free public views of the water from everywhere in my new neighborhood. I can't believe anyone would voluntarily destroy it for any amount of money.

I've also lived in and toured in enough cities to know upzoning kills creative communities. It's true in Austin, which became unaffordable for artists and the working class. Same with Vancouver BC and Portland. In fact, there's no example of a city where upzoning did *anything but* displace thousands, raise rents, and flatten culture.

Nothing in the proposed "Family Zoning Plan" will make it easier for actual working families or artists like me to live in my neighborhood. It's mostly luxury or market-rate studios and 1-bedrooms.

So please *approve all* of Supervisors Chen's and Chan's amendments, especially the protection of *all* rent-controlled units. I'm in a Victorian triplex, so I get to stay under the mayor's amendment, but our neighbors — actual families — in the rent-controlled duplexes nearby *can get evicted???*

That's wrong, and that alone will displace thousands. Please protect them and the last of the rent-controlled housing that keeps communities together. And please honor *all* their amendments for *real* affordable housing and small business protections.

And please seize this opportunity to be remembered as a heroic legacy legislator — ***PLEASE SPARE OUR WATERFRONT FROM UPZONING*.** Walling it off is a disgrace no one wants, but *everyone will remember*.

Thank you,

Paul Erickson
North Beach rResident

From:	Lily Wong
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); ChenStaff; Sciammas, Charlie (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Cooper, Raynell (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Logan, Samantha (BOS)
Cc:	Jessica Ho; Li Miao Lovett; Manson Leung; Lamar Heystek; Ben Wong; Kimberly Szeto; Leon Chow; Gabi W.
Subject:	General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan BOS File No. 250966
Date:	Sunday, October 19, 2025 7:42:37 PM
Attachments:	10.20.25 SCCD LUT Committee Letter Zoning.pdf

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

Dear Supervisors, Aides and Mr. Carroll,

Please see attached letter for the Sunset Chinese Cultural District's letter regarding the Family Zoning Plan, file No. 250966.

Lily

Lily Wong 黃麗瑜
Director of Community Engagement 社區聯繫總監
Sunset Chinese Cultural District Director 日落區中華文化區總監

1400 Judah Street
San Francisco, CA 94122
415-665-4212 | *wahmei.org*
sfsccd.org
Direct: (707) 653-5813

SUNSET CHINESE CULTURAL DISTRICT
日落區中華文化區

October 19. 2025

TO: Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors Land Use and Transportation Committee
FROM: Sunset Chinese Cultural District Housing Sub-Committee

SUBJECT: Proposed Family Zoning Amendments – **The Critical Need for Funding**

Honorable Supervisors,

I submit this comment regarding the zoning changes under consideration, on behalf of the **Sunset Chinese Cultural District (SCCD)'s Housing Sub-Committee.**

We recognize and strongly support that zoning reform is an essential step toward addressing San Francisco's deep-seated housing and affordability crisis. However, while new zoning maps and increased density are necessary, they are not, on their own, sufficient to protect and stabilize communities like the Sunset District.

Impact on the Sunset District

The Sunset is a unique, historic, and culturally rich community, home to a significant population of working-class families, seniors, and Chinese American residents. The Cultural District's 2025 July Westside Housing Convening highlights the primary concerns of residents: a fear of displacement, the loss of essential culturally competent small businesses, and inadequate infrastructure (such as parking and transit) to support increased density.

We recognize that zoning modifications are a part of the mix of solutions that help drive housing affordability. However, **protective measures for existing situations are critical to a sustainable neighborhood and would better align with community interests for its legislative passage.** Without the targeted protective measures and resources required to implement them, we create a fertile environment for land speculation, potentially leading to the demolition of buildings that house our long-standing small businesses and the very heart of SCCD's placemaking efforts. As the Cultural District's work, including the community feedback received in the 2025 July 26 Housing Convening, underscores, these are not just houses; they are the infrastructure that supports the cultural and economic lives of hundreds of families.

Support for Essential Amendments

We commend and **strongly support the proposed amendments and legislation by Supervisors Melgar, Chen, and Chan** that seek to mitigate these exact risks. Specifically:

- **Protecting Vulnerable Populations and Commitment to 100% Affordable Housing (Supervisor Chen):** Amendments that include protections for priority equity geographies, standards for family-size dwelling units, and due diligence to evaluate 100% affordable housing alternatives on public land, ensuring that the family zoning plan has specific measures to support San Francisco's families can thrive without displacement.
- **Tenant and Anti-Displacement Safeguards (Supervisor Melgar):** Amendment making it ineligible for rent-controlled buildings with 3+ units from the local program. That helps protect tenants by diminishing the speculation and creates shield walls against predatory development tactics that target vulnerable tenants and families.
- **Small Business and Legacy Protections (Supervisor Chan):** Legislation file number 250808 focuses on protecting storefronts and legacy businesses is vital. These businesses, such as the local bakeries, markets, and social service providers, are irreplaceable assets that define the Cultural District. We must ensure that new housing is built *with* them, not *over* them.

The Missing Piece: Funding and Implementation

While these zoning changes and protective amendments represent excellent public policy, **we must emphasize that the vision of the Sunset Chinese Cultural District will not be effective or impactful without dedicated funding tied directly to these efforts.**

Zoning is a regulatory tool; it is not a funding mechanism. The promise of new housing is hollow for the Sunset's low- and moderate-income residents unless there is a concurrent financial commitment to:

1. **Small Business Stabilization:** Creating a dedicated fund for small business relocation, lease assistance, and capital improvements, as proposed by some supervisors, is mandatory to prevent displacement along corridors like Irving and Taraval.
2. **Affordable Housing Production:** Dedicated funding for land acquisition and the creation of **100% affordable housing** projects—particularly on public or faith-based sites—is the only way to guarantee that the new units meet the needs of the working families and seniors who are currently struggling to stay in the neighborhood.
3. **Prioritizing Infrastructure Upgrades:** Investing in essential public transit, utilities, and community services (as raised during the SCCD's convenings) must be an integral part of the holistic rezoning effort, ensuring quality of life keeps pace with density.

We urge the Land Use Committee to advance this legislation while working actively with the Mayor's Office and the Budget and Finance Committee to ensure that the vital policies crafted to

protect the Sunset are financially empowered for real-world impact. The community deserves not just a plan, but the resources to make that plan equitable and successful.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Lily Wong
Director, Sunset Chinese Cultural District

Cc: SCCD Housing Sub-Committee
Benson Wong, Wah Mei School
Gabi Wu
Jessica Ho
Kimberly Szeto, ASIAN, Inc.
Lamar Heystek, ASIAN, Inc.
Li Miao Lovett
Manson Leung, Self Help for the Elderly

From: Judy Irving
To: Melgar, Myrna (BOS); ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff
Cc: Carroll, John (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS)
Subject: Upzoning and demolitions, etc.
Date: Sunday, October 19, 2025 5:56:55 PM

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

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:	Jean Barish
To:	Carroll, John (BOS)
Cc:	ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; MahmoodStaff; MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS)
Subject:	Re: Land Use & Transportation Committee Meeting - October 20, 2025
Date:	Sunday, October 19, 2025 5:26:41 PM
Attachments:	25_10_18 Letter to LUC.docx

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

Dear Mr. Carroll,

Attached is a letter to the Land Use and Transportation Committee regarding the Oct. 20, 2025 meeting. Please include this in their information packet.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Jean

Jean B Barish
jeanbbarish@hotmail.com
President, Planning Association for the Richmond

October 18, 2025

Board of Supervisors Land Use and Transportation Committee
City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Re: Land Use and Transportation Committee Meeting, October 20, 2025
Agenda Items 1 – 4, Family Zoning Plan

Dear Supervisors Melgar, Chen, and Mahmood;

I am writing on behalf of Planning Association for the Richmond ("PAR"), an organization representing hundreds of Richmond District residents, regarding Items 1, 2, 3, and 4 on the October 20, 2025, LUC Agenda. These are Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan" Agenda Items that will significantly amend the City's General Plan, Planning Code, Zoning Map and Implementation Program and Land Use Plan of the City's certified Local Coastal Program. For the reasons set forth below, PAR strongly opposes all of these Agenda items.

Little or No New Housing is Needed

A recent audit conducted by the office of the California State Auditor has determined that the Regional Housing Needs Assessment ("RHNA") that the data Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) uses to provide key housing guidance for the State's local governments is not accurate. Data entry is flawed; HCD could not demonstrate that it considered all the factors that state law requires; and HCD could not support its use of healthy housing vacancy rates. Additionally, the HCD assessment relies on unsubstantiated projections of future housing needs. (https://information.auditor.ca.gov/reports/2021-125/index.html)

Additionally, there are many empty units in San Francisco as well as many other units in the construction pipeline. Planning Department data shows a pipeline of over 70,000 new units. Meanwhile, the city's population has declined by over 31,000 since 2020, with thousands of vacant units. The housing market in San Francisco does not follow conventional laws of supply and demand. A body of research shows that increasing construction, especially of market-rate housing, does not decrease housing prices. This is especially true here since most of the new units will be market rate, not affordable.

The entire foundation on which the Mayor's "Family Housing Plan" is built is fatally flawed.

5758 Geary Blvd., #356 San Francisco, CA 94121-9804
415-541-5652 Voicemail
sfparpresident@gmail.com

The Plan Does Not Meet the City's Need for Affordable Housing

The proposed upzoning plan fuels speculative development, threatening to replace existing affordable housing with luxury condominiums lived in their apartments for decades. The City should focus on ways to finance the over 72,000 approved, community-backed housing units awaiting construction. Additionally, the City should advocate for State recognition of housing capacity recently permitted by four-plexes and six-plexes on single-family lots -- the preferred housing type.

The current upzoning Plan will lead to more evictions, higher rents, and the loss of cherished open spaces. This is unacceptable.

The Plan Will Harm Small Businesses

Many small businesses, including over 400 Legacy Businesses that make San Francisco's neighborhoods so unique, are at risk. Commercial tenants, almost all of them small independent businesses, will get nothing in return for being displaced, since California does not allow commercial rent control or commercial displacement protections. A small community-serving business that is displaced for new construction will likely never come back.

Since there is no commercial rent control in California, and 90% of business owners in San Francisco do not own their buildings, every new building that replaces a pre-existing one will result in the loss of one or more small businesses. In addition, there are no requirements in the Plan to have new commercial space sized so that it would be affordable, pricing out local businesses by speculative property flips and rising commercial rents. This would have an unacceptable, impermissible impact on the very heart of San Francisco. It must be prevented.

Density Decontrol Throughout the Residential Neighborhoods Is Unacceptable

The plan includes a "sea of blue" throughout many neighborhoods of single-family and two- or three-unit buildings.
https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/6e0e399f9c82456dbda233eacebc433d/#data_s=id%3AdataSource_3-195febbfca6-layer-24-195fe855951-layer-20%3A104373

Those areas are identified as sites where density decontrol could apply. Specifically, corner homes and mid-block buildings on lots over 8,000 square feet could be converted to multi-unit buildings up to 65 feet tall. And all the other homes on these residential streets could be converted into 4 story buildings with ten, twelve, or perhaps even more units. The net effect of this density decontrol is that up to 800,000 units could be built if this Plan is accepted.

5758 Geary Blvd., #356 San Francisco, CA 94121-9804
415-541-5652 Voicemail
sfparpresident@gmail.com

This is absurd on its face. It could result in the addition of over ten times the number of units mandated by the State. This density decontrol is part of a 50-year plan, not the 8-year plan required by the State. Common sense mandates it must be rejected.

Mitigations for Increased Infrastructure and the Environmental Impact of this Plan are Inadequate

The Family Housing Plan does not include a clear plan for infrastructure improvements, including water, sewer, emergency services, road upgrades and signals, transit, and schools and medical facilities. Higher density developments will have many impacts that are not mitigated in this legislation. More waste will be generated, the collection of which must be provided for; there will be more pressure on electrical systems; greenhouse gas emissions will increase; there are no provisions for accommodating the increased demand for parking; and there will be a need for more fire and police protection. The impact of these and other infrastructure issues has not been adequately studied.

Not only must infrastructure needs be considered, but the Plan will radically alter the neighborhood character of the Richmond District, impacting the quality of life for its residents as well as the quality of the environment. Towering buildings in our neighborhoods will cast long shadows, block sunlight, erase historic character, and disrupt the human-scale streetscapes that define San Francisco's unique identity. Further, the Plan allows 80% lot coverage, threatening greenbelts, tree canopy, and neighborhood character, with no updated environmental review.

There will be significantly more congestion and environmental pollution; views will be blocked; and beloved neighborhood corridors will be transformed into luxury enclaves for investors—not homes for working families. All these issues must be thoroughly considered and plans for mitigations of these impacts must be in place before this Plan can be approved.

There are Alternatives to Extensive Upzoning

PAR does not oppose all development. But instead of a massive blanket upzoning and density decontrol plan that will create a great deal of disruption, displacement, and environmental damage, PAR favors a more precise approach to, and submits the following recommendations:

- targeted rezoning and development.
- community participation in all development decisions
- protections for tenants and businesses
- the revitalization of downtown San Francisco by converting offices to residences.
- consideration of environmental issues, the need for sound infrastructure and transit planning, and the importance of maintaining community character.

5758 Geary Blvd., #356 San Francisco, CA 94121-9804
415-541-5652 Voicemail
sfparpresident@gmail.com

Conclusion

The Family Housing Plan is a betrayal to many San Franciscans, who will face disruption, financial loss, and a compromised environment and quality of life. It is merely a generous gift to developers and investors who will get streamlined approvals and massive profits.

In view of the foregoing, PAR urges you to oppose the Agenda Items 1, 2, 3, and 4 as currently written.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Jean B Barish

Jean B Barish
President, Planning Association for the Richmond

cc: Mayor Daniel Lurie
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Director, SF Planning Department Sarah Dennis-Phillips
John Carroll, Clerk

5758 Geary Blvd., #356 San Francisco, CA 94121-9804
415-541-5652 Voicemail
sfparpresident@gmail.com

From:	Greg Holzman
To:	Sauter, Danny (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); Lurie, Daniel (MYR)
Subject:	Stop the upzoning. Don't ruin our waterfront
Date:	Sunday, October 19, 2025 4:36:16 PM

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

Folks
I have lived on N Point St for over 40 years. I swim at Aquatic Park for 40 years (proud member of the SERC).
Please don't ruin our waterfront. It is the life's blood of our tourist dollars not to mention its character.
In a former career, I built SF Renaissance, a painting and construction company renovating Victorians. Now and for the last 30 plus years, I have built companies that sell organic fruits and juices.
I moved from NYC in 1976. I have tried to be a part of this city and its heart since then. This is still the prettiest city in the USA. Please: Don't Screw it up
Sincerely
Greg

Greg Holzman
Managing Member
TerraFresh Organics
Cell 415 999 2355

From: lgpetty
To: Carroll, John (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff
Cc: Chan, Connie (BOS); SherrillStaff; ChanStaff (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Engardio Staff; BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Supervisors: Time to Write Your Own Zoning Plan to Achieve State AND Public Approval.
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 4:55:52 PM

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

Re: the Mayor's Family Zoning Plan -
Oct. 20, 2025 Land Use Agenda
Items 1-4, Files 250966, 250700, 250701 & 250785

Dear Land Use Chair Melgar, Vice Chair Chen and Supervisor Mahmood,

This Mayor's Zoning Plan comes to you after many years in the making at the Planning Dept.

It comes in the name of Compliance with State Law, under threat of "something worse."

But is it really compliance? Or is it simply an unpopular mass of severe concessions and capitulations thrown to an insatiably aggressive State Government?

The Mayor's Plan is overstuffed and bloated with all the things we COULD do, rather than what we NEED to do.

We are delivering to U.S. and foreign investors, global corporate developers & speculators -- everything they could ever wish for -- a deregulated hugely desirable ocean-urban landscape to use for a free-for-all no rules game of demolition, buying, selling, and reselling.

It does not have to
be this way.

This is the time for Supervisors to step up-- to shape a Zoning Plan with moderation and common sense -- listening to those most affected, rather than those who will profit from it. And merely offering a few amendments to the Mayor's Plan is not going to transform it into something that fits San Francisco, or wins public support.

The Mayor's Plan plan is controversial, not because it proposes Change. It is opposed by an unusually large and broad coalition of San Franciscans -- renters, homeowners, seniors and young residents, businesspeople, tenant and environmental protectors.

Why? Because they are opposed to Change? No. It is because they are opposed to Overcompliance. To Overkill. To overly massive unnecessary upheavals with little reward for them or their children, and few protections from exploitation.

It's not too late to fix this; to achieve Compliant Change AND win widespread approval. It's up to you now to create a better way:

Confine upzoning to vacant land, unused or very little-used nearly empty parcels. Dedicate public lands (including Muni properties) to 100 percent affordable housing, with concrete instructions for funding and infrastructure. Limit construction to eight stories for major boulevards. Limit heights on neighborhood commercial streets and other thru-streets to six-story maximums on corner lots only, with no height increases on surrounding streets. Require a minimum of 25 per cent affordable units and 30 per cent family-size units (3 & 4 & 5 bedrooms) in all market rate residential or mixed-use projects.
Ban demolition of rent-controlled units, and remove all of them from upzoning. Prohibit demolition of historical, cultural & landmarked properties, and legacy busineses. Disallow mergers and conversions. Provide tenant protections per Sup. Chen and small business protections per Sups. Melgar and Chan, and make them <u>stronger</u> than they are now.

This "**Board of Supervisors Zoning Plan"** (together with the Pipeline and 4-6-plex legislation) would be sufficient to comply with RHNA building requirements, especially incentivizing affordable housing.

Supervisors, it's up to you, our elected representatives, to write a reasonable, Compliant Zoning plan that responds to State requirements AND the needs of San Franciscans.

We are counting on you to do this.

A good faith first step would be to hold a Full Board hearing on the Mayor's Plan open to public comment.

Thanks for consideration,

Lorraine Petty

D2/5 Senior voter
Affordable housing Advocate
Seniors and Tenants Advocate
Member, SFTU & SDA

From:	Peter Dwares
To:	Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Lurie, Daniel (MYR)
Subject:	Housing
Date:	Friday, October 17, 2025 4:00:00 PM

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

Housing the poor, homeless is not affordable. Affordable for Police and Teachers is correct but possible without subsidy.

I have lived on the Filbert Steps Telegraph Hill since 1975. I am for historic preservation, for not tampering with North Beach or Telegraph Hill. It works. Let's not mess it up. Focus on what was deteriorating affected with too little policing, sacrificing safety for Wokeism, permissive druggies on Market Street and Union Square and other parts of the City. Let's build where we need buildings and let's require charm. High rises have no place here in traditional neighborhoods.

Peter Dwares
Dwares Group
331 Filbert Street
San Francisco, CA 94133

415-986-5885 - work
415-986-5893 fax
415-260-6530 cell

***Dictated but not reviewed.**

From:	Keith Robert Saggers
To:	Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Myra.Melgar@sfgov.org; Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); carollynandkeith@yahoo.com
Subject:	Upzoning
Date:	Friday, October 17, 2025 2:16:32 PM

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

Dear Mayor Lurie,

I fully support your plan to upzone the Fisherman's Wharf area between Columbus and Embarcadero, Jefferson Street and Bay Street,

To 60ft. and 80ft.

Please follow thru, I live here and it is not historical like North Beach, the area needs redeveloping.

Keith Saggers
2310 Powell St.3462
San Francisco
CA94133

Sincerely,
Keith Robert Saggers
San Francisco, CA 94133

From:	Yan, Calvin (BOS)
To:	seankim4@gmail.com
Cc:	Chan, Connie (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS)
Subject:	FW: GBMA Support Letter for Supervisor Connie Chan"s amendment
Date:	Friday, October 17, 2025 12:58:49 PM
Attachments:	20251016_GBMA_support letter_Connie Chan"s Amendment.pdf

Hi Sean,

Thank you so much for your email and letter of support.

I am copying Jen from Chair Melgar's Office and Clerk Carroll for the inclusion of your letter to the file.

Calvin Yan 甄錦浩
Office of Supervisor Connie Chan, District 1
市參事陳詩敏辦公室, 第一區

From: Sean Kim <seankim4@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 16, 2025 5:07 PM
To: Yan, Calvin (BOS) <calvin.yan@sfgov.org>
Cc: Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>
Subject: GBMA Support Letter for Supervisor Connie Chan's amendment

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

Hi Calvin,

This is Sean Kim, Vice President of Geary Blvd Merchants Association.
Could you forward this support letter to Land Use and Transportation Committee?
Thanks

Regards,

Sean Kim

Vice President of Greater Geary Blvd Merchants and Property Owners Association

Mobile : 415-827-4220
email : seankim4@gmail.com
Website :
https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___www.gearyblvd.org___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzo5MTFlYTc5ODA5N2IxMzUzOTc4ZWVkYjEyNzFkYmRjZTo3OjEwNTA6YmYzNmUwNzExNWY0MzE0NjM5MjQ3ODg5OGNjYjdmMWZhZTUwNTFhNzg2NTYzOWJjM2ZhNjk0ZDlmYzk1OGYyZTp0OlQ6Tg

Date: 10/16/2025

Land Use and Transportation Committee
City Hall, Room 250
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Chair and Members of the Land Use and Transportation Committee,

On behalf of the Geary Boulevard Merchants Association (GBMA) and the small businesses we represent along Geary Boulevard, we express strong support for Supervisor Connie Chan's amendment requiring Conditional Use Authorization before replacing a Legacy Business in Neighborhood Commercial Districts.

Upzoning grants major new value to developers but offers no protection to the long-standing businesses that built and sustained our neighborhoods. Financial programs such as grants or rent relief are helpful but cannot cover the real costs of displacement — moving out, temporary space, another build-out for a permanent location, and years of lost revenue and customers.

Supervisor Chan's amendment restores fairness and accountability. It does not block redevelopment but creates a process for communication and planning between developers, landlords, and Legacy Businesses before permanent displacement occurs.

Legacy Businesses are more than economic anchors. They are part of San Francisco's cultural and community fabric. This is a land use decision about what kind of city San Francisco wants to be: one that grows with its people, not apart from them.

We respectfully urge you to advance this amendment to the full Board of Supervisors and support its adoption.

Sincerely,

David Heller
President
Geary Boulevard Merchants Association

Sean Kim
Vice President
Geary Boulevard Merchants Association

From:	David Harrison
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); ChenStaff; ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS)
Subject:	Coalition Letter re: Family Zoning Plan
Date:	Friday, October 17, 2025 10:57:52 AM
Attachments:	Outlook-A black an.png LAND USE RE Coalition Letter of Support for San Francisco's Family Zoning Plan.pdf

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

Hello,

Please find the attached coalition letter in support of the family zoning plan proposal.

All the best,

David Harrison *(He/Him)*
Director of Public Policy
(O) 415-352-8803 (C) 202-262-5860
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
235 Montgomery Street, Suite 760
San Francisco, CA 94104

October 17, 2025

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Land Use and Transportation Committee
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

RE: Business Community Support for San Francisco's Family Zoning Plan

Dear Chair Melgar, Vice-Chair Chen, and Supervisor Mahmood,

As leaders in the San Francisco business community, representing employers of all sizes and industries, we know that a strong economy depends on sufficient housing for workers and families. We, the undersigned organizations, write to express our strong support for Mayor Daniel Lurie's Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco continues to face a severe housing shortage that impacts workers, families, and businesses across the city. Too many employees who power our economy are forced to live far from their jobs, enduring long commutes that strain families, limit career opportunities, and weaken connections to our neighborhoods. The Family Zoning Plan helps address this challenge by expanding opportunities for family-sized housing in more neighborhoods while providing safeguards for small businesses and keeping San Francisco eligible for critical state housing and infrastructure funding.

Economic Benefits for Businesses of All Sizes

Building enough housing to meet our city's needs could generate nearly $5.6 billion in new spending at local businesses. By concentrating new homes near commercial corridors, this plan will drive new foot traffic, create opportunities for ground floor retail, and provide a stable customer base for neighborhood-serving businesses. These benefits extend across industries,

strengthening our ability to attract and retain talent and ensuring San Francisco remains a competitive place to grow jobs.

Protecting and Supporting Small Businesses

We recognize that land use changes can raise important questions for small businesses. Importantly, the vast majority of new housing will be built on underutilized sites such as parking lots, gas stations, or vacant buildings. This will preserve existing storefronts while revitalizing parcels that present the best opportunities for redevelopment.

In the limited cases where relocation may be necessary, the Family Zoning Plan includes important safeguards such as early notification, relocation assistance, waived permit fees, and incentives to relocate existing or legacy businesses in new projects. We also support Chair Melgar's proposed Small Business Mitigation Fund, which will provide assistance to small businesses while still moving forward with housing that will strengthen our City's economic foundation.

Shared Vision for San Francisco's Future

The Family Zoning Plan is a critical step toward addressing our city's housing needs while ensuring that small businesses, large employers, and working families all have a path to thrive. By making it possible for more workers to live near their jobs, San Francisco will strengthen its workforce, reduce congestion and pollution from long commutes, and create a healthier and more equitable city for everyone. When our workforce can afford to live in our city, employers are better able to retain talent and reduce turnover, making San Francisco a more attractive and competitive place to do business.

We appreciate your leadership in advancing this legislation with urgency and care, and we stand ready to work alongside you in building a more economically inclusive, vibrant, and strong San Francisco.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
Rodney Fong, President & CEO

Bay Area Council
Matt Regan, Senior Vice President, Public Policy

SPUR
Sujata Srivastava, Chief Policy Officer

Advance SF
Wade Rose, President and CEO

Hospital Council Northern and Central California
Michon Coleman, Regional Vice President, San Francisco Section

Golden Gate Restaurant Association
Laurie Thomas, Executive Director

Building Owners & Managers Association San Francisco
John Bryant, CEO

SF New Deal
Simon Bertrang, Executive Director

San Francisco Apartment Association
Janan New, Executive Director

East Cut Community Benefit District
Andrew Robinson, Executive Director

Kate Robinson
Chair, San Francisco Benefit District Alliance

Ben Blieman
President, California Nightlife Association

Cynthia Huie
President, Small Business Commission

Sharky Laguana
Former President, Small Business Commission & CEO, Bandago

Teddy Kramer
CEO and Founder, NEON

Manny Yekutiel
Owner, Manny's

Cc: Honorable Members and Staff, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

From:	Christopher Pederson
To:	Melgar, Myrna (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; Carroll, John (BOS)
Cc:	Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC); Tanner, Rachael (CPC); Chen, Lisa (CPC); Andrews, Michelle (BOS)
Subject:	Support the Family Zoning Plan - Land Use & Transportation Committee Agenda Items 1-4 (Oct. 20, 2025)
Date:	Friday, October 17, 2025 8:19:56 AM
Attachments:	Letter to BoS Land Use Comm re Family Zoning Plan.pdf

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

Attached is the comment letter of the San Francisco League of Conservation Voters in support of the Family Zoning Plan.
Sincerely,
Christopher Pederson
President
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters

San Francisco League of Conservation Voters

October 17, 2025

Re: Support the Family Zoning Plan, Agenda Items 1-4

Dear Chair Melgar, Vice Chair Chen, and Supervisor Mahmood:

The San Francisco League of Conservation Voters urges the Land Use and Transportation Committee to recommend that the Board of Supervisors pass the proposed ordinances to implement Mayor Lurie's Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco and California as a whole face a climate crisis and a housing crisis. Transportation is the largest source of greenhouse gas emissions from both the city and the state. The scarcity and high price of housing in coastal cities such as San Francisco, however, are forcing families to locate on the fringes of metropolitan areas where the automobile is the primary and, too often, the only viable mode of transportation.Those inland suburban and exurban areas have more extreme climates, encroach on threatened natural habitat and agricultural lands, and face high wildland fire hazards. To address the state's climate and housing crises, then, coastal cities and the state must promote much more multi-family housing located near major transit lines, employment centers, and commercial districts and in walkable, transit-oriented neighborhoods.

By virtue of San Francisco's mild climate, its extensive public transit network, its concentration of major employment centers, its walkability, and its density, San Francisco is among the most environmentally appropriate locations in the entire state for new multi-family housing. On a per capita basis, San Franciscans drive less, use less energy and water, and occupy less land than other Californians. Providing more multifamily housing for people to live in San Francisco is therefore a crucial step for addressing the state's and city's climate and housing crises.

The Mayor's Family Zoning Plan, by allowing more multifamily housing along major transit lines and close to commercial districts does exactly this. Given that the city has previously rezoned much of the eastern half of the city to allow more multifamily housing, it is appropriate for the Family Zoning Plan to concentrate on western and northern neighborhoods that have provided little new multifamily housing in recent decades. Those northern and western

neighborhoods are also mostly higher resource neighborhoods where potential concerns about displacement and gentrification are minimal.

The SFLCV understands that upzoning can raise concerns about the displacement of small businesses and rent-controlled housing. The SFLCV supports addressing those concerns, but any such measures should not undercut the Family Zoning Plan's strategy of promoting significantly more multifamily housing close to major transit lines, employment centers, and commercial districts.

Sincerely,

Christopher Pederson
President
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters

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:	Family Zoning Plan File Nos 250700, 250701, 250966 -17 letters
Date:	Friday, October 17, 2025 9:06:54 AM
Attachments:	17 letters - Family Zoning.pdf

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the attached 17 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

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:	brideynewman@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Bridget Newman
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Thursday, October 16, 2025 9:46:14 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.

In 2022, the Budget and Legislative Analyst's Policy Analysis Report stated "With . . . one year remaining to meet RHNA goals for 2015-2023, San Francisco is 10,617 units short for affordable housing, but has produced 6,000 units with market rate housing in excess of RHNA target. In 2020, only 20% of 4,044 housing units added were for very low, low or moderate income households." What provisions in the Family Zoning Plan, with its generous give-aways to developers who build BIGGER prevent the occurrence of this same scenario?

Additionally, if rent-controlled housing is demolished to make way for new condo towers (more human warehouses than "homes"), even IF some of the units are for very low, low or moderate income, what will happen to the rental protections for those tenants displaced?

Very perfunctory research indicates that the diverse, eclectic neighborhoods of San Francisco are among the top five reasons tourists come to our city. If they all become filled with boxes of undifferentiated, characterless tall towers that block the sky and foster wind tunnels, what will there be to see in our neighborhoods?

Finally, transit has been cut back; many of these planned behemoths offer little to no parking. What kind of terrible tangle and road rage does this presage for our streets?

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,
Bridget Newman
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: natashjadewolf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Natashja Dewolfe
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 16, 2025 3:17:55 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 hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments: I have lived in San Francisco since 1971 and I have never seen such a horrible, detrimental plan. Please, this is not tenable! Don't ruin San Francisco!

Sincerely,
Natashja Dewolfe
San Francisco, CA 94122

From:	KAYECHANDLEY@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kaye Handley
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Thursday, October 16, 2025 3:18:56 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 hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:
My husband and I recently bought an apartment in Cow Hollow area which would be severely impacted by high rises and signifcantly increased density.
WE chose the neighborhood for its character and do not want a dense city landscape.
We also don't see how this type of new high rises in affluent neighborhoods will do anything to alleviate the homeless situation.
We ask you to respect and preserve the character of ours and other neighborhoods by reducing new height limits and crating true affordable housing in areas where it can make economic sense.

Sincerely,
Kaye Handley
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: barbara.barbhand@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Barbara Handler
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 16, 2025 3:22:51 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 immmediately affected by the so-called "Family Zoning Plan" as my picture window looks out on what will soon be a 6 story buildig thanks to Scott Weiner's actions. There needs to be a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan". San Franciscans do not want the Manhattanization of our communities!

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Barbara Handler
San Francisco, CA 94110

From:	noguera@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Hatun Noguera
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Thursday, October 16, 2025 3:25:30 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 hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments: "recall fever" is still spreading.

Sincerely,
Hatun Noguera
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: bilgepump100@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Robert Hall
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 16, 2025 3:52:30 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 hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Robert Hall
San Francisco, CA 94117

From: khoegger2@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Ken Hoegger
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 16, 2025 4:02:41 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 hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:As a realtor broker for 45 years, I foresee the Laurie-Weiner "Family Zoning Plan".as creating a Gold Rush for speculators; many of which will be corporate interests with limited concerns for San Francisco's community interests. We need a plan that addresses affordability and retains the unique character of each of our neighborhoods.
Many options exist for achieving the above goals while meeting the State Housig Mandate: up-zoning intense transit corridors, incentivizing ADU's especially for seniors, City bond programs to finance affordability.
SanFrancisco has historically been a leader in innovation, let us continue to be proud of our heritage.

Sincerely,
Ken Hoegger
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: neil@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of neil maclean
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 16, 2025 4:42:37 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 hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Up Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's modern history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is a way of hiding from the public.
Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

I was born in this city and I am proud of how we contribute to regional and national politics. Our rent, health and environmental protections set us apart from the rest of country. This move, should it pass, models our city after Las Vegas.

Sincerely,
neil maclean
San Francisco, CA 94110

From: rosenstein.jacob@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of JACOB ROSENSTEIN
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 16, 2025 4:53:37 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, 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): As a Noe Valley resident, I'm alarmed that demolished homes of charm may destroy the quaint nature of my neighborhood. I urge you to reject the extreme upzoning plan of the State of California.

Sincerely,
JACOB ROSENSTEIN
San Francisco, CA 94131

From: margaret@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of margaret bradley
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 16, 2025 5:18:30 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Dear SF Leadership,

We are very concerned for the entire city, it appears the due diligence necessary to make such sweeping changes hasn't been addressed. The ingress/egress issues along major arteries into and out of the city are already challenging, especially on 19th Ave and Lombard. The subsidence issues with building weights is also of big concern, especially when it comes to the sewer system in the city. See Wired Magazine article (May 23, 2023) regarding irreversible issues on the east coast:

New York City Is Sinking. It's Far From Alone

Subsidence is a hidden vulnerability for coastal cities—models that project how much sea levels will rise in a given area don't yet take it into account. By 2050, average sea levels in the US will go up a foot, and by that time, 70 percent of the world's people will be urbanites, up from 56 percent today. In coastal cities, that boom will exacerbate the issue because more people will need to extract more groundwater and will need more buildings and roads, which will in turn increase the pressure on sediments.

"If that coastal migration correlates with building new infrastructure along the coast, it's very likely that we will see a change in land elevation," says Virginia Tech environmental security expert Manoochehr Shirzaei, who did the previous study of subsidence on the East Coast. (He wasn't part of this research team but reviewed their paper for the journal.)

A major concern for coastal areas, Shirzaei says, is the deformation of floodplains. "The area has to have a certain slope, so if there is heavy precipitation, water drains," Shirzaei says. "But when you have structures that create localized subsidence, it temporarily changes the slope of the floodplains. So it means that water would sit there for longer periods of time." This essentially creates a great big bowl for heavy rainfall to fill, which can flood roads and buildings. Even worse, climate change is already causing fiercer rainfall and hurricanes, along with stronger storm surges that push walls of water inland.

And this article in
Wired Magazine on Jan 5, 2025

Critical Infrastructure Is Sinking Along the US East Coast
Up and down the Atlantic Coast, the land is steadily sinking, or subsiding. That's destabilizing levees, roads, and airports, just as sea levels are rising.

We are also having a hard time understanding why we would give away our local power to address an issue as important as this one. Developers, we fear, will be the only ones to win.

We are all for affordable housing but the developers I know say this isn't the answer for affordable housing, it's a coup for luxury.

We also understand there are many projects in the pipeline negating the need to build as much housing that is required by the state.

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Thank you for your thoughtful consideration on such an important matter.

Sincerely,
margaret bradley
San Francisco, CA 94123

From:	marlabastienknight@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Marla Knight
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Thursday, October 16, 2025 5:57:05 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 hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Marla Knight
San Francisco, CA 94133

From:	jim-connelly@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of jim connelly
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Thursday, October 16, 2025 6:28:41 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

The current Upzoning Plan and recently passed SB 79 could be devastating for our Cow Hollow neighborhood impacted by both Bills.

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
jim connelly
San Francisco, CA 94123

From:	kielygomes@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Karen Schwartz
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Thursday, October 16, 2025 6:57:37 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 hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Karen Schwartz
San Francisco, CA 94114

From:	kcogorman@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of KEVIN O"GORMAN
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Thursday, October 16, 2025 7:22:37 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Please hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

The current proposal is not weell vetted by many homeowners effected. It decimates the character of neighborhoods, does not alleviate low-income access, overbuilds, and paves the way for the kind of demolition we still regret fron the 60s 'development' fiasco. Thousands of homeowners are unaware of the impact of this plan due to tepid outreach. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
KEVIN O'GORMAN
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: zano999@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Martin Zanfardino Zanfardino
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 16, 2025 9:25:35 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 hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

The Mayor"s plan in conjunction with Scott Weiner and Danny Sauter is completely flawed. Sauter without any input from his constituents added North Beach and surrounding areas to the up zoning plan. He also halted the long ongoing appeal for North Beach and Telegraph Hill to be designated Historic Districts as is Jackson Square. I have been to meetings where Sauter totally disregards constituents questions and concerns and seems to power through his self serving political agenda. He obviously does not understand the specific special spirit of the District. Rather than ruin the waterfront of Fishermans Wharf and the character of NB and Telegraph Hill he has made it obvious he is in support of the developers (local and not) rather than preserving the History of his neighborhood. Lifting the special use protections for the area is also another travesty.

Sincerely,
Martin Zanfardino Zanfardino
San Francisco, CA 94133

From:	frankblanket@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Derrick Scocchera
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Thursday, October 16, 2025 9:27:16 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

It's essential to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's disastrous "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Sincerely,
Derrick Scocchera
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: nicolelambrou@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Nicole Lambrou
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 16, 2025 11:40:00 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 25+ year resident of SF, a clinical and school psychologist - working in leadership and organization development and living in Clarendon Heights. I am VERY concerned and saddened about this upzoning proposal. I am not against development - and support affordable housing but this proposal is negligent and doesn't consider factors which played a big part in many people moving to and staying in San Francisco - including quality of life - clean air, beauty, being able to see the sky and overall physical and psychological health. I moved from NY city - manhattan in 2002 and was so relieved to be in a city that was affordable, beautiful and valued quality of life. That has changed significantly - our skyline of downtown has completely changed - and the city has been overtaken by the wealthy - but there's still time to make important changes. Let's not become the next Athens, Greece - which was destroyed by the developers in the 60's by antiparochi and now residents continually complain about the destruction, pollution and terrible quality of life.
https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___https://www.bbc.com/culture/article/20191011-the-surprising-story-of-athens-offbeat-architecture___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzplZGNlNGEyZTZmMGIxN2VlNDYxODkyODYxMDAwN2E0ODo3OjJjMjM6ZDlhZWJhY2Y3MjY3OGNiM2E5ZTQ3MmUwYTAzNmQzYjUwMTkzOWZiYmM1MzM5YzkyOTI3OTJkNjQ0ZGJjYTM1ODpwOlQ6Tg
https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___https://www.theguardian.com/cities/2017/sep/12/athens-modern-heritage-austerity-neoclassical-architecture-acropolis-greece___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzplZGNlNGEyZTZmMGIxN2VlNDYxODkyODYxMDAwN2E0ODo3OmE3Yzk6ZGNiY2JlZTc3YTU2MGU3YjZmMDY3MjkyNWQzYTAzNTBiMDYzMWYwOTliMTUxYjhmYjk3MTRkMjQ4YmYyYzdmNTpwOlQ6Tg

Don't sell out to developers and Scott Weiner. They don't understand and appreciate what makes San Francisco unique and are only concerned about their profits and political careers.

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Nicole Lambrou
San Francisco, CA 94114

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: Public Comment: Requested Amendments to Mayor Lurie"s Upzoning Plan
Date:	Thursday, October 16, 2025 3:01:38 PM

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the below communication 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

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: Lydia Bruno <lydia.e.bruno@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 16, 2025 2:53 PM
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; BOS-Supervisors <bos-supervisors@sfgov.org>; BOS-Legislative Aides <bos-legislative_aides@sfgov.org>
Subject: Public Comment: Requested Amendments to Mayor Lurie's Upzoning Plan

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

Hello,

My partner and I are longtime residents and District 4 voters. We've lived in SF for almost 2 decades and in our current home for almost 15 years. We are deeply active in our community, volunteering in our local parks almost every weekend and organizing free bird field trips. We

know our neighbors by name, shop regularly at local businesses and belong to the local community garden.

Rent control has allowed us to remain in SF and in our beloved home and find stability and community. We've truly found our place in the world and built a life in SF grounded deeply in community service.

We urge the board of supervisors to ensure Mayor Lurie's upzoning plan includes the affordable housing requirements below.

1. Prohibit the demolition of rent controlled buildings and buildings with small businesses
2. Expand rent control
3. Enforce the vacancy tax
4. Landbank public sites for affordable housing for seniors, families and the public workforce
5. Build pipelines for local employment using prevailing wage requirements, and pipelines for creative financing

Remember, there are over 40,000 vacant units in San Francisco and 8,000 unhoused people. We have the housing, we just need it to be affordable, accessible and stable!

Thank you for making sure SF communities are not displaced!

Lydia Bruno & Travis Smith
District 4 Residents

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); BOS Legislation, (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject:	FW: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan - File Nos. 250700, 250701, 250966
Date:	Thursday, October 16, 2025 12:26:09 PM

Dear Supervisors,

Please see below, from Jason Zhang, 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

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: Jason Zhang <noreply@adv.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Wednesday, October 15, 2025 7:45 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan

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.

Jason Zhang
jasonz0762@gmail.com
520 Cayuga St
San francisco , California 94112

From:	Bullock, John (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:	40 Letters Regarding File Nos. 250700, 250701 and 250966
Date:	Wednesday, October 15, 2025 4:04:55 PM
Attachments:	40 Letters Regarding File Nos. 250700_701_966.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached 40 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

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:	JANIS and BOB HARRER
To:	Carroll, John (BOS)
Cc:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC); Tanner, Rachael (CPC); Chen, Lisa (CPC); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); Mary Jane Large
Subject:	Land Use and Transportation Committee Meeting on Family zoning Plan
Date:	Wednesday, October 15, 2025 2:28:24 PM
Attachments:	BOS Land Use Com 10152025.pdf

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

On behalf of the Barbary Coast Neighborhood Association, I am forwarding the attached letter to the Land Use and Transportation Committee. The letter provides comments on the Family Zoning Plan, which we understand will be discussed at the Committee's meeting on Monday October 20. Thank you for your consideration.

Regards,
Bob Harrer
BCNA board member

BARBARY COAST NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION

BCNA
PO Box 2045
San Francisco, CA 94126
BCNA@bcnasf.org
www.bcnasf.org

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

OFFICERS

Mary Jane Large, Pres.
Marcy Albert, 1st VP
Michele Hennessey, 2nd VP
Philippe Sonne, Treas.
Bill Hannan, Secy.

MEMBERS AT LARGE

David Albert
Bob Harrer
Lee Robbins
James Seff
Diana Taylor

October 15, 2025

Via email

Board of Supervisors Land Use and Transportation Committee
1 Dr. Carlton Goodlett Place
City Hall
San Francisco CA, 94102-4689
c/o Clerk John Carroll
John.Carroll@sfgov.org

Re: Land Use and Transportation Committee, October 20, 2025 Hearing
Item: Family Zoning Plan

Dear Supervisors Melgar, Chen and Mahmood:

On behalf of the Barbary Coast Neighborhood Association (BCNA), this letter submits our comments on the most recent September 30, 2025, version of the Family Zoning Plan (the Plan) issued by the Planning Commission and posted on its website. BCNA serves the residents and businesses in the northeastern waterfront along the Embarcadero from Bay Street to Clay Street. The residents of our densely populated, mixed use neighborhood live in a wide variety of housing, including the Gateway, one of San Francisco's largest rent-controlled apartment complexes, the income-restricted Broadway Cove and 735 Davis Street offering housing for families and seniors, the Broadway Family Apartments and the Broadway Sansome complex, as well as an array of market rate condominiums, apartments and flats. In a very real sense, the BCNA neighborhood has been living and exemplifying the announced goals of the Plan for many years.

Backing onto the Embarcadero as we do, our membership takes great enjoyment and pride in our location along one of the nation's, if not the world's, most scenic waterfronts. Since our formation, we have been very active in issues impacting the entire northeastern waterfront, and especially have sought to protect the expansive views and feeling of openness provided by the Embarcadero's unique promenade for both residents and tourists alike. This has included continuing support for the existing 40-foot height limit along the City's waterfront. It is our concern for the protection of the Embarcadero and the northeastern waterfront that leads BCNA to make a very targeted request of the Land Use and Transportation Committee. For the reasons set forth below, we request that the block labeled #4 on the accompanying map be removed from coverage by the Family Zoning Plan entirely and be zoned to exclude the construction of any housing on it.

Our September 9, 2025, initial comment letter to the Planning Commission on the Family Zoning Plan centered on the impact that the July 29 version of the Plan would have had on the triangle of lots bordered by the Embarcadero, Bay Street and Powell Street. We continue to believe, as expressed in that letter, that the best way to protect the unique importance of the Embarcadero is with a firm 40-foot height limit for all housing within that triangle. We appreciate and wish to commend the September 30 version of the Plan on its implicit acknowledgment of the importance of protecting of the Embarcadero and the northeastern waterfront embodied in its:

1. Reduction of the base height for that entire triangle to 40 feet; and
2. Removal of the lots numbered 1-3 on the attached map from coverage by the Plan altogether.

However, we remain seriously concerned about the Plan's treatment of the block labeled #4 on the enclosed map. That block sits directly across the Embarcadero from the major tourist attractions of Pier 39 and the Plaza de California. While we appreciate that the September 30 version of the Plan now lowers the proposed local program height limit on block #4 from 85 feet to 65 feet, we don't believe that is sufficient to protect this unique location. Left unchanged, applying the state program's 100% density bonus to the 40-foot base height in combination with density decontrol could allow a 12-story tower on block #4. Density decontrol is available because it accompanies the block's inclusion in a proposed commercial/mixed use district. We view this as an unnecessary and unacceptable threat to the preservation of the human scale and singular attractiveness of the Embarcadero promenade. A 12-story tower would be a particular affront to, and an unfortunate greeting for, Pier 39 visitors and those arriving at the Cruise Ship Terminal, who come expecting the welcoming human scale and street level ambiance that make San Francisco San Francisco. As the Supervisors are well aware, tourism is a vital contributor to San Francisco's economy and brought in over $9 billion last year, per SF Travel.

We therefore are requesting that Block #4 be removed from coverage of the Family Zoning Plan and that the construction of residential units on Block #4 be expressly prohibited. We recognize that this request may appear unusual. However, given the impact density decontrol could have on this critical location, and the resultant potential for an inadvertent disadvantage to the local program vis a vis the state program, we fail to see any other approach that will bring the appropriate level of certainty that the future built environment of block #4 will not mar this vital section of the Embarcadero and the waterfront.

There can be no doubt that strong protection of the Embarcadero and the waterfront is of vital interest to all San Franciscans. Starting with public opposition to the Fontana Towers in the early 1960's through the removal of the Embarcadero Freeway to the comments received by the Port of San Francisco in Spring 2024 on its draft Waterfront Resilience Program that "[t}he Embarcadero Promenade is viewed as a critical asset and there is a strong desire to preserve and enhance it", San Francisco voters have made it clear that they do not support development that diminishes access to and enjoyment of the expansiveness of the Embarcadero and its connection to the Bay.

The mantra regarding real estate from time immemorial has been "location, location, location". Real estate is not a fungible asset where one parcel is the functional equivalent of another. For better or worse, the Family Zoning Plan will impact thousands of parcels across San Francisco. But only a very few of those parcels can negatively impact the experience of San Francisco's incomparable Embarcadero. Block #4 is one of those parcels. Mayor Lurie, various members of the Board of Supervisors and other city officials in recent days have stressed that passage of the Family Zoning Plan is the only way for San Francisco to maintain local control over building decisions and to use local knowledge to guide thoughtful residential development. But deciding where <u>not</u> to build also can be an important exercise of local control and knowledge. Protection of the irreplaceable public asset of the Embarcadero and the northeastern waterfront is a value historically held by all San Franciscans, and

we therefore urge the Land Use and Transportation Committee to express that value by removing Block #4 from coverage by the Family Zoning Plan and by prohibiting the construction of any residential units on that block in the future.

We further request this letter be entered into the record of the Land Use and Transportation's October 20 hearing on the Family Zoning Plan. Please contact Bob Harrer with questions or comments on our request and this comment letter.

Sincerely,

BCNA Board of Directors, by
Mary Jane Large, President
maryjanelarge@me.com

Robert Harrer, Former President and Board Member
theharrers@aol.com

cc: All other members of the Board of Supervisors, Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
Sarah Dennis-Phillips, Planning Director, sarah.dennis-phillips@sfgov.org
Rachael Tanner, Planner rachael.tanner@sfgov.org
Lisa Chen, Planner lisa.chen@sfgov.org
Michelle Andrews, legislative aide, Supervisor Sauter, Michelle.Andrews@sfgov.org

Family Zoning Plan Zoning Map Ordinance:
Proposed Local Program Height Limits

September 30, 2025

Supervisorial District 3



From: Kleanthes Koniaris
To: SauterStaff
Cc: Board of Supervisors (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); Bell, Tita (BOS)
Subject: District 3 zoning impact – Bay St. 105-foot height limit
Date: Friday, October 10, 2025 7:34:55 PM
Attachments: Screenshot 2025-10-10 at 18.33.24.png

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

Dear Supervisor Sauter and Colleagues,

I live at 222 Francisco Street in District 3. My building sadly lost a lot of value during COVID that hasn't come back. It still has its north-facing water view, however.

Under the Mayor's proposed *Family Zoning Plan*, parcels directly north of me are slated for **105-foot buildings**. If those are built, my view of the water will be entirely blocked. Based on comparable sales data in similar circumstances, I estimate this would result in an additional **30% loss in property value**. I've attached a zoning map illustrating the issue.

I understand that the intent of the plan is to increase housing, but this **dramatic height increase** seems both unnecessary and harmful to the neighborhood. Developers will naturally build to the maximum allowed height, especially on parcels so close to the waterfront — locking in their own views while everyone south loses theirs. Meanwhile, this area already faces severe transportation constraints (the Embarcadero and Bay Street are chokepoints), so additional density would bring more congestion, less parking, and a lower overall quality of life.

I respectfully ask that you **either oppose the Family Zoning Plan in its current form** or **amend it to reduce the 105-foot height limit north of Bay Street**. In my case, SB 79 would actually be less damaging.

I believe many of my neighbors share these concerns, and that there is room for a **reasonable zoning compromise** that allows for growth without devastating existing communities.

Best Regards,

Kleanthes Koniaris

222 Francisco Street

San Francisco, CA 94133



From: Zack Subin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Sunday, October 12, 2025 9:06:15 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 & Commissioners,

As a D11 resident, I am excited to see more homes near Ocean Ave to support our small businesses and transit!

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.

Zack Subin
zack.subin@fastmail.fm
192 Caine Ave
San Francisco, California 94112

From: Barbara Heffernan
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 13, 2025 1:22:30 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,
Barbara Heffernan

Barbara
California

From:	Allison Ettenger
To:	Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS)
Cc:	Tanner, Rachael (CPC); Chen, Lisa (CPC); Segal, Ned (MYR); Bonde, Aly (MYR); Calvillo, Angela (BOS)
Subject:	District 8 Resident Supporting Family Zoning Plan
Date:	Tuesday, October 14, 2025 11:40:13 AM

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

Hello Supervisor Mandelman,

I recently moved into District 8 with my family after living in District 9 (where I lived for 10 years). We love living in District 8 (Upper Noe Valley) and that we can access Muni lines (the J, 24, 36, and many others) and also can walk to my daughter's preschool and Upper Noe Recreation Center. We nearly relocated to the East Bay this past year due to a lack of suitable housing options. But we're so glad we stayed in SF, and I am looking forward to finding a kindergarten program for my daughter in SFUSD (hopefully at Alvarado or Dolores Huerta) to keep deepening our roots in the community.

I'm writing to ask you to support the Family Zoning Plan which is coming to the Board of Supervisors soon. By allowing small- and mid-scale apartments across more neighborhoods—especially along safe, transit-served corridors—it helps deliver the types of homes families actually use: multi-bedroom units close to childcare, after-school programs, and open space. This is essential to keeping families tied to the community and increases our well-being.

My friends and neighbors (in Districts 8 and 9, both current and former) are following this legislation closely. We are hopeful you and your colleagues can make real progress on the city’s housing shortage.

Many thanks for your time.

Sincerely,
Allison Ettenger

From:	Tim Omi
To:	Lurie, Daniel (MYR)
Cc:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); Segal, Ned (MYR); alyssa@talaryabrands.com; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Tang, Katy (ECN); commissionstreamlining
Subject:	SFCDMA Support for the Mayor's Family Zoning Plan
Date:	Friday, October 10, 2025 10:33:38 AM
Attachments:	CDMA Letter of Support Family Zoning .pdf

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

Timothy Omi
tim@sfcdma.org
1-415-590-0930
President, San Francisco Council of District Merchants Associations
President, Fillmore Merchant Association

Dear Mayor Lurie and Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to inform you that the San Francisco Council of District Merchants Associations (SFCDMA) has formally voted to support the Mayor's Family Zoning Plan. After extensive deliberation and numerous conversations with the Planning Department, Supervisors, and Mayors office a majority of our board reached consensus in favor of this important measure.

Back in August, SFCDMA proposed three key additions to the Family Zoning Plan aimed at mitigating small business displacement and reducing the potential negative impacts of large construction projects on our commercial corridors. These corridors form the backbone of San Francisco's neighborhoods — they are where small businesses give our city its identity, culture, and sense of community.

We deeply appreciate the collaborative process that has allowed merchants and community leaders to engage directly with the Mayor's Office and members of the Board. The open dialogue and responsiveness we have experienced mark a positive new chapter in how small businesses participate in shaping city policy.

We are also encouraged that Supervisor Melgar's proposals — including restaurant displacement assistance, expanded buildout support, and an increase to the small business displacement cap — will be incorporated into the plan. Additionally, we urge the City to move quickly to establish a Small Business Displacement Fund in good faith and to implement the incentive for in-kind commercial space replacement within the developer incentive program, as discussed with the Planning Department.

Thank you for your partnership and for ensuring that San Francisco's growth continues to include — and protect — the small businesses that make our city vibrant.

Sincerely,
Timothy Omi
President
San Francisco Council of District Merchants Associations

From: Justin Truong
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Saturday, October 4, 2025 10:21:19 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 & Commissioners,

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: natashjadewolf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Natashja Dewolfe
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stand With Your Constituents! {Files: 250700, 250701, 250966}
Date: Sunday, October 5, 2025 8:58:34 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's upzoning map is fundamentally flawed. Blanket upzoning will not deliver affordability — it will fuel speculation, displacement, and higher housing costs.

The city needs more time to get this right. Rushing a permanent land use change without full public awareness is reckless and unacceptable.

As the largest rezoning and wealth redistribution in San Francisco's history, I urge you to withhold support unless the map is significantly revised to reflect your constituents' concerns.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Natashja Dewolfe
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: natashjadewolf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Natashja Dewolfe
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Sunday, October 5, 2025 8:58:45 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,
Natashja Dewolfe
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: kielygomes@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Karen Schwartz
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Sunday, October 5, 2025 9:04:01 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,
Karen Schwartz
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: diana.giampaoli@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Diana Giampaoli
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stand With Your Constituents! {Files: 250700, 250701, 250966}
Date: Sunday, October 5, 2025 9:36:42 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's upzoning map is fundamentally flawed. Blanket upzoning will not deliver affordability — it will fuel speculation, displacement, and higher housing costs.

The city needs more time to get this right. Rushing a permanent land use change without full public awareness is reckless and unacceptable.

As the largest rezoning and wealth redistribution in San Francisco's history, I urge you to withhold support unless the map is significantly revised to reflect your constituents' concerns.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): It will not be low income. It will just take away light and bring in more empty storefronts ruining our beautiful neighborhoods. Just making the builders richer and they don't care about anything but themselves. So many empty buildings in SF to fix and house people. Teachers, etc won't be able to afford these buildings.

Sincerely,
Diana Giampaoli
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: esens123@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Erik Sens
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stand With Your Constituents! {Files: 250700, 250701, 250966}
Date: Sunday, October 5, 2025 10:39:01 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's upzoning map is fundamentally flawed. Blanket upzoning will not deliver affordability — it will fuel speculation, displacement, and higher housing costs.

The city needs more time to get this right. Rushing a permanent land use change without full public awareness is reckless and unacceptable.

As the largest rezoning and wealth redistribution in San Francisco's history, I urge you to withhold support unless the map is significantly revised to reflect your constituents' concerns.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Erik Sens
San Francisco, CA 94122

From:	symondspaula@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Paula Symonds
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Sunday, October 5, 2025 11:13:16 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): As a San Franciscan of 80+ years i know that our city has been known around the world for its jewel like beauty. We can add affordable housing without turning San Francisco into a high rise jungle. We need parks and trees. We do not need towers. We can find ways to add affordable housing using creativity but the bash and burn of our leaders seems to them to be easier. There is no imagination in this plan only ways for the rich to get richer.

Sincerely,
Paula Symonds
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: zano999@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of martin zanfardino
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stand With Your Constituents! {Files: 250700, 250701, 250966}
Date: Sunday, October 5, 2025 10:23:33 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's upzoning map is fundamentally flawed. Blanket upzoning will not deliver affordability — it will fuel speculation, displacement, and higher housing costs.

The city needs more time to get this right. Rushing a permanent land use change without full public awareness is reckless and unacceptable.

As the largest rezoning and wealth redistribution in San Francisco's history, I urge you to withhold support unless the map is significantly revised to reflect your constituents' concerns.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
martin zanfardino
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: jlzsf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of judith zimrin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stand With Your Constituents! {Files: 250700, 250701, 250966}
Date: Sunday, October 5, 2025 10:23:51 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's upzoning map is fundamentally flawed. Blanket upzoning will not deliver affordability — it will fuel speculation, displacement, and higher housing costs.

The city needs more time to get this right. Rushing a permanent land use change without full public awareness is reckless and unacceptable.

As the largest rezoning and wealth redistribution in San Francisco's history, I urge you to withhold support unless the map is significantly revised to reflect your constituents' concerns.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
judith zimrin
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: PhilD0210@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Phil Dillard
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Sunday, October 5, 2025 11:32:05 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,
Phil Dillard
San Francisco, CA 94133

From:	mark.r.berwick@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mark Berwick
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Stand With Your Constituents! {Files: 250700, 250701, 250966}
Date:	Monday, October 6, 2025 8:04:52 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's upzoning map is fundamentally flawed. Blanket upzoning will not deliver affordability — it will fuel speculation, displacement, and higher housing costs.

The city needs more time to get this right. Rushing a permanent land use change without full public awareness is reckless and unacceptable.

As the largest rezoning and wealth redistribution in San Francisco's history, I urge you to withhold support unless the map is significantly revised to reflect your constituents' concerns.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): Please consider the long term implications of this plan and strongly question the flawed justifications being used to push it through. The consequences of allowing this plan to move forward are huge for residents and the future of the city. From everything I've read, we don't need these more units to comply with the state's requirements (we need to look more closely at what's available), the growth forecasts being used are completely disconnected with reality of our city's growth in recent years (which is actually shrinking), and simply adding units has not proven to be an effective means to improve affordability. Please give this further consideration and diligently review the assumptions, the need and the resulting indelible changes we'll all suffer.

Sincerely,
Mark Berwick
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: gfpedler@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Gary Pedler
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stand With Your Constituents! {Files: 250700, 250701, 250966}
Date: Tuesday, October 7, 2025 10:51:40 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's upzoning map is fundamentally flawed. Blanket upzoning will not deliver affordability — it will fuel speculation, displacement, and higher housing costs.

The city needs more time to get this right. Rushing a permanent land use change without full public awareness is reckless and unacceptable.

As the largest rezoning and wealth redistribution in San Francisco's history, I urge you to withhold support unless the map is significantly revised to reflect your constituents' concerns.

As passed by the Planning Commission, the plan would do little to provide reasonably priced housing, force people out of existing housing, overburden the infrastructure, and destroy the character of a city that earns a lot of money as a place tourists want to visit.

I urge you to scale this plan back drastically and find a more measured, step-by-step approach to the issue.

Sincerely,
Gary Pedler
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: Jared Boot-Haury
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 7, 2025 6:25:56 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 & Commissioners,

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.

Jared Boot-Haury
jwboot3@icloud.com
351 King St, Unit 122
San Francisco, California 94158

From: Derek Gendvil
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 7, 2025 6:27:47 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 & Commissioners,

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.

Derek Gendvil
dgendvil@gmail.com
9030 w. Sahara ave. #360
Las Vegas , Nevada 89117

From: Sandy Carter
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 7, 2025 6:36:36 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 & Commissioners,

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.

Sandy Carter
carters989@gmail.com
740 Anza Street
San Francisco, California 94118

From: Noah Garcia
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 7, 2025 6:38:52 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 & Commissioners,

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.

Noah Garcia (D5 Resident)

Noah Garcia
noahgarcia80@gmail.com
564 Fell St
San Francisco, California 94102

From: Samah Shah
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 7, 2025 6:53:06 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 & Commissioners,

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

I've lived in the Richmond of 6 years and this neighbourhood especially urgently needs more homes. We have not built enough housing for our residents and the people who work here, but this plan finally 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.

Samah Shah
samahsemail@gmail.com
1732 Anza St Apt 3
San Francisco, California 94118

From: Casey Frost
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 7, 2025 7:02:32 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 & Commissioners,

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.

Casey Frost
caseyfrost13@gmail.com
111 Monterey Blvd
San Francisco, California 94131

From: Leah Loversky
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 7, 2025 7:22:15 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 & Commissioners,

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.

Leah Loversky
ldloversky@gmail.com
1207 CHESTNUT ST APT 10
San Francisco, California 94109

From: Mark Goldberg
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 7, 2025 7:27:26 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 & Commissioners,

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.

Mark Goldberg
mark.goldbergsf@gmail.com
2362 Bay Street
San Francisco, California 94123

From: Teresa Dal Santo
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 7, 2025 7:30:50 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 & Commissioners,

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.

Teresa Dal Santo
dalsantot@gmail.com
2031 Powell Street,
San Francisco, California 94133

From: teeeets@gmail.com
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 7, 2025 7:42:55 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 & Commissioners,

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.

teeeets@gmail.com
838 Anza St
Sf, California 94118

From: Anthony Criscione
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 7, 2025 8:42:39 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 & Commissioners,

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 Avenue
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Justin Truong
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 7, 2025 11:23:52 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 & Commissioners,

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: shsetterfield@gmail.com
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 7, 2025 11:59:21 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 & Commissioners,

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.

shsetterfield@gmail.com
88 Hoff St, #206
San Francisco, California 94110

From: John Steponaitis
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Wednesday, October 8, 2025 12:54:31 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 & Commissioners,

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.

John Steponaitis
steponaj@gmail.com
910 Geary 20
San Francisco, California 94109-7095

From: Shane Booth
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Wednesday, October 8, 2025 6:52:46 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 & Commissioners,

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.

Shane Booth
shanerama@gmail.com
112 Delano Ave
San Francisco, California 94112

From: Patrick Le
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Wednesday, October 8, 2025 8:03:09 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 & Commissioners,

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.

Patrick Le
patrickle1994@gmail.com
511 Eureka St
San Francisco, California 94114

From: James Lemaire
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Wednesday, October 8, 2025 9:22:20 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 & Commissioners,

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.

James Lemaire
james.roderick.lemaire@gmail.com
3685 17th St
San Francisco, California 94114

From: Irene Koo
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Wednesday, October 8, 2025 10:36:03 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 & Commissioners,

As a resident of D1 Inner Richmond, I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan. I especially hope my own Supervisor Connie Chan hears our voices in support of this 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.

I imagine raising a family here in SF, and I'd love for it to be in the Inner Richmond and in a city where the Family Zoning Plan is making the city we love, even better.

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

Irene Koo
irenekoo08@gmail.com
157 8th Avenue
San Francisco, California 94118

From: Brandon Jackson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Wednesday, October 8, 2025 8:11:21 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 & Commissioners,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan. I live South of Market, and by far the majority of housing built in recent decades in San Francisco has been around my neighborhood. But much of this housing is not suitable for families or mixed-age households.

Meanwhile, the west side of the city has built very little housing in recent decades, and has continually resisted even modest proposals to increase housing. We do not need drastic upzoning of the west side in order to improve this situation. The changes proposed in the Family Zoning Plan will go a long way to achieving this goal, and I urge you to support this for the benefit of ALL San Franciscans.

Respectfully,
Brandon Jackson

Brandon Jackson
brandonmjackson77@gmail.com
68 Harriet Street, Unit 7
San Francisco, California 94103

From: Westside Observer
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Lurie"s Zoning Plan • Streamlining"s Double-Cross • 29-Sunset Bus Line • Zoo"s Fundraiser • Diamond Heights Tower • High School Hookey •
Date: Thursday, October 9, 2025 9:58:26 AM

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





A Future for Westside Neighborhoods?

Six Fatal Flaws in Lurie's Rezoning Plan

The recall of Engardio sent shock waves through Lurie's supporters on the Board of Supervisors — Sherrill (Marina), Sauter (North Beach, Chinatown), and Melgar in District 7 — face large-scale opposition to the proposal.

The Planning Commission passed the proposal on a 4-3 vote. Its failure to get one vote from any of the supervisor-appointed commissioners shows the distinctly partisan character of the proposal.

The growing opposition to the proposal was starkly shown at a press

conference the same day when Lurie was booed for extended periods during his remarks.

by Calvin Welch

Read More

Move Fast — Break Things?

Voters Double-Crossed at Commission Streamlining Task Force

Hey Task Force — Prop D LOST. Implement Prop. E! It Won.

Weakening commissions is precisely what the Task Force is doing to hand Mayor Lurie more strong mayor authority. While it was supposed to be a "hedge" against a "strong mayor" the Task Force recommends implementing the opposite.

by Patrick Monette-Shaw

Read More

Navy's Final Insult

Plan to "Explode" Toxic Site Endangers Neighbors

The Navy exhibits poor behavior. Can we really trust their judgment that the buildings located on Parcel G are safe for demolition by explosion?

An explosion will create a dust cloud that will impact the Palou Avenue neighborhood, with playgrounds, schools, churches and transit lines. And worse, the toxic debris must be removed — traveling down numerous side streets to Third Street, exposing all those passing by to heavily poisonous dust.

by Glenn Rogers

Read More



Planners want to eliminate 12 stops for SF’s longest bus route

Makeover for 29-Sunset Line

The 29-Sunset bus line, notorious for being jampacked with students heading to and from school, may soon get some much-needed help. SFMTA wants to remove bus stops at a dozen intersections that do not meet standards—800 feet minimum distance between stops.

by Jason Chinn

Read More

More Information



City's planners approve 104-foot tower in Diamond Heights despite broad community opposition.

Neighborhood Finds It Hard to Battle AT&T

The final vote was typical of the Planning Commission today: four Mayoral appointees voted yes. All three Supes appointees voted no

The "monopole" would soar over existing trees and create a major new element on the skyline in a part of town where most construction is limited to four stories.

The neighborhood was organized, and speakers at the commission meeting were 100 percent against the proposal (although 13 people in

the neighborhood wrote to support the plan, with 83 opposed). Speakers noted that the tower would be an eyesore—but also a potential fire threat.

by Tim Redmond

Read More

Moving captive wild animals such as gorillas, like Cecil, across the country continues the cycle of artificial, high-stakes social manipulation

Animal Rights Activists Cold-Shoulder Zoo's Gala Fundraiser

Behind the feel-good PR lies a disturbing truth says Barker. This isn't about animal welfare. It's about control, breeding quotas, and the illusion of progress

The Zoo is eagerly preparing for its annual Gala Fundraiser this October 18. The recent arrival of newest resident Cecil the Zoo's new male silverback Western lowland gorilla, is in the spotlight. He was born at the Cincinnati Zoo in Ohio. His arrival in San Francisco at 27 years old marks his third place of residence within a zoo establishment.

by Jonathan Farrell

Read More

Truency Is A Serious Problem for California Schools

In the 2024–25, SFUSD students lost an estimated 4.4 million hours of learning and SFUSD lost over $60 million in state funding due to student absences. In California, school funding is based on attendance. If a student does not show up, the district loses money.

by Carol Kocivar

Read More

Earthquake Brace + Bolt program *Extended*

CRMP EXTENDS EARTHQUAKE GRANT APPLICATION DEADLINE

Extension through October 17 aligns with California Great ShakeOut to boost
earthquake preparedness awareness. Grants of up to $3000 are available for eligible homeowners in our area.

Sign Up

The Things That Make Us Grumpy

Quinten expands on the recall of Supervisor Joel Engardio, Prop 50, even Trump's announcement last month that he would award one-time mayor Rudy Giuliani the highest US civilian honor, the Presidential Medal of Honor.

Read More

PLEASE SUPPORT LOCAL NEWS REPORTING!

Got an opposing view? We seek to represent all sides of the discussion.

Your Feedback Is Welcome

Please subscribe! Subscription is Free

But as a Sustaining Subscriber at $5 a month, we'll make your 16¢ a day go a long way! Or become a benefactor. We count on you to keep us online

— thanks!

Subscribe / Donate

The Westside is blessed with all kinds of opinions. We try to show all sides of a question. Got an opposing position? Let us know. We're here for you.

Copyright © 2025 Westside San Francisco Media, All rights reserved.
You are receiving this email because you opted in via our website.

Our mailing address is:
Westside San Francisco Media
PO Box 170524
San Francisco, CA 94117-0524

Add us to your address book

Want to change how you receive these emails?
You can update your preferences or unsubscribe from this list.



From:	johnpmurray415@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Murray
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Thursday, October 9, 2025 2:09:15 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,
John Murray
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: sptsantilis@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Senta Tsantilis
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 9, 2025 5:22:57 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,
Senta Tsantilis

From:	Carroll, John (BOS)
To:	JANIS and BOB HARRER; Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Sciammas, Charlie (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Cooper, Raynell (BOS)
Cc:	Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC); Tanner, Rachael (CPC); Chen, Lisa (CPC); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); Mary Jane Large
Subject:	RE: Land Use and Transportation Committee Meeting on Family zoning Plan - BOS File No. 250700, 250701, 250966
Date:	Thursday, October 16, 2025 9:14:00 AM
Attachments:	BOS Land Use Com 10152025.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 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. 250700
- Board of Supervisors File No. 250701
- Board of Supervisors File No. 250966

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: JANIS and BOB HARRER <theharrers@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 15, 2025 2:27 PM
To: Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>
Cc: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC) <sarah.dennis-phillips@sfgov.org>; Tanner, Rachael (CPC) <rachael.tanner@sfgov.org>; Chen, Lisa (CPC) <lisa.chen@sfgov.org>; Andrews, Michelle (BOS) <michelle.andrews@sfgov.org>; Mary Jane Large <maryjanelarge@me.com>
Subject: Land Use and Transportation Committee Meeting on Family zoning Plan

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

On behalf of the Barbary Coast Neighborhood Association, I am forwarding the attached letter to the Land Use and Transportation Committee. The letter provides comments on the Family Zoning Plan, which we understand will be discussed at the Committee's meeting on Monday October 20. Thank you for your consideration.

Regards,
Bob Harrer
BCNA board member

BARBARY COAST NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION

BCNA
PO Box 2045
San Francisco, CA 94126
BCNA@bcnasf.org
www.bcnasf.org

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

OFFICERS

Mary Jane Large, Pres.
Marcy Albert, 1st VP
Michele Hennessey, 2nd VP
Philippe Sonne, Treas.
Bill Hannan, Secy.

MEMBERS AT LARGE

David Albert
Bob Harrer
Lee Robbins
James Seff
Diana Taylor

October 15, 2025

Via email

Board of Supervisors Land Use and Transportation Committee
1 Dr. Carlton Goodlett Place
City Hall
San Francisco CA, 94102-4689
c/o Clerk John Carroll
John.Carroll@sfgov.org

Re: Land Use and Transportation Committee, October 20, 2025 Hearing
Item: Family Zoning Plan

Dear Supervisors Melgar, Chen and Mahmood:

On behalf of the Barbary Coast Neighborhood Association (BCNA), this letter submits our comments on the most recent September 30, 2025, version of the Family Zoning Plan (the Plan) issued by the Planning Commission and posted on its website. BCNA serves the residents and businesses in the northeastern waterfront along the Embarcadero from Bay Street to Clay Street. The residents of our densely populated, mixed use neighborhood live in a wide variety of housing, including the Gateway, one of San Francisco's largest rent-controlled apartment complexes, the income-restricted Broadway Cove and 735 Davis Street offering housing for families and seniors, the Broadway Family Apartments and the Broadway Sansome complex, as well as an array of market rate condominiums, apartments and flats. In a very real sense, the BCNA neighborhood has been living and exemplifying the announced goals of the Plan for many years.

Backing onto the Embarcadero as we do, our membership takes great enjoyment and pride in our location along one of the nation's, if not the world's, most scenic waterfronts. Since our formation, we have been very active in issues impacting the entire northeastern waterfront, and especially have sought to protect the expansive views and feeling of openness provided by the Embarcadero's unique promenade for both residents and tourists alike. This has included continuing support for the existing 40-foot height limit along the City's waterfront. It is our concern for the protection of the Embarcadero and the northeastern waterfront that leads BCNA to make a very targeted request of the Land Use and Transportation Committee. For the reasons set forth below, we request that the block labeled #4 on the accompanying map be removed from coverage by the Family Zoning Plan entirely and be zoned to exclude the construction of any housing on it.

Our September 9, 2025, initial comment letter to the Planning Commission on the Family Zoning Plan centered on the impact that the July 29 version of the Plan would have had on the triangle of lots bordered by the Embarcadero, Bay Street and Powell Street. We continue to believe, as expressed in that letter, that the best way to protect the unique importance of the Embarcadero is with a firm 40-foot height limit for all housing within that triangle. We appreciate and wish to commend the September 30 version of the Plan on its implicit acknowledgment of the importance of protecting of the Embarcadero and the northeastern waterfront embodied in its:

1. Reduction of the base height for that entire triangle to 40 feet; and
2. Removal of the lots numbered 1-3 on the attached map from coverage by the Plan altogether.

However, we remain seriously concerned about the Plan's treatment of the block labeled #4 on the enclosed map. That block sits directly across the Embarcadero from the major tourist attractions of Pier 39 and the Plaza de California. While we appreciate that the September 30 version of the Plan now lowers the proposed local program height limit on block #4 from 85 feet to 65 feet, we don't believe that is sufficient to protect this unique location. Left unchanged, applying the state program's 100% density bonus to the 40-foot base height in combination with density decontrol could allow a 12-story tower on block #4. Density decontrol is available because it accompanies the block's inclusion in a proposed commercial/mixed use district. We view this as an unnecessary and unacceptable threat to the preservation of the human scale and singular attractiveness of the Embarcadero promenade. A 12-story tower would be a particular affront to, and an unfortunate greeting for, Pier 39 visitors and those arriving at the Cruise Ship Terminal, who come expecting the welcoming human scale and street level ambiance that make San Francisco San Francisco. As the Supervisors are well aware, tourism is a vital contributor to San Francisco's economy and brought in over $9 billion last year, per SF Travel.

We therefore are requesting that Block #4 be removed from coverage of the Family Zoning Plan and that the construction of residential units on Block #4 be expressly prohibited. We recognize that this request may appear unusual. However, given the impact density decontrol could have on this critical location, and the resultant potential for an inadvertent disadvantage to the local program vis a vis the state program, we fail to see any other approach that will bring the appropriate level of certainty that the future built environment of block #4 will not mar this vital section of the Embarcadero and the waterfront.

There can be no doubt that strong protection of the Embarcadero and the waterfront is of vital interest to all San Franciscans. Starting with public opposition to the Fontana Towers in the early 1960's through the removal of the Embarcadero Freeway to the comments received by the Port of San Francisco in Spring 2024 on its draft Waterfront Resilience Program that "[t}he Embarcadero Promenade is viewed as a critical asset and there is a strong desire to preserve and enhance it", San Francisco voters have made it clear that they do not support development that diminishes access to and enjoyment of the expansiveness of the Embarcadero and its connection to the Bay.

The mantra regarding real estate from time immemorial has been "location, location, location". Real estate is not a fungible asset where one parcel is the functional equivalent of another. For better or worse, the Family Zoning Plan will impact thousands of parcels across San Francisco. But only a very few of those parcels can negatively impact the experience of San Francisco's incomparable Embarcadero. Block #4 is one of those parcels. Mayor Lurie, various members of the Board of Supervisors and other city officials in recent days have stressed that passage of the Family Zoning Plan is the only way for San Francisco to maintain local control over building decisions and to use local knowledge to guide thoughtful residential development. But deciding where <u>not</u> to build also can be an important exercise of local control and knowledge. Protection of the irreplaceable public asset of the Embarcadero and the northeastern waterfront is a value historically held by all San Franciscans, and

we therefore urge the Land Use and Transportation Committee to express that value by removing Block #4 from coverage by the Family Zoning Plan and by prohibiting the construction of any residential units on that block in the future.

We further request this letter be entered into the record of the Land Use and Transportation's October 20 hearing on the Family Zoning Plan. Please contact Bob Harrer with questions or comments on our request and this comment letter.

Sincerely,

BCNA Board of Directors, by
Mary Jane Large, President
maryjanelarge@me.com

Robert Harrer, Former President and Board Member
theharrers@aol.com

cc: All other members of the Board of Supervisors, Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
Sarah Dennis-Phillips, Planning Director, sarah.dennis-phillips@sfgov.org
Rachael Tanner, Planner rachael.tanner@sfgov.org
Lisa Chen, Planner lisa.chen@sfgov.org
Michelle Andrews, legislative aide, Supervisor Sauter, Michelle.Andrews@sfgov.org

Family Zoning Plan Zoning Map Ordinance:
Proposed Local Program Height Limits

September 30, 2025

Supervisorial District 3



From:	Vladimir Vlad
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS)
Cc:	HVNA President; HVNA Vice President; Cooper, Raynell (BOS); Villarreal, Fernando (MYR)
Subject:	HVNA - Letter of Support - Family Zoning Plan
Date:	Tuesday, October 14, 2025 11:09:38 AM
Attachments:	2025 10 13 HVNA Family Zoning Plan.pdf

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

Hi John,

Please find attached HVNA's letter of support for the Family Zoning Plan ahead of the Land Use & Transportation meeting on the 20th.

Thanks,

Vladimir

HAYES VALLEY
NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION

October 13, 2025

Myrna Melgar, Chair
Chyanne Chen, Vice Chair
Bilal Mahmood
Land Use and Transportation Committee

RE: HVNA Support of Family Zoning Plan

Dear Chair Melgar, Vice-Chair Chen, and Supervisor Mahmood,

On behalf of the **Hayes Valley Neighborhood Association (HVNA)**, we are writing to express our support for the proposed **Family Zoning Plan (FZP)**.

HVNA views this plan as a crucial, well-balanced measure necessary to increase San Francisco's housing supply, support our city's diverse family base, and ensure housing availability for future generations. The Family Zoning Plan represents a thoughtful, incremental approach to density that aligns perfectly with the established character and successful mixed-use environment of Hayes Valley.

1. **Alignment with Existing Neighborhood Character:** Hayes Valley is already a dense, walkable, and transit-rich neighborhood. The FZP encourages **gentle density** by allowing up to four units in single-family zones. This density increase is consistent with the scale and character of our blocks, allowing for greater housing production without the radical height or bulk increases that often cause neighborhood opposition.
2. **Addressing Family Needs:** San Francisco is facing a critical loss of families and a dwindling supply of units appropriate for households with children. The FZP specifically targets this imbalance by encouraging multi-bedroom units through density bonuses, helping to retain the very families that enrich our public schools and local businesses.
3. **Increasing Supply in High-Opportunity Areas:** By allowing greater housing production in historically exclusive single-family areas, the FZP contributes to city-wide housing goals and promotes equitable distribution of housing in areas with excellent access to jobs, transit, and open space.

HVNA recognizes that addressing the city's housing shortage requires shared responsibility. We believe the Family Zoning Plan is a modest, necessary, and strategic step forward that will deliver meaningful results while preserving the livability and beauty of San Francisco's diverse neighborhoods for residents of all backgrounds.

We support the Board of Supervisors tasked with approving a responsible and HCD compliant plan such as **the Family Zoning Plan.**

Sincerely,

Vladimir Vlad, Chair HVNA Transportation & Planning Committee

David Robinson, President, HVNA

Joe Maloney, Vice President, HVNA

From: Erin Elliott
To: Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS)
Cc: Sauter, Danny (BOS)
Subject: Reject Upzoning plan
Date: Sunday, October 5, 2025 2:52:15 PM

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

Greetings all.

I live in 94133 and I am against the proposed changes in the Upzoning plan.

Please reject this initiative!

Kindly,

Erin Elliott
Erin@erins.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:	30 Letters regarding File Nos. 250700, 250701, and 250966
Date:	Thursday, October 2, 2025 1:29:35 PM
Attachments:	30 Letters regarding File Nos. 250700, 250701, and 250966.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached for 30 letters regarding File Nos. 250700, 250701, and 250966.

File No. 250700: Ordinance amending the Zoning Map to implement the Family Zoning Plan by: amending the Zoning Use District Maps to: 1) reclassify certain properties currently zoned as various types of Residential to Residential Transit Oriented - Commercial (RTO-C); 2) reclassify properties currently zoned Residential Transit Oriented (RTO) to Residential Transit Oriented - 1 (RTO-1); 3) reclassify certain properties from Residential districts other than RTO to RTO-1; 4) reclassify certain properties currently zoned Neighborhood Commercial (NC) or Public (P) to Community Business (C-2); and 5) reclassify certain properties from Public to Mixed-Use or Neighborhood Commercial Districts; amending the Height and Bulk Map to: 1) reclassify properties in the Family Zoning Plan to R-4 Height and Bulk District; 2) change the height limits on certain lots in the R-4 Height and Bulk District; and 3) designating various parcels to be included in the Non-Contiguous San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Sites Special Use District (SFMTA SUD); amending the Local Coastal Program to: 1) reclassify all properties in the Coastal Zone to R-4 Height and Bulk District; 2) reclassify certain properties to RTO-C and Neighborhood Commercial District; 3) designate one parcel as part of the SFMTA SUD; and 4) directing the Planning Director to transmit the Ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of public necessity, convenience, and welfare under Planning Code, Section 302; making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and making findings under the City's Local Coastal Program and the California Coastal Act of 1976. (Mayor, Mahmood, Dorsey)

File No. 250701: Ordinance amending the Planning Code to: 1) create the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program to incent housing development through a local bonus program and by adopting a Housing Sustainability District, 2) modify height and bulk limits to provide for additional capacity in well-resourced neighborhoods, and to allow additional height and bulk for projects using the local bonus program, 3) require only buildings taller than 85 feet in certain Districts to reduce ground level wind currents, 4) make conforming changes to the RH (Residential, House), RM (Residential, Mixed), and RC (Residential-Commercial) District zoning tables to reflect the changes to density controls, and parking requirements made in this Ordinance, 5) create the RTO-C (Residential Transit Oriented-Commercial) District, 6) implement the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's Transit-Oriented Communities Policy by making changes to parking requirements, minimum residential densities, and

minimum office intensities, and requiring maximum dwelling unit sizes, 7) revise off-street parking and curb cut obligations citywide, 8) create the Non-contiguous San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Sites Special Use District, 9) permit businesses displaced by new construction to relocate without a conditional use authorization and waive development impact fees for those businesses, 10) make technical amendments to the Code to implement the above changes, 11) make conforming changes to zoning tables in various Districts, including the Neighborhood Commercial District and Mixed Use Districts, and 12) reduce usable open space and bicycle parking requirements for senior housing; amending the Business and Tax Regulations Code regarding the Board of Appeals' review of permits in the Housing Choice Program Housing Sustainability District; also, amending the Local Coastal Program to implement the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program and other associated changes in the City's Coastal Zone, and directing the Planning Director to transmit the Ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment; 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 public necessity, convenience, and welfare findings under Planning Code, Section 302. (Mayor)

File No. 250966: Ordinance amending the General Plan to revise the Urban Design Element, Commerce and Industry Element, Transportation Element, Balboa Park Station Area Plan, Glen Park Community Plan, Market and Octavia Area Plan, Northeastern Waterfront Plan, Van Ness Avenue Area Plan, Western SoMa (South of Market) Area Plan, Western Shoreline Area Plan, Downtown Area Plan, and Land Use Index, to implement the Family Housing Zoning Program, including the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program, by adjusting guidelines regarding building heights, density, design, and other matters; amending the City's Local Coastal Program to implement the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program and other associated changes in the City's Coastal Zone, and directing the Planning Director to transmit the Ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment; 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 adopting findings of public necessity, convenience, and welfare under Planning Code, Section 340.

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: cdmccoy@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Casey McCoy
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stand With Your Constituents! {Files: 250700, 250701, 250966}
Date: Thursday, October 2, 2025 11:31:14 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's upzoning map is fundamentally flawed. Blanket upzoning will not deliver affordability — it will fuel speculation, displacement, and higher housing costs.

The city needs more time to get this right. Rushing a permanent land use change without full public awareness is reckless and unacceptable.

As the largest rezoning and wealth redistribution in San Francisco's history, I urge you to withhold support unless the map is significantly revised to reflect your constituents' concerns.

Zoning laws are not just random legislation among thousands of laws; they're paramount to the feel of a place, the quality of life in a society, the amount of sky that meets the eye. They're the promise that a factory or a high-rise won't suddenly appear among single-family homes. They constitute a sacred obligation which a government has to its residents, the willful abandonment of which is an unforgivable betrayal.

Nordic countries, when they need more housing, build out new infrastructure and transit in areas that have not been residential, and then build upward in those "new" areas. In this way, current residents are not betrayed. If they can do this, so can San Francisco and California - the world's 4th biggest economic power.

Sincerely,
Casey McCoy
San Francisco, CA 94116

From:	phil.lumsden999@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Philip Lumsden
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Thursday, October 2, 2025 9:47:39 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 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,
Philip Lumsden
San Francisco, CA 94133

From:	alicefw@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Alice Williams
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Thursday, October 2, 2025 8:13:35 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.

Everyone wants a separate entrance home. Nothing good can happen putting many people in a small space. What kind of infrastructure did you plan to increase? How many more police do you plan to hire?

San Francisco is dense enough. If I wanted to live in NYC I would have moved there!
Surely someone has calculated the capacity for this small 7 by 7 mile piece of land?

Sincerely,
Alice Williams
San Francisco, CA 94116

From:	jennkroot@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jennifer Kroot
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Wednesday, October 1, 2025 8:08:57 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):

I will do everything I can to stop extreme upzonging. I voted for Lurie and I'm incredibly disappointed. I thought that he cared about SF more than billionaires and developers. WE ALL KNOW THAT UPZONING WILL NOT SOLVE HOMELESSNESS OR HELP WITH AFFORDABILITY. Developers, Airbnb and tech billionaires own this city.

Sincerely,
Jennifer Kroot
San Francisco, CA 94117

From: jherrod9@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Julie Herrod-Lumsden
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Wednesday, October 1, 2025 7:02:28 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 30-year resident of North Beach, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's and Supervisor Sauter's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and FAMILIES and small businesses, and the transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We DEMAND that you:

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

Mayor Lurie's and Sauter'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 development.

These plans also clear the way for a MASS EXODUS OF RESIDENTS—YOUR CONSTITUENTS. Why are you so foolishly intent on eliminating us? Don't you kinda need resident voters so you can push your weight around?

Think about it (if you're able). WHY BITE THE HAND THAT FEEDS YOU?

Be careful.

HANDS OFF OUR NEIGHBORHOODS!!!

Sincerely,
Julie Herrod-Lumsden
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: epml@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Michael Larsen
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stand With Your Constituents! {Files: 250700, 250701, 250966}
Date: Wednesday, October 1, 2025 2:55:26 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's upzoning map is fundamentally flawed. Blanket upzoning will not deliver affordability — it will fuel speculation, displacement, and higher housing costs.

The city needs more time to get this right. Rushing a permanent land use change without full public awareness is reckless and unacceptable.

As the largest rezoning and wealth redistribution in San Francisco's history, I urge you to withhold support unless the map is significantly revised to reflect your constituents' concerns.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Michael Larsen
San Francisco, CA 94109

From:	randymazzei@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Randall Mazzei
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Wednesday, October 1, 2025 2:21:13 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,
Randall Mazzei

From: shop@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of beth weissman
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stand With Your Constituents! {Files: 250700, 250701, 250966}
Date: Wednesday, October 1, 2025 4:20:20 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's upzoning map is fundamentally flawed. Blanket upzoning will not deliver affordability — it will fuel speculation, displacement, and higher housing costs.

The city needs more time to get this right. Rushing a permanent land use change without full public awareness is reckless and unacceptable.

As the largest rezoning and wealth redistribution in San Francisco's history, I urge you to withhold support unless the map is significantly revised to reflect your constituents' concerns.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): The destruction of this northern/western part of SF will be permanent and we will never again have the unique flavor that makes SF special. Walk around Broadway from Webster towards Van Ness and you'll see the truly brutal high rises that were allowed there. The beauty of the area can never be regained. SF population is not growing, and rushing around adding ugly housing makes no sense. Please vote no.

Sincerely,
beth weissman
San Francisco, CA 94115

From: cutelynx@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Qi Wolf
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stand With Your Constituents! {Files: 250700, 250701, 250966}
Date: Tuesday, September 30, 2025 7:17:54 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's upzoning map is fundamentally flawed. Blanket upzoning will not deliver affordability — it will fuel speculation, displacement, and higher housing costs.

The city needs more time to get this right. Rushing a permanent land use change without full public awareness is reckless and unacceptable.

As the largest rezoning and wealth redistribution in San Francisco's history, I urge you to withhold support unless the map is significantly revised to reflect your constituents' concerns.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Qi Wolf
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: esinsf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Eihway Su
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Tuesday, September 30, 2025 6:05:57 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 who lives on Parnassus Avenue in Cole Valley, 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 love San Francisco's community that cares about people who have not been economically privileged, our diversity, as well as our beautiful, old buildings.

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,
Eihway Su
San Francisco, CA 94117

From: bilgepump100@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Robert Hall
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stand With Your Constituents! {Files: 250700, 250701, 250966}
Date: Tuesday, September 30, 2025 5:32:49 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's upzoning map is fundamentally flawed. Blanket upzoning will not deliver affordability — it will fuel speculation, displacement, and higher housing costs.

The city needs more time to get this right. Rushing a permanent land use change without full public awareness is reckless and unacceptable.

As the largest rezoning and wealth redistribution in San Francisco's history, I urge you to withhold support unless the map is significantly revised to reflect your constituents' concerns.

Perhaps you'll get the Engardio treatment for promoting this dreadful plan.

Sincerely,
Robert Hall
San Francisco, CA 94117

From: leah606@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Roselyn De Jesus
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stand With Your Constituents! {Files: 250700, 250701, 250966}
Date: Tuesday, September 30, 2025 5:18:06 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's upzoning map is fundamentally flawed. Blanket upzoning will not deliver affordability — it will fuel speculation, displacement, and higher housing costs.

The city needs more time to get this right. Rushing a permanent land use change without full public awareness is reckless and unacceptable.

As the largest rezoning and wealth redistribution in San Francisco's history, I urge you to withhold support unless the map is significantly revised to reflect your constituents' concerns.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):
Please stop selling SF and its residence out. I like how our pockets of different communities have developed; and how we find a way to work with each other, no matter what part of San Francisco we happen to live. Don't destroy the soul of my favorite city.

Sincerely,
Roselyn De Jesus
San Francisco, CA 94122

From:	David Lehr
To:	Lurie, Daniel (MYR)
Cc:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); jengardio@gmail.com; MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); FielderStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS); ChenStaff; 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); Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC); Tanner, Rachael (CPC); Switzky, Joshua (CPC); Chen, Lisa (CPC); Gibson, Lisa (CPC); Segal, Ned (MYR); Jones, Ej (MYR)
Subject:	Strongly Opposed to Mayor Lurie"s Upzoning Plan
Date:	Tuesday, September 30, 2025 4:50:12 PM

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

Dear Mayor Lurie,

I've been proud to call District 2 my home for over 20 years. As a longtime San Franciscan, I'm deeply concerned and strongly opposed to Mayor Lurie's plan. It threatens to tear down cherished homes, push out renters and small businesses, and reshape our neighborhoods into exclusive corridors of unaffordable luxury high-rises.

This plan isn't just about development—it's about displacement disguised as progress. It puts the interests of wealthy developers and billionaire investors far ahead of the families and communities who have built this city over decades.

We urgently ask you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Call for a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

The Mayor's upzoning maps would permanently alter San Francisco's land use in ways that go well beyond what's necessary—and without any guarantees that housing will be affordable for everyday residents.

Together, we must protect the heart and soul of our city from these sweeping changes that threaten to silence community voices and erase the vibrant neighborhoods we love.

Thank you for considering my input as you make this critical decision for San Francisco's future.

Dave Lehr

District 2 Resident

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: Tuesday, September 30, 2025 3:57:31 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.

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:	irismvbucchioni@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Iris Vahrenhorst-Bucchioni
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Tuesday, September 30, 2025 3:12:54 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 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.

Please safe the unique character of San Francisco with it's distinctly different neighborhoods. Don't make our city look the same everywhere you go.

Sincerely,
Iris Vahrenhorst-Bucchioni
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: donna.howe@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Donna Howe
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Tuesday, September 30, 2025 2:42:20 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): As a resident of Ingleside Terraces, one of the few remaining intact Historic Garden Neighborhoods, I implore you to exempt historic category A properties from the current upzoning map. According to recent tabulations based on the city survey, removing these properties will not significantly impact the the required number of new homes desired by the State of California. It is absolutely possible to both meet future housing goals and embrace the past. By further modifying the proposed zoning map, you can gain the support of many of your constituents, particularly homeowners and landlords who contribute significantly to city coffers trhough payment of property taxes.

Sincerely,
Donna Howe
San Francisco, CA 94127

From:	donna.howe@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Donna Howe
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Stand With Your Constituents! {Files: 250700, 250701, 250966}
Date:	Tuesday, September 30, 2025 2:31:05 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 longtime resident of the Westside, but one who has also lived and worked in many sections of our wonderful city, I believe Mayor Lurie's upzoning map is fundamentally flawed. Blanket upzoning will not deliver affordability — it will fuel speculation, displacement, and higher housing costs.

The city needs more time to get this right. Rushing a permanent land use change without full public awareness is reckless and unacceptable.

As the largest rezoning and wealth redistribution in San Francisco's history, I urge you to withhold support unless the map is significantly revised to reflect your constituents' concerns.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):I am concerned about this week's attempt to adopt construction guidelines for single family homes that may not jive with historical architectural elements. Further, by trying to eliminate the HPC or to allow the Planning Department to assume the role of historic preservation, more necessary guardrails will be circumvented. Such manipulation does not engage the community in meaningful ways. Having already removed environmental reviews, how will the city ensure that new and modified builds will be transparent and in line with the exiting city plan?

Sincerely,
Donna Howe
San Francisco, CA 94127

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: Tuesday, September 30, 2025 2:14:46 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,
Hatun Noguera
San Francisco, CA 94127

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:	Tuesday, September 30, 2025 2:13:59 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.

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: Stand With Your Constituents! {Files: 250700, 250701, 250966}
Date: Tuesday, September 30, 2025 2:13:24 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's upzoning map is fundamentally flawed. Blanket upzoning will not deliver affordability — it will fuel speculation, displacement, and higher housing costs.

The city needs more time to get this right. Rushing a permanent land use change without full public awareness is reckless and unacceptable.

As the largest rezoning and wealth redistribution in San Francisco's history, I urge you to withhold support unless the map is significantly revised to reflect your constituents' concerns.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Hatun Noguera
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: ericajoykatrak@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Erica Katrak
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Tuesday, September 30, 2025 11:12:20 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Please don't destroy our magical city. 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. In 2023, four- and six-plex legislation was signed into law, which created the capacity for ~400,000 units. Add the ~70,000 units in the pipeline, and San Francisco has way more than the net units required by the state's rashly passed quotas and this is all already transforming our city with not enough thought and careful city planning.

The State Department of Finance projects only ~17,000 new residents by 2050 and there are still ~40,000 vacant units sitting empty. In my neighborhood, there are luxury McMansions and condos that have been for sale and vacant for over a year. Lurie's upzoning scheme is unnecessary, excessive, and counterproductive to achieving real affordability in San Francisco. It seems like a blatant gift to wealthy development firms, who destroy our city's history and character and put up huge, personality-devoid buildings in place of it. They have been destroying irreplaceable places and rent controlled dwellings and affordable starter homes for years. On top of all that, did you know that a third of our country's landfills are filled with construction debris? There's no angle to this path that makes any sense to me. Let's do better than this.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps. Why do we need this at all? Who is asking for it?
- 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 and barely any protections for historic places that cannot be replaced. 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 and the erasing of culture and identity disguised as progress. It reminds me heavily of the "urban renewal" programs of the 60s and 70s. Let's please find better, smarter, more thoughtful ways forward. This is an iconic and diverse and creative and beautiful city, and we need to put care into keeping it that way.

Sincerely,
Erica Katrak

From: chrisverplanck@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Christopher VerPlanck
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, September 29, 2025 2:58:57 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,
Christopher VerPlanck
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: Jack Eidson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Family Zoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, September 29, 2025 1:28:33 PM

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

Hello,

I am writing to express my strong support for Mayor Lurie's Family Zoning Plan, and to encourage the Board of Supervisors to pass it urgently.

I am a resident of District 8, and would gladly welcome more neighbors and more vitality to my neighborhood, the Castro. The Family Zoning Plan puts both my neighborhood and the full city on a stronger path toward recovery and growth.

It should also not be discounted that passing a measure like the Family Zoning Plan is required by the state in order to stay in compliance with California law. Any supervisor who ignores that reality is unfit to serve this city.

Thanks,
Jack Eidson (94114)

From: paulagiants@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Paula Katz
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Sunday, September 28, 2025 8:26:45 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Hello,

I am a resident of District 4. I want to add that I supported Prop K, love Sunset Dunes, and opposed recalling Joel Engardio. However, as a San Franciscan resident and taxpayer, 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 have lived in the Sunset for over 30 years. There are many other ways to increase housing in San Francisco without ruining our neighborhood. The Mayor's up zoning plan is wrong for San Francisco.

Sincerely,
Paula Katz
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: Justin Daulton
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended!
Date: Sunday, September 28, 2025 7:06:24 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – must be amended! There are other area's in need of redevelopment and revitalization in the city, especially downtown in Union Square and reaching outwards. This should be counted towards requirements and needs.

The current plan takes away the charm, vibe and character of existing established neighborhoods that are are not in need (nor they should be) of redevelopment. As a resident for over 20 years, and whom has fully planted roots in the Richmond distrcit, I whole heartedly appeal to modify this plan to not so serverly upzone established neighborhoods and instead focus on vacant areas that are in need of redevelopment.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

Sincerely, Justin

Justin
California

From: joringer67@gmail.com
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Saturday, September 27, 2025 2:51:13 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

California

From: maryanntittle@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of MaryAnn Tittle
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Saturday, September 27, 2025 9:24:22 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,
MaryAnn Tittle

From: maryanntittle@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of MaryAnn Tittle
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Saturday, September 27, 2025 9:23:09 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,
MaryAnn Tittle

From: kirinp@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kirin Parmar
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Friday, September 26, 2025 7:41:47 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am a proponent of affordable housing who would like to see the proposed SF Upzoning Mandate be fine-tuned to meet holistic needs.
I hold a B. Arch (Hons), M. City Planning and MS (Transportation Engineering). I am also a certified Breakthrough Coach with good communication skills and a natural mediation ability. I grew up mostly in Singapore (tops in building affordable housing and supporting infrastructure) and did my grad studies at Berkeley. I recently hosted an impressive and high-level representative for Lima, Peru's most successful social housing development company called Besco, which is a for-profit private developer. Despite variations in what we can replicate, we have resources to learn from that further include the experiences of Auckland, NZ, Portland, OR and Seattle, WA. We will have to adjust to 1) what our local culture will tolerate within reason, 2) the heightened need for EQ safety and evacuation routes, 3) the limited space to expand making it much harder to meet desirable setbacks, 4) the limits of the existing supportive infrastructure. And 5) last but not least, how we can retain enough of the heart and soul of what makes San Francisco the local, national and global draw that it is. Singapore saved costs by having the government act as developer. Besco in Lima was able to lower costs and create enough profit by the scale of the contracts they keep winning due to their holistic follow-up services business model (in addition to an enforced non-corruption mandate). (Some of the aspects they provide that do not fit the limitations of SF could fit other CA cities, something to pass on to our Senator and Governor). I would like to see more inclusive and thus hopefully more creative brainstorming of a model for affordable building that keeps costs down and gets more buy-in from residents. Also, people tend to be more accepting of change when they feel heard and validated about their feelings and views first. They have been heard at the Planning Commission Hearing, but not actually validated or shown empathy which has further escalated fears and thus opposition. I think it is important that the public feels they have had adequate time to participate in the possible solutions. Things shift when the opposing forces have their worst-case scenario fears allayed, and come to their own conclusions about the possible measures to meet parameters as a result of being part of the brain-storming. I'd like to see the soliciting of views evolve from the negative inducing-mindset focus of what we don of what we do not want, to the pro-active, positive engagement over what we want in order to reach the 36,000 mandated units. Having non-political independent experts weigh in is also crucial. Who can we invite? Retired experts are potentially a great resource. There is such an important psychological element to getting buy-in. I conclude by asking where I can further contribute with my relevant insights, expertise or resourcefulness. I have been active on Nextdoor where over 2,600 folk (at an early count) viewed my post soliciting support in understanding what is going on. After more than 160 comments, things calmed down with the inclusion of my explanation that we genuinely do have a housing crisis that is part of a global housing crisis, and why the impetus to solve this had to come from the State. I personally do not want under the current political environment, to have it look like our governor and senator are doing something that feels like a betrayal as has been implied by the genuinely alarmed. But I do agree that the SF mandate such as it is to-date, is cause for alarm. It lacks clarity on density bonuses, a sense of control over maximum buildout within the up-zoned areas, sensitivity to other important parameters that would ensure we don't destroy cherished public spaces with gloomy shaded or wind-channeling tunnels, and assured preservation or continuity of cherished architecture and small businesses.

Sincerely,
Kirin Parmar
San Francisco, CA 94132

From:	chamaret@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jun Ishimuro
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Wednesday, September 24, 2025 8:46:46 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.

Views and historic neighborhoods are our city's important resource as one of the top tourist destinations in the world. Tourist industry hire 60000 people and it is a common summer time job for San Francisco resident students. Like all national parks, we have responsbility to preserve our city's view and historic neighborhoods for our future which will also generate revenues for the city and its residents.

Sincerely,
Jun Ishimuro
San Francisco, CA 94114

From:	Carroll, John (BOS)
To:	Liam Hennessy
Cc:	Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Sciammas, Charlie (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Cooper, Raynell (BOS)
Subject:	RE: Up Zoning Plan - BOS File Nos. 250700, 250701, and 250966
Date:	Wednesday, September 24, 2025 3:01:00 PM
Attachments:	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 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. 250700

  Board of Supervisors File No. 250701

  Board of Supervisors File No. 250966

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: Liam Hennessy <dolbay@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 22, 2025 7:13 PM
To: Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>
Subject: Up Zoning Plan

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

Dear Supervisors,

My name is Liam Hennessy and I am a long-time resident of North Beach and a recent retired San Francisco Unified School teacher. My neighborhood was not originally included in any upzoning plan until our Supervisor Danny Sauter decided to add it. Why? He has never answered this question or many others that neighbors such as myself have tried to get him to answer.

I am very upset that without so much as a public meeting or notification, North Beach was put into this reckless plan even though the neighborhood is already one of the densest in our beautiful city. The creators and backers of this plan never took into account any of the concerns of the neighborhood's residents! Mayor Lurie and Supervisor Sauter even postponed the voting on North Beach becoming a Historic Neighborhood, in hopes I am sure, that it would not get in the way of his "Family Zoning Plan" proposal being adopted.

There has not been enough collaboration with the people who are going to be most affected by this proposal. This Family Zoning plan was not created to enrich the lives of individuals who want to live in North Beach or for those that already do or for those that will be pushed out because of it. This is not an easy fix to our housing crisis. We need to be more creative with our approach to our housing needs. However, those approaches Should Not Come from the Big Developers trying to get a HUGE WINFALL or POLITICIANS WHO ARE BOUGHT in order to climb the political ladder, BUT by the people of North Beach. We have a huge stake in this and this decision will change the neighborhood forever. Once it is done there is no going back. Remember the Redevelopment Era?

The plan to include North Beach into Lurie's Upzoning proposal was a blatant lie to all of the residences and businesses in North Beach by politicians that used their power to hide the fact that their ambition for power/money is more important than the community that elected them.
Making decisions about the fate of a person's neighborhood behind a facade of wanting to create more housing for the working people is disingenuous, especially since it was all hidden from the constituents. High Rise Condominiums all along the Wharf, splattered around North Beach, Telegraph Hill, etc. will not be affordable to the individuals that this proposal is trying to house. It will only be affordable to the rich, It will ruin the neighborhood and it will create another

redevelopment nightmare with horrible consequences.

Danny Sauter and his YIMBY lobbyists along with the Planning Department have not involved the neighborhood residents, businesses etc. in the decision to replace our incredible neighborhood, which tourists travel the world to see, with a Miami Beach one instead. This plan was not done with the constituents' needs in mind, but rather with those of developers and Mr Sauter’s donors instead(and in secret). It is not what is best for North Beach or the City at large.

Please make significant changes to the Up Zoning map because it will destroy North Beach. As a native, as a retired San Francisco Unified School teacher I plead that you really take a hard look at what is being proposed, how it will impact North Beach and the City at large, maybe even go to St. Peters and Paul's and pray on it… you never know.

Onwards,
Liam Hennessy
169 Pfeiffer Street
San Francisco Ca 94133

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:	186 Letters regarding File Nos. 250700 and 250701
Date:	Thursday, September 11, 2025 2:37:26 PM
Attachments:	186 Letters regarding File Nos. 250700 and 250701.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached for 186 letters regarding File Nos. 250700 and 250701.

File No. 250700: Ordinance amending the Zoning Map to implement the Family Zoning Plan by: amending the Zoning Use District Maps to: 1) reclassify certain properties currently zoned as various types of Residential to Residential Transit Oriented - Commercial (RTO-C); 2) reclassify properties currently zoned Residential Transit Oriented (RTO) to Residential Transit Oriented - 1 (RTO-1); 3) reclassify certain properties from Residential districts other than RTO to RTO-1; 4) reclassify certain properties currently zoned Neighborhood Commercial (NC) or Public (P) to Community Business (C-2); and 5) reclassify certain properties from Public to Mixed-Use or Neighborhood Commercial Districts; amending the Height and Bulk Map to: 1) reclassify properties in the Family Zoning Plan to R-4 Height and Bulk District; 2) change the height limits on certain lots in the R-4 Height and Bulk District; and 3) designating various parcels to be included in the Non-Contiguous San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Sites Special Use District (SFMTA SUD); amending the Local Coastal Program to: 1) reclassify all properties in the Coastal Zone to R-4 Height and Bulk District; 2) reclassify certain properties to RTO-C and Neighborhood Commercial District; 3) designate one parcel as part of the SFMTA SUD; and 4) directing the Planning Director to transmit the Ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of public necessity, convenience, and welfare under Planning Code, Section 302; making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and making findings under the City's Local Coastal Program and the California Coastal Act of 1976. (Mayor, Sauter, Mahmood, Dorsey)

File No. 250701: Ordinance amending the Planning Code to: 1) create the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program to incent housing development through a local bonus program and by adopting a Housing Sustainability District, 2) modify height and bulk limits to provide for additional capacity in well-resourced neighborhoods, and to allow additional height and bulk for projects using the local bonus program, 3) require only buildings taller than 85 feet in certain Districts to reduce ground level wind currents, 4) make conforming changes to the RH (Residential, House), RM (Residential, Mixed), and RC (Residential-Commercial) District zoning tables to reflect the changes to density controls, and parking requirements made in this Ordinance, 5) create the RTO-C

(Residential Transit Oriented-Commercial) District, 6) implement the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's Transit-Oriented Communities Policy by making changes to parking requirements, minimum residential densities, and minimum office intensities, and requiring maximum dwelling unit sizes, 7) revise off-street parking and curb cut obligations citywide, 8) create the Non-contiguous San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Sites Special Use District, 9) permit certain Legacy Businesses to relocate without a conditional use authorization and waive development impact fees for those businesses, 10) make technical amendments to the Code to implement the above changes, and 11) make conforming changes to zoning tables in various Districts, including the Neighborhood Commercial District and Mixed Use Districts; amending the Business and Tax Regulations Code regarding the Board of Appeals' review of permits in the Housing Choice Program Housing Sustainability District; amending the Local Coastal Program to implement the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program and other associated changes in the City's Coastal Zone, and directing the Planning Director to transmit the Ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment; 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 public necessity, convenience, and welfare findings under Planning Code, Section 302. (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: Beth Chia
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR)
Cc: Board of Supervisors (BOS); Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC); wtpcc-delegates@googlegroups.com
Subject: Family Zoning Plan
Date: Wednesday, September 10, 2025 10:10:59 PM
Attachments: Letter of Family Zoning Plan.docx

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

Beth Liwen Chia
390 Santa Ana Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94127

September 10, 2025

To: daniel.lurie@sfgov.org
cc:Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org,
sarah.dennis-phillips@sfgov.org,
wtpcc-delegates@googlegroups.com

The Honorable Daniel Lurie
Mayor of the City and County of San Francisco
City Hall, Room 200
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102
Via email and U.S. Mail

Re: "Family Zoning Plan"

Dear Mayor Lurie,

The Balboa Terrace Homes Association represents approximately 950 residents, with a mix of families and seniors. Our neighborhood generally reflects the racial make of the city. We shop, eat and do business in West Portal and on Ocean Ave. We strongly oppose the so-called "Family Zoning Plan" as it threatens to destroy the small businesses we rely on and will reduce existing family housing through speculative development and demolition.

This proposal isn't a family housing plan - it's a demolition plan. Density decontrol, as proposed, eliminates unit limits on single-family parcels. It incentivizes demolition of some of San Francisco's most affordable family housing stock to make way for high-rent, small-unit developments unsuitable for families. This plan encourages speculative development for high income singles that will drive up land values, displace families, and erode thriving communities.

This proposal will destroy thriving communities. The proposed unconstrained up zoning and density decontrol will destabilize neighborhoods, drive tenant and small business evictions, and hollow out small, local business districts like Ocean Avenue, West Portal Avenue and Lakeside Village.

The state's 82,000-unit housing mandate ignores economic realities. San Francisco should instead challenge the state's arbitrary and unrealistic population projections, since it is already the densest city in California and the second densest city in the United States, second only to New York City. The high cost of housing in New York City proves that densification does not produce lower housing costs.

The City does not face a housing supply shortage. In fact, the Planning Department's Q2 2025 data shows a pipeline of 71,183 new units, including over 10,000 units near Ingleside Terraces at Balboa Reservoir, Stonestown, and Parkmerced. Meanwhile, the city's population has declined by 31,938 since 2020, with an estimated 36,000 vacant units. The proposal's emphasis on increasing the supply of housing units is not based on the facts. Over the past 30 years, as the housing stock grew 27% and the

population increased only 11%, rent and housing prices still soared. The development encouraged by this proposal will be market-rate and aimed towards higher income individuals, further exacerbating affordability problems.

We propose the following recommendations to align any zoning plan with community and citywide goals:

1. **Remove Density Decontrol and maintain setbacks, height transitions, and massing rules. -** Existing approved projects in the pipeline and capacity can accommodate more than the arbitrary 82,000-state mandated new housing units without demolishing thriving neighborhoods. Your efforts to reduce bureaucratic and regulatory barriers such as permit reform will stimulate more construction activity more quickly than would blanket up zoning.

2. **Remove provisions that allow 65' heights on interior residential street corner lots and 8,000 square foot lots.** This provision 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. Proposed lot mergers will invade vital greenbelts, backyards, and trees that provide vital open space in an otherwise dense urban environment.

3. **Provide for a forty-foot height limit** on residential and commercial corridors.

4. **Protect historic resources and prohibit demolition of existing housing stock:** Require alternatives to demolition of eligible historic resources (Category A). Apply Preservation Design Standards to new projects in Category A neighborhoods.

5. **Provide housing choices scaled for families with children** and increase the required family housing units consistent with the City's family-friendly policies. Preserve the small business.

6. **Ensure adequate infrastructure** – San Francisco's infrastructure will not support massive increases in building even the plan were to encourage it. Providing additional water, electricity, fire, police, and sewer capacity will be expensive and time consuming. Muni is already facing chronic deficits and cannot take additional strain. Increased zoning density should not be approved until infrastructure studies have been conducted and capital projects are approved and funded to support the proposed new development.

7. **Incentivize building the existing pipeline:** Encourage developers to build approved units or, if they do not, revoke entitlements.

8. **Repurpose under-utilized buildings:** Offer greater incentives to convert under-utilized downtown structures into housing as has been successfully done in Washington DC, New York and Los Angeles.

In conclusion, the "Family Zoning Plan" as proposed encourages the demolition of sound housing, invites speculation, drives up costs, destroys architecturally historic structures, paves over green space and destroys our sense of community.

We ask that you adopt these recommendations, reject density decontrol, and formulate a sensible plan that preserves our neighborhoods, prioritizes affordability, and includes community input. We strongly

support the building of new housing, but any new housing plan needs to be sensible and include the input and collaboration of those who will be most affected. We demand to be heard.

Very truly yours,

Beth Li-Wen Chia

From: covaron@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Christine Varon
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Thursday, September 11, 2025 9:08:33 AM

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 Christine Baron and I live in district too with my family of three children and a full-time care provider for my 24 year-old disabled adult daughter. We have raised our family here and are grateful to all San Francisco has given to our family.

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

I really hope we can all work together to review and come up with a thought out plan to expand San Francisco’s housing, which it definitely needs, and I am fully support.

Sincerely,
Christine Varon

Sincerely,
Christine Varon
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: marian.research@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Marian Wallace
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Thursday, September 11, 2025 9:03:33 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.

San Francisco's charm and tourist-attractiveness gets eaten away by the kind of building permissiveness for which these new rules pave the way. Once you start to add high rises so easily, there is no turning back. These are not well-though-out plans. They will not benefit the people of San Francisco.

Sincerely,
Marian Wallace
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: cathieanderson@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Catherine Anderson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Thursday, September 11, 2025 9:01:11 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.

As a senior citizen, who worked hard and paid taxes in San Francisco, I thankfully have rent control or I could no longer afford to live here. In my building as units open, they charge market rates, so the landlords are still making a good income. When I retired, making $50,000-$70,000.00/year - depending on circumstances - that was considered a "middle class" salary and I was proud how I was doing. Now my yearly income is considered "lower class". Social Security is based on our salaries we made before current inflation. Inflation if frightening for seniors.

Many seniors live in our building, as well as young persons. We live well together, and seniors provide history and contributed to life to San Francisco. If seniors are displaced and forced out of their own homes to provide space for unknown new younger, richer persons - where would they go? How is this humane? There are many places in and around that can be built up without displacing the current residents. Seniors naturally fade out on their own - either going to more assisted living, or passing away, or other reasons. This has been a natural turn around for rent control apartments for decades, and happens naturally in our building. We have more younger persons than seniors now.

Finally, building towers in neighborhoods that are architecturally historic destroys what we love about San Francisco, and the living conditions for those around it. Blocking sunlight, fresh air and creating more heat and glare for the residents who live around it.

Recently the building commission approved a building to exceed the height limit of our neighborhood by nearly double for the addition of only 5 affordable units. (842 California Street). This huge modern glass building will block sunlight, fresh air and quality of life for the hundreds of current residents living next to it. It may also add heat and glare to the neighborhood. It destroys the victorian feel of the neighborhood and we are in a major pathway for tourists from hotels towards downtown. Many tourists take pictures on our block as this is what they often come to San Francisco for. It will also be devastating for the University Club by basically building a wall in front of their balconies, blocking views for their many weekend rental events.

All this for only 5 units.

I would like more affordable housing of course, but done in a thoughtful way considering current residents, and the history and architecture of the neighborhood. It feels like just building without these considerations, would be similar to what DOGE was criticized for - just demolishing the good things while trying to achieve a goal, instead of doing so in a thoughtful, planned manner.

Please protect current San Franciscans in your future planning.

Sincerely,
Catherine Anderson
San Francisco, CA 94108

From: gfgoffman@gmail.com
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Thursday, September 11, 2025 8:53:08 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

California

From: phil.lumsden999@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Philip Lumsden
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Thursday, September 11, 2025 8:45:43 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.

As a North Beach resident for over 30 years, as well as a Coit Tower employee, I am acutely aware of the universal charm and attraction that North Beach has in today's world. I speak with people from all corners of the planet who tell me how they specifically came to SF just to visit North Beach. Its ambience and similarity to several old world European towns draws visitors from everywhere and keeps locals flocking to the neighborhood. Why deliberately change, no--uproot--an already proven enduring success story is beyond me. Especially when it appears to being done without proper notification to the very residents it will most impact. Please reject this proposal and let North Beach thrive again!
ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Philip Lumsden
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: Eric Dasmalchi
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Thursday, September 11, 2025 8:20:22 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 & Commissioners,

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.

Eric Dasmalchi
edasmalchi@gmail.com
3333 Mentone Avenue
San Francisco, California 94130

From:	sf.lorna@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lorna Walker
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Thursday, September 11, 2025 7:02:55 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): I live in lower Pacific Heights and, in my voting district, only three blocks are due to be upsized. I can only assume it's because Mayer Lurie did not want to upsize part of his neighborhood and is forcing the "poor "part of district 2 to bear the full brunt of the upsizing. My street is residential and should not be destroyed! Do not vote for this discriminatory upsizing that will destroy San Francisco.

Sincerely,
Lorna Walker
San Francisco, CA 94115

From:	marymmoc@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mary OConnell
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Thursday, September 11, 2025 5:16:38 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, in Cow Hollow ,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,
Mary OConnell
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: Ron Nieberding
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Thursday, September 11, 2025 3:37:33 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 & Commissioners,

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.

Ron Nieberding
nieberding2@gmail.com
18 10th St Apt 640
San Francisco, California 94103

From: Simone Mittelstaedt
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc: Nellie King Solomon
Subject: Don"t Demolish SF
Date: Wednesday, September 10, 2025 11:29:17 PM

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

Dear Members,

My name is Nellie King Solomon, and my family and I have lived on Bellair, a small alley in North Beach, for 53 years. My father built our house, and my 17-year-old daughter is the third generation to live there. We are the urban fabric of this city, and we are being ignored.

The upzoning plan being considered today is an unjust and secretive attack on our neighborhood. Our community was never meant to be on this map. It was not in the original Housing Element.

New Supervisor Danny Sauter and Scott Wiener have thrown us into this plan without asking or even telling our neighbors. This is being done in secret with developers and donors in mind, not with the constituents' needs. It’s bad politics and possibly illegal. This plan is not only politically corrupt but physically flawed for three crucial reasons:

First, my father, a lifetime city planner and low income Architect, explained that the planned pencil towers are not viable for affordable housing on these sites. The land is unstable "fill" from after the 1906 earthquake, and the substantial foundations required mean they can only be built as luxury housing.

Second, these waterfront sites are threatened by rising sea levels.

Third, this plan is based on a false premise. We do not have a housing shortage in this particular area. Six months ago, I found 40 vacant two-bedroom units on Zillow in my immediate blocks alone.

This is a plan that will demolish affordable housing, not create it. I agree with Daniel Lurie that the waterfront needs a facelift, but let's make it walkable low-rise housing that fits the character of San Francisco, not shady, windy tunnels created by high-rises.

Commissioners, I ask you to stop. Don’t give free rein to these developers. You have a cautionary tale right here in San Francisco: Joel Engardio and London Breed ignored their constituents and their careers ended. Please, do not fall into the same trap at our neighborhood's expense.

Your legacy will be the fabric of San Francisco. Let it be a good one. Remove North Beach, the Wharf, and Telegraph Hill from your development map.

Native San Francisco 3 generations in North Beach,
Nellie King Solomon.

Nellie King Solomon
nellie@nelliekingsolomon.com
www.nelliekingsolomon.com
@nelliekingsolomon

From:	Joseph Smooke
To:	Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Bonde, Aly (MYR); So, Lydia (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Mcgarry, Sean (CPC); Campbell, Amy (CPC); Williams, Gilbert A (CPC); Imperial, Theresa (CPC); Braun, Derek (CPC); Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides; Zisser, David@HCD; Ionin, Jonas (CPC); Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC); Chen, Lisa (CPC); Tanner, Rachael (CPC)
Subject:	REP-SF Letter re "Family Zoning Plan"
Date:	Thursday, September 4, 2025 2:14:22 PM
Attachments:	REP-SF Letter re Upzoning 4Sept2025.pdf

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

Dear Mayor Lurie, Board of Supervisors President Mandelman and Planning Commission President So,

On behalf of the Race & Equity in all Planning Coalition, SF (REP-SF), please find our letter regarding the "Family Zoning Plan" attached to this e-mail.

REP-SF respectfully submits this letter in advance of, and in reference to the September 11, 2025 Planning Commission hearing on this matter which has been previously referred to as Planning File #2021-005878CWP. It also pertains to Legislative Files #250701, #250700, and #230001.

--joseph

co-founder of People Power Media
Creators of PRICED OUT
See the animation that will change the way you think about housing!

4 September 2025

Mayor Daniel Lurie

Supervisor Rafael Mandelman, President, Board of Supervisors

Planning Commissioner Lydia So, President, Planning Commission

Re: "Family Zoning Plan"

Legislative Files #250701 (Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes)

#250700 (Zoning Map)

#230001 (General Plan Amendments)

Planning File #2021-005878CWP, and related

Dear Mayor Lurie, Board of Supervisors President Mandelman, and Planning Commission President So:

The Race & Equity in all Planning Coalition (REP-SF) strongly objects to the Housing Element Rezoning Program, "Family Zoning Plan" (FZP). We have spent numerous hours reading and analyzing the above-referenced legislative files, especially the nearly 500 page File #250701 which establishes the "FZP." REP-SF members and allies, people with decades of experience in policy (both inside and outside City Hall), land use, affordable housing development and policy, tenants rights, and small business issues have collaborated on our analysis of the FZP. As a result of this thorough, collaborative effort, we have the following top-line conclusions:

1. **Recycles Failed Policies:** The Housing Element (Table 4.1-5 from the Housing Element EIR) cites statistics from the US Census showing that over a 70 year period, San Francisco has built just under one and a half new housing units for every new person when relating net new housing to population growth. Spanning periods of white flight from the inner city, suburbanization supported by BART and new highways, Redevelopment, booms and busts of the tech industry, the financial crisis, and the COVID pandemic, the population of our City increased roughly 100,000 people, while

developers built roughly 140,000 new housing units. Currently, based on our Planning Department's Q2 Housing Development Pipeline report, there are 71,183 housing units already entitled.

The problem isn't a lack of past or latent supply. The systemic problem for San Francisco is a lack of sustained investment and prioritization in affordable housing. The Q2 Housing Development Pipeline report provides an indication of this imbalance in that only 17,675, roughly 25%, of the entitled units, are slated to be affordable. The problem is not whether San Francisco is building. Both market rate and affordable developers know how to build in San Francisco. The problem is that for decades, we've seen decreasing investment in affordable housing, and an extraordinary over-reliance on market-based approaches.

While we realize that there is demand for market rate housing, we also see the continuing over-production of market rate housing and the under production of affordable housing as a result of political and systemic failures at all levels of government. When we assess the political failings of the past and recommend what bold solutions should look like in order to build a vital, resilient, affordable City, we have to demand leadership and investment in truly affordable housing. Please refer to REP-SF's Citywide People's Plan for detail about our community-led, visionary and practical plan. You can also see much of this plan reflected in the Housing Element by referring to the attached Implementing Actions which were supposed to have been implemented by the end of January 2025.

2. **Tenants Lose:** The FZP rolls back decades of work by tenant and housing advocates to create a network of tenant protections. Landlords still find ways to evict and forcibly displace tenants, but at least the protections we have won have given us tools for fighting back, to save our neighbors and save our communities. The FZP, however, encourages and enables demolitions, conversions, and mergers of existing housing citywide, including in areas designated through prior legislation as being part of the Priority Equity Geographies Special Use District (PEG). Making matters worse, the FZP's rezoning includes PEG areas, and layers local incentives over state incentives to encourage redevelopment indiscriminately, including sites with existing occupied housing, and existing occupied rent-controlled housing.

3. **No Room for Families:** The FZP claims by its name to be a plan for families, but we can only conclude that this program is titled "Family Zoning Plan" to obscure the fact that this plan actually makes it harder for families to find or secure a future in San Francisco. The application of "form based density" over such a vast area of the City, along with the insufficient 2+ bedroom, and even more meager 3+ bedroom

requirements for developments in the RTO-1, RTO-M and RTO-C districts fall far short of qualifying this FZP as being a zoning plan for families.

4. **No Affordable Housing:** Since the Housing Element passed in January 2023, the City has been incrementally dismantling its inclusionary housing program, in some cases bringing affordable housing requirements for market rate developments down to zero. The City has also blocked significant new funding sources for what used to be among the most productive community-based affordable housing development sectors in the country. The FZP incentivizes market speculation, and increases land values which make it much harder for affordable housing developers to acquire land.

   Various state density bonus programs require very low percentages of on-site inclusionary housing, but the FZP proposes a local alternative to the state density programs so developers won't have to build any of the on-site affordable units required by the state (instead, they can pay a fee or skip any affordability requirement and provide rent control for smaller projects with starting rents and rents for new tenancies being at full market rate).

   The Housing Element requires roughly 47,000 units of housing to be affordable at prices market-rate developers will never provide except at extremely small percentages and only when forced to. Therefore, the FZP makes it impossible for San Francisco to provide more than a small fraction of the affordable housing we desperately need.

5. **Makes "Affordable Housing" Too Expensive:** With the last RHNA cycle, San Francisco built nearly four times more expensive, market rate housing than affordable housing. This FZP puts our City in the position to tilt production even more on the side of expensive market rate housing. The impact that this has on the affordability of "affordable housing" is massive.

   Most of the affordable housing produced in San Francisco is either "inclusionary" or "below market rate" (BMR) units built by market rate developers, or "Low Income Housing Tax Credit" (LIHTC) units built by affordable housing developers. Both of these programs set apartment rents based on a percentage of a target "Area Median Income" (AMI) level. Since the "median income" is the income level at which there's an equal number of households above and below that amount, the more we add households to the higher income levels, the AMI increases. As the AMI increases, household incomes for seniors, disabled, and working people don't increase. However, for these people whose incomes aren't increasing, if they live in BMR or affordable LIHTC housing, or if they're seeking housing in those types of "affordable housing", rents are increasing twice as fast as inflation. Here's a sample set of numbers to illustrate this point:

60% AMI for a 2-person household in 2025 is $74,800. Base rent for a 1-BR apartment for a 60% AMI unit is $1,591.

60% AMI for a 2-person household in 2019 (just prior to COVID) was $59,100. Base rent for a 1-BR apartment for a 60% AMI unit was $1,305.

This is a 22% increase in just 6 years.

The Rent Board increases (based on the increase in the Consumer Price Index) from 2019 to 2025 totaled 11.5%, so the rise in rents based on AMI was double the rate of increase for rent stabilized units.

6. **Attacks Small Businesses:** The FZP creates new incentives for properties with small businesses to be redeveloped, but provides no protections or financial support for locally owned, neighborhood serving small businesses when they are displaced. It also provides no support for these types of businesses that will be impacted by the nearby construction incentivized by the FZP.

   Additionally, the FZP directly attacks locally owned, neighborhood serving small businesses by creating the new RTO-C districts that encourage formula retail and large scale commercial uses that will compete directly with small businesses on adjacent commercial corridors.

7. **Public Sites Giveaway:** The FZP proposes to sell off more than 20 sites owned by a public agency, SFMTA, for market rate development. The ability for a market-rate developer to profit by developing a publicly owned site is an undeserved benefit for a market rate developer, but additionally, the FZP proposes to provide public subsidies to market-rate developers if they increase their inclusionary housing merely to 25% of the units. In the past, SFMTA sites such as Ocean Gateway at the Frida Kahlo Way entrance to City College, have been successfully developed for 100% affordable housing. These 20+ sites identified in the FZP should follow this successful model and put our publicly owned resources to use for the greatest public good which is housing that is affordable for those the market leaves far behind.

There is another pathway forward.

The mission of the Race & Equity in all Planning Coalition is to build a future in San Francisco with diverse communities, stable, affordable housing, and equitable access to resources and opportunities. The Housing Element, and the required rezoning plan, must be rooted in racial and social equity, and refocus on prioritizing affordability and community stability. Following is our outline, including strategies, for how the City can achieve this.

1. **Recognize What SF Has Already Done:**

   San Francisco has already entitled more than 70,000 housing units that are in the pipeline to move into construction. San Francisco must advocate to the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) to count as many of the units already entitled as possible in our Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) mandates. Using the FZP to upzone for 800,000 primarily expensive, market rate units, for a City that struggles to provide for the infrastructure needs for its current roughly 800,000 residents in order to meet a State mandate of 82,000 units is absurd.

   San Francisco must also advocate to HCD to count Housing Preservation Program (HPP) projects toward the RHNA goals. This is supported by the Board of Supervisors Resolution #250467, passed in May 2025, which supports California State Assembly Bill No. 670 (Quirk-Silva), to allow local governments to count investments in preserving affordable housing toward their Regional Housing Needs Allocation goals.

   In addition, San Francisco must also advocate to HCD to recognize the significant steps the City has taken to comply with the upzoning deadline and efforts to meet our mandates, including 1) fourplex/sixplex legislation; 2) entitlements already conferred (as mentioned above); 3) streamlining measures already in place including Mayor Breed's "Housing Constraints" Legislation, and implementation of SB 423 before the rest of the State, plus permit expediting measures, plus elimination of inclusionary requirements and community impact fees.

2. **Support & Protect Tenants:**

   REP-SF appreciates the leadership of the Planning Commission and the hard work and dedication of Planning staff to work with REP-SF and the SF Anti-Displacement Coalition on legislation that helps to clarify how the State's Housing Crisis Act will be implemented in terms of developer obligations and the rights tenants have when displaced. We hope that this legislation will provide significant tools and systems to mitigate some of the worst damage to our communities and to people's lives that the Housing Crisis Act can cause.

   We need to clearly state, however, that the "Tenant Protection Ordinance" (TPO) is not legislation that creates protections for tenants. All the TPO does is to detail developers' obligations to tenants under a State program that enables the demolition of existing rent controlled and existing occupied housing under a vague set of conditions. The TPO establishes some systems of accountability and enforcement for those conditions.

   While the State's Housing Crisis Act creates vulnerabilities for tenants, the Mayor's FZP creates new threats to tenants that cause REP-SF and SFADC great concern. The

proposed change to Planning Code Section 317 to allow for the demolition of residential flats without a conditional use permit process pursuant to a broad set of scenarios puts thousands of tenants at risk citywide.

The Mayor's FZP also proposes to remove language that appears in the purpose statements for many Zoning Districts throughout the City that states "Existing residential units are protected by limitations on demolitions and upper story conversions" or "To prevent the loss of existing Residential Units above the First Story are prohibited even if such loss of Residential Units would otherwise be allowed pursuant to Section 317 of this Code." These are just two examples. Several other Zoning Districts have similar provisions accompanied by zoning tables that show demolitions, mergers, or conversions to be "NP" (not permitted). The FZP proposes to eliminate all these "NP" designations and revise them to "C" (requiring Conditional Use Authorization). However, as elaborated below, the State has caused the Conditional Use process to be preformative and inconsequential.

We have read Planning staff's assertions that the revisions described above are just to be consistent with State law because demolitions and conversions are allowed per the State's Ellis Act. However, it's important to note that the Ellis Act has been in place since 1985. The protections against demolitions and conversions have been in our Planning Code for many years and have been used successfully to challenge and deny proposed demolitions and conversions to protect tenants from eviction. The Ellis Act is not a new State law for which we need to make the proposed revisions to the Planning Code.

We have also read Planning staff's assertions that we have nothing to worry about because all proposed demolitions will be subjected to a Conditional Use Permit process, and the Planning Commission typically rejects project proposals that put tenants at risk. However, the amendment to Section 317 quoted above directly contradicts Planning's assertion by creating an exception to the Conditional Use requirement for residential flats.

Additionally, the State's Housing Crisis Act very clearly disallows the Planning Commission to deny a developer's project that plays by the rules. Since the State considers our Conditional Use Permit process to be a discretionary process, and since the Housing Crisis Act allows for demolitions that displace existing tenants, the fact that the Mayor's FZP proposes to remove language from the Planning Code intended to preserve existing housing and protect tenants, it is clear that the FZP deliberately puts tenants in great danger. The early draft of the Tenant Protection Ordinance that Planning has shared with us attempts to create objective criteria that developers have to meet, otherwise the Planning Commission could deny a project's approval, but that

would only be afforded to tenants in the Priority Equity Geographies SUD. Therefore, we can only interpret these proposed changes to the Planning Code in the Mayor's FZP as a direct attack on tenants and communities throughout the City.

To support and protect tenants, the City must advance and implement the following:

1. Prohibit the demolition of all existing rent controlled units.
2. Restore all language in the Planning Code for Zoning Districts that says that "existing residential units are protected" (and similar) to prevent against demolitions, conversions and mergers of units that have been protected.
3. Retain existing Zoning District controls that disallow and discourage the demolition of existing residential units.
4. Disallow conversions of existing residential units to non-residential.
5. Eliminate the proposed changes to Planning Code Section 317 that encourage demolitions, mergers and conversions of Residential Flats.

3. **Real Family & Dignified Housing**:

REP-SF does not support density decontrol. The proposal to incentivize density decontrol to half of San Francisco contradicts the stated goal of “creating more space for families, workers, and the next generation of San Franciscans.” This approach will result in proliferation of small units, which are only advantageous for developers and investors, and not for the needs of San Francisco’s families.

To support real and dignified family housing, the City must advance and implement the following:

a. The City must require that at least 25% of the units in upzoned areas and along commercial corridors have at least three bedrooms, and that all unit sizes meet the standards established by the California Tax Credit Allocation Committee.
b. Reduce the maximum unit size from 4,000 to 2,800 square feet. Setting a limit of 4,000 square feet is much too large, especially given that there's also an opportunity for project sponsors to build even larger units with a Conditional Use Authorization, and we know that with permit streamlining, a project cannot be denied through the CUA process. Large penthouse-style units should be prohibited as they are always extravagantly expensive.
c. Retain the common area requirement for "efficiency dwelling units with reduced square footage"
d. The minimum size of "efficiency dwelling units with reduced square footage" and group housing units must be 275 square feet. Our member organizations have seen projects approved with efficiency dwelling units as small as 215 square feet

which might be right-sized for an investor who's not planning to live in the unit, but it is entirely insufficient as a "dwelling unit."

e. The "objective design standards" are a step in the right direction. However, the Zoning Administrator must not be able to adopt new standards or revisions to the standards without a public hearing. There must be a process for public input.

4. **Affordable Housing First and Truly, Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing:**

As REP-SF stated in our April 4 letter addressed to the Planning Commission, Housing Element implementation must focus on affordable housing first.

Please refer to the Housing Element Actions attached in the chart below. Several pathways for funding affordable housing now are outlined in the following Housing Element Actions: 1.1.2, 1.1.3, 1.1.4, 1.1.5, 1.1.9, 1.1.13, and 1.1.14. These include budgeting recommendations, public finance tools, philanthropic and State funding sources, and expanding existing jobs-housing linkage fees.

Lack of available funding to implement these actions is not an excuse. There is more money coursing through San Francisco's economy than ever before. To put this in perspective, San Francisco' population has decreased by 45,000 people since 2019, however its budget has increased from $13B in 2019 to $15.9B for 2025 - 26. With approximately one billionaire for every 11,600 residents, San Francisco has an extreme concentration of wealth to the detriment of the majority of its residents. Planning must advocate for new, progressive revenue sources where needed. Wealthy sectors of the economy must pay their fair share otherwise there is no equity in our Housing Element. Diverting funds earmarked for affordable housing, and not prioritizing initiatives to address these Housing Element actions puts San Francisco out of compliance with its Housing Element and violates the City's legal obligation to Affirmatively Further Fair Housing.

To put affordable housing first, the City must advance and implement the following:

a. Planning should meet with every developer whose entitled project is not moving forward into construction, and for every developer unable to move their project into construction in the next 12 months, the City must negotiate to acquire these sites for affordable housing development.
b. Engage communities in every District to identify priority sites for affordable housing development. Then, create a multi-site Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) that includes upzoning these sites for greater feasibility for affordable housing, and restricting market rate housing on these sites to the base heights prior to the FZP.

c. Create a real affordable housing feasibility plan.
    i. Advocate to the State for a multi-year commitment of significantly increased funding for the Multi-Family Housing Program.
        1. Any statewide and regional affordable housing bond measures must be additional to a multi-year budget commitment for affordable housing development and preservation.
    ii. Advocate for a multi-year local commitment of City funding for affordable housing development and acquisitions/ preservation.
d. Public Lands for 100% Affordable/ Social Housing. No more market rate housing development on public lands.
    i. This includes the SFMTA sites.
e. Restore inclusionary housing requirements citywide to 2022 levels.
f. The proposed "use it or lose it" provision in the FZP must have no exceptions or extensions except for 100% affordable/ social housing projects.

5. Market Rate Developers Already Have Plenty of Tools:

Market rate developers already have the tools they need to develop. As this article from the SF Chronicle on August 28 notes, market rate development won't rebound until housing is more expensive.

> "*San Francisco property owners told the Chronicle in July that rents still aren't back to 2019 levels and expenses have shot up during that time due to inflation. As a result, virtually no new apartment construction is underway in San Francisco despite the rent increases.*"

This shows that 1) zoning is not the impediment to new development; and 2) market rate developers will not develop if it means that housing prices will fall, especially from over-supply.

During the last Housing Element cycle, without nearly as many tools, developers built 30,000 new units and entitled another 70,000 that are ready to move into construction when the market turns around. San Francisco has done plenty for market rate housing short of financing and building it itself. What San Francisco needs to do now is turn its attention to affordable housing.

We hear allegations that affordable housing costs too much money to develop. Two factors can significantly reduce those costs. 1) Use publicly owned land like the SFMTA sites - and other publicly owned sites - so affordable housing developers don't have to pay market prices for land; 2) Purchase sites from private owners, especially those in distress; 3) Commit substantial local funding to affordable housing that can be built without Low Income Housing Tax Credits to avoid the legal fees, application fees,

syndication costs, etc that make LIHTC projects so incredibly expensive on a per square foot basis. Then you can build smaller scale, wood frame, affordable housing on smaller sites in the Well Resourced Neighborhoods, and take advantage of enabling legislation for building affordable housing on sites owned by faith based institutions.

6. **Support & Protect Small Businesses:**

   Although REP-SF and Small Business Forward optimistically presented a set of recommendations to the Planning Commission in April of this year for supporting and protecting small businesses, and that presentation was enthusiastically received by this Planning Commission, efforts to turn these recommendations into legislation have stalled. In fact, this FZP creates new threats to small businesses that we could have never anticipated. For instance, the proposed RTO-C creates direct competition with small businesses on our existing commercial corridors by encouraging large scale commercial uses and formula retail.

   The overall impact of the FZP, therefore, is to incentivize high-end market rate development, providing housing that small business owners and their staff cannot afford to live in, on sites where the greatest feasibility will be to tear down an existing one-story commercial building while providing no support for the displaced small business or a truly actionable ability to return in the new development. Whether it takes place over 3 years or 30, the effect is the same. The FZP is a plan to destroy the essential fabric of neighborhood-serving small businesses that provide critical linguistically, culturally and economically accessible goods and services for San Francisco's low income and diverse communities, and that provide jobs, vitality, and resiliency to San Francisco's network of neighborhoods.

   To support and protect small businesses, the City must advance and implement the following:

   a. Displacement Prevention, not just Developer Incentives:
      i. Retain and enforce the commercial vacancy tax
      ii. Require developers to provide minimum warm shell conditions to increase feasibility for neighborhood-serving small businesses such as finish flooring, ADA compliant bathrooms, and lighting fixtures.
         1. If the project involves demolition of a commercial space that previously had a restaurant or bar, the developer must provide minimum warm shell conditions such as venting for kitchen exhaust, a hand sink, a floor sink, and other fixtures to meet Department of Public Health requirements.
      iii. Require the SF Office of Small Business to do proactive community outreach to all small businesses informing them of their rights and

protections, and informing them of the services provided by the Office of Small Business. Small businesses throughout San Francisco are unaware of the new state laws and local programs that incentivize and streamline development.

b. Change State Laws to Support Displaced Businesses
    i. Amend AB 2011/AB 2243 (CA Govt Code Sections 65912.100). The Mayor must work with our State legislators to amend AB 2011/ AB 2243 to accomplish the following:
        1. Require developer payments to businesses with gross receipts up to $2M.
            a. Businesses that were in operation for 1 - 5 years should receive relocation assistance equal to six months rent; businesses in operation for 6 - 10 years should receive nine months rent; businesses in operation for 11 - 15 years should receive twelve months rent; businesses in operation for 16 - 20 years should receive fifteen months rent; businesses in operation for more than 20 years should receive eighteen months rent.
            b. Payments to businesses should include compensation for tenant improvements in the temporary location and tenant improvements in the newly constructed building.
        2. Make these developer payments a requirement for all businesses displaced by upzoning and permit streamlining, including but not limited to SB 423, SB 330, State Density Bonus, AB 1287, local upzoning and permit streamlining programs.
        3. Allow municipalities to require developer payments into a fund to be used to compensate businesses near the construction site that will be impacted while work is being done.
        4. Allow municipalities to require developers to provide a first right of refusal for existing businesses to return into the newly constructed building with a space that works for the temporarily relocated business, and at a rent level sustainable for the displaced business, and within a reasonable range of what the rent was for the old space.

c. RTO-C Districts
    i. Revise the RTO-C to reduce the allowable square footage per storefront, and prohibit formula retail.

7. **Public Sites for Public Good:**

   SFMTA's sites must be developed for 100% affordable housing. Other publicly owned sites must be reserved for this same purpose. If we sell or give away our public lands for market-rate housing while we expect affordable housing developers to pay inflated market prices for land, then we as a City are effectively providing a direct subsidy to market-rate housing developers while putting our affordable housing developers at a severe disadvantage.

   Selling off SFMTA sites is in direct violation of Housing Element Action 1.2.7. This demand to stop selling off our public lands for profit-driven, market-rate housing is supported by Housing Element Actions 1.2.6 and 1.2.7, which include expansion of the City's Public Land for Housing Program and the Surplus Public Lands Ordinance, in compliance with the state Surplus Lands Act.

8. **Implement The Housing Element:**

   There is a huge list of Housing Element Implementation actions that were supposed to have been accomplished prior to January 31, 2025. The list attached below is just a handful of those actions - the ones that appear in the categories of "Affordable Housing Funding" and "Affordable Housing Production."

   Pasted in here are just a few that are overdue that would move San Francisco on the right track for building the affordable housing our communities desperately need.

1.2.2	Affordable Housing Production	Strategically acquire sites and identify targeted funding for land acquisition and banking for affordable housing throughout the city. This will include lots for consolidation that can accommodate permanently affordable housing of at least 50 to 100 units or more through publicly funded purchases, in balance with investment in affordable housing preservation and production and in strategic coordination with sites owned by religious, nonprofit, and public property owners. Prioritize sites of interest identified in coordination with American Indian, Black, and other communities of color. Consider sites that accommodate fewer than 50 units as additional affordable housing funding, financing, and operating approaches are secured.
1.2.3	Affordable Housing Production	Prioritize land dedication, donation, or purchase of sites as a major strategy for securing affordable housing, including social housing and shared equity cooperatives, through partnerships with religious institutions, other philanthropic or private property owners, and non-profit developers, including ownership models referenced under Action 1.6.1.
1.2.5	Affordable	Develop a land acquisition process and program that permits inexpensive long-term

	Housing Production	leases for land developed with high affordability.
1.2.8	Affordable Housing Production	Prioritize support to neighborhood-based affordable housing developers, particularly those managed by American Indian, Black, and other communities of color. Partner with affordable housing developers to purchase privately owned entitled sites where construction may be stalling.
1.4.6	Affordable Housing Preservation	Utilize value capture from up-zonings to support large affordable housing developments in need of substantial repair or rehabilitation, to fund rebuilding and financial feasibility of existing affordable units for current residents while creating more affordable homes.

The State Already Controls San Francisco's Planning and Zoning

The FZP that will be heard before the Planning Commission on September 11 targets most of the City for upzoning. This local upzoning program adds to the upzoning programs that the State has already decreed by increasing the "base height" on commercial corridors throughout vast areas of the city. Developers are then able to apply the State Density Bonus and AB 1287 to these new base heights without a meaningful increase in inclusionary or Below Market Rate (BMR) affordable housing requirement. The requirement goes from a ridiculously low 12% to an absurdly low 16% even after a developer has doubled the size of their building and secured commensurate profits far out of scale with the 4% increase in inclusionary.

We hear that the Mayor's FZP is necessary because otherwise, the State might take over its planning and zoning processes. We also hear that the State might withhold affordable housing subsidies.

These assertions don't acknowledge the fact that the State, through bills such as SB-828, SB-423, SB-330, AB-1287, AB-2011 and the State Density Program, has already taken over San Francisco's zoning powers as well as its ability to plan. And, the State is already withholding affordable housing funding by putting up absurd road blocks to critical projects that are ready to go, and supported by communities. What San Francisco needs to do is take a stand and push back against the State rather than ramming through the FZP which is simply an extraordinary package of developer giveaways.

San Francisco's "Family Zoning Plan" Is Unsupportable

Profit-driven developers only build when there's profit to be made. Their business model is not to make housing more affordable, but to increase the prices of housing to turn a profit for themselves. There is evidence mounting to discredit the approach of allowing profit-driven developers and their lobbyists to set housing policy, as doing so violates the City's needs,

especially for greater affordability, decreased homelessness, decreasing inequality, and increased opportunity for workers, families and seniors. A sample of academic studies and articles are listed here.

1. "Making it easier to build housing in SF's Central SoMa would lead to modest boost, study says." SF Chronicle by Roland Li, Feb 28, 2025.
    a. "A push to make it easier to build housing in San Francisco's Central South of Market district would yield only 325 new homes over 20 years"
    b. "The expected impact of waiving requirements would be negligible compared to no action: housing prices would fall by 0.08%..."
2. "Build Baby Build? Housing Submarkets and the Effects of New Construction on Existing Rents." Anthony Damiano and Chris Frenier, University of Minnesota, October, 2020.
    a. "...increased supply at the top end of the market may not be an effective mechanism for reducing rent pressures faced by low-income households in the short-run."
    b. "We find that rents in lower tier rental units close to new market-rate development were about 6.6 percent higher than comparison units following the completion of new buildings."
3. "Where Is the Housing Shortage?" Kirk McClure and Alex Schwartz, January 2024.
    a. This study finds that "from 2000 to 2020, housing production exceeded growth of households by 3.3 million units."
    b. In a similar finding, REP-SF finds Table 4.1-5 "California and San Francisco Population and Housing Trends, 1950 - 2020" from the 2022 SF Housing Element Environmental Impact Report which clearly shows that San Francisco's population increased by 98,608 people while the number of housing units increased by 140,687 during that same period.
4. "Upzoning and gentrification: Heterogeneous impacts of neighbourhood-level upzoning in New York City." Minjee Kim and Hyojung Lee. Urban Studies Journal, December 2024.
    a. "We find that upzoning is positively associated with signs of gentrification - upzoned neighbourhoods became whiter, more educated and more affluent in the long run. Upzoning is also associated with increases in housing production, but housing prices also increased."
5. "Supply Constraints Do Not Explain House Price and Quantity Growth Across U.S. Cities." NSchuyler Louie, John Mondragon, Johannes Wieland, National Bureau of Economic Research, March, 2025.
    a. "...we find that higher income growth predicts the same growth in house prices, housing quantity, and population regardless of a city's estimated housing supply elasticity."

    b. "Using a general demand-and-supply framework, we show that our findings imply that constrained housing supply is relatively unimportant in explaining differences in rising house prices among U.S. cities. These results challenge the prevailing view of local housing and labor markets and suggest that easing housing supply constraints may not yield the anticipated improvements in housing affordability."
6. "Can New Housing Supply Mitigate Displacement and Exclusion? Evidence from Los Angeles and San Francisco." Karen Chapple and Taesoo Song, Journal of the American Planning Association, March, 2024.
    a. "...particularly in the hottest markets, the new market-rate units could fail to spur low- and moderate-income households' in-migration and exacerbate their out-migration. Likewise, the positive impacts of the new market-rate units may fade over time. Subsidized housing generally mitigated both exclusion and displacement slightly in most markets."

Conclusion

The Mayor's FZP is far more dangerous than we expected based on Planning's informational presentations to the Planning Commission prior to the actual legislation having been introduced. The FZP threatens tenants and small businesses in ways that disregard decades of community-based policy making that has built a resilient city through a network of strong neighborhoods. Instead, the FZP provides market-rate condo developers with extraordinary tools and incentives - giveaways for them to use for profit and speculation while tenants and small businesses suffer and are displaced.

All the City's efforts so far to implement the Housing Element have been to deregulate and empower condo developers to build expensive, market rate housing, while no efforts have been made to increase feasibility for affordable housing. Reducing and eliminating inclusionary housing and development impact fee requirements, selling off public lands, and escalating land values through State and local upzonings have all *diminished* short and long-term feasibility for affordable housing.

This imbalance in implementation persists despite the RHNA goals being tilted clearly toward the greatest need, which is for truly, permanently affordable housing. This imbalance jeopardizes our residents, our essential workers, and our communities and violates San Francisco's clear legal requirement to Affirmatively Further Fair Housing.

We are running out of time. Two years have already passed since adoption of the Housing Element, and as noted above, critical Housing Element Actions that were supposed to have been implemented to set the City on its way toward equitable outcomes have not moved. We need to work together, the City along with community organizations, to embrace racial, social,

and economic equity; to put affordable housing first; and to fulfill our City's legal obligations to truly, Affirmatively Further Fair Housing.

Respectfully submitted,

The Race & Equity in all Planning Coalition, San Francisco (REP-SF)

cc:

SF Board of Supervisors
SF Planning Commission
HCD Assistant Deputy Director, David Zisser

Housing Element Actions Overdue as of January 31, 2025:

Affordable Housing Funding

Action 1.1.2	Include affordable housing investment needs in annual City budget process and Capital Planning process to identify existing housing funding sources, funding gaps and potential new funding sources, including regular general fund allocations that can be made as part of the budget process and local general obligation bonds or other funding sources that require voter approval.
Action 1.1.3	Create a budgeting tool to track housing investments, including permanently affordable housing production, preservation, and housing services; including investments that advance community identified priority actions, per Action 4.1.3; tracking investments that advance racial and social equity, per Action 4.1.1 and achieve targets for investment in Well-resourced Neighborhoods as referenced in Action 1.2.1 and in Priority Equity Geographies.
Action 1.1.4	Explore the development of public financing tools such as Infrastructure Finance Districts or a municipal bank to leverage the City's co-investments in order to lower direct City subsidy for permanently affordable housing and/or increase feasibility of approved projects.
Action 1.1.5	Continue to develop and support alternative and philanthropic funding sources to deliver permanently affordable housing faster and at a cheaper per unit cost through tools such as the Housing Accelerator Fund.
Action 1.1.9	Advocate for State legislation to expand non-competitive, permanently affordable housing funding sources that would be distributed to jurisdictions by formula, like the Permanent Local Housing Allocation (PLHA).

Action 1.1.13	Conduct a feasibility study in coordination with Action 1.1.12 to assess large employers' affordable housing funding on an ongoing basis to complement the jobs-housing linkage requirements and provide paths for large employers to contribute funding to and/or partner with non-profit developers to provide homeownership opportunities.
Action 1.1.14	Explore expanding jobs-housing linkage fees to large employer institutional developments (medical and educational) who are currently not subject to jobs-housing linkage fees, in coordination with Action 1.1.12.
Action 1.1.15	Increase staffing at responsible agencies for analysts and community development specialists to implement expanded affordable housing programs in relation to increased funding and targets and to incorporate community strategies into the implementation of the Housing Element.

Affordable Housing Production

Action 1.2.2	Strategically acquire sites and identify targeted funding for land acquisition and banking for affordable housing throughout the city. This will include lots for consolidation that can accommodate permanently affordable housing of at least 50 to 100 units or more through publicly funded purchases, in balance with investment in affordable housing preservation and production and in strategic coordination with sites owned by religious, nonprofit, and public property owners. Prioritize sites of interest identified in coordination with American Indian, Black, and other communities of color. Consider sites that accommodate fewer than 50 units as additional affordable housing funding, financing, and operating approaches are secured.
Action 1.2.3	Prioritize land dedication, donation, or purchase of sites as a major strategy for securing affordable housing, including social housing and shared equity cooperatives, through partnerships with religious institutions, other philanthropic or private property owners, and non-profit developers, including ownership models referenced under Action 1.6.1.

Action 1.2.4	Regularly track the pipeline of development sites and land banked for affordable housing development funded by OCII, MOHCD, and other relevant agencies, and develop strategies to ensure sufficient sites to accommodate affordable housing production relative to available funding over a rolling 4- to 8-year outlook and to meet the goals to construct housing in Priority Equity Geographies and Well-resourced neighborhoods per Action 1.2.1.
Action 1.2.5	Develop a land acquisition process and program that permits inexpensive long-term leases for land developed with high affordability.
Action 1.2.6	Continue and expand the City's Public Land for Housing Program through public-private partnerships and use City resources to support the maximum number of permanently affordable housing units on underutilized publicly owned and surplus sites, balancing the financial needs of enterprise agencies and ensuring adequate space and resources to address gaps in community infrastructure, services, and amenities. As part of this program, continue to implement the City's Surplus Public Lands Ordinance codified in Administrative Code Chapter 23A, in compliance with the state Surplus Lands Act (Government Code 54220-54234). The City will target 500 to 2000 affordable units in the RHNA planning period. Revisit strategies as appropriate.
Action 1.2.7	Support the maximum number of permanently affordable housing units and improved transit facilities on SFMTA-owned sites slated for development by leveraging private investment in market-rate units with public funding.
Action 1.2.8	Prioritize support to neighborhood-based affordable housing developers, particularly those managed by American Indian, Black, and other communities of color. Partner with affordable housing developers to purchase privately owned entitled sites where construction may be stalling.
Action 1.2.9	Support and expedite delivery of the permanently affordable housing projects in former Redevelopment Areas led by the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure (OCII).

Action 1.2.10	Support co-housing developments on parcels owned by non-profits, like sites owned by religious institutions, to further encourage philanthropically financed affordable housing.

From: Patricia Callahan
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Thursday, September 4, 2025 12:29:44 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Patricia
California

From: damianinglin@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Damian Inglin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, September 8, 2025 10:37:35 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

WE NEED FAMILIES TO REBUILD SAN FRANCISCO (LITERALLY), NOT WEALTHY CHILDLESS EX-PATS BUYING CANYONS OF LUXURY FLATS. THIS PROPOSAL WILL FURTHER DEEPEN THE DISASTER THAT SAN FRANCISCO HAS CREATED.

As a long-term San Franciscan residing in the Marina, 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,
Damian Inglin
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: justintruong56@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Justin Truong
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, September 8, 2025 10:28:51 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.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Justin Truong

From:	sjgorskilaw@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Stephen Gorski
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Monday, September 8, 2025 10:27:23 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 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):
We need to scale this measure back as Sen. Weiner insured no height changes post increased height limits and this creates an untenable position in D4. If a corner lot goes up 8-12 floors and the adjacent building is 2 floors, nothing will assist if there is an earthquake to prevent extreme risk in the neighborhood. Also, we need to convince Sacramento to put the right number of new housing units in SF and not accept its minuscule % of about 5,200 units when there was over 50,000 units in reality. Absurdity in Sacramento must not unduly burden SF with one size fits all approach to increasing our housing units.

Sincerely,
Stephen Gorski
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: pattired12@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Patti McMahon
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, September 8, 2025 10:21:35 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): I agree we need more housing. I think addressing the empty offices downtown and converting those into housing should be the first step. I agree that removing old decrepit building around the city and replacing with 4-5 story projects makes sense. I do not think Richmond district should have 10-14+ story projects.

Sincerely,
Patti McMahon
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: inor@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of R. Zierikzee
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, September 8, 2025 10:17:31 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):

I am very concerned about being evicted so the owner can upzone the building I live in. I may have right of return but I would have no way to pay for moving and much higher rent in another building. I am a senior on a fixed income.I am one of many and we are afraid for our survival. Please consider the implications of upzoning for citizens like myself. We really need LOW INCOME housing. Thank you for considering my perspective.

Sincerely,
R. Zierikzee

From: juliedearborn@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Julie Dearborn
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, September 8, 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,

As a senior citizen living in a rent controlled apartment in the Richmond, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's upzoning plan in its current form. It is too extreme, it offers not protections for rent-controlled buildings or the tenants who live in them. Mayor Lurie really sold out the Richmond District with this plan.

I urge 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,
Julie Dearborn
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: cablecar@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Wesley Valaris
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, September 8, 2025 10:14:39 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 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: You were voted in to protect the districts, voters, (especially) including property owners. Now you are showing your allegiance with big money developers as Scott Weiner and Joel Engardio are so entangled. None of these major disruptive changes to our unique neighborhoods will effect you and your cronies negatively as it will those of us that have worked so hard to deserve the way of life that WE EARNED. Maybe it's time for another RECALL.

Sincerely,
Wesley Valaris
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: ratt57@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Doug McKirahan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, September 8, 2025 10:10:53 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.

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,
Doug McKirahan
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: kimmckeownsf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kim McKeown
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, September 8, 2025 9:59:28 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,
Kim McKeown
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: shashacooks@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Anastasia Yovanopoulos
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, September 8, 2025 9:48:58 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]

Dear [elected official],

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,
Anastasia Yovanopoulos D8
SF, CA 94114

Sincerely,
Anastasia Yovanopoulos
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: natashjadewolf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Natashja Dewolfe
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, September 8, 2025 9:46:49 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,
Natashja Dewolfe
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: leah606@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Roselyn De Jesus
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Sunday, September 7, 2025 6:31:15 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):
The Outer Sunset has always felt like a family. We may not know most of the people we pass daily, but it's a safe place for families and a wonderful place for connection. I have found community. People actually care about each other. I've seen many people help strangers or ask if I was OK when I needed help. Turning San Francisco into a higher density city is changing the soul of the neighborhood. We are not New York City.

Sincerely,
Roselyn De Jesus
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: laurasparn99@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Laura Parnell
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Sunday, September 7, 2025 3:32:21 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.

Sincerely,
Laura Parnell
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: Eric Mar
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Sunday, September 7, 2025 10:25:03 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Eric
California

From: Jack Huntington
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Sunday, September 7, 2025 8:10:39 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Jack
California

From: Dorrie Huntington
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Sunday, September 7, 2025 7:34:12 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,

Dear Supervisor Mandelman,
Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Dorrie Huntington

Dorrie
California

From: Rachel Lagunoff
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Sunday, September 7, 2025 2:20:22 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 & Commissioners,

I am a retired educator and longtime resident of San Francisco who strongly supports Mayor Lurie's Family Zoning Plan to increase housing density in key areas across the city. I have been living in Mission Bay since 2008 and love that I can reach everything I need within a 10-to-20-minute walk, including several public transport options.

More people in the city could have an eco-friendly and convenient lifestyle like this if the Plan goes through and more people who work in the city could afford to live here. A variety of housing types (including high rises) and walkable, thriving neighborhoods near transit benefit everyone in San Francisco and more of those is what the Family Zoning Plan is designed to deliver.

Thank you for considering what's best for our city to maintain its vitality and growth.

Rachel Lagunoff
rachlag@gmail.com
300 Berry Street, #1206
San Francisco, California 94158

From: Michelle Welch
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Saturday, September 6, 2025 10:51:46 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Michelle
California

From: James Wen
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Saturday, September 6, 2025 6:25:58 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 & Commissioners,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan as a lifelong westside resident. My friends have either been priced out of SF or are living at home or with multiple roommates. Housing is foundation of a stable life. While my friends in Chicago or Austin are settling down and thinking of having kids, my friends and I are debating moving out and having a normal adult life or being financially responsible by staying at home or with roommates. I urge you to vote yes on the Mayor's housing map. It may not help my friends who already left SF, but it will help those who are younger find a foothold in this city.

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.

James Wen
jgw787@gmail.com
157 Westwood Drive
San Francisco, California 94112

From: Jatinshravan Pathangi Janardhanan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Saturday, September 6, 2025 4:03:55 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 & Commissioners,

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.

Jatinshravan Pathangi Janardhanan
jatinshravan@gmail.com
255 Berry Street, Apt 103
San Francisco, California 94158

From:	costello3@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Tim Costello
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Saturday, September 6, 2025 4:03:46 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):
- how would this improve the affordable housing crisis in SF? This would be incredibly profitable for developers yet completely ruin the daily lives of the current residents of the neighborhood for years to come.
- parking in the area is impossible already and adding countless trucks to the area to build unnecessary high rises, it would ruin the lives of commuters living in the city
- how could you justify additional high rise units when landlords already own countless apartments across the city without taking necessary action against the landlords that work together to keep the rent high across the city for all tenants.

I appreciate you taking our message seriously as this would destroy the daily life of your current residents.

Thank you
-

Sincerely,
Tim Costello

From: James Nicholson
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Saturday, September 6, 2025 2:29:01 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

James
California

From: justin.e.donahue@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Justin Donahue
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Saturday, September 6, 2025 11:12:36 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.

In addition, I am a resident of San Francisco since 2007 and lived in Duboce Triangle since 2010. I deeply appreciate the fabric of our neighborhood, and it deeply saddens me that we're choosing to upzone the neighborhoods of the historic homes that make our city world famous. People come all around the world to see our Victorians, and these plans will destroy what we've curated and protected for over a century. It's a short-sided plan that takes into no consideration HISTORY. Take a step back, take the time and rethink the plan. Look at the buildings that have been built over the past few decades. The buildings that have already destroyed the beauty of our neighborhoods. Upzone THOSE buildings. They are big ugly boxes that will (are already) falling apart with due to their cheap materials. Use this opportunity to bring new life to those areas when those ugly dilapidations are ready for revival.

Sincerely,
Justin Donahue
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: katmacdphoto@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kathryn MacDonald
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Saturday, September 6, 2025 8:53:13 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.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Kathryn MacDonald
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: nielsp33@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Niels Pearson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Saturday, September 6, 2025 7:27:03 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.

Specifically, we live on Russian Hill, in a 95 year old historic resource 20 story condominium at the foot of the "Paris Block" itself populated by residences that survived the 1906 earthquake. The upzoning in our surrounds is to 65 feet would destroy the historic fabric of our neighborhood and add nothing to assuage the affordable housing issues in this city. Only high end developers would profit.

Niels L Pearson
President
Bellaire Tower HOA
1101 Green Street

Sincerely,
Niels Pearson
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: dodolist@chanezon.com
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, September 5, 2025 5:54:21 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,
DC

California

From: dispreg@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Gene Milleson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Friday, September 5, 2025 3:21:47 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 resident of the West Portal / Forest Hill neighborhood, 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.

The plan to build up to 85 ft monstrosities, towering over single family homes should be of sufficient concern on it's own to oppose the plan.

However this innanity is compounded by doing so on the Laguna Honda/ 7th Ave corridor; a two lane road (yes, briefly extended to three) already besieged by traffic the majority of the day. This proposal will undoubtedly add traffic and parking congestion to a neighborhood already overwhelmed with cars racing through as a shortcut so frequently as to prohibit our kids from being able to walk the 10m stroll to/from school unattended, cross intersections or even ride bicycles safely on our streets. Proposing these changes without first preparing for and mitigating the inevitable increase to the current risk, especially to our children and elderly neighbors, is short sighted and shameful.

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,
Gene Milleson
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: jayelliott415@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jay Elliott
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Friday, September 5, 2025 2:42:42 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

San Francisco is a unique city. Just because the state has given us a mandate (and one we can push back on as a Charter City), does not mean we need to comply on their timeline. I am not against building or growth, but as a fourth generation San Franciscan who takes stewardship of our beautiful city seriously, we need to be thoughtful in our growth plans. We do not want to be another Vancouver (a sea of half-empty highrises) or Miami.

San Francisco Leadership should be fighting to balance the future needs with the realities of where we live -- on the tip of a peninusula, sandwiched between two major earthquake faults, with a Westside built on sand, and insufficient infrastructure. In my lifetime, the city has never crested over 900,000 residents and we have shrunk from several boom periods. We also need to be honest about what this housing is, because it is NOT affordable housing. That's a real conversation we should have, but are not.

Therefore, 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.

DO NOT FALL to pressure, resist. Let's work together for common sense, practical and real solutions. Let's stop conflating homelessness and housing; affordable housing and highrises. This is the time and this is the issue where we need real leadership.

Sincerely,
Jay Elliott
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: Claudia Stern
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, September 5, 2025 12:07:49 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,
Claudia J. Stern
SF Homeowner since 1989

Claudia
California

From: jap94116@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Joseph Perez
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Friday, September 5, 2025 12:02:31 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

To whom it may concern ,
As San Franciscans, we reject Mayor Lurie's plan to bulldoze homes, push out renters and small businesses, and replace our neighborhoods with luxury towers no one can afford.

We demand:

- Scale back the upzoning maps
- Delay the rushed January 2026 deadline

This plan isn't progress — it's displacement dressed up as "development."

Sincerely,
Joseph Perez
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: ryan.darin@gmail.com
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Friday, September 5, 2025 12:00:41 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 & Commissioners,

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.

ryan.darin@gmail.com
338 2nd Avenue
San Francisco, California 94118

From: skreamy@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Susan Reamy
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Friday, September 5, 2025 10:51:49 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 Reamy
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: Ann Zuppann
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, September 5, 2025 9:47:47 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

San Francisco has been a world class city of beauty, humanity, diversity and vision. We should not destroy that for the financial benefit of a tiny number of construction corporations. The irreplaceable must be protected while making real changes to increase diversity.

Sincerely,

Ann
California

From: kboru@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kevin Boru
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Friday, September 5, 2025 8:32:23 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 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 unique value of San Francisco is not being given thoughtful consideration here. This obtuseness is no different than denial of climate change, the anti-vax / anti-science movements etc so criticized by liberals vis-a-vis RW politics. Wake up and rethink this idiocy

Sincerely,
Kevin Boru
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: Gael Bruno
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Thursday, September 4, 2025 8:11:39 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely, Gael Bruno

Gael
California

From: Stephen Gorski
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Thursday, September 4, 2025 8:06:12 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,
Stephen J. Gorski, Esq. D4 resident for over 35 years

Stephen
California

From: lisa@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lisa DeMattei
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Thursday, September 4, 2025 7:54:57 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.

Please preserve the historic westside neighborhoods and business corridors which make San Francisco unique. Yes, we need more affordable housing options but do this in a thoughtful and strategic manner. Let's consider children and families in our community when making these decisions and what"s best for their future. Thank you!

Sincerely,
Lisa DeMattei
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: letty_lee@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Letty Lee
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Thursday, September 4, 2025 7:51:14 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 native San Franciscan living in the city for over 4 decades, 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! This is not okay to do this to our city.

Sincerely,
Letty Lee
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: denolacarole@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Carole De Nola
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Thursday, September 4, 2025 7:50:18 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,
Carole De Nola
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: raander2000@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Rose Ann Anderson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Thursday, September 4, 2025 7:50:07 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,
Rose Ann Anderson

From: alicefw@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Alice Williams
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Thursday, September 4, 2025 7:49:16 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,
Alice Williams
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: mediasusan2@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Susan Pfeifer
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Thursday, September 4, 2025 7:49:16 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,
Susan Pfeifer
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: egan.eagle@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kathleen Egan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Thursday, September 4, 2025 7:48:45 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, a business owner, and a mom - I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's up zone plan.

My family and I call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- heavily consider the environmental remificatikns
- postpone rhe 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 protect.

Sincerely,
Kathleen Egan
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: epoulos63@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Elisa Poulos
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Thursday, September 4, 2025 7:48:13 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,
Elisa Poulos
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: qwertyuiopfox@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Michael Fox
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Thursday, September 4, 2025 7:46:21 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,
Michael Fox
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: epoulos63@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of elisa poulos
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Thursday, September 4, 2025 7:46:13 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!

Sincerely,
elisa poulos
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: kathygrogan@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kathy Grogan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Thursday, September 4, 2025 7:46:07 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,
Kathy Grogan
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: jentobiason@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jennifer Tobiason
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Thursday, September 4, 2025 7:46:06 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.

Please put more thought into our next steps and please do not upzone on this mass scale.

Sincerely,
Jennifer Tobiason
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: mediasusan2@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Susan Pfeifer
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Thursday, September 4, 2025 7:45:32 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 Pfeifer
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: Celeste May
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Thursday, September 4, 2025 6:30:50 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,Celeste May

Celeste
California

From: terese.t8@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Terese Tortorelli
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Thursday, September 4, 2025 5:47:43 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,
Terese Tortorelli
San Francisco, CA 94122

From:	j.barulich@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of J. Barulich
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Thursday, September 4, 2025 4:30:19 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): Who benefits from the proposed changes? Current residents who already experience a shortage of infrastructure items such as Police, Fire, transportation, aging sewer systems, parking, and other services that adding more units to will only make worse? No. Developers who stand to make big bucks, and politicians who are wooed, wined, and dined by same? Yes. It's a common theme that repeats itself over and over: Developers destroy middle class residents for high rise stacks of units, make their money, then move to the next community leaving the remaining residents to deal with the overburdened infrastructure and destruction of the quality of life they previously enjoyed. Call it what you will, but stewardship of neighborhood character deserves consideration.

Sincerely,
J. Barulich
San Francisco, CA 94116

From:	nbsphoto@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Naomi Barulich
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Thursday, September 4, 2025 3:29:50 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

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): Changing the character of the Sunset hurts the vibrancy of our City. Luxury developers will command market rates. How does this help families and minimum wage workers stay in SF? The property across from Sloat has NO commercial renters. Your experiment there isn't working. And only 30% rented?!

Sincerely,
Naomi Barulich
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: buscafusco@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of P Buscafusco
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Thursday, September 4, 2025 2:54:05 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

My family has owned businesses and properties in the Sunset since 1946 and I find this plan of Mayor Lurie's to be thoroughly corrupt, unconscionable and based on an absolutely preposterous claim of a housing crisis.

Anyone who signs on to this will forever be remembered as someone who betrayed their constituents, someone who betrayed San Franciscans, specifically for the suspicious business interests that have already been fooling around in the politics of the Sunset, namely Jeremy Stoppelman, Lucas Lux, et al.

We call upon you to completely eliminate any existing upzoning plans and request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline.

Sincerely,
P Buscafusco
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: fraley@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Michael Fraley
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Thursday, September 4, 2025 2:49:57 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Please take our plea for help seriously -- we feel threatened as a family style neighborhood in the Outer Sunset, by extreme plans for development.

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,
Michael Fraley
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: maryfburns@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mary Burns
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Thursday, September 4, 2025 2:20:15 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, and a resident of West Portal, 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 seen the promise of "affordable" housing disappear when developers show up. SF's population is decreasing, there are some 90,000 units already in the pipeline, and there is plenty of space on the West Side for reasonably priced apartment buildings without the outrageous demolition of small homes that give our neighborhoods their family character.

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,
Mary Burns

From: angelasolleder@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of ANGELA SOLLEDER
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, September 8, 2025 2:47:19 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,
ANGELA SOLLEDER
San Francisco, CA 94115

From: angelasolleder@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of ANGELA SOLLEDER
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, September 8, 2025 2:45:46 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,
ANGELA SOLLEDER
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: Luke3580@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Luke Perkocha
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, September 8, 2025 2:39:56 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): I am NOT opposed to thoughtful upzoning, and in fact want it, so that I can downsize my dwelling needs and my daughter can return to live here. However, this plan is too radical, too rushed, too long term ("generational" or "50 year") and is being done without sufficient transparency for or input from the public. Many citizens are unaware of the plan, due to insufficient notification. The postcard, sent only recently, and only after political pressure, is very uninformative, without any details of the plan or its implications. San Francisco already has the second highest density of any American City, behind only New York. It is also unique in being only 49 square miles, bounded on 3 sides by water. As a charter city, it should have more latitude in permitting local control. Zoning is only ONE component of MANY local and state policy errors which have made San Francisco housing so expensive, including but not limited to: permitting costs and inefficiencies, ineffective, yet expensive climate change building mandates, costly union and ideologically promoted construction hiring, building and work rules and anti-landlord rent control and tenant policies that discourage development of rental housing as well as rental unit turnover. As a "magnet" city, internationally known for its beauty and a seat of high tech innovation, it also attracts wealthy tenants and buyers, many of whom are buying primarily as an investment, and not for personal use. This ill-considered plan has manifold and hidden unintended consequences which can easily destroy the charm and character that makes neighborhoods in the City attractive, and will do so without improving affordability. The plan could permit massive density increases that completely transform long established, yet still always changing neighborhoods, and are not even needed to meet state mandates, when pipeline projects are considered. Notwithstanding state mandates, it is the responsibility of local leaders, as City stewards, to push back vigorously when external mandates are inappropriate. I urge you to do this. Thank you very much.

Sincerely,
Luke Perkocha
San Francisco, CA 94116

From:	Michael Barrango
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS)
Subject:	Family Zoning Plan
Date:	Monday, September 8, 2025 2:36:35 PM

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

Please vote no on the Family Zoning Plan. I believe this upzoning plan heavily favors developers and real estate speculators at the expense of residents (homeowners and renters alike) and small businesses. In addition, what would be the effect on the infrastructure with such large developments.

I am not against raising height limits within reason and I fully realize the need for additional affordable housing units. But there is no incentive for developers to have affordable units if the building is less than 10 stories. There are quite a few housing projects already in the works that would bring San Francisco close to the State mandated housing requirement. We do not need to have gigantic skyscrapers all over the city.

Respectfully,
Alice Barrango

From: bilgepump100@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Robert Hall
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, September 8, 2025 2:33:22 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):

Sincerely,
Robert Hall
San Francisco, CA 94117

From:	bilgepump100@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Robert Hall
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Monday, September 8, 2025 2:30:35 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):

Sincerely,
Robert Hall
San Francisco, CA 94117

From: cyssf2003@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Christina Shih
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, September 8, 2025 2:29:10 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

My addition: I have lived in SF since 1983, my mother was born here. For the first time in all those decades I am seriously considering leaving SF IF the family zoning plan is passed. Your plan would put an 8 story building RIGHT NEXT TO MY HOUSE and all along Geary Blvd. Geary Blvd is not a monolithic traffic artery. Yes, there are many commercial buildings and medical facilities but those are in the more central areas. Outer Geary is residential with small businesses. I live in the historic residential park neighborhood and you would destroy that history. Remember how the Fillmore was destroyed in the name of urban renewal?

I remember my realtor told me that in SF EVERY block is different. You are taking a sledgehammer to solve a problem that requires more finesse. People come to SF for its distinct neighborhoods and varied charm, not monolithic high rise, high density structures.

Remember, the western part of SF elected you. You are rapidly losing political support with this plan.

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,
Christina Shih
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: tvobsf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Anthony Villa
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, September 8, 2025 1:48:55 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,
Anthony Villa
San Francisco, CA 94122

From:	cutelynx@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Qi Wolf
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Monday, September 8, 2025 1:42:51 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,
Qi Wolf
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: stephenshilling@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Stephen Shilling
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, September 8, 2025 1:25:55 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,
Stephen Shilling
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: noble.angulo@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sabine Angulo
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, September 8, 2025 1:25:34 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,
Sabine Angulo
San Francisco, CA 94122

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]
Date: Monday, September 8, 2025 1:24:36 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.

Sincerely,
Patricia Huey
San Francisco, CA 94117

From: erikashe@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Erika Shershun
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, September 8, 2025 1:02:38 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.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Erika Shershun
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: mathias1us@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of marcy israel
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, September 8, 2025 12:51:28 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 opposed to the upzoning in the neighborhoods proposed. They do not make sense. Along the park? This will not be affordable housing, but park view housing. the excuse of housing on bus lines is absurd, bus lines can adapt to housing. There are many areas of SF that are not developed that could accomadate housing without destroying our neighborhoods and the charm of SF. Height brings wind tunnels, blocks views and impacts negatively.

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,
marcy israel
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: renitaherrmann@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Renita Herrmann
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, September 8, 2025 12:50:02 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. The lack of a response from other emails I have sent makes me realize my voice is not heard.

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,
Renita Herrmann
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: bkerester@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Brian Kerester
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, September 8, 2025 12:35:22 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 San Francisco for 33 years, raised my children in the city, and plan on remaining here for many years to come. My wife and I moved here from New York City and understand, based on experience, the impact of dense neighborhoods and tall buildings.

While I am in favor of upzoning in general and providing more housing throughout the city, I strongly oppose the Mayor's plans to build structures greater than five stories in most neighborhoods except the financial district, which already has tall buildings and need people, and parts of and parts of Van Ness, 19th Street, and Geary Streets, which are wide and are major transportation corridors. The maximum height for buildings in any neighborhood other than the financial district should be five stories along these major transportation corridors. FYI - Chestnut and Union Streets are not transportation corridors; they are narrow streets with stores and housing, and one bus line each.

I have studied the population and geography of the city in detail and calculated the density for the 41 neighborhoods. The upzoning plans focus on building more structures and accommodating more people in some of the most densely populated sections (Marina, Cow Hollow, Pacific Heights, Russian Hill, North Beach) of the city, which I find unfair to everyone. The average density of these neighborhoods is already 39,571 people per square mile, which is dramatically higher than the city average of 17,107; many neighborhoods have considerably fewer people. These densely populated neighborhoods were built up over the past 100 years and already have numerous buildings which are in excess of 8 stories tall - we do not need more of them. I can send you my spreadsheet, which shows the population and density by 41 neighborhoods.

The city and the real estate developers should focus on building up neighborhoods that are low-density and need people. The city and developers did a great job building out the China Basin and Mission Bay areas. There is plenty of room in the undeveloped neighborhoods to build moderate-height (5-story) buildings. In addition to creating new housing in the city, you need to develop the infrastructure to support it - transportation, police, fire, retail, schools, and parks.

Your plan is a gift to real estate developers. You are not protecting the citizens who live here and made these neighborhoods attractive. Please withdraw your plan, seek citizen input, and develop something that develops the numerous undeveloped areas of San Francisco that desperately need more people and housing.

Thank you,

Brian Kerester

Sincerely,
Brian Kerester
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: emailamr@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Ann Rubin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, September 8, 2025 11:52:15 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, 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,
Ann Rubin
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: ryan.salma@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Ryan Salma
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, September 8, 2025 11:35:59 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,
Ryan Salma
San Francisco, CA 94115

From:	sptsantilis@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Senta Tsantilis
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Monday, September 8, 2025 11:31:43 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 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,
Senta Tsantilis

From: skreamy@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Susan Reamy
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, September 8, 2025 11:27:59 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 Reamy
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: rhanda@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Rhanda Salma
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, September 8, 2025 11:26:42 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,
Rhanda Salma
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: daniellemarone@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Danielle Marone
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, September 8, 2025 11:25:55 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 !

I am not opposed to buildings that add housing but opposed to buildings that are out of proportion with the scale of the neighborhood.

The outer Sunset does not have the infrastructure to keep up with the large scale buildings that are proposed and it destroys the small community feeling that we cherish.
Please limit new buildings g heights to 5 stories.

Thanks

Sincerely,
Danielle Marone
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: susanmackowski@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Susan Mackowski
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, September 8, 2025 11:18:17 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.

There is no reason to destroy the character of San Francisco's neighborhoods, whose ongoing vibrancy far surpasses the desolate business terrain downtown. Face it, jobs (except for AI) are not in SF, anywhere but. Make it easier for homeowners, small apartment building owners, and owners of vacant lots to add on units and build using current regulatory height standards.

Sincerely,
Susan Mackowski
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: ntlarsen@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Niels Larsen
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, September 8, 2025 11:16:35 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,
Niels Larsen
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: travelzoe@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Zoe Fuentes
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, September 8, 2025 11:16:19 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,
Zoe Fuentes
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: donna.howe@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Donna Howe
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, September 8, 2025 11:02:43 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

MR. MAYOR AND FRIENDS (YES, I CONSIDER YOU MY FRIENDS) AT CITY HALL -

PLEASE BE WILLING TO SIT DOWN AND SPEAK WITH COMMUNITY LEADERS FROM ALL THE NEIGHBORHOODS TO HEAR THEIR CONCERNS AND SUGGESTIONS TO REACH A MORE NUANCED COMPROMISE APPROACH TO BUILDING MORE HOMES IN SAN FRANCISCO. WE ARE NOT OPPOSED TO BUILDING, JUST WANT A MORE MEASURED APPROACH THAT TAKES INTO ACCOUNT TOPOGRAPHY, HISTORY, LONG-STANDING NEIGHBORHOOD CONTRIBUTIONS AND THE CLOSE-KNIT COMMUNITIES THAT ALREADY EXIST AND THAT ARE THRIVING. THERE IS STILL TIME TO EXAMINE ALTERNATIVES AND OFFER SACRAMENTO ANOTHER SF OPTION THAT LOOKS TO THE FUTURE BY VALUES THE PAST.

RECALCULATE POTENTIAL NUMBERS OF BUILDS POSSIBLE UNDER SUPERVISOR MELGAR'S PREVIOUS LEGISLATION - PARTICULARLY NOW IN LIGHT OF NEW PERMITTING CHANGES. WE CAN STILL GAIN UNITS VIA CORNER OPPORTUNITIES, AND ADUS, AND MORE MIDRISE HEIGTHS WHILE KEEPING EXISTING LEVELS OF VIBRANCY AND OPEN SPACE.
THIS IS WHAT YOUR TAX-BASE CONSTITUENTS WANT TO SEE AND WILL SUPPORT...DEVELOPMENT WITHOUT EXTREME UPZONING.

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's CURRENT 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): THERE ARE OPTIONS, REAL ONES. DON'T LOSE THIS OPPORTUNITY, MAYOR, TO BUILD SOLIDARITY WITH ALL YOUR CONSTITUENTS, PARTICULARY THOSE WHO SUPPORT SO MUCH OF YOUR CURRENT WORK TO MAKE SF A MORE SAFE AND VIBRANT PLACE TO LIVE AND WORK, BUT WHO HAVE LEGITIMATE CONCERNS ABOUT THE FAMILY ZONING PLAN YOU ARE PROPOSING.

Sincerely,

Donna Howe
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: maryanntittle@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of MaryAnn Tittle
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, September 8, 2025 10:50:27 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,
MaryAnn Tittle

From: maryanntittle@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of MaryAnn Tittle
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, September 8, 2025 10:48:10 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,
MaryAnn Tittle

From:	tab@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Teresa Butler
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Monday, September 8, 2025 10:41:44 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):Completely misguided plan; thoughtless; destructive.

Sincerely,
Teresa Butler
San Francisco, CA 94122

From:	Rachael Clausen
To:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	letter in opposition to potential rezoning of height and/or density in west side of San Francisco
Date:	Monday, September 8, 2025 3:05:50 PM
Attachments:	San Francisco Planning Department (1).pdf

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

Dear Clerk of the Board:
Please provide each district supervisor a copy of the attached letter.

thank you,
Rachael Clausen

September 5, 2025

San Francisco Planning Department
49 South Van Ness Avenue, #1400
San Francisco, CA 94103

RE: Case No 2021-005878CWP
Board File Nos. 250700 and 250701

Dear Members of the Family Zoning Planning Team – Panning Department:

I am writing as a concerned resident of San Francisco to express my strong opposition to any proposal for “upzoning” in the San Francisco neighborhoods commonly referred to as “the west side of San Francisco.”

These neighborhoods are one of the few remaining parts of San Francisco that maintain a lower-density, residential character with green space, family-oriented homes, and a quieter, more suburban atmosphere. Many of us choose to live here specifically for those qualities, and we are concerned that blanket upzoning would irreversibly damage what makes this community livable.

This area was built to be different from the city’s denser core neighborhoods. Its architectural character, single-family homes, and cohesive layout reflect decades of thoughtful development. That legacy deserves careful stewardship, not sweeping rezoning that treats all neighborhoods as interchangeable.

The residents in the west side of San Francisco are car dependent. Daily necessities like groceries, schools, parks, and services are spread out and not easily accessible by foot or public transit. Adding large multi-unit buildings without dedicated parking will increase the strain on already limited street parking, increase traffic congestion, and worsen pedestrian safety, especially in neighborhoods and streets not built to support higher traffic volumes.

Other major cities understand that not all neighborhoods are appropriate for high-density development. In New York City, for example, most large-scale development is concentrated in Manhattan, where infrastructure and transit systems can support it, not in Staten Island, the Bronx, or the residential parts of Brooklyn, which are also part of New York City. San Francisco should take a similarly balanced approach. Just because state law mandates more housing doesn't mean every neighborhood must absorb the same burden**,** especially areas in the west side of the City that lack the infrastructure and transit to support it responsibly.

What is especially troubling is that the upzoning maps focus almost entirely on the working and middle-class neighborhoods on the west side of the City, excluding major residential areas in Presidio Heights, St. Francis Wood, Forest

Hill, Goldengate Heights, Noe Valey, the Bayview and South of Market. If the goal is truly about equitable housing policy, why are only certain neighborhoods being asked to shoulder the weight of this change? This selective targeting suggests a process shaped more by politics and convenience than by fairness or smart planning.

We also have to ask: who is this housing actually for? Many younger San Franciscans and new arrivals are not looking to live in the proposed upzoning areas. They prefer vibrant, walkable neighborhoods like the Mission, Bernal Heights, Noe Valley or Hayes Valley, areas with better transit access and more cultural life. The west side of San Francisco does not offer that kind of lifestyle. There is a very real risk that upzoning here will lead to units that sit vacant or are priced far out of reach. With an estimated 60,000 vacant units already in San Francisco, simply building more housing, especially at market rate, will not address the real issue: affordability**.**

I also want to speak to the increasingly common tactic of labeling any community concern as "NIMBYism." That is not what this is. We are not opposed to housing; we are opposed to poorly planned, inequitable, developer-driven policies that ignore local context and livability. Just because we oppose upzoning *here* does not mean we oppose progress. We simply want policies that are fair, thoughtful, and serve the people who need housing most. Our neighborhoods should not be sacrificed in the name of "progress" defined by large developers with deep pockets and political access. We ask you, as the oversight body, to represent San Franciscans, not special interest groups.

Meanwhile, our infrastructure cannot support major increases in density. Public transit is limited. Roads, sewers, and emergency services are already strained. Local schools may not have capacity. Adding hundreds or thousands of units without matching investment in basic infrastructure and public services is not sustainable, and it puts everyone, current and future residents alike, at risk.

San Francisco needs to grow, but it must grow *wisely*. Upzoning should be targeted, infrastructure-aware, and community-informed. I respectfully urge you to oppose any blanket upzoning in the west side of San Francisco unless it is part of a broader, equitable, and sustainable citywide plan that prioritizes affordability, infrastructure investment, and true community engagement.

Sincerely,

Rachael Clausen
Parkside resident

cc: Board of Supervisors – via electronic mail

From: patricia_inez@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Patrice Thompson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, September 9, 2025 5:18:31 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.

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,
Patrice Thompson

From: sfgoldsmith@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sarah Goldsmith
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, September 9, 2025 2:51:22 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

This plan is not affordability, it is a redevelopment plan selling off our city to the highest bidder at the expense of working people, rent controlled residents, and families. This plan incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacing renters and our cherished small businesses, and the crass transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors. How can this plan claim to serve families when it does not meaningfully set conditions for affordability? How can this plan claim to serve the generations of San Franciscans to come when it incentivizes demolition? This plan offers no solution for our current catastrophic vacancy rate, no scalability of the infrastructure needed to support increases in density across our city, and doesn't even acknowledge our current trend of population decline. Peer cities have bought into blanket upzoning - Vancouver, Austin, Manhattan, Hong Kong - and presented a cautionary tale. Trickle down economics doesn't work, and neither does this plan masquerading as abundance. This is not a matter of simple supply and demand - our equity driven market demands complex solutions centering everyday San Franciscans like the constituents you serve.

I call on you as a San Franciscan who wants to build a family, send my kids to SFUSD, and live my life in our great city 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 can you claim to serve our city when you support a plan our greatest neighborhood organizations, housing advocates, and small business owners unanimously oppose? Do better by our city, and do better by yourself by doing the right thing and scaling back this map and taking the time needed to craft a viable plan with community support.

Sincerely,
Sarah Goldsmith
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: mmueller5@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Michael Mueller
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, September 9, 2025 2:42:45 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 resident of district 2, 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.

San Francisco doesn't have the transportation infrastructure to support the increased density (a single bus route on a surface street is not credible mass transit). The upzoning will result in a massive increase in land values, which means that developers will be forced to build maximum height limit buildings to make the economics work, with no concern for which buildings will be replaced or how the neighbors and neighborhoods close to the proposed building will be impacted. This plan needs to be dramatically curtailed, particularly in the north and western parts of the city which cannot take the increased density.

Sincerely,
Michael Mueller

From: Roger Weinman
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, September 9, 2025 2:42:15 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,
Roger

Roger
California

From: abdkl@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of David Little
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, September 9, 2025 2:31:00 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

To all San Francisco Board of Supervisors -and- Mayor Laurie
PLEASE listen to your constituents. Proposition K was and remains a disaster. The traffic nightmare that the Sunset & Parkside and Outer Sunset has become for us residents a constant pain. Nineteenth Avenue, part of the 280 route to the Golden Gate Bridge is constantly busy. The California coastal economy is constantly impacted. Peninsula and Marin coastal commuters, even not counting S.F. residents, now have an unneeded half hour added to their daily commute.

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,
David Little
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: rbinsf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Rita Pisciotta
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, September 9, 2025 2:01:01 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, 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,
Rita Pisciotta
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: rbinsf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Rita Pisciotta
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, September 9, 2025 2:00:21 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,
Rita Pisciotta
San Francisco, CA 94133

From:	sternc@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Claudia Stern
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Tuesday, September 9, 2025 12:32:29 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 and voted in San Francisco since 1985. I am appalled at the development plan currently under consideration by the Planning Commission. 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,
Claudia Stern
San Francisco, CA 94121

From:	peter.yedidia@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Peter Yedidia
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Tuesday, September 9, 2025 12:12:18 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I've lived in San Francisco for 50 years and now reside 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.

Sincerely,
Peter Yedidia
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: theodora.m@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Theodora Manty
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, September 9, 2025 12:08:20 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.

I think it's awful that those of us who would be impacted by this were not invited to meetings to learn about this plan. When I voted for Lurie, I thought I was voting for someone who really had our interests at heart. I see he, in some way, is taking a page from the President's book and trying to pull a fast one on us! Why didn't the Mayor come to our neighborhood association meetings to talk to us? Our supervisor, Myrna Melgar is in cahoots with him as she ignores her constituents. She does have a representative from her office attend our meetings, but he can't answer all of our questions and address our concerns. She is the one who can! Oh well, this is the present state of our federal and local governing bodies.
Theodora Manty

Sincerely,
Theodora Manty
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: esinsf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Eihway Su
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, September 9, 2025 10:41:15 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, 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,
Eihway Su
San Francisco, CA 94117

From: meeshell1943@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Michelle Welch
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, September 9, 2025 9:10:10 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,
Michelle Welch
San Francisco, CA 94117

From: knit1purl1@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of PATIENCE HUTCHINSON
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, September 9, 2025 7:11:55 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.

It's very important to preserve San Francisco's uniqueness. Turning it into Manhattan is not only unnecessary but it would destroy the city, if seismic issues don't destroy oversized buildings first. I was born in San Francisco and am shocked to see that San Francisco born mayors such as London Breed and Daniel Lurie do not understand the uniqueness of their home city. If this new redevelopment scheme happens, history will show it to be a tremendous mistake.

Sincerely,
PATIENCE HUTCHINSON
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: peterboothlee@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Peter Lee
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, September 9, 2025 4:18:47 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,
Peter Lee
San Francisco, CA 94118

From: THE_DREADNOUGHT@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of JEFFREY RICKER
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, September 8, 2025 11:33:57 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.

SF residents do not want to be force fed Wienertopia from Sacramento!

Sincerely,
JEFFREY RICKER
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: h.weiner@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Herbert Weiner
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, September 8, 2025 10:19:12 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,
Herbert Weiner
San Francisco, CA 94112

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]
Date:	Monday, September 8, 2025 9:49:31 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 massive upzoning, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes; displacement of renters, longtime homeowners and small businesses; and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors. Golden Gate Park shouldn't become Central Park.

We need affordable housing but we sure don't need or want luxury units in super tall buildings that ruin our neighborhood vibe.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back and scale downwards ! the 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: alantor@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Allen Lantor
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, September 8, 2025 8:09:52 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: These plans will ruin the present fabric and essence of the neighborhoods and neighborhood business communities that make San Francisco special and a desired place to live, as well as a desired destination for tourists to visit. These plans are not the right approach to address the problem you are attempting to resolve. Ruined neighborhoods, destruction of local businesses, increased congestion, higher crime, and stressed infrastructure will be the result. Please vote against the upzoning plans. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Allen Lantor
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: lori.ottolini.geno@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Margret Geno
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, September 8, 2025 8:01:47 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):
Why this is a poorly conceived plan:
1. Infrastructure feasibility, systems and infrastructure cannot sustain this type of density - feasibility study was limited
2. Actual Growth of the city does not reflect the nature of this project.
3. The lack of neighborhood oversight
4. Loss of Neighborhood integrity.

Sincerely,
Margret Geno
San Francisco, CA 94127

From:	khoegger2@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Ken Hoegger
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Monday, September 8, 2025 7:54:31 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.

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 have abundant open space in Visitation Valley and along 3rd St which has a new light rail , ideal for commuters.. The east side is loaded with abundant and deteriorating industrial sites.unlike the westside.
As a 45 year real estate broker I assure you increasing the supply of market rate housing which Wii be a result of the zoning changes will not address the real housing problem which is affordability. Contractors are not incentivized to build low cost housing on sites they pay for at market rate. The old construction axiom has been "it costs the same to drive a nail in a shed as it does in a mansion." We ask you to not contribute to the demise of SF's unique village character.
Ken and Kathy Hoegger, SF Proud Natives

Sincerely,
Ken Hoegger
San Francisco, CA 94127

From:	parrott371@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of N P
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Monday, September 8, 2025 7:52:29 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,
N P

From:	khoegger2@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Joseph Hoegger
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Monday, September 8, 2025 7:37:10 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,
Joseph Hoegger

From: francesschreiberg@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Frances Schreiberg
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, September 8, 2025 6:58:17 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 Franciscan living on the same block in North Beach since 1976 and having raised my daughter here, 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. It, or earlier legislation, will also permit a building of some 24 stories at the bottom of my block which will seriously impact my 2 tenants who will leave my building - and whose rent I depend on in retirement to pay my mortgage, property tax, and insurance. This is what I depend on in my retirement.

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.

The proposed changes to upzone North Beach / Telegraph Hill do not impact me directly as I'm already adversely affected by earlier legislation that increased height and density. But it will impact my neighbors, many who are also small property owners, who will lose tenants during 2 - 3 years of construction which one reasonably should anticipate when you upzone this historic neighborhood.

Sincerely,
Frances Schreiberg
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: lwb6@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Carolyn Butler
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, September 8, 2025 6:49:21 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,
Carolyn Butler

From: askalice@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Alice Polesky
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, September 8, 2025 6:12:54 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 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:	carolkellyclark@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of carol clark
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Monday, September 8, 2025 5:46:48 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,
carol clark
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: christyoconnell@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Christy O"Connell
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, September 8, 2025 5:24:31 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 for almost twenty-four 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):

Sincerely,
Christy O'Connell
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: Mitch Conquer
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Monday, September 8, 2025 5:14:18 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 & Commissioners,

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.

Mitch Conquer
mitchconquer@gmail.com
77a Pearl Street
San Francisco, California 94103

From:	jim-connelly@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of jim connelly
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Monday, September 8, 2025 4:39:00 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Please vote against this extreme measure that will change the Victorian neighborhoods forever!!

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,
jim connelly
San Francisco, CA 94123

From:	v.barker@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Virginia Barker
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Monday, September 8, 2025 4:34:01 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, 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 plan is destructive of Rent Control. Rent Control is the largest, most successful housing affordability plan the City has. It is essential to maintaining a diverse city economy and culture. Yet, the City plans to destroy Rent Control in the name of housing affordability - for the rich. The plan should be named Mayor Lurie's Let Them Eat Cake Upzoning. The tenant "protections" are risable. The Plan is a betrayal of San Franciscans, most of whom have relied for nearly half a century on the City's fair and effective Rent Control protection. It will damage the lives and livelihoods - of your constituents!

Sincerely,
Virginia Barker
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: kcodysf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kate McCaffrey
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, September 8, 2025 4:08:18 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): I am a native San Franciscan. I have lived in the Sunset/Parkside district my whole life. This plan would destroy my beloved neighborhood. Please take action against this!

Sincerely,
Kate McCaffrey
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: jvspangenberg@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jill Spangenberg
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, September 8, 2025 3:36:23 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):
These changes will also not be felt evenly - some neighborhoods such as Sea Cliff, Presidio Heights, Marina will feel less effect. The Outer Richmond where I live (between Geary & Clement) would be heavily impacted. This is not a fair application of sharing the burden, and hence the effect on home values. This will make the homes of the wealthiest home owners located in less impacted neighborhoods increase in value while impacted homes will be less valuable, exacerbating wealth disparity. Some corridors such as Geary make sense if transit improvements follow (and primarily, transit has to be SAFE, EFFICIENT & CLEAN if residents are to use it). Outer Clement does not make sense, nor do the streets between the major arteries.

Sincerely,
Jill Spangenberg
San Francisco, CA 94121

From:	informationmistress@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of lori higa
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Monday, September 8, 2025 3:33:59 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.

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've been a homeowner & resident in San Francisco for over 35 years, living in the Russian Hill, Sunset district & now SoMa neighborhoods. Please prioritize the needs of your constituents overvdevelopers. Don't destroy the charm, history & character of all of SF's wonderful neighborhoods with half baked development legislation & ideas in reaction to the affordability crisis in our town without preserving what is loved.

Sincerely,
lori higa
San Francisco, CA 94103

From: birker@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Birke Reimnitz
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, September 8, 2025 3:24:16 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.

This is NOT for the good of the city! This will destroy the character of this city!

Sincerely,
Birke Reimnitz
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: kayechandley@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kaye Handley
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, September 8, 2025 3:15:48 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

My husband and I recently moved to San Francisco, a place we have long loved for its charm and beauty. Despite the city's tarnished image and crime in areas around Union Square, we decided to buy here and now have a home in Cow Hollow. WE ARE VERY CONCERNED about plans to build up neighborhoods around the city with high rises that will increase density and destroy the charm of the city we chose.
As former residents of New York City we know what high rises and increased density do to a neighborhood of local restaurants and shopkeepers. And to the beauty of the city. We don't need that here.
This will do nothing to alleviate homelessness. This is not affordable housing for low-income residents. DON'T DESTROY OUR NEIGHBORHOODS on the false promise of helping the homeless.

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,
Kaye Handley
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: alecd69@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Alec Davis
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, September 8, 2025 3:15:05 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,
Alec Davis
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: khoegger2@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Joseph Hoegger
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, September 8, 2025 3:05:53 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 deadliney

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.

As a 45 year real estate broker, my experience of the San Francisco market is that increasing the supply of upscale units that would make up the majority of additions that would be allowed under the zoning changes being proposed WOULD NOT BRING DOWN PRICES. We do not need more housing, we need AFFORDABLE HOUSING.
We need a mix of market and affordable housing in areas like the Brisbane Visitation Valley areas where estimations of 30,000+ units have been projected. The Bay View 3rd Street corridor is ideal for large scale development with aging warehouses along with a new 3rd Street light rail. A new trans bay tunnel has been proposed.
Many westside zoning change advocates promote new zoning as a way to bring the westside into housing balance with the eastside. Is it not more desirable to enhance eastside neighborhoods by ridding them of abandoned and crumbling industrial buildings?
We have the land to meet the goals of the state housing element, let's not destroy our village like character that exists in our neighborhoods. I always felt proud to be a San Francisco native when New Yorkers observed our neighborhoods to be a conglomeration of villages.

Sincerely,
Joseph Hoegger
San Francisco, CA 94127

From:	Andrew Robinson
To:	CPC-Commissions Secretary; Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	SUPPORT-Family Zoning
Date:	Wednesday, September 10, 2025 5:54:16 PM
Attachments:	SUPPORT- Family Zoning_The East Cut_09.09.25.pdf

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

Dear Members of the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors,
On behalf of The East Cut Community Benefit District, please find attached our letter of support for approval of the Family Zoning Plan.

Sincerely,
Andrew

--

The East Cut Community Benefit District | 528 Folsom Street | San Francisco, CA 94105
O: 415.543.8223 | C: 415.891.7302 | theeastcut.org | instagram.com/theeastcut

THE EAST CUT

September 9, 2025

San Francisco Planning Commission
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400
San Francisco, CA 94103

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

RE: Support for San Francisco's Family Zoning Plan

Dear Members of the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors,

On behalf of The East Cut Community Benefit District (CBD), I write to express our strong support for the Family Zoning Plan. The East Cut is home to a flourishing residential community, thousands of workers, and a growing network of small businesses. Our experience has shown that vibrant cities rely on a healthy balance of housing, commerce, and public space. The Family Zoning Plan moves us closer to that balance.

Housing Growth Supports Neighborhood Vitality

San Francisco continues to face an acute housing shortage that threatens the stability of families, the competitiveness of our workforce, and the strength of our neighborhood economies. By expanding opportunities for family-sized and mid-rise housing in more neighborhoods, the Family Zoning Plan will make it possible for more workers and families to live in San Francisco. With housing growth projected to generate nearly $5.6 billion in local spending, this plan also strengthens the retail and service industries that are critical to thriving communities.

Protecting and Supporting Small Businesses

The Family Zoning Plan rightly prioritizes development on underutilized lots, such as parking lots, gas stations, or vacant buildings, preserving existing storefronts wherever possible. In those rare cases where relocation is necessary, the plan provides thoughtful protections, including early notification, relocation assistance, waived permit fees, and incentives to retain or incorporate legacy and community-serving businesses into new projects. These safeguards ensure that housing growth strengthens rather than undermines our small business ecosystem.

Shared Responsibility Across the City

For too long, a limited set of neighborhoods have stepped forward to increase our city's housing stock, making room for people across the economic spectrum, while others have remained off-limits. The Family Zoning Plan takes a more balanced, citywide approach, distributing housing opportunities more

528 Folsom Street
San Francisco
CA 94105

415.543.8223
info@theeastcut.org
theeastcut.org

fairly across San Francisco. This not only advances equity but also protects the city's eligibility for vital state housing and infrastructure funding.

A Stronger San Francisco for Families and Workers

The East Cut CBD strongly believes that San Francisco's future depends on making our neighborhoods places where people can both live and work. The Family Zoning Plan is an important step toward that future. By advancing this plan, the City will retain talent, stabilize communities, strengthen small businesses, and build a more inclusive, resilient economy.

expediently.
Sincerely,



Andrew Robinson
Executive Director, on behalf of
The East Cut Community Benefit District Board of Directors

From: Simone Alberti
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Wednesday, September 10, 2025 10:00:57 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 & Commissioners,

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.

Build, build, build!

Simone Alberti
simo.alb88@gmail.com
131 Noe St.
San Francisco, California 94114

From:	nhf009@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Nancy Fee
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Wednesday, September 10, 2025 8:22:40 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 native San Franciscan and a Russian Hill resident of 30 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
- At a minimum, follow the thoughtful and entirely reasonable recommendations of San Francisco's 50+ year historic preservation organization, SF Heritage:
    1. Exclude all category A parcels in the proposed upzoning area
    2. Tie completion of the SF Survey and the subsequent designation of qualifying landmarks and historic districts to a clear and specific timeline in the zoning plan
    3. Execute a complete and total revision of the Planning Department's Historic Preservation program including a reassessment of strategy and shared goals among constituents and elected leaders.

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.

Protect, don't destroy our special places, built environment and urban culture.

Sincerely,
Nancy Fee

From: tracyclagett@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of E. T. Clagett
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, September 10, 2025 7:59:50 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 forty-year resident of Ingleside Terraces,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 written to you previously describing the potentially perilous my residential property is in under this plan.

I fully agree with the following concise statement: 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.

If these plans are brought to full fruition--over a period of years--San Francisco will be a city inhabited only by the wealthy and the poor. Families do not want to live in--or surrounded by--highrise multi-unit buildings, and all middle -lass families who can manage to leave the city will do so.

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 call upon you not to adopt this destructive plan for San Francisco.

Sincerely,
E. T. Clagett
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: hobb2@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sherri Samu
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, September 10, 2025 7:52:45 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.

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.

These upzoning plans are hiding behind the state's requirements to build affordable additional housing. Instead, the 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.

The number of units San Francisco is required to plan for keeps changing and our Planning Department refuses to show their math or offer alternative plans. Mayor Lurie, and his way too powerful but inexperienced housing chief Ned Segal, have not pushed back on lobbyist demands because they don't understand the math or loopholes, while developers and their own planning department run circles around them.

It is presented as accepted fact that this flawed plan is all we have, and everyone must fall in line. No discussion; no proof; no debate allowed.

Again, I call on you to:

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

Sincerely,
Sherri Samu
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: Gladys Soto
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Wednesday, September 10, 2025 7:07:31 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 & Commissioners,

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.

Gladys Soto
gladysholdersoto@gmail.com
218 Genebern Way
San Francisco, California 94112

From: Mark Holmquist
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Wednesday, September 10, 2025 6:43:06 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 & Commissioners,

Though I'm unfortunately traveling for work and won't be able to attend tomorrow's commission hearing, I'm writing to express my strongest support for the Family Zoning Plan. I've been following this legislation with rapt attention for quite some time, in its various iterations. Since I moved to the city 15 years ago, housing has been such a fraught topic--the source of so much financial stress and difficulty for so many people living here--myself included. I've watched so many people give up and leave, not because they wanted to, but because they felt they didn't have a choice.

The ONLY way this will ever get better is to reduce the myriad bureaucratic sources of friction and incentivize and enable the construction of as much housing as possible, reasonably located in transportation and retail corridors . We need to push back against the engrained, privileged (and tone-deaf) voice of the NIMBYs who have ruled this city for far too long.

This is also one of many steps we need to take to expedite the cultural reawakening of our city--to attract and bring back the youth, the artists, the drivers of activity that will breathe fresh life back into every corner of SF.

I'm so proud of our city for bringing this to the table, for making it happen. Let's get it over the finish line and watch our city start its next chapter. Thank you for doing your part!

Mark Holmquist

Mark Holmquist
markfb9@gmail.com
549 Duncan St
San Francisco, California 94131

From:	madatian.j@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jasmine Madatian
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Wednesday, September 10, 2025 6:14:49 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 native 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.

Please don't ruin our neighborhoods!

Sincerely,
Jasmine Madatian
San Francisco, CA 94116

From:	Stan Hayes
To:	So, Lydia (CPC)
Cc:	Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC); rachel.tanner@sfgov.org; Chen, Lisa (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Imperial, Theresa (CPC); Braun, Derek (CPC); Campbell, Amy (CPC); Mcgarry, Sean (CPC); Williams, Gilbert A (CPC); CPC-Commissions Secretary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); nancy Shanahan
Subject:	OPPOSITION - Proposed Family Zoning Plan (2021-005878 GPA PCA MAP)
Date:	Tuesday, September 9, 2025 6:26:07 PM
Attachments:	THD Com Ltr_CPC_Upzoning Plan_FINAL 9-9-25.pdf

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

Dear President So and Commissioners,

On behalf of the Telegraph Hill Dwellers (THD), we write to strongly **OPPOSE** the above-cited Mayor's proposed Family Zoning Plan. Please accept the attached letter as THD's initial comments on the Plan.

For the reasons set forth in our letter, the Mayor's Zoning Plan is inconsistent with the approved Housing Element, resulting in new major impacts not considered in the FEIR.

We urge the Planning Commission to require the Planning Department and Office of the Mayor to remove North Beach, Telegraph Hill, and Northern Waterfront areas from the Mayor's Zoning Plan.

Sincerely,

Stan Hayes and Nancy Shanahan

Co-Chairs, Planning & Zoning
Telegraph Hill Dwellers

September 9, 2025

Lydia So, President
San Francisco Planning Commission
49 S. Van Ness, Suite 1400
San Francisco, CA 94103
Via email: commissions.secretary@sfgov.org

RE: OPPOSITION to Proposed Family Zoning Plan (2021-005878 GPA PCA MAP)
Items 14(a), 14(b) and 14(c): General Plan Amendments; Planning Code Text Amendments; and Zoning Map Amendments

Dear President So and Commissioners,

On behalf of the Telegraph Hill Dwellers (THD), we write to strongly **OPPOSE** the Mayor's proposed Family Zoning Plan ("Mayor's Zoning Plan"), specifically the inclusion in the Mayor's Zoning Plan of major portions of Telegraph Hill, North Beach, and the Northern Waterfront which were not in the 2022 Adopted Housing Element ("Housing Element") nor were the resulting new impacts considered in the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR).

For more than seventy years, since 1954, THD has worked hard to build, maintain, and celebrate the vitality, livability and sustainability of some of San Francisco's most cherished neighborhoods. We have embraced a vision of housing growth that prioritizes affordable housing while fully protecting our existing tenants, vibrant small businesses, historic resources, and diverse culture of District 3, safeguarding the soul, vitality, and vibrancy of our densely developed neighborhood. Now the Mayor's Zoning Plan puts all of that at risk.

As set forth below, the Mayor's Zoning Plan is inconsistent with the approved Housing Element, resulting in new major impacts not considered in the FEIR.

1. **Remove North Beach, Telegraph Hill, and the Northern Waterfront, including Fisherman's Wharf from the Mayor's Zoning Plan.**

In mid-2025, Mayor Lurie proposed a Draft Upzoning Plan that for the first time included proposed height increases and density decontrols in the North Beach, Telegraph Hill, and Northern Waterfront areas, which had not been included in any of the previously proposed Upzoning Maps. Most notably, these changes were not in the *"Proposed Action"* analyzed in the adopted and certified FEIR, nor were they included on any of the "*Rezoning Program Scenarios*" contained in the adopted Updated 2022 Housing Element ("Housing Element"). And, every figure considered in the FEIR, including for example the possible future consideration of a Housing Sustainability District, specifically excluded these areas.

As revealed in the proposed Addendum to the FEIR, although the Housing Element and FEIR assumed and considered that the Northeast Planning District would provide net new housing units of only *800 units*, the Mayor's Zoning Plan now proposes *5,900 units*, a stunning *650% increase*. The proposed major height increases and density decontrol in the Mayor's Zoning Plan to accommodate this increase would have significant additional impacts on existing tenants,

small businesses, historic resources, parks and open spaces, and the diverse culture of District 3 that were never considered during the extensive public process leading up the adoption of the Housing Element.

Further, most of the areas in North Beach and the Northern Waterfront area now shown as being added to Mayor's Zoning Plan are within the *Priority Equity Geographies Special Use District*, which the Housing Element and FEIR assumed would not be within the areas to be upzoned or density decontrolled.

We have learned from discussions with individuals in the Planning Department, confirmed by emails obtained through a Sunshine Act Request, that the addition to the Mayor's Zoning Plan of these sensitive areas of District 3 was done with the specific approval of District 3 Supervisor, Danny Sauter. We urge the Planning Commission to require the Planning Department and Office of the Mayor to remove North Beach, Telegraph Hill, and Northern Waterfront areas from the Mayor's Zoning Plan.

2. Major Impacts to District 3 Neighborhoods Not Addressed in the FEIR

The Mayor's Zoning Plan would imperil our neighborhood's existing rent-controlled, multi-unit family housing, ethnic diversity, historic and cultural resources, parks, and economic vibrancy of our small neighborhood businesses. Moreover, it would encourage speculation and set up conditions that would have adverse social and economic effects on our neighborhoods. As pointed out below, such impacts are in direct conflict with the adopted Housing Element.

Significant New Threats to Existing Tenants and Rent-Controlled Housing

North Beach and Telegraph Hill are among the densest neighborhoods in San Francisco, with roughly 82% of our residents living in existing pre-1979 multi-family, rent-controlled buildings that house 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 maps show that rent-controlled buildings in District 3 (built before 1979 with 2+ units, excluding condos) represent approximately **32,336** units. And data collected by the SF Anti-Displacement Coalition and the SF Rent Board shows that, as a result of the Ellis Act, owner move-ins, buy-outs, and other no-fault evictions, many of our most vulnerable seniors and low-income tenants have already been displaced by speculators who turned their former homes into TICs and condominiums, often merging units for increased profits.

The Mayor's Zoning Plan, with its proposed upzoning and density decontrol in North Beach and Telegraph Hill, would further increase property values in these neighborhoods resulting in even greater speculation, demolitions, and displacement of our tenant population, which is in direct conflict with the Housing Element. Section 2 of the Housing Element: "Stabilizing Tenants and Rental Housing" acknowledges these threats:

[1] https://www.city-data.com/neighborhood/North-Beach-San-Francisco-CA.html

> *"Tenants often face greater housing precarity because they do not own their own homes and are more likely than homeowners to be lower income, face high housing cost burdens, and are often at greater risk of displacement. A majority of San Francisco residents are tenants, so tenant stability is often key to stabilizing communities."*

Existing legal protections for tenants have not prevented evictions, nor will the so-called "tenant protections" for rent-controlled buildings contained in the legislation enacting the Mayor's Zoning Plan prevent the flood of displacement incentivized by the proposed upzoning and density decontrol in District 3. Incentives for redevelopment provided by the upzoning and density decontrol, along with deregulation, will intensify demolition and displacement, destabilizing our communities. This creates long-term blight as properties become vacant, and developers dither because of outside factors like financing and adverse market conditions. Displaced tenants will be unable to afford the new units, even in the very low number of so-called "affordable units" assumed in the Mayor's Zoning Plan, and will disappear from our neighborhood.

We urge the Planning Commission to require the Planning Department and the Mayor's office to remove from the proposed Draft Upzoning Plan all height increases and density decontrols from existing multi-family, rent-controlled housing. The density of pre-1979 rent controlled units is the reason North Beach was never, until now, a part of the *"Proposed Action"* in the adopted and certified 2022 Housing Element EIR.

Significant New Impacts to Small Businesses

Columbus Avenue and Union and Powell Streets are part of the economic and cultural anchors of North Beach. Our small-scale retail corridors, where many are individually listed as Legacy Businesses, support hundreds of jobs, contribute significantly to the economic vibrancy and livability of our neighborhood, and are integral to the tourism industry that further contributes to supporting local employment and small businesses.

Importantly, the Housing Element does not call for upzoning or density decontrol of any of the retail corridors in North Beach, nor did it call for upzoning on Lombard, North Point, Beach, Jefferson, Chestnut, Francisco, or Bay Streets. None of the North Beach or Northern Waterfront retail corridors now shown in the Mayor's Zoning Plan were considered or analyzed in the adopted FEIR.

As stated in a joint letter to Mayor Lurie from multiple Westside and Northern neighborhood business leaders, including many from North Beach:

> *"Despite being labeled "family zoning," the plan will not deliver affordable housing for working families or protect small, family-run businesses. Instead, it threatens to displace workers, shutter long-standing neighborhood institutions, and hand over our communities to speculative development.*
>
> *"Already, parcels are being acquired and storefronts left vacant in anticipation of redevelopment. Our neighborhood businesses—still recovering from the pandemic, debt,*

> *and rising costs—cannot survive without stronger protections. The proposed upzoning, which allows 6–14+ story projects to replace century-old, three-story buildings, would overwhelm narrow streets, strain emergency services, and force closures of businesses that have served San Francisco for generations."*

Although the Mayor's Zoning Plan offers developers height increases and additional density in return for agreeing to locate displaced businesses in their proposed developments, we are aware that the ground floors of many new large apartment and condominium buildings are mostly vacant – look at those on Market Street or other corridors like Van Ness Avenue.

In District 3, the experience of The Jug Shop, a 60-year-old Legacy Business on Pacific Avenue at Polk Street foretells the future of our small businesses resulting from the Mayor's Zoning Plan. The Jug Shop was displaced and its home demolished to make way for a large-scale market-rate condominium development. The Jug Shop temporarily relocated a block away, hoping to return to the ground floor of the new condominium building on the site of its former long-time home. Unable to afford the build-out on the ground floor of the new building, it was forced to go out of business after 60 years of continuous operation. This will be the model for District 3 going forward if the proposed upzoning is adopted.

Upzoning these corridors would trigger redevelopment that almost always begins with demolition and displacement of small businesses. Like The Jug Shop, absent legal protections, displaced businesses would not survive the transition. Additionally, adjacent businesses are often dragged down by years of construction-related disruption. Noise, fencing, blocked sidewalks, lost parking, and reduced foot traffic can destabilize commercial blocks. The result is not affordable housing—it is the slow erosion of the vitality and street life, and the interconnectivity of the community, that make our neighborhoods work.

Furthermore, upzoning and density decontrol on commercial corridors in District 3 would increase property values and lead to commercial rent increases, forcing out many small businesses that are thriving economically under the existing zoning. The upscale commercialization of our neighborhood will never lead to more affordable housing.

We urge the Planning Commission to require the Planning Department and the Mayor's office to remove North Beach and its thriving neighborhood commercial corridors from the Mayor's Zoning Plan. They were never a part of the Housing Element, never appeared in any prior upzoning maps and were not considered part of the *"Proposed Action"* in the adopted and certified FEIR.

Significant New Impacts to Historic Resources

North Beach and Telegraph Hill are among the oldest and most significant historic neighborhoods in San Francisco. The Telegraph Hill Historic District, filled with survivors of the 1906 Earthquake and Fire, is one of the earliest historic districts designated under Planning Code Article 10. A fully documented proposed North Beach National Register Historic District, which the Mayor and Supervisor Sauter have thus far refused to support, clearly qualifies for recognition on the California and National Registers of Historic Places. The Washington Square Historic District, The Powell Street Shops Historic District, and the Upper Grant Avenue Historic

District are recognized by the City Planning Department as eligible for the California Register of Historic Resources. Washington Square is San Francisco Landmark No. 226. The Northern Waterfront contains at least seven Article 10 landmarks and National Register listed buildings. In addition, surveys of North Beach and the Planning Department's maps show hundreds more "A-Rated Buildings" in District 3.

As these areas were not included in the Housing Element, the addition of these historic areas to in the Mayor's Zoning Plan would threaten historic sites and districts with potential demolition and redevelopment, potentially significant additional impacts not analyzed in the FEIR. An Addendum to the FEIR is not a substitute for analysis of additional impacts from a changed project.

Attached to the Addendum to the FEIR is *Appendix D, Memorandum Regarding Potential Zoning Map Changes In Supervisor District 3*, which proports to use the FEIR and the Addendum to the FEIR as a substitute for environmental review in anticipation of adding even more development to the Mayor's Zoning Plan, by changing the base density of significant areas within the Article 10 Northeast Waterfront Historic District along Sansome Street to form-based density. Layering a State Density Bonus on form-based density within this historic district would allow building heights to be supercharged upward to as high as 200-300 feet (as demonstrated by proposed buildings at 950 and 1088 Sansome). This increase in development intensity is of particular environmental impact concern given the high frequency and severity of landslides in that area. This addition to the Mayor's Zoning Plan is clearly a major impact that has not been analyzed in the FEIR.

To illuminate the disparities between the Housing Element and the Mayor's Zoning Plan, we share the following actions contained in the Housing Element which specifically provide for the designation and promotion of historic districts:

> *"4.5.5 Designate historically and culturally significant buildings, landscapes, and districts for preservation using the Citywide Cultural Resource Survey, Planning Code Articles 10 and 11, and state and national historic resource registries to ensure appropriate treatment of historic properties that are important to the community. . .and to unlock historic preservation incentives for more potential housing development sites."*
>
> *"4.5.8 Promote historic preservation and cultural heritage incentives, such as tax credit programs and the State Historical Building Code, for use in residential rehabilitation projects through general outreach, interagency collaboration with MOHCD and OEWD, building trades collaboration, educational materials, community capacity building efforts, and the regulatory review process."*

In conflict with the above provisions of the Housing Element, there is no provision in the Mayor's Zoning Plan to provide protections for historic buildings, and there are no historic preservation incentives, such as making available tax credit programs, the Mills Act property tax reduction, or the State Historical Building Code, for use in residential rehabilitation projects. Further, the Mayor and Supervisor Sauter have continued to thwart the designation of the North Beach National Register Historic District.

The protection of cultural assets and historic resources is a legitimate exercise of the City's police powers and the City's ability to protect historic resources is a well settled legal principle. The failure to include such protections in the Mayor's Zoning Plan is a choice to intensify threats of demolition of our City's cultural assets and historic resources important to our communities. These protections must be added to the Mayor's Zoning Plan.

We urge the Planning Commission to recommend the addition of protections and incentives for the preservation of historic properties, and to urge the Mayor and Supervisor Sauter to join with local businesses, organizations, residents, and property owners in support of the designation of the proposed North Beach National Register Historic District.

New Shadow Impacts to Parks and Open Spaces in North Beach

North Beach is among the areas of the City with the greatest density and the least amount of parks and open space per person with only two well-used parks – Joe DiMaggio Playground and Washington Square (Landmark No. 226) – both under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department. In addition to these parks, Levi's Plaza Park, a private open space bounded by The Embarcadero and Battery Street, designed by renowned landscape architect Lawrence Halprin, is proposed to be changed to form-based density by Mayor's Zoning Plan. The additional impacts to these parks and open spaces were not analyzed in the FEIR.

The Mayor's Zoning Plan proposes to upzone up to 65 feet (from the existing height limit of 40 feet) parcels surrounding Joe DiMaggio Playground for projects using the Housing Choice local program. While State Density Bonus projects could be as high as 2 times the current height limit, or 80 feet (8 stories), a change to form-based density could allow even greater heights. This would also be the case for parcels surrounding Washington Square Park.

Because Joe DiMaggio Playground and the landmarked Washington Square are under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Department, they are protected by a voter-approved Planning Code amendment restricting the construction of any structure exceeding forty feet in height that would cast a shadow that is adverse to the use of the park from between one hour after sunrise to one hour before sunset. Because of the small size and location of Washington Square, it has been determined that it can tolerate no new shadow. In addition, any new shadow on Washington Square must be assessed for its impact on an Article 10 Landmark site.

Since the area including North Beach, Telegraph Hill and the Northern Waterfront was not proposed for upzoning in the Housing Element, the FEIR did not assess the additional shadow impacts on parks and open spaces in the areas added by the Mayor's Zoning Plan, including but not limited to Washington Square, Joe DiMaggio Playground, and the Levi Plaza Park.

Significant New Impacts on the Northern Waterfront

For more than 60 years, the northern portion of District 3, nearest to the waterfront, has been zoned at a maximum height of 40 feet. The Mayor's Zoning Plan proposes increasing those heights to 65 and 85 feet, along with density decontrol. Layering a State Density Bonus on density decontrol could supercharge building heights upward to much higher than 85 feet.

The effect of this layering can be seen for a proposed nearby building at 955 Sansome. Currently zoned to a maximum height of 84 feet, by layering a State Density Bonus and density decontrol, the proposed building is nearly 300 feet in height. For reference, this is more than three times the zoned height limit, more than three times taller than the tallest building in the Northeast Waterfront Historic District in which it is located, and even taller than Telegraph Hill itself.

If the upzoning to 85 feet proposed between Bay Street and Beach Street is adopted, buildings, such as that proposed at 955 Sansome almost certainly would be built, creating a new wall on the waterfront, which was soundly rejected by San Francisco voters in 2013, and by a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors last year.

Also, the 2022 Housing Element Update identifies significant portions of the Northern Waterfront as earthquake *Liquefaction Hazard Zones* (see Figure 4.1-26, Liquefaction Hazards). Since none of that area was proposed for upzoning in the Housing Element, the FEIR did not assess earthquake liquefaction impacts in that area and their potential significance. However, the Mayor's Zoning Plan extended upzoning to portions of the Northern Waterfront that are within the *Liquefaction Hazard Zones*. As such, analysis of liquefaction hazard impacts must be done.

We further call your attention to the fact that the area being upzoned on the Northern Waterfront is within the *Priority Equity Geographies Special Use District* and outside of the Well-Resourced Neighborhoods that are the focus of the Housing Element. It appears this area was included to provide incentives for developers to build large market-rate housing with bay views, offering significant profit.

We urge the Planning Commission to require the Planning Department and the Mayor's office to remove the Northern Waterfront from the Mayor's Zoning Plan.

3. The RHNA Mandate to Build Affordable Housing Is Overstated in the Proposed Upzoning Plan

The 2022 Housing Element update was adopted to promote the construction of housing units to meet San Francisco's 2023-2031 Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) that mandates the creation of more than 82,000 units within the city, requiring that 47,000 or 57% of the 82,000 units be affordable by extremely low income, very low income, low income, or moderate-income groups.

The RHNA mandate, however, is based on outdated high-growth population projections that no longer apply. We note that the State's Department of Finance now forecasts that in 2030, and even in 2050, thousands fewer people will live in San Francisco than in 2020. Why, then, are we letting Sacramento push us into an 82,000-unit RHNA mandate?

In conflict with the adopted Housing Element, the Mayor's Zoning Plan overstates the RHNA mandates to build or preserve affordable housing. Moreover, the numerous new State (and local) housing laws enacted since the adoption of the Housing Element and certification of Housing Element FEIR have already vastly reduced the constraints on development of market-rate housing, making it even more difficult, if not impossible, for the RHNA affordable housing mandates to be met. The effect of these new State and local laws represent a change in circumstance that was not taken into consideration in the FEIR.

We urge the Planning Commission to ask that the Planning Department and the Mayor's office revisit the RHNA mandate to better match updated population projections. Please explain why the proposed upzoning plan has no meaningful provision to provide for the affordable housing that the RHNA mandate is predicated on. And, if the currently proposed SB 79 passes, is there any need to upzone?

4. Incorporate by Reference REP Letter

We wish to incorporate by reference the conclusions, recommendations and strategies contained in the letter dated September 4, 2025, to Planning Commission from Race & Equity in All Planning Coalition (REP-SF).

* * * * * * * *

In conclusion, we urge the Planning Commission to recommend to the Planning Department and the Mayor's office to remove Telegraph Hill, North Beach, and the Northern Waterfront from the Mayor's Zoning Plan consistent with the 2022 Housing Element.

Sincerely,

Stan Hayes and Nancy Shanahan

Co-Chairs, Planning & Zoning
Telegraph Hill Dwellers

cc: Mayor Daniel Lurie daniel.lurie@sfgov.org
Supervisor Danny Sauter danny.sauter@sfgov.org
Sarah Dennis-Phillips, Director of Planning sarah.dennis-phillips@sfgov.org
Rachel Tanner, Director, Citywide Planning rachel.tanner@sfgov.org
Lisa Chen, Planner lisa.chen@sfgov.org
Lydia So, President lydia.so@sfgov.org
Kathrin Moore, Vice President kathrin.moore@sfgov.org
Theresa Imperial, Commissioner theresa.imperial@sfgov.org
Derek Braun, Commissioner derek.braun@sfgov.org
Amy Campbell, Commissioner amy.campbell@sfgov.org
Sean McGarry, Commissioner sean.mcgarry@sfgov.org
Gilbert Williams, Commissioner gilbert.a.williams@sfgov.org
Jonas Ionin, Secretary commissions.secretary@sfgov.org
Members, San Francisco Board of Supervisors Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

From: Tim Colen
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Wednesday, September 10, 2025 5:02:53 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 & Commissioners,

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.

Tim Colen
timcolen@gmail.com
1501 Greenwich St, Unit 502
San Francisco, California 94123

From: Liam Hennessy
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: RE: OPPOSITION to Proposed Family Zoning Plan (2021-005878 GPA PCA MAP)
Date: Wednesday, September 10, 2025 4:59:41 PM

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

To Whom It Concerns

My name is Liam Hennessy and I have lived in North Beach since 1985. I reside in a flat on Pfeiffer and Stockton streets. My neighborhood was not originally included in any upzoning plan until our Supervisor Danny Sauter decided to add it. Why? He has never answered this question or many others that neighbors such as myself have tried to get him to answer.

I am very upset that without so much as a public meeting or notification, North Beach was put into this reckless plan even though the neighborhood is already one of the densest in our beautiful city. The creators and backers of this plan never took into account any of the concerns of the neighborhood's residents! Mayor Lurie and Supervisor Sauter even postponed the voting on North Beach becoming a Historic Neighborhood, in hopes I am sure, that it would not get in the way of his "Family Zoning Plan" proposal being adopted.

There has not been enough collaboration with the people who are going to be most affected by this proposal.This Family Zoning plan was not created to enrich the lives of individuals who want to live in North Beach or for those that already do or for those that will be pushed out because of it. This is not an easy fix to our housing crisis. We need to be more creative with our approach to our housing needs. However, those approaches Should Not Come from the Big Developers trying to get a HUGE WINFALL or POLITICIANS WHO ARE BOUGHT in order to climb the political ladder BUT by the people of North Beach. We have a huge stake in this and this decision will change the neighborhood forever. Once it is done there is no going back. Remember the Redevelopment Era?

The plan to include North Beach into Lurie's Upzoning proposal was a blatant lie to all of the residences and businesses in North Beach by politicians that used their power to hide the fact that their ambition for power/money is more important than the community that elected them.
Making decisions about the fate of a person's neighborhood behind a facade of wanting to create more housing for the working people is disingenuous, especially since it was all hidden from the constituents. High Rise Condominiums all along the Wharf, splattered around North Beach, Telegraph Hill, etc will not be affordable to the individuals that this proposal is trying to house. It will only be affordable to the rich, It will ruin the neighborhood and it will

create another redevelopment nightmare with horrible consequences.

Danny Sauter and his YIMBY lobbyists along with the Planning Department have not involved the neighborhood residents, businesses etc. in the decision to replace our incredible neighborhood, which tourists travel the world to see, with a Miami Beach one instead.
This plan was not done with the constituents' needs in mind, but rather with those of developers and Mr Sauter's donors instead(and in secret). It is not what is best for North Beach or the City at large.
native, as a retired San Francisco Unified School teacher I plead that you really take a hard look at what is being proposed, how it will impact North Beach and the City at large, maybe even go to St. Peters and Pauls and pray on it… you never know.

Onwards,
Liam Hennessy
169 Pfeiffer Street
San Francisco Ca 94133Please make significant changes to the UpZoning map because it will destroy North Beach. As a

From: Samah Shah
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Wednesday, September 10, 2025 4:37:49 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 & Commissioners,

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.

Samah Shah
samahsemail@gmail.com
1732 Anza St Apt 3
San Francisco, California 94118

From: Molly Ryan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Wednesday, September 10, 2025 3:28:47 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 & Commissioners,

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.

Molly Ryan
mollybierman@gmail.com
2440 Green Street
San Francisco, California 94123

From: chrisalism@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Christina Mallia
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, September 10, 2025 3:26:04 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 husband and I bought our beautiful 1911 house in 1989. We love our neighborhood and neighbors in the Outer Sunset. We ask that Mayor Daniel Lurie, the Supervisors and Boards appreciate and protect us from Upzoning and the unwanted and negative changes proposed to our historic neighborhoods.

Sincerely,
Christina Mallia
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: allie@thekelsey.org
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Wednesday, September 10, 2025 3:10:46 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 Commissioners and Supervisors,

On behalf of The Kelsey, we write in strong support of the Family Zoning Plan. As a San Francisco–based nonprofit co-developing affordable, accessible, and inclusive housing, and advancing policies that make disability-forward housing the norm, we recognize how urgently the city needs bold action to address its housing shortage.

The Family Zoning Plan is critical to advancing inclusive housing, addressing our housing shortage, and undoing exclusionary zoning practices. By allowing more homes to be built in San Francisco's neighborhoods, this plan helps create housing that is:

- More available – Increasing overall housing supply makes it possible for more people, including disabled people, low-income residents, and families of all kinds, to secure a stable home in the city.
- More affordable – Increasing supply helps moderate costs across the housing market. Just as importantly, new development under this plan will deliver more inclusionary affordable units, directly expanding deeply needed affordable housing opportunities.
- More accessible – Newer and larger housing is more likely to meet modern accessibility standards, and can go further by incorporating cross-disability design principles such as those outlined in the Inclusive Design Standards. More new homes mean more homes that work for people with disabilities, older adults, and others with diverse access needs.

This plan is aligned with The Kelsey's vision for disability-forward housing: communities that are affordable across income levels, accessible to people with diverse disabilities, and inclusive of people with and without disabilities living side by side. Expanding supply through thoughtful zoning reform is a critical part of making this vision real in San Francisco.

At the same time, zoning reform alone will not solve the city's housing crisis. We urge the City and County of San Francisco to complement the Family Zoning Plan with increased public investment in affordable housing, including:

- Greater subsidy for affordable housing production and preservation to ensure affordability to people living at extremely low incomes, including San Franciscians who rely on SSI;
- Inclusionary zoning that targets more deeply affordable homes, including percentage adjustments for developers who include units at 15-20% AMI;

- Require or incentivize new developments to go beyond minimum accessibility, ensuring housing works for people with a wide range of disabilities;
- Acquisition and designation of land specifically for affordable housing; and
- Targeted housing supports for the most marginalized communities, including low-income people, people with disabilities, and those who have been displaced.

The Family Zoning Plan is a leap forward for San Francisco housing policy. When paired with stronger investments in affordability, accessibility, and inclusion, it can help ensure our city builds the housing needed so all residents—disabled and non-disabled, across all incomes—can thrive.

Thank you for your leadership and for advancing policies that move us closer to a more equitable and inclusive San Francisco.

allie@thekelsey.org
1 Sansome St
San Francisco, California 94104

From:	kuongpm@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Phoebe Kuong
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Wednesday, September 10, 2025 2:12:39 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,
Phoebe Kuong
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: Ciara Keegan
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Wednesday, September 10, 2025 2:07:48 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Ciara
California

From: Melissa Petlak
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Wednesday, September 10, 2025 1:51:10 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 & Commissioners,

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.

Melissa Petlak
melissa.kolod@gmail.com
1863 Filbert St
San Francisco , California 94123

From: ariane.electra@gmail.com
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Wednesday, September 10, 2025 1:45:09 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

California

From: geoff.gordon.smith@gmail.com
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Wednesday, September 10, 2025 1:42:31 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

California

From: mghernandez117@gmail.com
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Wednesday, September 10, 2025 1:36:34 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent and rent controlled tenant, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,
Melissa

California

From: noahsloss@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Noah Sloss
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, September 10, 2025 1:11:00 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):

As a rent controlled tenant it's obvious this plan will incentivize the owner of my building and others like it to evict and demolish. I will not forget your actions on this issue.

Sincerely,
Noah Sloss
San Francisco, CA 94115

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]
Date:	Wednesday, September 10, 2025 1:01:13 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): also this is just. Too much for the areas around Van Ness Ave where the neighborhood has been subject to extended periods of construction along the Van Ness corridor, whichfor years made it difficult to use local businesses. Construction of high-rise buildings will bring us back into that setting again, which is really unfair to businesses and also unfair to the neighborhood. I am totally against this plan because it enables and encourages extreme high rises which will end up being luxury apartments, and result in little or no low cost housing. The limit in this area should be 6 stories which is reasonable, considering developers, always put things on the roof that make it seem like more seven stories and put high ceiling retail on the first floor to provide better views to the upper floors. I am not against more housing, I am against this plan, which puts the brunt of the development and construction in the Van Ness and surrounding Russian Hill and Polk Gulch areas which are completely different in character . Also lower Van Ness is completely different than upper Van ness and you should take that into consideration in your plan as well . Thank you for listening.

Sincerely,
Lynn Ferrante
San Francisco, CA 94109

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]
Date: Wednesday, September 10, 2025 1:00:52 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: ycg1226@proton.me
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Wednesday, September 10, 2025 12:39:09 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

California

From: justin.t.dolezal@gmail.com
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Wednesday, September 10, 2025 12:35:32 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

California

From: gmclaughlin415@gmail.com
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Wednesday, September 10, 2025 12:29:10 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

California

From: marlowekarl@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Marlowe Bjorklund
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable [File No: 250700 and 250701]
Date: Wednesday, September 10, 2025 12:26:26 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 upzoning plan, which would encourage the demolition of existing homes, displace renters and small businesses, and turn our neighborhoods into corridors of unaffordable luxury towers.

This plan empowers developers, silences residents, and is being rushed to satisfy a state mandate that's outdated and out of touch with San Francisco's current reality. That mandate should be challenged — not used to justify permanent zoning changes.

You can not rewrite the city's land use overnight with most residents unaware. And once this plan is adopted, there is no going back — even if it proves disastrous.

We urge you to:

– Protect renters and small businesses
– Preserve neighborhood scale and historic character
– Require real affordability
– Slow the process and engage the public

Don't rush a decision that will reshape San Francisco forever. We need thoughtful planning — and leadership that listens.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Marlowe Bjorklund
San Francisco, CA 94123

From:	wongchowfun@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sharon Wong
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Wednesday, September 10, 2025 12:20:11 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.

Let's not turn our beautiful city into Manhattan. Let's make sure we protect our low-rise historic neighborhoods while ensuring affordable housing.

Sincerely,
Sharon Wong
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: denniseblum@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Dennis blum
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, September 10, 2025 11:48:16 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,
Dennis blum
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: jamesd13@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of James d Nicholson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, September 10, 2025 11:24:20 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): this whole situation that you are putting us residents in is completely out of whack. This will destroy the character of the sunset and all of San Francisco. High rises stay downtown residential houses and no more than four units on commercial corridors. Please reconsider this devastating zoning plan. I have children that would love to stay in San Francisco, but all of this housing being built will be market rate. Which is still out of touch for the middle class. From what I see this is all backed by out of the area, billionaires who are looking for long-term speculation opportunities.

Sincerely,
James d Nicholson
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: jvistnes1@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jessica Vistnes
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, September 10, 2025 10:18:46 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

When I spoke to Mayor Lurie at the Union Street Festival when he was campaigning for Mayor, I asked him for his position on the upzoning in the Cow Hollow and Marina neighborhoods. He said that he thought that six stories would be reasonable. Now the heights are eight stories along a large portion of Lombard Street and rise to 14 STORIES on Lombard from Laguna going east towards Van Ness. That's quite a difference, with enormous implications for the iconic views that tourists come to this neighborhood to admire. I urge you to reconsider the extremely tall towers that will block some of the most beautiful public views of the bay and hills for residents as well as tourists walking around and driving those little yellow Go Cars. Please don't put many "Fontana Towers" at the bottom of a hill - blocking the views that make San Francisco the most beautiful city in the country - if not the world.

Sincerely,
Jessica Vistnes
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: zizivaga@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Vivian Imperiale
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, September 10, 2025 9:57:59 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

San Francisco should be proud of the several well-thought-out residential parks in our city. I was a happy homeowner in a different neighborhood but when a home in Ingleside Terraces came on the market I made an immediate offer and now have lived here since the Seventies. I used to go by the neighborhood on the bus and admired what I saw. Now it is wonderful to live in an area with front, side, and back gardens. We should cherish special neighborhoods that cannot be replaced. This one is a gift from the developer, Leonard, who went broke because he insisted on using high quality materials such as redwood. In a novel move he built homes around a former historical racetrack. I walk my dog on the central street that follows the racetrack configuration.

Ingleside Terraces architectural and historical place in San Francisco should be honored and left intact.

Sincerely,
Vivian Imperiale
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: klschulkin@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of karen schulkin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, September 10, 2025 8:41:32 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.

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
The citizens of SF need to be involved in the decision making. This is a most important piece missing here. We know there are ways to intervene with the State and expect you to do so. Thank you.

Sincerely,
karen schulkin
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: shaylamihalypro@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Shayla Mihaly
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, September 10, 2025 7:09:44 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.

Please do not ruin our beautiful city out of ego and greed. Very few will benefit and many will suffer. SF deserves better than this.

Sincerely,
Shayla Mihaly
San Francisco, CA 94118

From: bspfitch@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Robert Fitch
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, September 9, 2025 10:35:28 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): All the talk about "housing" when there are vacant residential units. The city allows venture capitalists and foreign investors to sit on empty properties. Additionally, there are vacant lots, abandoned retail and other sites that could be developed without destroying existing housing and businesses.

Sincerely,
Robert Fitch
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: kumasong@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Karen Kirschling
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, September 9, 2025 10:24:29 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,
Karen Kirschling

From: catherinerobyns@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Catherine Robyns
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, September 9, 2025 8:57:27 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 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,
Catherine Robyns
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: jherrod9@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Julie Herrod-Lumsden
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, September 9, 2025 8:22:16 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): Tell Lurie and Turncoat Sauter to BACK OFF OUR NEIGHBORHOODS!!!

Sincerely,
Julie Herrod-Lumsden
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: jherrod9@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Julie Herrod-Lumsden
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, September 9, 2025 8:18:15 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):Tell Lurie and Turncoat Sauter to BACK OFF OUR NEIGHBORHOODS!!!

Sincerely,
Julie Herrod-Lumsden
San Francisco, CA 94133

From:	Small Business Forward
To:	Lurie, Daniel (MYR)
Cc:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); So, Lydia (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Braun, Derek (CPC); Imperial, Theresa (CPC); Mcgarry, Sean (CPC); Williams, Gilbert A (CPC); Campbell, Amy (CPC); Ionin, Jonas (CPC); CPC-Commissions Secretary
Subject:	Letter from Westside & Northern neighborhood business leaders
Date:	Thursday, September 11, 2025 9:28:55 AM
Attachments:	Westside & Northern Business Leaders letter-11.pdf

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

Mayor Lurie,

Attached is an open letter from Westside & Northern neighborhood business leaders expressing our opposition to the upzoning plan.

We've posted this letter online and are periodically updating the letter as additional small business leaders sign on.

Sincerely,
Christin Evans

Co-owner, Booksmith & Alembic
Steering Committee Member, Small Business Forward

cc: Board of Supervisors
Planning Commission

smallbusinessforward.org

Dear Mayor Lurie,

As Westside and Northern neighborhood business leaders, we oppose your proposed upzoning plan. Despite being labeled “family zoning,” the plan will not deliver affordable housing for working families or protect small, family-run businesses. Instead, it threatens to displace workers, shutter long-standing neighborhood institutions, and hand over our communities to speculative development.

Already, parcels are being acquired and storefronts left vacant in anticipation of redevelopment. Our neighborhood businesses—still recovering from the pandemic, debt, and rising costs—cannot survive without stronger protections. The proposed upzoning, which allows 6–14+ story projects to replace century-old, three-story buildings, would overwhelm narrow streets, strain emergency services, and force closures of businesses that have served San Francisco for generations.

Currently your proposed upzoning has:

- **No early notification** of housing development projects with current commercial tenants or to neighboring commercial tenants.
- **No displacement assistance** for small businesses displaced by rising rents, non renewal of lease, including no provision for relocation assistance (such as AB2011 style payments determined by length of tenancy.)
- **No construction mitigation or financial consideration for neighboring small businesses** that will see loss of parking and interruption of foot traffic due to lengthy construction projects.
- **No requirement that new construction will be suitable for small businesses** to return to or rent at affordable rates. As we’ve seen with development along Market Street and Ocean Avenue, more than half of new buildings still have vacant storefronts years after completion. Warm shell conditions should be required, including suitable turn key spaces for displaced restaurants.
- **No recognition of the likely displacement of working class jobs** for luxury housing we can’t afford. Small business workers typically make 30-80% of Area Median Income (AMI) – about **$30k - $80k per year.** The housing demographic that your plan targets is only accessible to those making $120k or more per year, with an average rent over $3,000 per month, vastly out of reach for our workers.

Our intact neighborhood commercial corridors are the charming villages that help make San Francisco such a desirable place to live and work. We are tight-knit communities that weathered a global pandemic, but have not benefited from the continued focus on Downtown revitalization. The proposed upzoning would supercharge displacement of beloved “mom & pop” neighborhood businesses due to higher rents and little to no legal protections. It would increase the number of vacancies along our corridors, lead to business disruption and job loss, and bring a number of disruptive construction projects, harming our economic vitality.

Much more needs to be done to mitigate the very real harms that can be anticipated from the blanket upzoning proposed. We urge you to engage with us on adding real and meaningful solutions to mitigate these harms and engage with us around our thoughts on proposed solutions for addressing the affordable housing need:

- **Work with neighborhood groups to identify appropriate sites** for higher-capacity development without destroying existing corridors.
- **Establish real protections** to prevent small business closures and layoffs.
- **Preserve Legacy Businesses and beloved institutions** that provide historic enrichment, cultural pride, and help define their communities for locals and tourists alike.
- **Invest in Small Business Funds.** Invest in small business funds and support, rather than directing all resources downtown.

Sincerely,

Jesse Ahluwalia, The Laundry Corner (Inner Richmond)

Shelby Ash, The Music Store (West Portal)

Richard Azzolino, Sotto Mare Restaurants (North Beach)

Bill Barnickel, President Outer Sunset Merchants Professional Association (Outer Sunset)

Kenzie Benesh, Yo También Cantina (Inner Sunset)

Elias Bikahi, Le Sandwich (North Beach)

Belle Bueti, Body Philosophy Club (Clement)

Anna Bullard, West Portal Bookshop (West Portal)

Liam Caldwell, Armstrong Carpet's (West Portal)

Regan Caponi, O'Reillys Pub (Haight-Ashbury) and Comet Club and President of Union Merchants Association (Union Street)

Janet Clyde, Vesuvio Cafe (North Beach)

Shawn Connolly, SF Skate Club & EduSkate (Western Addition)

Robert Emmons, SF Mercantile (Haight-Ashbury) & Welcome to Castro (Castro) and President of Haight-Ashbury Merchants Association (Haight-Ashbury)

Christin Evans, The Booksmith & The Alembic (Haight-Ashbury)

Jeremy Fish, Fish Tank (North Beach)

Pedro Galletti, Mozzarella di Bufala Restaurant (West Portal)

Nikki Greene and Isabella Hill, Happy House (North Beach)

Thomas Hamilton, Gamescape (Divisadero)

David Heller, Beauty Network and President of Greater Geary Boulevard Merchants (Geary)

Judy Irving, Pelican Media (North Beach)

Tony Kamel, Sunset Shoe Repair (Inner Sunset)

Kamal Kandel, Sewa (Inner Richmond) and Yarsa's Restaurant (North Beach)

Rick Karp and David Karp, Cole Hardware (Cole Valley, North Beach, Russian Hill)

Elaine Katzenberger, City Lights Booksellers & Publishers (North Beach)

Nolan Kellett, Hawaii West (North Beach)

Teague Kernan, Tupelo & Belle Cora (North Beach)

Sean Kim, Joe's Ice Cream (Central Richmond)

Darren Lacy and Jennifer McMahon, Da Flora Restaurant (North Beach)

Dennis Lin, Burmese Kitchen (Inner Richmond)

Frances Lau, S & S Grocery (North Beach)

Matt Lopez, White Cap (Taravel)

Danny Macchiarini, Macchiarini Creative Design (North Beach)

Lisa Merrall, Fireside Bar (Inner Sunset)

Marcus Moo, Alushe Coffee Bar (Geary)

Lisa Moore, Siren Boutique (West Portal)

Pete Mulvihill & Kevin Ryan, Green Apple Books (Inner Sunset, Clement)

Quentin Navia, Peña Pachamama (North Beach)

Andrew Nelson and Caitlyn Skye Wild, Golden Sardine (North Beach)

Brody Nowak, Rising Star Laundry (Cole Valley)

Annie O'Keeffe, O'Keeffe's Bar (Inner Richmond)

Ida Pantaleo Zoubi, Caffe Trieste (North Beach)

Sunshine Powers, Love on Haight (Haight-Ashbury)

Al Ribaya, Al's Attire (North Beach)

Nicole Schwieterman, Fleetwood SF (Clement)

Mark Sodini, Sodini's Restaurant (North Beach)

Lynnet Spiegel, Jeffrey's Natural Pet Foods (North Beach)

Hanna Suleiman, Cafe Greco (North Beach)

Deidre Von Rock, Von Rock Law and President of West Portal Merchants Association (West Portal)

Richard & Amanda Weld, Tantrum (Clement)

Wendy Williams, Day Moon Bakery (Outer Sunset)

Diana Zogaric, Shaw's Ice Cream (West Portal)

Shadi Zughayar, Coit Liquor and Alimento (North Beach)

Other merchant leaders signing in solidarity with Westside & Northern Neighborhood leaders:

Henry Karnilowicz, President of South of Market Business Association (South of Market)

Cc: Board of Supervisors
Planning Commission

From: Gerard Koskovich
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan: Protect Rent-Controlled Housing
Date: Thursday, September 11, 2025 10:58:04 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis. it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why I join the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods in calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future. As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.

Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing. Likewise reserve large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.

Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom—including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.

Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.

Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"). Enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Gerard Koskovich

Gerard
California

From: Gregory Sykes
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Thursday, September 11, 2025 10:53:03 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Gregory
California

From: jeanettetraverso@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jeanette Traverso
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Thursday, September 11, 2025 10:50:43 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

My family & I have lived in North Beach for decades. We should convert the existing oversupply of vacant buildings into housing. That way we solve the housing & vacancy problems without destroying the incomparable character of our walkable neighborhoods. My husband I have worked long & hard to create a wonderful life in San Francisco. For all the reasons below, I beg you to reverse course on your upzoning development plans.

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,
Jeanette Traverso
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: SARA MILES
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Amend Lurie's Redevelopment Plan
Date: Thursday, September 11, 2025 10:48:41 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

SARA
California

From:	sarahoreilly3@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sarah O"Reilly
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Thursday, September 11, 2025 10:22:44 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Hello All San Francisco Elected Officials,

My name is Sarah O'Reilly and I live at 2034 Leavenworth St. #4 in Russian Hill. My husband was a San Francisco native as was his father, Aunts and Uncles and he loved this city. We believe that we should be offered affordable housing for more people but that we should do it in keeping with our amazing, beautiful city. Please consider a more thought out plan.

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 really hope this plan can be reconsidered to preserve and expand responsibly our amazing city.

Sarah O'Reilly

Sincerely,
Sarah O'Reilly
San Francisco, CA 94133

From:	mkjanis@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of janis kaempfe
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Thursday, September 11, 2025 9:53:54 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.

This action will be the biggest threat in San Francisco history to the majority of San Franciscans who are renters. It will displace renters and increase the homeless population. You have a moral obligation to San Franciscans who you represent to vote against this upzoning plan.

Sincerely,
janis kaempfe
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: mkjanis@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of janis kaempfe
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Thursday, September 11, 2025 9:44:43 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 (optional):

Sincerely,
janis kaempfe
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: mkjanis@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of janis kaempfe
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Thursday, September 11, 2025 9:44:00 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,
janis kaempfe
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: jg1964chi@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Joan Albertson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Thursday, September 11, 2025 9:31:12 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 COMMENT Please listen to the citizens of this neighborhood. We have a mixture of apartment buildings, 2 flats. 3 flats and single family homes. We are doing just fine. Have you considered fire danger in high risers. And what about blocking sun light and being able to see the sky. And what will be done about parking. You know we pay for parking that gives us the ability to park 4 to 6 blocks away from where we live. So wonderful to lug groceries up and down the hills. Thanks for reading my comments.

Sincerely,
Joan Albertson
San Francisco, CA 94109

From:	SON-SF SaveOurNeighborhoodsSF
To:	So, Lydia (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Braun, Derek (CPC); Campbell, Amy (CPC); Imperial, Theresa (CPC); Mcgarry, Sean (CPC); Williams, Gilbert A (CPC); CPC-Commissions Secretary; Chen, Lisa (CPC); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; Carroll, John (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); SherrillStaff; Segal, Ned (MYR); Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC)
Subject:	Oppose 14a-c, 2021-005878GPA/MAP/PCA, FAMILY ZONING PLAN - September 11, 2025 Meeting
Date:	Thursday, September 11, 2025 8:39:53 AM
Attachments:	9-11-25 - PLANNING COMMISSION LTR SON-SF .pdf

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

Attention San Francisco:

Land Use/Transportation Committee

Board of Supervisors

Supervisor Joel Engardio - District 4

Chief of Housing & Economic Development Ned Segal

Mayor Daniel Lurie

Planning Director Sarah Dennis-Phillips

Please see attached PDF Letter to **Oppose 14a-c, 2021-005878GPA/MAP/PCA, FAMILY ZONING PLAN** - September 11, 2025 Meeting.

Thank you for your time in considering our concerns.

Regards,
Renee Lazear & Shawna McGrew
(Co-founders - SON-SF ~ Save Our Neighborhoods SF)
info@sonsf.org

September 10, 2025

San Francisco Planning Commission
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400
San Francisco, CA 94103

SUBJECT: Oppose 14a-c, 2021-005878GPA/MAP/PCA, FAMILY ZONING PLAN - September 11, 2025 Meeting - Agenda Items 14a and 14b

Dear Commissioners:

SON-SF (Save Our Neighborhoods SF) represents over 4,000 District 4 and other district residents who advocate for thoughtful and inclusive planning, historic preservation, and thriving local businesses in our neighborhoods. We organized around the threat of putting up 50 stories (lowered to 24 stories – for now) at 2700 Sloat Blvd. The Sloat project is still moving forward. This despite the fact that the neighboring six-year-old Westerly project only approximately one-third of the 56 units have sold; the rest remain empty. The Westerly's ground floor commercial space is vacant, and the site generally looks derelict. This project adds nothing to the neighborhood – is this Mayor Lurie's plan for all of the West Side?

SON-SF agrees that San Francisco needs affordable housing; however, Mayor Lurie's plan does little to increase the amount of truly affordable housing. Even worse, the plan will have a negative impact on our communities by increasing density and height limits without addressing critical needs such as needing more green space for new residents, increased congestion without MUNI funding for more transit, lack of equity by not placing low-income families in the new, market-rate buildings, and the big one - *infrastructure*. In the Sunset District the lack of adequate water for firefighting is a major concern. If a disaster should occur, there is currently not enough water to put out a fire. The onshore winds from the ocean will quickly push the flames uphill and over into the rest of San Francisco. More density equals more fuel. This should be a concern for the entire city.

The Planning Department maps change every week. There is a lot of confusion over the Mayor Lurie's proposed map and the further impact that state legislation will have on the final allowed heights. The entire system around this upzoning map is so opaque that some local groups have held Town Halls to try to explain to residents what the City wants to do.

However, our greatest concern is that the focus has been on the City telling us what the City wants to do. There have been no plans to involve the neighborhoods in local-level decision-making about what is going to happen specifically to their neighborhood, to their business district, and even to the lot next door to them.

A city can and should have more than one type of housing. People move to the Sunset and the Parkside from other parts of the city because the families want individual homes and yards for their children to play in. We need a plan that involves the residents, so that we can plan for new affordable housing and increased density in a way that does not destroy the resources that attract people to our neighborhood in the first place.

Sincerely,
Renee Lazear & Shawna McGrew
(Co-Founders - SON-SF ~ Save Our Neighborhoods SF)
info@sonsf.org

Cc:
SF Land Use/Transportation Committee
SF Board of Supervisors
SF Supervisor Joel Engardio - District 4
San Francisco Chief of Housing & Economic Development Ned Segal
San Francisco Mayor Daniel Lurie
SF Planning Director Sarah Dennis-Phillips

From:	Paul Wermer
To:	So, Lydia (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Braun, Derek (CPC); Campbell, Amy (CPC); Imperial, Theresa (CPC); Mcgarry, Sean (CPC); Williams, Gilbert A (CPC); CPC-Commissions Secretary; Chen, Lisa (CPC)
Cc:	Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; Carroll, John (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); SherrillStaff; Segal, Ned (MYR); Lurie, Daniel (MYR)
Subject:	OPPOSE: 14a-c, 2021-005878GPA/MAP/PCA, FAMILY ZONING PLAN
Date:	Wednesday, September 10, 2025 8:22:56 AM
Attachments:	PHRA Opposition to Family Zoning Plan.pdf

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

Dear Planning Commissioners:

Our detailed letter of opposition to the "Family Zoning Plan" is in the attached ***PHRA Opposition to Family Zoning Plan.pdf***

Sincerely,

Paul Wermer

--
Paul Wermer
Board President
Pacific Heights Residents Association

PACIFIC HEIGHTS RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION
2443 FILLMORE STREET, P.O. BOX 178
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94115

September 10, 2025

San Francisco Planning Commission (VIA EMAIL)
49 South Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94103

Subject: Oppose 14a-c, 2021-005878GPA/MAP/PCA, FAMILY ZONING PLAN

Dear Planning Commissioners:

The Pacific Heights Residents Association (PHRA) represents residents and businesses between Bush & Union Streets and Van Ness & Presidio Avenues. Since our founding in 1972, we have been consistent in our advocacy for good planning and historic preservation.

PHRA would welcome the opportunity to work with Planning to develop the fine grained plan to provide the mixed income housing San Francisco so desperately needs. We understand that housing affordability is a critical problem that San Francisco must address. To do so requires careful, thoughtful planning, with increased height and density in appropriate locations, as well as appropriate changes to land use controls. It needs support from thoughtful policies that 1) ensure both long term affordability for the mix of household incomes and 2) provide for the essential city infrastructure needed to support his growth.

Regrettably, the plan and legislation before us now fails to provide that fine grained plan. While the Family Zoning Plan might increase housing for households in the top quintile of income, it unfortunately fails to address the housing needs of more than 70% of San Francisco households. As such it must be rejected.

This legislation fails to address:

1) how it will ensure adequate housing affordability for the range of household incomes in San Francisco. Without a clear path to that goal, lower income workers will be forced out of San Francisco, with a range of negative impacts to stated city objectives such as addressing climate change, reducing traffic congestion, and equity. Regrettably, in spite of the plan's name, there is nothing that ensures that family-friendly housing will be built, except for families with incomes in the top quintile. In particular, the plan and related legislation appears to ignore the induced demand for BMR units created by market rate development, as documented in Planning's Residential Nexus Study.

2) how existing community character – and indeed local communities themselves – will be integrated into planning decisions. This is a significant quality of life issue, with impacts on various vulnerable segments of the population: the local community is essential for health and well-being. The legislation does not address the complex problem of protecting of our marvelous local retailers, who make our NCDs worth visiting.

3) how the city will plan to implement appropriate upgrades to critical infrastructure, since it does not know when or where significantly increased density will appear.

4) how R-4 zoning impacts equity, mental health and well being by reducing Dwelling Unit Exposure with potential impacts on both children and mobility-impaired people. (per green building research)

These issues are expanded on in the attachment; it is of necessity lengthy.

PHRA would like to be able to support a housing plan that targets mixed income development that meets San Francisco's unmet housing needs, developed in better consultation with the various neighborhoods. That is not this plan. To reiterate, PHRA would welcome the chance to engage with Planning to develop a such a plan. We know there are opportunity sites within our boundaries that could support such housing; we know that careful changes to the zoning controls can help new small business develop.

That is not the type of plan that is before you today. PHRA strongly opposes this plan and legislation because it fails to meet San Francisco's real needs.

Sincerely yours,

Paul H Wermer
President, Pacific Heights Residents Association

cc: Land Use and Transportation Committee, San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Supervisor Stephen Sherrill
Ned Segal, Chief of Housing and Economic Development, San Francisco
Daniel Lurie, Mayor

PHRA: Attachment to Letter of Opposition

1) It is clear that San Francisco must provide for housing supporting the mix of incomes in San Francisco, and especially those service workers that make life possible. This legislation fails to provide a clear path to housing that supports households with an income less than that of the top quintile.

Permanently upzoning a very large number of properties in the hope that a small percent of those properties will build more housing is not "planning". It is setting up a process whereby somewhere someone will build some structure in which some unknown number of residential units will be provided at some price to someone who can afford that price. Enabling stochastic processes that are not understood is not planning, and does nothing to assure affordability.

2) The legislation ignores the ramifications of building large numbers of market rate projects of 9 units or less. Yet the newly increased base heights encourage such market rate projects. This ignores the Residential Nexus results that market rate units create a demand for at least 30% of BMR units.

Furthermore, the fact that developers of 10 or more residential units can fee out for ~$250/sq ft means that they are paying less than half the price of an on-site inclusionary unit. If this results in a 100% market rate building, we don't offset existing demand at all – for every 10 market rate units, we need to build at least 3 BMR units, not 2, just to meet the total induced demand (but if they are only paying half the cost for the BMR, will even the 20% of the nominal inclusionary housing be built?)

3) This legislation fails to link developments to the necessary infrastructure improvements required to support an increased population. This includes sewer capacity, electrical demand, transit services – all of which currently have significant local constraints, if not system wide constraints. The impact fees do not cover the Cap Ex requirements for the new infrastructure demand.

Worse, by allowing the RTO-C districts to permit full rear yard coverage on the ground floor, we shift from rear yard infiltration of storm water to an additional 30% storm-water flow during rainfall events for lots with ground floor coverage of the rear yard area. This is a serious problem with the increased probability of extreme precipitation events. This rezoning intentionally aggravates the existing sewage system problems, including increased discharges of polluted water to bay and ocean.

4) The proposed RTO-C zoning allows commercial use up to 4,999 sq ft on a lot, removing potential additional residential units in favor of more profitable business uses. While the legislation prohibits the removal of residential units by a project, it does not require additional units to build up to the base height.

Furthermore, the RTO-C permitted uses have not been discussed with the affected neighborhoods, and most community members have no understanding of what the implications are. While there are appropriate uses, encouraging hotels or short stay lodging in previously residential areas encourages the development of short stay units over long term, rent controlled lodging. And yet the proposed RTO-C allows this.

Furthermore, RTO-C fails to allow trade shops, zoning which might encourage craftspeople to live and work at the same address – something that might help create space for interesting small businesses that create attractions for tourists as well as local residents. Historically business owners lived above their shops – and this might be something to encourage in rebuilding attractive, walkable neighborhoods.

Unless and until there has been neighborhood outreach to identify and address legitimate concerns related to unintended consequences of the rezoning to allow specific commercial uses, this legislation should not be approved.

5) The "plan" does not contain credible protections for existing small businesses from the threats imposed by development projects. These small neighborhood businesses – from restaurants to bars to regional products and carefully curated inventories - these distinct neighborhood commercial districts are essential to making San Francisco an attractive place to visit. Yet they face ill-defined threats under this plan. It is not only the displacement of an existing business on the project site. Less obvious, but very damaging, are the noise and obstructed access that deter customers from patronizing neighboring businesses. Promises of trailing legislation are a way to remove pressure on the City to actually do something meaningful.

6) The plans fails to recognize the significance of neighborhood character, and the importance of historic preservation in maintaining the unique neighborhood characteristics. The reason tourists visit San Francisco is not for its warm and sunny Ocean Beach, or because its theater scene rivals London or New York. It is because of its human scale, the distinct neighborhoods with their own cultures. It is the walkability and the views. And this plan does not recognize these as valuable common assets that we all benefit from.

References supporting the argument that this plan will not address the housing affordability problem:

1) The Emperors New Housing (a thorough examination of the housing problem)
2) Incomes Determine Housing Prices (A Federal Reserve Bank blog post)
3) Supply Constraints Do Not Explain House Price and Quantity Growth Across U.S. Cities (Federal Reserve Bank Working Paper)
4) New high density rental construction in England actually increased area rents
5) Chicago – Increased density increased housing costs
6) Austin, TX upzoning did not reduce housing costs
7)There are numerous articles on the Minneapolis 2040 Rezoning plan, which upzoned large areas. The 2040 plan appears to have reduced the rate of rent increases, but not improved affordability.
8) An online search on TOD and property values primarily finds articles highlighting increases in property values, but not improved affordability.

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:	104 Letters Regarding File Nos. 250700 and 250701
Date:	Thursday, September 4, 2025 12:36:20 PM
Attachments:	104 Letters Regarding File Nos. 250700 and 250701.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached 14 letters regarding File Nos.:

250700: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan
250701: 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: kh@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of kaivan harouni
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, September 2, 2025 9:43:10 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,
kaivan harouni

From: lilyffll90@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lily Leung
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, September 2, 2025 11:00:10 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,
Lily Leung

From: mike.gilleran@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of mike gilleran
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, September 2, 2025 11:57:04 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):

My wife and I have lived in Ingleside Terraces for 39 years. We love the neighborhood. We moved to IT in 1986 because of the single-family home character of the neighborhood. The thought that these wonderful homes could be demolished and turned into four story multi-unit dwellings (with the attendant significant infrastructure problems) is frightening. Not to mention six stories for corner lots!

It will take just one neighbor to sell to a developer for the downhill skid to begin, and the character of the neighborhood will change no matter how luxurious the new buildings are (with parking?). I can understand thoughtful upzoning on commercial corridors such as Ocean Avenue, although I worry about the future of small businesses on that corridor as well as on West Portal as I am not aware of any guaranteed protections for our small businesses. But the introduction of multi-unit dwellings with substantial new height and land use allowances (and there is nothing "gentle" about any of that) in any neighborhood is not sound thinking. My wife lived in Manhattan. That is not our vision for this wonderful city.

Again, I can understand thoughtful upzoning on commercial corridors, with protection for small businesses. I cannot understand or support the current upzoning plan as it pertains to all SF neighborhoods. This is a bad idea, and there is no going back once the mistake is made.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,
mike gilleran
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: cathi.dennehy@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Catherine Dennehy
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, September 2, 2025 2:37:32 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Dear San Francisco Department of Building and Planning, San Francisco Board of Supervisors and Mayor Lurie.

I am a mutli-generational San Franciscan with roots in the city that date back to the 1860's. I was disheartened to see the new proposal for upsizing of buildings around the city.

I oppose building heights of 60 feet and above in residential neighborhoods, such a along Chestnut and Lombard streets. High rise structures will permanently change the character of the city landscape. I would like to see the history and beauty of the city maintained. I understand that some expansion for housing is necessary.

High rise structures should be limited to downtown areas like other major cities, where there is also opportunity for repurposing of existing structures (once used as offices, can become housing). Let's repurpose what we can to see what we need, before upsizing everywhere across the city!

This is an extreme proposal that is being considered. When high rise structures are erected in residential areas, it drastically changes city character and NOT FOR the better.

I 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.

PLEASE, PLEASE Stop and reset your plans so as to not destroy a gorgeous city into one that is overbuilt, unattractive, and lacking any character at all. There is still time to DO what is right for San Franciscans and generations to come.

Sincerely,
Catherine Dennehy
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: tiredepot@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jimmy Ng
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, September 2, 2025 3:34:52 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,
Jimmy Ng
San Francisco, CA 94132

From: esens123@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Erik Sens
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, September 2, 2025 3:51:32 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,
Erik Sens
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: pingli28@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Alan Yuan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, September 2, 2025 3:52:35 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):

Sincerely,
Alan Yuan
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: thomasorgain@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Thomas Orgain
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, September 2, 2025 3:53:13 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,
Thomas Orgain
Auburn, CA 95602

From: taylorc2525@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Clara Taylor
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, September 2, 2025 4:36:43 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:

***** Please ethically perform your sworn duty for our communities. We are the communities who voted for you. Please please take a moment to consider if this was you and your family your immediate and extended family. How would you feel about having all of your entire community rezoned so that you did not have your community anymore at all ever. Again, I ask you to perform your sworn ethical duty to protect and uplift our communities not demolish our communities. we voted for you, remember that.

- 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,
Clara Taylor
San Francisco, CA 94112

From:	djamgarov@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Vladimir Djamgarov
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Tuesday, September 2, 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,

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,
Vladimir Djamgarov
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: tofufight@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Philip von Furstenberg
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, September 2, 2025 5:14:34 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): The home I live in was bought by my father, who handed the house down to me. He worked extremely hard his entire life to take care of his family. It is a tremendous honor to take care of the home he worked so hard for. The neighborhood is an amazing place to live and call home. Tearing up this neighborhood will make a few people rich, but the majority of people even worse off. A handful of people will buy a big condo and never set foot it in it. Prices will skyrocket and less people like teachers and county workers will be able to afford to live in the community they work in.

Sincerely,
Philip von Furstenberg
San Francisco, CA 94116

From:	milomatthews@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Milo Matthews
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Tuesday, September 2, 2025 5:58:53 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,
Milo Matthews
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: planetpotts@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Janet Potts
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, September 2, 2025 6:33:51 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

A life long resident of the Sunset district I strongly oppose the upzoning proposed 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:
- Strive to represent your constituents and not developers and lobbyists

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps

- Request an extension of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline so that communities you serve have a voice

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 pure and simple. Stop the madness

Sincerely,
Janet Potts
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: molinelli@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Amy Molinelli
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, September 2, 2025 7:43:34 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):
Please look at the vacant housing in this city and the amount of luxury housing that is VACANT! Stop attacking middle class residents and small business owners like myself and my husband a teacher, when we can barely afford the city and are being attacked. There is so much housing being built for luxury and it's not sustainable. so much of our real estate sits empty - go after foreign owned shell apartments first! Then let's talk up zoning!

Sincerely,
Amy Molinelli
San Francisco, CA 94118

From: jeaninejue.mm@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jeanine Jue
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, September 2, 2025 9:47:58 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:

Sincerely,
Jeanine Jue
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: michaeljbrant@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Michael Brant
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, September 2, 2025 10:16:00 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

The upzoning proposals are excessive and destructive. Buildings of 8 or 12 or 22 stories are totally out of keeping with the character of the Sunset neighborhood, even along transit corridors. More reasonable heights could fit the neighborhood, while still providing new housing, but not massive apartment blocks. And apparently ANY street could now have developments of four stories? This is unreasonable and destructive and is opposed by all residents of the affected neighborhoods. NO to reckless construction, YES to planning consideration for established neighborhoods. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Michael Brant
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: sebraleaves@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of sebra leaves
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, September 3, 2025 1:00:25 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 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,
sebra leaves
San Francisco, CA 94110

From: chavja@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Andres Chavez
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, September 3, 2025 9:17:25 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 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,
Andres Chavez
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: Madeline Campbell
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Wednesday, September 3, 2025 10:24:08 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 and Commissioners,

I am a resident of District 2, right on the border of District 1 and the Richmond District, and I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan. My partner and I are young professionals who want to put down roots in San Francisco, but we've realized that even with above-average incomes, homeownership here is far out of reach. That's disheartening for people like us who are committed to this city and want to stay.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes, and the Family Zoning Plan is a thoughtful step forward. It expands housing choices across the city—particularly in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It creates flexibility for families to add backyard units, in-law apartments, and small-scale buildings that allow loved ones to stay close. This plan will help make housing more affordable and accessible for a broader range of San Franciscans.

While there has been some pushback on the west side, as a Richmond resident, I strongly support this plan. Our commercial corridors are ideal for additional housing, and we must do our part to meet the city's housing needs.

This proposal is community-informed, consistent with the Housing Element, and grounded in the real needs of residents. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and sustainable for San Francisco's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone has a place to belong. Thank you for your leadership and collaboration.

Sincerely,
Madeline Campbell

Madeline Campbell
maddiedove8@gmail.com
340 Arguello Blvd Apt. 305
San Francisco, California 94118

From: Anna McMurray
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Wednesday, September 3, 2025 10:29:28 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 & Commissioners,

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.

Anna McMurray
annamcm4@gmail.com
1428 Funston Avenue
San Francisco, California 94122

From: Charley Goss
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Wednesday, September 3, 2025 10:31:54 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 & Commissioners,

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.

Charley Goss

Charley Goss
charley@sfaa.org
1238 Sutter Street
San Francisco, California 94109

From: David Harrison
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Wednesday, September 3, 2025 10:47:31 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 & Commissioners,

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

My wife and I are proud San Franciscans and are committed to the prospect of starting and raising our family in San Francisco. Housing costs presents a huge challenge to this dream. San Francisco urgently needs more homes and this proposal presents the measured way to achieve this.

I urge you to please take a stand and support this proposal that is the right thing for San Franciscans and young families. The future of our city depends on it.
Sincerely,
David H.
District 7

David Harrison
deharriso202@gmail.com
200 Irving Street, Apt 7
San Francisco, California 94122

From: mlrinsfo@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Martha Rudd
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Saturday, August 30, 2025 8:40:56 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,
Martha Rudd
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: susanmackowski@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of susan mackowski
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Saturday, August 30, 2025 9:18:02 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 rash upzoning plan comes at a time when residents and employers are not swarming into, but rapidly exiting San Francisco. It comes at a time when our federal government seems intent on telling its citizens how to live -and now the state is telling tax paying, home owning citizens of SF how our neighborhoods should look. Finally, keep in mind that SF is not a city of industry (except, perhaps, for AI). We don't have a business base that is intent on building community as in NYC. We rely on tourism for our revenue -and tourists love the character and welcoming streets of our neighborhoods.

Please put a stop to this gift to developers. It will have long term, harmful impacts that will hurt all of us.
ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
susan mackowski
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: noguera@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Hatun Noguera
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Saturday, August 30, 2025 9:43:52 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): Do not destroy the beauty of our city.

Sincerely,
Hatun Noguera
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: BigWayne19@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Wayne Phillips
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Saturday, August 30, 2025 9:54:28 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,
Wayne Phillips
Orinda, CA 94563

From: Philip Lumsden
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Saturday, August 30, 2025 9:57:45 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Philip
California

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]
Date: Saturday, August 30, 2025 10:11:58 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 Robert Smith
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: maryanntittle@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of MaryAnn Tittle
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Saturday, August 30, 2025 10:27:44 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,
MaryAnn Tittle

From: denolacarole@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Carole De Nola
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Saturday, August 30, 2025 10:35:23 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 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,
Carole De Nola
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: Carolyn Miller
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Saturday, August 30, 2025 10:39:40 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,

To Danny Sauter:

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Carolyn Miller

Carolyn
California

From: FredPenczakMD@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Fred Penczak
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Saturday, August 30, 2025 10:41:14 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

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.

The laws which govern development in our communities have been carefully thought out over decades, and millions of Californians have built their lives around them. This assault from Sacramento on all of our communities does not serve us (the constituents), rather the development industry and those who profit from it. In its wake of profiting, our communities, families, and lives are destroyed. You and all our elected representatives should oppose this. Please do your job and protect your community. Thank you, Fred

Sincerely,
Fred Penczak
San Rafael, CA 94903

From: magyorke@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Michelle GT
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Saturday, August 30, 2025 11:05:28 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 in District 1, 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,
Michelle GT
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: janiceruthwood46@gmail.com
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Saturday, August 30, 2025 11:12:33 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

California

From: minicazim@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Monica Zimmerman
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Saturday, August 30, 2025 11:37:12 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):why would you want to change our beautiful and diverse city into manhattan? That's not why we live here!!!
The neighborhoods will change dramatically if you jam more high rises and more people into already full neighborhoods. This would be a huge mistake which will never be able to be changed! Big mistake!

Sincerely,
Monica Zimmerman
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: David Brian Harrington
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Saturday, August 30, 2025 11:48:13 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

[Arbitrary rezoning lacks the proper focus to solve our city's affordability crisis! Note all the constituencies that have been overlooked!

David Brian Harrington
San Francisco]

David Brian
California

From: sfamc2@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Arnold Cohn
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Saturday, August 30, 2025 12:25:08 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.

Save our neighborhoods from becoming Manhattens. Families need space for themselves and their fellow residents.

Sincerely,
Arnold Cohn
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: mark@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mark Schlesinger
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Saturday, August 30, 2025 12:35:45 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 are long-time residents of Cow Hollow, and fear what this initiative will do to our neighborhood and others.

Sincerely,
Mark Schlesinger
San Francisco, CA 94123

From:	judydoanesf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Judith Doane
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Saturday, August 30, 2025 2:27:35 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):

Sincerely,
Judith Doane
San Francisco, CA 94115

From: lunbeck@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Robert Lunbeck
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Saturday, August 30, 2025 4:59:56 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 longtime resident of Lakeside, I urge you to amend this flawed upzoning proposal. Even a single new large apartment building or condo that replaces current Lakeside housing will irretrievably damage the entire neighborhood. This proposal will make nearly every upzoned single-family house a TEARDOWN, as its highest use will be sale for demolition and new multi-family construction. Because of this, upzoning is a strong disincentive to needed maintenance in this historically single-family neighborhood, leading to neighborhood deterioration over time.

I would be happy to discuss further.

Sincerely,
Robert Lunbeck
San Francisco, CA 94127

From:	scarampi@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sebastiano Scarampi
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Saturday, August 30, 2025 5:22:43 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,
Sebastiano Scarampi
San Francisco, CA 94115

From:	beverly.yang@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Beverly Wong
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Saturday, August 30, 2025 6:05:17 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 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 live in Forest Hill, half a block from the Forest Hill Station. The planned rezoning will directly impact my family and my neighbors, disrupting the current quiet and safe family-centered neighborhood culture, impact our property value, introduce unwanted traffic at an already congested intersection, and make the neighborhood less safe for our children. Please allow our community to at least have a voice in these plans that will greatly impact our everyday lives.

Sincerely,
Beverly Wong
San Francisco, CA 94116

From:	ron86wong@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Ronald Wong
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Saturday, August 30, 2025 8:00:08 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.

I was born and raised in San Francisco, and I have always loved this city for its neighborhoods that feel like home—places where children can play safely, where neighbors know each other, and where families like mine can grow together. Now, as I raise my own family here, I fear that rezoning our residential areas for commercial buildings will erode that sense of community. What looks like progress on paper will bring traffic, noise, and disruption, and once the heart of a neighborhood is lost, it can never truly be restored.

Sincerely,
Ronald Wong
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: alyssa.jy.wong@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Alyssa Wong
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Saturday, August 30, 2025 8:12:19 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 13 year old resident of Forest Hill living on Magellan Street, and I am writing this to tell you that I am strongly in opposition to this building project. I only recently turned 13, and I got the news that my beautiful neighborhood was huddled under the looming threat of 85 foot buildings defacing our streets as a birthday present. I might not be old or powerful enough to understand the turning of the world or the movements of the moon, but I know this much: I will not stand to see my home surrounded by foreign giants of buildings. However, my parents taught me to always see things two ways, so I understand that more housing will allow more people to live in this city. Now please open your eyes to our point of view. We are people who value the simplicity and peacefulness of our lives, and this construction will devastate our home, and, also as my parents taught me, home is where the heart is. And the heart is how we live. This project will affect not just my life, but the lives of my whole family and the rest of my neighbors. The construction extends not only to my home, but also to my school, my friends' houses, and the quiet and festive spots that I cherish most. Imagine if you were a newly turned 13 year old girl celebrating finally being a teenager, when suddenly: BOOM. Tall buildings rise up sinisterly against the skyline of your beloved neighborhood. You rush off to school, away from the nightmare that now surrounds your home, but once you get there, BOOM. More giants cast their shadow over your small school. You run as fast as you can to your favorite comfort shop, but, you guessed it, BOOM. More buildings right on the spot. You realize that basically your whole life is now covered in these giants, and down the street, all your neighbors come to similar conclusion. Surely you, for the good of all these people in the city you have devoted yourself to, can understand our perspective and make a change. Thank you for your time in reading this.

Sincerely,
Alyssa Wong

From:	vozalegre@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of L. Diaz
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Saturday, August 30, 2025 10:55:28 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

From: Emma Dunbar
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Sunday, August 31, 2025 6:36:45 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely, a 25 year resident and parent of three children who are North Beach natives and wife of a North Beach small business owner.

Emma Dunbar

Emma
California

From: ntlarsen@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Niels Larsen
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Sunday, August 31, 2025 7:01:22 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,
Niels Larsen
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: Lori Brooke
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Sunday, August 31, 2025 7:46:29 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Lori
California

From:	shashacooks@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Anastasia Yovanopoulos
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Sunday, August 31, 2025 12:13:40 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]

Dear [elected official],

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,
Anastasia Yovanopoulos San Francisco, CA 94114
Start Over

Sincerely,
Anastasia Yovanopoulos
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: erinkcronjn@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Erin Cronin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Sunday, August 31, 2025 12:45:11 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,
Erin Cronin
San Francisco, CA 94117

From: lisa_youngworth@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lisa Youngworth
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Sunday, August 31, 2025 1:57:02 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,
Lisa Youngworth

From: catvse@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Torr Tietz
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Sunday, August 31, 2025 5:05:36 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.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Torr Tietz
San Francisco, CA 94131

From: Ann Robinson
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, September 1, 2025 11:22:39 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Ann
California

From: Julie Herrod-Lumsden
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, September 1, 2025 3:20:43 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis—it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods—a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates—is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent—and a 44-year resident of San Francisco including 35 years in North Beach (long before Lurie and Sauter arrived to destroy them, respectively)—I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement:
Use creative financing and local jobs to construct ALREADY-APPROVED projects while protecting existing communities.

Landbank public sites:
Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.

GUARANTEE ACTUAL affordability:
Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom—including releasing VOTER-MANDATED FUNDS for affordable housing.

Protect families:
REQUIRE minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and REMOVE permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.

Protect small businesses and RENT-CONTROLLED housing:
Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect REAL costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, COMMUNITY-DRIVEN planning—not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I IMPLORE you to work with us to make this a REAL community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

In other words, please work with us to develop a community plan that delivers ACTUAL

AFFORDABLE HOUSING FOR CITIZENS—not just more power and money for greedy, selfish “politicians” and developers.

Sincerely,
Julie Herrod-Lumsden
35-Year North Beach Resident
Retired Coit Tower Employee

Julie
California

From: johngarrity@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John J. Garrity
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, September 2, 2025 7:30:20 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 J. Garrity
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: Patricia Callahan
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, September 2, 2025 8:39:47 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Patricia
California

From: calbearsph@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Patricia Hechinger
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, September 2, 2025 8:51:56 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,
Patricia Hechinger
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: rwaller@sbcglobal.net
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Thursday, August 28, 2025 5:04:35 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

California

From: Teagan Thompson
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Thursday, August 28, 2025 5:26:39 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Teagan
California

From: Jean Oppermann
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Thursday, August 28, 2025 6:12:18 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,
Jean Oppermann
I worked for and voted for preserving neighborhoods, protecting and encouraging small business, and helping to make San Francisco affordable for normal people. I can't tell you how disappointed I am with this short sighted plan. I've lived here over 50 years. When a neighborhood is gentrified to blandness San Francisco loses everything that makes it unique and a destination for tourists. I voted for the era of Willie Brown's love affair with big developers to be over.

Jean

California

From: Susan Spencer
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Does Not Pencil Out - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Thursday, August 28, 2025 7:01:17 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal looks good at first glance, but it will not mitigate San Francisco's affordability crisis. Upzoning will make the situation worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development. In San Francisco, we already have so much luxury housing sitting unoccupied (and unsold) that it should be clear we don't need more of the same old same old.

The Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – has a better plan for San Francisco's future. I urge you to support it.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Susan
California

From: bilgepump100@sbcglobal.net
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Thursday, August 28, 2025 8:36:27 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

California

From: Tes Welborn
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Is Not Real Affordability!
Date: Thursday, August 28, 2025 9:03:53 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,

Instead of a give away to developers and some big property owners, protect San Francisco neighborhoods, business districts, and actively build affordable housing, 30-80% AMI.
Don't have the funds now? Get options on key sites, and tell Newsom to cough up the money! The mandate to rezone is an unfunded mandate.

A long time resident, I know how important our neighborhoods, their shopping districts, an small business in general are to our city. And to that important commodity: tourism. Small businesses create more jobs than all the big businesses.

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Tes
California

From: Jean Balibrera
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, August 29, 2025 8:37:05 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Jean
California

From: phil.lumsden999@gmail.com
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, August 29, 2025 8:54:27 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

California

From: Paul Conroy
To: MandelmanStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; ChanStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; SauterStaff; SherrillStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Cc: Board of Supervisors (BOS); CPC-Commissions Secretary; "ITHA Board"
Subject: Family Zoning Plan
Date: Friday, August 29, 2025 11:43:32 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

Ingleside Terraces, a century-old neighborhood of 738 homes, is a vibrant, diverse community of homeowners, renters, families and seniors. With twice the city's average number of children, our neighborhood offers family-sized housing within walking distance of small businesses on Ocean Avenue and West Portal. We strongly oppose the so-called "Family Zoning Plan" as it will dismantle this community through speculative development and demolition.

This proposal isn't a family housing plan - it's a demolition plan. Density decontrol, as proposed, eliminates unit limits on single-family parcels. It incentivizes demolition of some of San Francisco's most affordable family housing stock to make way for high-rent, small-unit developments unsuitable for families. This plan encourages speculative redevelopment that will drive up land values, displace families, and erode thriving communities.

This proposal will destroy thriving communities. The proposed unconstrained upzoning and density decontrol will destabilize neighborhoods, drive tenant and small business evictions, and hollow out small, local business districts like Ocean Avenue, West Portal Avenue and Lakeside Village. Density decontrol risks paving over vital green spaces. We welcome thoughtful planning and for over 100 years, our neighborhood has supported development along Ocean Avenue. But this proposal is rezoning without a plan.

The state's 82,000-unit housing mandate ignores economic realities. The mandate overrides San Francisco's rights, as a Home Rule Charter City, to regulate its own housing development as a municipal function. San Francisco should instead challenge the state's unrealistic population projections, since it is already the densest city in California and the second densest city in the United States, second only to New York City. The high cost of housing in New York City proves that densification does not produce lower housing costs.

The City does not face a housing supply shortage. In fact, the Planning Department's Q2 2025 data shows a pipeline of 71,183 new units, including over 10,000 units near Ingleside Terraces at Balboa Reservoir, Stonestown, and Parkmerced. Meanwhile, the city's population has declined by 31,938 since 2020, with an estimated 36,000 vacant units. The proposal's emphasis on increasing the supply of housing units is misguided because the San Francisco housing market doesn't follow the laws of textbook supply and demand. Over the past 30 years, housing stock grew 27% while population increased only 11%, yet rent and housing prices still soared. The development encouraged by this proposal will be market-rate and aimed towards higher income individuals, further exacerbating affordability problems.

We propose the following recommendations to align any zoning plan with community and citywide goals:

1. **Remove Density Decontrol and maintain setbacks, height transitions, and massing rules. -** Existing approved projects in the pipeline and capacity can accommodate more than the 82,000 state mandated new housing units without demolishing thriving neighborhoods. The current planning code prevents outsized structures from overwhelming existing blocks. Existing codes maintain green space - crucial for environmental sustainability, providing carbon sequestration, improved air and water quality, and enhanced biodiversity.

2. **Remove provisions that allow 65' heights on interior residential street corner lots and 8,000 square foot lots.** This provision 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. Proposed lot mergers will invade vital greenbelts, backyards, and trees that provide vital open space in an otherwise dense urban environment.

3. **Provide for a forty-foot height limit** on residential and commercial corridors in and immediately surrounding Ingleside Terraces, including Ocean Avenue, which is terraced 25 to 35 feet higher than adjacent single family homes.

4. **Protect historic resources and prohibit demolition of existing housing stock:** Require alternatives to demolition of eligible historic resources (Category A). Apply Preservation Design Standards to new projects in Category A neighborhoods.

5. **Provide housing choices scaled for families with children** and increase the

required family housing units consistent with the City's family-friendly policies. Preserve the small business villages adjacent to neighborhoods.

6. **Ensure adequate infrastructure** - particularly water, fire suppression, sewer, transportation, public safety, and schools. Increased zoning density should not be approved until infrastructure studies have been conducted and capital projects are approved and funded to support the proposed new development.

7. **Incentivize building the existing pipeline**: Encourage developers to build approved units or, if they do not, revoke entitlements.

8. **Repurpose under-utilized buildings**: Offer greater incentives to convert under-utilized downtown structures into housing as has been successfully done in Washington DC, New York and Los Angeles.

In conclusion, the "Family Zoning Plan" as proposed encourages the demolition of sound housing that has existed for generations, invites speculation, drives up costs, destroys architecturally historic structures, paves over green space and diminishes community.
We ask that you adopt the recommendations made above, rejecting density decontrol and formulating a sensible plan that preserves our neighborhoods, prioritizes affordability, and includes community input. We strongly support the building of new housing, but any new housing plan needs to be sensible and include the input and collaboration of those who will be most affected. As of now, we have not been included.
San Francisco's families deserve a housing strategy that builds on our strengths, not one that tears them down.

Very truly yours,

Paul Conroy, President
Ingleside Terraces Homes Association
www.ithasf.org

Cc (via email): Mayor Daniel Lurie
San Francisco Planning Commission
Ingleside Terraces Homes Association (ITHA) Board of Directors
All Ingleside Terraces residents via Email and ITHA Newsletter
West of Twin Peaks Central Council

Neighborhoods United SF

From: johnavalos11@gmail.com
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, August 29, 2025 12:44:29 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

California

From: shirley@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Shirley Chow
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Friday, August 29, 2025 2:42:34 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,
Shirley Chow

From: Helene Perini
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, August 29, 2025 3:59:34 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Helene
California

From: Catherine Roads-Redhouse
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, August 29, 2025 4:05:01 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 a law school student working full time and already my landlord has raised my rent this year. Even though I thought I was protected because of the age of the building I live in, because it is a condo the laws don't apply. I'm worried my landlord will raise it again. The cost of living in the city is so high and I don't see a raise from my job happening in the immediate future while I am still in school.

I love this city and can't imagine living anywhere else. Please don't let this next tech boom force educators and artists out.

Please make amendments to this rezoning that protects renters!

and also.....

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that

repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,
Catherine

Catherine
California

From: Linda Galliher
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, August 29, 2025 4:43:07 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,
Linda Galliher, J.D.

Linda
California

From: leebloch@yahoo.com
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, August 29, 2025 5:01:40 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

California

From: Chelsea Corbett
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: What are ya'll doing? Why is Sauter turning his back on his neighborhood?
Date: Friday, August 29, 2025 5:47:24 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,

Personal note: I'm deeply unsettled by Sauter's proposal regarding his, and our, North Beach neighborhood. This is fully against what he campaigned for, and as a young professional in the area that supports development, I'm disturbed by his lack of honesty. We did not vote for that level of hypocrisy. -Chelsea

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Let's be good to one another,
Chelsea

Chelsea
California

From: Lori Milburn
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, August 29, 2025 6:00:36 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Lori
California

From: Blandina Farley
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, August 29, 2025 6:34:03 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Personal Letter from Blandina

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing to you not just as a long-time resident of North Beach, but as someone who has spent most of my life right here in its heart and whose livelihood is deeply rooted in the soulful backstories, beauty, history & colorful characters of San Francisco. For decades, I've lived above a restaurant on Columbus Avenue, right in the heart of this vibrant, unique neighborhood. I've seen this city grow, shift, and struggle — and I've stood by it through it all, because I love it.

I work as a tour guide, so I talk to people — locals and tourists — every single day. I can tell you without hesitation: they do not come here for high-rises and generic development. They come for the soul of San Francisco. They come for the eccentricity, the color, the music, the art, the activism, and the history. They come for the Beats, the Bohemians, the thinkers, the risk-takers, the ones who dared to live and create freely.

I talk about those people on my "Cirque in the City" tours, and I live among them too. I've worked with North Beach Citizens since Francis Ford Coppola originated the org after recognizing the need while writing the script for the Godfather at Caffe Trieste, have been associated with North Beach Neighbors where I believe Danny started his political journey , and the Telegraph Hill Dwellers. I serve on the board of the North Beach Business Association, and I also work with Music City SF and Dear San Francisco. I've witnessed — and been a part of — communities from the Mission to the Haight to Chinatown rallying around one another, artists supporting small businesses, entertainers and craftspeople keeping culture alive against rising tides of displacement.

Rent control is not just a policy — it's a lifeline. Without it, I simply couldn't afford to live in the city I love, the city I fight for, and the city I represent every day to people from around the world. If it's taken away, people like me — those who are the heartbeat of San Francisco — will be forced out. And what kind of city will we be then?

San Francisco has always been a beacon of compassion, intelligence, and creative thinking. We are known across the globe as a city of freedom, of invention, of care for the marginalized, of spirit that cannot be replicated or replaced. Even when people criticize the United States, they often say, "But I love San Francisco." Let's not betray that legacy.

Please don't stand with those who want to homogenize this city into something unrecognizable — something safe for investors but hostile to the people who give it its soul. Stand with those of us who live here, love it fiercely, and are willing to fight for its future. Protect rent control. Protect our neighborhoods. Protect the people who are San Francisco.

With hope and heart,
Blandina Farley
North Beach Resident & Tour Guide
Board Member, North Beach Business Association
Guide, Cirque in the City Tours / Music City SF / Dear San Francisco

Blandina
California

From: s@ssteuer.com
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, August 29, 2025 9:30:41 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

California

From: Carol Verburg
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, August 29, 2025 9:52:25 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, DEFINE AFFORDABILITY LITERALLY INSTEAD OF IN A WAY THAT SHUTS OUT MOST RESIDENTS WHO MOST NEED HOUSING, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Carol
California

From: Jean Balibrera
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, August 29, 2025 10:15:03 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Jean
California

From: Eve Tarquino
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, August 29, 2025 10:17:13 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,
Eve Tarquino

Eve

From: Ann Rubin
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, August 29, 2025 10:45:35 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Ann
California

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]
Date: Saturday, August 30, 2025 8:22:25 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 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): Mayor Lurie. There are plenty of empty buildings in SF where we can give affordable housing without looking like NY. Stop the tall monsters and stop making your buddies rich. If you need to build....build nothing over 4 stories. Please take this into consideration. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Diana Giampaoli
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: Cynthia Servetnick
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Saturday, August 30, 2025 8:25:45 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,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Cynthia
California

From:	teotose@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Beth Levitsn
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Saturday, August 30, 2025 8:27:13 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.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Beth Levitsn
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: Suzanne Schutte
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Wednesday, September 3, 2025 12:00:26 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 & Commissioners,

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

I am a retired high school teacher and a parent of 2 young adults and a son with ALS. My children grew up in San Fancisco as did I and my parents and grandparents. Two of my children have left San Francisco to find affordable housing elsewhere and I have worked tirelessly to find an apartment for my handicapped son and his caregivers. This once was a vibrant city where teachers and young families could live, raise their families and add their support to public schools and the community. We need more housing to make that possible

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.

Please support this bill!

Suzanne Schutte
suzannecschutte@gmail.com
2445 Pacific Ave
SAN FRANCISCO, California 94115

From: Anton Odqvist
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Wednesday, September 3, 2025 12:01:56 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 & Commissioners,

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.

Anton Odqvist
anton.odqvist@gmail.com
1428 Funston Ave
SAN FRANCISCO, California 94122

From: Abby Farrell
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Wednesday, September 3, 2025 12:08:41 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 & Commissioners,

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.

Abby Farrell
farrellabby3@gmail.com
1695 Beach St
San Francisco , California 94123

From: mlrinsfo@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Margo Rudd
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, September 3, 2025 12:38:01 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, 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,
Margo Rudd
San Francisco, CA 94123

From:	sbackman@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Susan Backman
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Wednesday, September 3, 2025 12:39:11 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

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 do not destroy our neighborhoods and make San Francisco just another cookie cutter city without vibrance and personality. Do not take away the what makes each neighborhood unique and ruin it with high rises that make no sense and do not solve issues of affordable housing.

Sincerely,
Susan Backman
San Francisco, CA 94118

From:	WMAECK@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of William Maeck
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Wednesday, September 3, 2025 12:39:14 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Hey Lurie,

You are an SF native. What are you thinking?
Is Sacramento telling you what to do?

It's insane.

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,
William Maeck
San Francisco, CA 94115

From: shop@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Beth Weissman
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, September 3, 2025 12:51:34 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: bill52kennedy@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of William Kennedy
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, September 3, 2025 12:56:04 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 not totally opposed to upzoning in SF. Having said that I believe the current proposal goes too far by allowing add-on heights that result in buildings out of scale with many neighborhoods. It seems to me that a more thoughtful approach that targets less developed areas around the Southeast waterfront would not only improve the desirability of these areas but also provide many new housing options. We do not have to destroy the human scale of existing San Francisco neighborhoods in order to get more affordable housing. We just need to develop wastelands like Candlestick point, more of the Hunter's point shipyard and the decaying portions of the South-Eastern Waterfront.

Sincerely,
William Kennedy
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: sfmeancat@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Renee Curran
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, September 3, 2025 1:04:27 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 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): Upzoning without any protections or guarantees of actual lived-in housing is simply a demolition plan designed to displace regular working people like me. It's unsustainable and cruel. It's time SF invested in its residents instead of providing more investment opportunities for billionaires.

Sincerely,
Renee Curran
San Francisco, CA 94122

From:	dcohen27@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of David Cohen
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Wednesday, September 3, 2025 1:14:34 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): As a resident of the Outer Richmond, I'm concerned about the drastically increased height limits in our oceanside neighborhoods, including the Richmond and the Sunset. These new buildings will be too far out of scale with the existing neighborhoods. I'd like to see us be more creative and think about how we can build additional housing near our downtown core, which has denser transit networks, access to BART, etc. and can better handle these taller buildings.

Sincerely,
David Cohen
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: witkasf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of SUSAN WITKA
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, September 3, 2025 1:27:26 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):

Sincerely,
SUSAN WITKA
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: mmmail2@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mary McFadden
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, September 3, 2025 2:26:08 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

Upzoning is not about affordability; the lack of affordable housing, health care, education, and necessities is a product of our unfair economic system. We cannot build our way out of problems caused by wealth disparity.

For example, say a house on a lot is listed at $1m. The developer/investors know that a home will sell for $1m. Upzoning allows a developer/investor to build ten housing units on that one piece of land, so the house has no value, but the land is worth $10m. Now all the neighborhood lots are worth $10m. Each unit doesn't sell for $100,000 $10 m ÷ 10 units), but each unit is listed at $1.5m and may sell for more, depending on who is buying it. By adding more units, that same lot is now worth $15m.

Another example, Vancouver, B.C. has tripled the number of housing units in the last 25 years. The population has not tripled, yet the average home price has gone from CA$400,000 to CA$1,700,000, a four-fold increase. The same is true in San Francisco, CA, where home prices rose 413% between 2000-2020 although the population rose by 12%. It is worth noting that the population rise in both cities was due to an influx of highly paid tech and finance workers, mostly white males, people mostly already in the top 10%.

Upzoning is just selling the city for profit. It is a giveaway to billionaire developers. You should be ashamed to support it.

Sincerely,
Mary McFadden
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: elainebregman@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Elaine Bregman
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, September 3, 2025 2:29:40 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,
Elaine Bregman
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: jscmamacita@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jocelyn Carter
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, September 3, 2025 3:13:53 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,
Jocelyn Carter
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: kielygomes@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Karen Schwartz
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, September 3, 2025 3:48:58 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,
Karen Schwartz
San Francisco, CA 94114

From:	jacksonwongesq@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jackson Wong
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Wednesday, September 3, 2025 4:35:37 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, 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): Re-zone the subject property along Laguna Honda Blvd out of the Forest Hill neighborhood that is governed by an HOA.

Sincerely,
Jackson Wong
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: bettymillermd@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Betty miller Kolotkin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, September 3, 2025 5:06:07 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):Building high rise structures would destroy the village shopping and family ambiance of our historic designated neighborhood.

Sincerely,
Betty miller Kolotkin
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: Ckar101@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kim Russo
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, September 3, 2025 8:48:52 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,
Kim Russo
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: judgold22@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Judith Goldstein
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, September 3, 2025 9:25:02 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 have lived in the Sunset most of my life and it has already gotten very congested. I live near Irving; there is terrible traffic and NO parking; I drive around for 20 minutes looking for parking. It is insane to build buildings with no parking. The sunset has always had a lower density and profile than other neighborhoods. Please don't ruin it. Please fill vacancies before building more and more ugly buildings that ruin the character of the neighborhood, don't provide parking, and increase traffic and pollution.

Sincerely,
Judith Goldstein
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: l_provenzale@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Laura Provenzale
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, September 3, 2025 10:08:48 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 will DESTROY what has made San Francisco such a unique and special place to live. You must Preserve historic and unique neighborhoods such as St Francis Wood and others or this city will be transformed negatively and permanently. Please, please, please stop this.

Sincerely,
Laura Provenzale
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: amangan@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Aileen Mangan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Thursday, September 4, 2025 9:46:26 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:

As a resident of San Francisco for over a decade, I've seen the negative impact of expensive new build apartment buildings in the city. Neighborhoods like Mission Bay are sterile, characterless, and extremely expensive. It is not a walkable neighborhood, public transit is very limited, and there are very few small businesses there, mostly chains. Please do not turn the rest of the city into that. Building housing can be done right and is needed, but this upzoning plan will just lead to even more expensive housing, driving out middle, working, and lower class citizens. I have zero confidence in the Mayor and his new agendas that will only benefit the wealthy. San Francisco is NOT a city for the wealthy. It has a rich history that would negatively impacted by this violent upzoning. THE PEOPLE DO NOT WANT THIS. LISTEN TO YOUR CITIZENS.

Sincerely,
Aileen Mangan
San Francisco, CA 94118

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:	Family Zoning Plan File Nos. 250700 and 250701 - 252 Letters
Date:	Thursday, August 28, 2025 1:09:28 PM
Attachments:	252 letters.pdf

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the attached 252 letters from members of the public regarding:

File No. 250700 - Ordinance amending the Zoning Map to implement the Family Zoning Plan by: amending the Zoning Use District Maps to: 1) reclassify certain properties currently zoned as various types of Residential to Residential Transit Oriented - Commercial (RTO-C); 2) reclassify properties currently zoned Residential Transit Oriented (RTO) to Residential Transit Oriented - 1 (RTO-1); 3) reclassify certain properties from Residential districts other than RTO to RTO-1; 4) reclassify certain properties currently zoned Neighborhood Commercial (NC) or Public (P) to Community Business (C-2); and 5) reclassify certain properties from Public to Mixed-Use or Neighborhood Commercial Districts; amending the Height and Bulk Map to: 1) reclassify properties in the Family Zoning Plan to R-4 Height and Bulk District; 2) change the height limits on certain lots in the R-4 Height and Bulk District; and 3) designating various parcels to be included in the Non-Contiguous San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Sites Special Use District (SFMTA SUD); amending the Local Coastal Program to: 1) reclassify all properties in the Coastal Zone to R-4 Height and Bulk District; 2) reclassify certain properties to RTO-C and Neighborhood Commercial District; 3) designate one parcel as part of the SFMTA SUD; and 4) directing the Planning Director to transmit the Ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of public necessity, convenience, and welfare under Planning Code, Section 302; making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and making findings under the City's Local Coastal Program and the California Coastal Act of 1976.

File No. 250701 - Ordinance amending the Planning Code to: 1) create the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program to incent housing development through a local bonus program and by adopting a Housing Sustainability District, 2) modify height and bulk limits to provide for additional capacity in well-resourced neighborhoods, and to allow additional height and bulk for projects using the local bonus program, 3) require only buildings taller than 85 feet in certain Districts to reduce ground level wind currents, 4) make conforming changes to the RH (Residential, House), RM (Residential, Mixed), and RC (Residential-Commercial) District zoning tables to reflect the changes to density controls, and parking requirements made in this Ordinance, 5) create the RTO-C (Residential Transit Oriented-Commercial) District, 6) implement the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's Transit-Oriented Communities Policy by making changes to parking requirements, minimum residential densities, and

minimum office intensities, and requiring maximum dwelling unit sizes, 7) revise off-street parking and curb cut obligations citywide, 8) create the Non-contiguous San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Sites Special Use District, 9) permit certain Legacy Businesses to relocate without a conditional use authorization and waive development impact fees for those businesses, 10) make technical amendments to the Code to implement the above changes, and 11) make conforming changes to zoning tables in various Districts, including the Neighborhood Commercial District and Mixed Use Districts; amending the Business and Tax Regulations Code regarding the Board of Appeals' review of permits in the Housing Choice Program Housing Sustainability District; amending the Local Coastal Program to implement the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program and other associated changes in the City's Coastal Zone, and directing the Planning Director to transmit the Ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment; 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 public necessity, convenience, and welfare findings under Planning Code, Section 302.

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:	Khalil Weldon Hoque
To:	Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS); ChenStaff
Subject:	I support more housing (via GrowSF.org)
Date:	Monday, July 28, 2025 1:27:57 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for more housing in San Francisco, including Mayor Lurie's family zoning plan.

As polling consistently shows, the vast majority of San Francisco residents across all demographics support building more housing. We need to:

- Support Mayor Lurie's family zoning plan to allow more housing on the west side
- Allow taller buildings near transit stops and major corridors
- Streamline the permitting process to reduce delays and costs
- Stop letting a vocal minority of NIMBYs block housing that our city desperately needs

San Francisco is 90% behind on our state-mandated housing goals. If we don't act soon, the state will strip our city of local control over zoning and development. We must build more housing to address our affordability crisis and ensure San Francisco remains a place where families can afford to live.

Thank you for your leadership on this critical issue.

From:	Prodan Statev
To:	Fielder, Jackie (BOS)
Cc:	FielderStaff; Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); act+sfpd-recruiting@growsf.org
Subject:	I support more housing (via GrowSF.org)
Date:	Monday, July 28, 2025 1:55:16 PM

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

Dear Supervisor Fielder,

I'm a resident of District 9 (16th and South Van Ness). I'm writing to express my strong support for more housing in San Francisco, including Mayor Lurie's family zoning plan.

As polling consistently shows, the vast majority of San Francisco residents across all demographics support building more housing. We need to:
- Support Mayor Lurie's family zoning plan to allow more housing on the west side
- Allow taller buildings near transit stops and major corridors
- Streamline the permitting process to reduce delays and costs
- Stop letting a vocal minority of NIMBYs block housing that our city desperately needs

San Francisco is 90% behind on our state-mandated housing goals. If we don't act soon, the state will strip our city of local control over zoning and development. We must build more housing to address our affordability crisis and ensure San Francisco remains a place where families can afford to live.

Thank you for your leadership on this critical issue.

Prodan
487 S Van Ness Ave

From:	Michael Ducker
To:	Sherrill, Stephen (BOS)
Cc:	SherrillStaff; Chan, Connie (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); act+sfpd-recruiting@growsf.org
Subject:	I support more housing (via GrowSF.org)
Date:	Monday, July 28, 2025 3:15:41 PM

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

Dear Supervisor Sherrill,

I'm a resident of District 2. I'm writing to express my strong support for more housing in San Francisco, including Mayor Lurie's family zoning plan.

As polling consistently shows, the vast majority of San Francisco residents across all demographics support building more housing. We need to:

- Support Mayor Lurie's family zoning plan to allow more housing on the west side
- Allow taller buildings near transit stops and major corridors
- Streamline the permitting process to reduce delays and costs
- Stop letting a vocal minority of NIMBYs block housing that our city desperately needs

San Francisco is 90% behind on our state-mandated housing goals. If we don't act soon, the state will strip our city of local control over zoning and development. We must build more housing to address our affordability crisis and ensure San Francisco remains a place where families can afford to live.

Thank you for your leadership on this critical issue.

Sent from my iPhone

From:	Carrie Barnes
To:	Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS); ChenStaff; act+more-housing@growsf.org
Subject:	I support more housing (via GrowSF.org)
Date:	Saturday, August 2, 2025 11:28:03 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for more housing in San Francisco, including Mayor Lurie's family zoning plan.

As polling consistently shows, the vast majority of San Francisco residents across all demographics support building more housing.

San Francisco is 90% behind on our state-mandated housing goals. If we don't act soon, the state will strip our city of local control over zoning and development. We must build more housing to address our affordability crisis and ensure San Francisco becomes a place where families can afford to live.

Thank you for your leadership on this critical issue.

Carrie Barnes (thank you again!)

Sent from my iPhone

From:	Pauline Lambert
To:	Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS); ChenStaff; act+more-housing@growsf.org
Subject:	I support more housing (via GrowSF.org)
Date:	Saturday, August 2, 2025 12:10:38 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for more housing in San Francisco, including Mayor Lurie's family zoning plan.

As polling consistently shows, the vast majority of San Francisco residents across all demographics support building more housing.

San Francisco is 90% behind on our state-mandated housing goals. If we don't act soon, the state will strip our city of local control over zoning and development. We must build more housing to address our affordability crisis and ensure San Francisco becomes a place where families can afford to live.

Thank you for your leadership on this critical issue.

From:	Andrew Lee
To:	Mahmood, Bilal (BOS)
Cc:	MahmoodStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); act+more-housing@growsf.org
Subject:	I support more housing (via GrowSF.org)
Date:	Saturday, August 2, 2025 12:45:31 PM

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

Dear Supervisor Mahmood,

I'm a resident of District 5. I'm writing to express my strong support for more housing in San Francisco, including Mayor Lurie's family zoning plan.

As polling consistently shows, the vast majority of San Francisco residents across all demographics support building more housing. We need to:

- Support Mayor Lurie's family zoning plan to allow more housing on the west side
- Allow taller buildings near transit stops and major corridors
- Streamline the permitting process to reduce delays and costs
- Stop letting a vocal minority of NIMBYs block housing that our city desperately needs

San Francisco is 90% behind on our state-mandated housing goals. If we don't act soon, the state will strip our city of local control over zoning and development. We must build more housing to address our affordability crisis and ensure San Francisco becomes a place where families can afford to live.

Referencing the article for easy access - https://growsf.org/research/2025-07-28-how-popular-is-housing/

Thank you for your leadership on this critical issue!

Best,
Andrew

From:	Thom Vavrina-Flores
To:	Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS); ChenStaff; act+more-housing@growsf.org
Subject:	I support more housing (via GrowSF.org)
Date:	Saturday, August 2, 2025 12:54:33 PM

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

Dear Supervisors, I'm writing to express my strong support for more housing in San Francisco, including Mayor Lurie's family zoning plan. As polling consistently shows, the vast majority of San Francisco residents across all demographics support building more housing. San Francisco is 90% behind on our state-mandated housing goals. If we don't act soon, the state will strip our city of local control over zoning and development. We must build more housing to address our affordability crisis and ensure San Francisco becomes a place where families can afford to live. Thank you for your leadership on this critical issue.

Thom Vavrina-Flores
631 Ofarrell St

From:	Angelica Michela
To:	Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	ChanStaff (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); act+more-housing@growsf.org
Subject:	I support more housing (via GrowSF.org)
Date:	Saturday, August 2, 2025 3:26:10 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for more housing in San Francisco, including Mayor Lurie's family zoning plan.

As polling consistently shows, the vast majority of San Francisco residents across all demographics support building more housing.

San Francisco is 90% behind on our state-mandated housing goals. If we don't act soon, the state will strip our city of local control over zoning and development. We must build more housing to address our affordability crisis and ensure San Francisco becomes a place where families can afford to live.

Thank you for your leadership on this critical issue.

Angelica Michela
District 7

Sent from my iPhone

From:	Annette Billingsley
To:	Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS); ChenStaff; act+more-housing@growsf.org
Subject:	I support more housing (via GrowSF.org)
Date:	Sunday, August 3, 2025 7:25:39 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for more housing in San Francisco, including Mayor Lurie's family zoning plan.

As polling consistently shows, the vast majority of San Francisco residents across all demographics support building more housing.

San Francisco is 90% behind on our state-mandated housing goals. If we don't act soon, the state will strip our city of local control over zoning and development. We must build more housing to address our affordability crisis and ensure San Francisco becomes a place where families can afford to live.

Thank you for your leadership on this critical issue.

Sent from my iPad

From:	Emily McDonnell
To:	Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS); ChenStaff; act+more-housing@growsf.org
Subject:	I support more housing (via GrowSF.org)
Date:	Monday, August 4, 2025 2:35:01 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for more housing in San Francisco, including Mayor Lurie's family zoning plan.

As polling consistently shows, the vast majority of San Francisco residents across all demographics support building more housing.

San Francisco is 90% behind on our state-mandated housing goals. If we don't act soon, the state will strip our city of local control over zoning and development. We must build more housing to address our affordability crisis and ensure San Francisco becomes a place where families can afford to live.

Thank you for your leadership on this critical issue.

Emily McDonnell
94110

From:	Tracy Tran
To:	Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS); ChenStaff; act+more-housing@growsf.org
Subject:	I support more housing (via GrowSF.org)
Date:	Monday, August 4, 2025 4:18:57 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for more housing in San Francisco, including Mayor Lurie's family zoning plan.

As polling consistently shows, the vast majority of San Francisco residents across all demographics support building more housing.

San Francisco is 90% behind on our state-mandated housing goals. If we don't act soon, the state will strip our city of local control over zoning and development. We must build more housing to address our affordability crisis and ensure San Francisco becomes a place where families can afford to live.

Thank you for your leadership on this critical issue.

From:	Santosh Jayaram
To:	Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	MandelmanStaff (BOS); act+more-housing@growsf.org
Subject:	Please act on SF housing needs..
Date:	Tuesday, August 5, 2025 6:13:16 AM

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

Rafa:

I am writing to urge you to prioritize more housing in San Francisco, including Mayor Lurie's family zoning plan.

Too many families are being priced out, and our city is falling dangerously behind on its state housing targets—by about 90%. If we fail to act, we risk losing local control over zoning altogether. Building more homes isn't just about meeting quotas; it's about ensuring San Francisco remains a place where people from all walks of life can live, work, and raise families.

I appreciate your attention to this issue and your efforts to help make San Francisco a city that is affordable and welcoming for everyone.

Sincerely,

Santosh Jayaram

PS: I am a supporter of yours and appreciate what you do on the board. Thank you.

From:	Stephen Voris
To:	Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS); ChenStaff; act+more-housing@growsf.org
Subject:	I support more housing (via GrowSF.org)
Date:	Tuesday, August 5, 2025 4:55:21 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for more housing in San Francisco, including Mayor Lurie's family zoning plan.

As polling consistently shows, the vast majority of San Francisco residents across all demographics support building more housing.

San Francisco is 90% behind on our state-mandated housing goals. If we don't act soon, the state will strip our city of local control over zoning and development. We must build more housing to address our affordability crisis and ensure San Francisco becomes a place where families can afford to live.

Thank you for your leadership on this critical issue.

Sent from my iPhone

From:	Paul
To:	Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS); ChenStaff; act+more-housing@growsf.org
Subject:	Yes! I support more housing (via GrowSF.org)
Date:	Wednesday, August 27, 2025 10:16:29 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,
I'm writing to express my strong support for more housing in San Francisco, including Mayor Lurie's family zoning plan. As someone who rented in the sunset for 8 plus years and recently switched to owning a home, yes, you betcha, pretty please, let's build more for all types and income levels and family sizes.

This seems to be in line with the polling. Polling consistently shows that the vast majority of San Francisco residents across all demographics support building more housing.

San Francisco is way, way, way behind on our state-mandated housing goals. If we don't act soon, the state will strip our city of local control over zoning and development. We must build more housing to address our affordability crisis and ensure San Francisco becomes a place where families can afford to live.

Thank you for your leadership on this critical issue.
Paul Foppe
2301 Lincoln Way
San Francisco, CA 94122

From:	scarampi@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sebastiano Scarampi
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Tuesday, August 5, 2025 12:57:22 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):i moved to San Francisco 50 years ago for its character and UNESCO world site beauty. Treating this beautiful, unique city like an unremarkable piece of developable land is a crime against beauty and reason. STOP IT!
Also, the city has lost by emigration since Covid enough population to render unnecessary the building of the mandated 80,000 units. Why this urge to destroy neighborhoods for the sake of increasing density that residents don’t want or need?

Sincerely,
Sebastiano Scarampi
San Francisco, CA 94115

From: koelsch1886@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Leslie Koelsch
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 1:05:32 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,
Leslie Koelsch
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: 4lisavukovic@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lisa Vukovic
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 1:25:19 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): Nothing about the plan tackles affordable housing. We have tons of empty warehouses in the Dogpatch and other neighborhoods that could be expanded. We shouldn't ruin well established, expensive neighborhoods with putting in new developments that ARE NOT affordable.

Sincerely,
Lisa Vukovic
San Francisco, CA 94108

From: erikashe@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Erika Shershun
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 1:26:33 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,
Erika Shershun
San Francisco, CA 94109

From:	bapresta@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Barbara Presta
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Tuesday, August 5, 2025 1:29:40 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 long time San Franciscan, I am writing to express my strong opposition to Mayor Lurie's upzoning plan. While I understand the need to addres housing, this approach would encourage wide spread demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors. High-rises are out of character with our neighborhoods and unafordabl for most San Franciscans.

We call on you to:

- Significantly reduce and scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Delay the January 2026 upzoning deadline to allow meaningful public input.

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.

The upzoning may serve powerful developers, but it does not serve the people of this city. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Barbara Presta
San Francisco, CA 94123

From:	mcheylin@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mary Heylin
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Tuesday, August 5, 2025 2:05:41 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,
Mary Heylin
San Francisco, CA 94123

From:	shashacooks@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Anastasia Yovanopoulos
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Tuesday, August 5, 2025 2:19:13 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]

Dear elected officials,

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,
Anastasia Yovanopoulos
San Francisco, CA 94114

Sincerely,
Anastasia Yovanopoulos
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: kielygomes@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of K. Schwartz
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 2:31:33 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): SAVE OUR CITY! We have 70K (?) new units already approved, let's add 15K more and STOP and see how the infrastructure holds up… build on the outskirts of town, like HISTORIC cities all over the world have done to expand. The Bayview is available, with a transit line there, don't destroy our Victorian neighborhoods!! In my neighborhood, Duboce Park is turning 125 years old soon, we love our quality of life with no density increases.

Sincerely,
K. Schwartz
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: njzajac@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Nancy Zajac
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 2:31:57 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,
Nancy Zajac
San Francisco, CA 94122

From:	epml@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Michael Larsen
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Tuesday, August 5, 2025 3:17:04 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,
Michael Larsen
San Francisco, CA 94109

From:	pete@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Peter Solvik
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Tuesday, August 5, 2025 3:19:19 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 voting and tax paying 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.

Sincerely,
Peter Solvik
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: patricia_sur@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Patricia Sur
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 3:31:07 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. I do support taller buildings in already-commercialized 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,
Patricia Sur
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: ademas1@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of ANITA DEMAS
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 3:41:43 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 disgusted and disappointed in this zoning non-solution. It will be disastrous to the look, feel and fabric of our city. The fact that affordability is not the main goal and that all the up-zoning is occurring along high rent corridors is proof that this is not to solve the housing crisis but to enrich developers and those with a financial stake in the plan. Shame on you all for entertaining this.

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,
ANITA DEMAS
San Francisco, CA 94118

From: randymazzei@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Randall Mazzei
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 3:52:43 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,
Randall Mazzei
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: nuptial.51.boxes@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of stephanie de maria
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 4:27:56 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

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):

North Beach is a historical district and needs to remain so - no up zoning in the most dense neighborhood in San Francisco

Sincerely,
stephanie de maria
San Francisco, CA 94133

From:	mary.hall.benjamin@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mary Benjamin
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Tuesday, August 5, 2025 5:31:14 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: the Marina District is a charming “village” that retains the original buildings and atmosphere from its concept. The new ordinance to allow tall buildings will ruin this.

Sincerely,
Mary Benjamin
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: monicareina@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Monica Reina Kadner
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 6:38:28 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 am not against creating real affordable housing for everyone but it should not be at the risk of destroying the soul of our dear city. High rises are not a good idea in a seismic area. We should build beautiful homes no taller than 4-6 stories and repurpose all those taller empty building that are already part of the looks in downtown San Francisco where a lot of people can also live and there is enough public transportation.

Sincerely,
Monica Reina Kadner
San Francisco, CA 94118

From: markphil711@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mark Philpott
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 7:15:27 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Greetings All,

I've lived in San Francisco since my mid-twenties, and have a five year Bachelor of Architecture with a concertration in Urban Design from Cal Poly, san Luis Obispo. I've toiled variously and called San Francisco home through a number of economic and population ups and downs. I think the current upzoning plans under consideration are too extreme, and will result in the displacement of existing businesses and renters that may not have a subsequent round of luck regarding housing or business endeavors. Vancouver, Canada undertook similar upzoning ideas, and the result was merely more and more luxury housing and or pied a terres, and the last time I checked some of the recently built luxury highrises in San Francisco aren't necessarily selling like hotcakes anymore anyway, so even more luxury housing seems less ideal.

An urban designer and professor from Vancouver suggested one solution is to make potential developments less dense and tall, and require a percentage of the new units to be available at below market rate. Often, developers can make money on new projects with a few concessions, it's just that their boatload of profit would be smaller. I don't think a smaller profit boat is too great a burden on developers.

Too, if indeed, the state government is brow-beating San Francisco into creating new housing asap, well, the commercial vacancy rate downtown, in the commercial core, is still at about 35%. That's one out of three square feet sitting unused. I suggest getting together development incentives for the conversion of commercial to residential, and simultaneously (maybe it would be somewhat easy for liscensed architects with a certain scope) compile a list of the manditory conversion procedures necessary (air ciruclation systems, fires egress stairwells, etc) in order for "Sally Developer" to somewhat expiditiously approach such a conversion process. The thing is, even if some of the downtown buildings are not exactly the most graceful of architectural sculptures, they are already there, and their conversions won't drastically change San Francisco's overall existing urban texture, nor destroy view corridors, nor displace businesses and tenants.

Please please be careful with upzoning. San Francisco's a neat place, and you could destroy that forever. That's in your grasp. What about more housing projects on wasted flat areas out in Hunter's Point, Mission Rock, or Dogpatch: ie, in the SE corner of the city? You really can't expect to shove 60,000 housing units out in the Richmond and have everyone there on board for the new deal. Please please think about what you're doing.

And I hate to bring this up but we're not even really talking about housing the working class can afford. People won't Bart on over to scrub toilets at the Hilton until the end of time. We need housing people in the 50k to 100k a year income bracket can afford. It's nowhere these days. And then too there's housing 8000 homeless. We really need a comprehensive housing for the future strategy and plan that includes homes for people all the way from homeless to 150k a year. Okay thanks for your time and have a great day.

Sincerely,
Mark Philpott
San Francisco, CA 94109

From:	marlowekarl@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Marlowe Bjorklund
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Tuesday, August 5, 2025 7:50:07 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): Maintaining the architectural and cultural integrity of San Francisco is possible while also finding ways to add more housing and address issues like homelessness in our city. The need is to develop our city without becoming something we are not. We need to focus on adding more public housing and transport to allow easier access to our "working" neighborhoods. Save the city's architectural history and spirit.

Sincerely,
Marlowe Bjorklund
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: deniselleck@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Denise Selleck
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 9:52:48 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,
Denise Selleck
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: kielygomes@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Karen Schwartz
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 10:23:31 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.

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):
SAVE OUR CITY! All over the world HISTORIC cities have preserved their original core, spreading out new housing in the periphery. Build in SOMA, in the Bayview, etc.
In my neighborhood (D8) Duboce Park will soon be 125 years old, and we love the existing ambiance/density. Don’t ruin it!

Sincerely,
Karen Schwartz
San Francisco, CA 94114

From:	meilie.wong@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mei Lie Wong
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Tuesday, August 5, 2025 10:33:39 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):San Francisco does not need anymore expensive high rise buildings. Do something about the empty buildings down town. If another college or school comes to the city, where are those service people, professors, students etc. going to live. Are they going to be able to afford more of the same that has already been built?

Sincerely,
Mei Lie Wong
San Francisco, CA 94117

From: carolkellyclark@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Carol Clark
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 11:09:25 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.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Carol Clark
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: peterboothlee@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Peter Lee
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 11:16:55 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,
Peter Lee
San Francisco, CA 94118

From:	marcimander@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Marcia Manderscheid
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Wednesday, August 6, 2025 5:39:22 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): I have enjoyed living in Pacific Heights for more than 50 years. Please take another look and revise this destructive plan.

Sincerely,
Marcia Manderscheid
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: merijohn@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of George Merijohn
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, August 6, 2025 5:45:24 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to respectfully request that you:

1) Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

2) Substantially scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps

Mayor Lurie's current housing plan will be voted on by the Planning Commission on September 11, 2025. If I were not scheduled to be away from SF that day, I would be at this meeting to offer my opposition argument in person.

I am deeply invested in San Francisco and have been for 40 years: I live here, work here, vote here, volunteer here, run businesses here. Please revisit this plan now. It is a free pass to demolish existing homes, displace renters and small businesses, and transform our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors. There is no guarantee of substantially increasing affordable housing in this plan and this is what SF needs the most. We don't need to build more luxury high rises in the city.

Please don't let the lobbyists and politicians who stand to profit from this plan permanently disfigure and diminish the quality of life of the people who live and work here.

SF does not need to be sold out to the highest bidder for short-sighted gain. The city needs a ground-up holistic 30 year sustainability plan, not a free pass to developers to stack in more lxury condos.

Mayor Lurie's current upzoning maps will 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 over building of luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers, lobbyists and conflicted politicians who stand to gain from it. They also gag and silence the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
George Merijohn
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: mathias1us@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Marcy Israel
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable [File No: 250700 and 250701]
Date: Wednesday, August 6, 2025 8:35:30 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

The corridors scheduled to be upzoned are inappropriate and out of proportion. There are many parts of the city that can be developed with higher buildings that are not now developed. Impacting neighborhoods is not the way to provide housing. What is the purpose for example of tall buildings along Fulton Street? It is to give "park view" housing, not affordable housing.

The charm of San Francisco is in the unique architecture of neighborhoods. Tall buildings also create wind tunnels and effect t he environmment.

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's upzoning plan, which would encourage the demolition of existing homes, displace renters and small businesses, and turn our neighborhoods into corridors of unaffordable luxury towers.

This plan empowers developers, silences residents, and is being rushed to satisfy a state mandate that's outdated and out of touch with San Francisco's current reality. That mandate should be challenged — not used to justify permanent zoning changes.

You can not rewrite the city's land use overnight with most residents unaware. And once this plan is adopted, there is no going back — even if it proves disastrous.

We urge you to:

– Protect renters and small businesses
– Preserve neighborhood scale and historic character
– Require real affordability
– Slow the process and engage the public

Don't rush a decision that will reshape San Francisco forever. We need thoughtful planning — and leadership that listens.

Sincerely,
Marcy Israel
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: upzoneoverreachemail@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Vance Nesbitt
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, August 6, 2025 8:57:17 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.

KEEP SAN FRANCISCO, SAN FRANCISCO!

Sincerely,
Vance Nesbitt
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: wi110w2ree@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Corey Bostrom
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, August 6, 2025 9:40:02 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 Sunset sits on top of sand dunes and limestone, too soft for a mega structure that only rich people can afford. I most certainly hope environmental impacts will be done, cause lately it seems like our so called civic leaders are circumventing that process and doing what they want. I guess it's acceptable to create many more future sinking Millennial towers all over the place? Seems nothing was learned from that debacle.

How about stop letting foreign investors buy housing they don't live in that drive up the market making it unaffordable for actual residents and citizens to buy or even rent. Very sad when my childhood friend saves her money for years to purchase a house in the City she was born and raised in, only to have a foreign investor come in and out bid her with cash. This is ridiculous, I'm all for more housing, but there has to be a better way without stealing from residents and businesses.

Overall this is an AFFORDABILITY crisis. I see for rent signs all over, just way too expensive. So let's just displace the people already living here. Take more parking spaces and driving areas away while wanting even more people to live here. Steal whole blocks of land, displace people and lie. You guys don't care or listen to anything. Your way or no way.

I'm a San Francisco native and I'm sad and disappointed at what is happening. You can't even get the homeless situation under control and now with the upzoning and future land grab even more good hard working citizens and families will be up rooted. But then again it's beginning to feel like our City politicians only want rich people to live here, might as well gate the whole City off.

Sincerely,
Corey Bostrom
San Francisco, CA 94116

From:	pat.gray8@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Patricia Gray
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Wednesday, August 6, 2025 9:48:49 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):Senator Weiner and Mayor Lurie should be fighting against these changes at the state and local levels! They are both aware that the additional housing is not needed. Our neighborhoods need to be revitalized and both the roads and Muni services improved.

Sincerely,
Patricia Gray
San Francisco, CA 94132

From: irismvbucchioni@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Iris Bucchioni
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, August 6, 2025 10:45:10 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.

San Francisco is a gem and it's character is made up of the many different neighborhoods within. Let's make sure these neighborhoods will continue to exist. The flavors and uniqueness of San Francisco are at stake. Preserve, protect, restore. Let's first focus on integrating the already approved construction for new housing and second, let's seriously look at our existing and unutilized buildings to meet the demand of affordable housing.

Sincerely,
Iris Bucchioni
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: upnup8@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Amy Jang
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, August 6, 2025 10:47:43 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 (optional): I would be ok with this type of upzoning if you could limit it to every other block or opposite corners. If you do this and you end up with 3-4 or 5 upzoned buildings on a single block, that would change sunlight access and mess up the vibe of the Richmond District.

Sincerely,
Amy Jang
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: Ckar101@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kim Russo
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, August 6, 2025 10:53:08 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,
Kim Russo
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: jknjl127@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jill Bittner
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, August 6, 2025 10:53:52 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 shameful 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 keep the beauty and charm of San Francisco intact. Don't turn SF into another ugly high rise disaster like Vancouver! Oppose the reckless and disgraceful sellout to developers of San Francisco through upzoning!

Sincerely,
Jill Bittner
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: shorak1234@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Steven Horak
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, August 6, 2025 11:16:11 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,
Steven Horak
San Francisco, CA 94127

From:	sbackman@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Susan Backman
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Wednesday, August 6, 2025 11:56:48 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. Leave this old legacy neighborhoods alone. And move all of the concerts from Golden Gate Park to China Basin where there is less disruption!

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Susan Backman
San Francisco, CA 94118

From: msmc5354@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of M Chin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, August 6, 2025 12:17:56 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): This upzoning plan will remove much of the character that makes San Francisco an historic and beautiful city. Do not accede to these unfortunate plans.

Sincerely,
M Chin

From:	sunsetsandy98@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sandy Glover
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Wednesday, August 6, 2025 12:43:21 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,
Sandy Glover
San Francisco, CA 94116

From:	janesmalley1@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jane Smalley
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Wednesday, August 6, 2025 12:58:35 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):

Sincerely,
Jane Smalley
San Francisco, CA 94118

From:	randymazzei@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Randy Mazzei
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Wednesday, August 6, 2025 1:29:23 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.

Sincerely,
Randy Mazzei
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: bobby8400@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Bobby Malhotra
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, August 6, 2025 1:38:33 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,
Bobby Malhotra
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: judyrobosf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mary Judith Robinson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, August 6, 2025 1:58:54 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I strongly oppose all efforts to upzone large areas of San Francisco as proposed by the Mayor and District 3 Supervisor. The proposals abrogate much public input that is critical to radical changes in the city's design and demeanor. They falsely claim that they will increase housing, which at present is readily available in many empty buildings in the city.

The results would destroy the physical beauty of a city popular for that very reason with tourists and residents alike. I am a long-time property owner in the Telegraph Hill-North Beach district and supporter of preserving historic sites - NOT demolishing them in the name of misleading claims of providing affordable housing.

Please OPPOSE ALL UPZONING plans and listen to city residents' views on the subject.

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.

Sincerely,
Mary Judith Robinson
San Francisco, CA 94133

From:	patricia_inez@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Patrice Thompson
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Wednesday, August 6, 2025 3:41:20 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.
I am a public high school teacher. The needs of the ordinary people, some of them poor, I serve are not being met by the massive upzoning that you are proposing. It benefits the developers and perhaps California senators like Scott Weiner, who is from back east, but it does not benefit children, elderly or middle-aged people in this city, and we are the people who elected you.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Patrice Thompson
San Francisco, CA 94121

From:	shop@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of beth weissman
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Wednesday, August 6, 2025 3:48:22 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):This type of thing happened in the 60's and hurt SF unimaginably. The "buck teeth" on the water, the ugly high rises on Broadway, the list goes on and on. We live in SF neighborhoods to NOT be New York, to be able to see water and greenery. If you have to build high rises, build them downtown where it's already a high rise area. This is a ridiculous plan

Sincerely,
beth weissman
San Francisco, CA 94115

From:	bisho@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of David F Bisho
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Wednesday, August 6, 2025 3:51:46 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Gentlemen and Gentleladies:

Pls do not let this happen. Our area here, Westwood Highlands Association, a single family neighborhood, like the Planning Commission, by the way, is now over 100 years old.

It was 100 years of planning with its hard-fought and myriad of zoning designations that gave the city its culturally rich rand diverse charm that it still has.

Please do not allow this hijacking/developers dream to happen. You don't have to. I venture to say that NO resident in San Francisco wants it. Please.
Sincerely
David F Bisho, President
Westwood Highlands Association
www.Westwood Highlands.org
415-290-7267

Sincerely,
David F Bisho
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: kevin.durrance@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kevin Durrance
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, August 6, 2025 4:03:10 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
- Take the time to craft a plan that does not create tall walls of buildings along transit corridors with no affordability guarantee. This is a once in a lifetime opportunity to map out a more dense but still livable west side.
- The current plan bisects most of the impacted blocks. The plan proposes upzoning on one side of the block while holding current heigh limits on the immediately adjacent parcels (the other half of the impacted blocks). This penalizes residents like me on those adjacent parcels. It also lowers the probability that additional housing will actually be developed due to the higher construction costs of these tall skinny building on residential sized lots.
- I understand the logic of increasing density close to public transit corridors, but the upzoning should be spread out over larger areas. That would still be within 5-10 min walks to public transit. This would actually increase the probability of new housing being built vs. the current proposal.
- The proposed plan will turn 19th Ave from Lincoln to Wawona into a walled 6 lane road. Why was the upzoning not designed to have height breaks on 19th Ave by spreading the upzoning also along the adjacent streets from Lincoln Viicente? Your proposal walls off views to the ocean for everyone east of 19th Ave.
- I support upzoning and density increases in general, but this plan does more harm than good.

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.

Sincerely,
Kevin Durrance
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: marinamorenous@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Marina Moreno
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, August 6, 2025 4:46:04 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 been a resident in San Francisco since 1986. I've seen a lot of change, a lot of boom and bust, and participated in a couple of the Tech ups and downs myself, as I always worked in the City.

I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which promotes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and local/small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

I design cabinets and closets for work, so I go to EVERY SINGLE corner of the city. I have seen how dead downtown office space is, yet a lack of planning on how all this empty space can be retrofitted to low and middle income housing. The answer is not to build more, but to MAKE IMMEDIATELY ACCESSIBLE all the space that is already there, and all the homes left vacant by foreign real estate investment speculators. WHILE LOWERING THE RED TAPE for home owners who want to organically add family and friend ADUs to make existing footprint a lot more dense.

All those luxury condos are simply second homes and pied-a-terre for rich people who have their primary residence in the suburbs and want a place to crash when they come party in our town. I know this is oversimplified, but I do see it first hand every single day, as these are my clients! Few of these new folks in new apartments are middle income people, NONE are low income people. Let's be real, please.

We demand 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.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Marina Moreno
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: stricker7@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Raphael Stricker
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, August 6, 2025 5:24:46 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 moved to charming San Francisco to get away from the crowds, noise and pollution of New York City. Please don't turn the charm of SF into the grit of NYC.

Sincerely,
Raphael Stricker
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: pass58@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of L Chin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, August 6, 2025 5:49:37 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, 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:

- REJECT the Mayor’s upzoning maps, that SF citizens OPPOSE
- 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. It is nothing but an excuse to shove destruction down the throats of every San Franciscan, while Lurie fails to address the actual problems of crime, drugs, public safety, homelessness and a worsening business environment with rational solutions.

Sincerely,
L Chin

From: sf21roger@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Roger Weinman
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, August 6, 2025 8:57:08 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We will vote you out.

SF is for people, not VC$.

You will continue to thrive bc of your greed.

SF had a good run, until you and your VC buds.

Grow up,
RW

Sincerely,
Roger Weinman
San Francisco, CA 94133

From:	vozalegre@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of L. Diaz
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Wednesday, August 6, 2025 11:24:06 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):
It has been proven time and time again that renters affected by these displacements are rarely able to returned to the "new" buildings built after their exit.
This is also a "legal" strategy to eliminate rent controlled eligibility all together due to the buildings' new construction year.
Plus, there is the obvious lack of affordable inventory for renters to move to another equal living space than the one they were just forced to vacate.

Sincerely,
L. Diaz
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: danaamarisa@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Dana Amarisa
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Thursday, August 7, 2025 4:28:31 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

No to Mayor Lurie's plan!!! -
As a San Franciso Cow Hollow resident, living in the apartment that my great-grandfather built when he heeded the call the City made to anyone with the means to please build housing after the great earthquake of 1906, 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 ruin my neighborhood. It would turn my home into a tourist area with high-rises built right next to my two-story house!! This imposes 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,
Dana Amarisa
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: sbogatsky@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sergei Bogatsky
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Thursday, August 7, 2025 8:23:26 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,
Sergei Bogatsky
San Francisco, CA 94116

From:	mauberret@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Raymond Mauberrrt
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Thursday, August 7, 2025 9:04:19 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):
Native San Franciscan apauled and concerned with unreasonable hight of ongoing and Proposed building projects throughout the city .
Potentially changing flavor and charm of this
Great city.

Sincerely,
Raymond Mauberrrt
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: sebraleaves@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of sebra leaves
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Thursday, August 7, 2025 10:06:36 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,
sebra leaves
San Francisco, CA 94110

From: selizabethvaughan@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Susan Vaughan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Thursday, August 7, 2025 10:16:02 AM

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:

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 plans will also destroy the architectural beauty and charm of San Francisco. Beauty and charm have value. Who wants to live in a Soviet-style hell scape of concrete high rises? A childhood friend from rural Pennsylvania recently visited. She had never been to San Francisco, and she was enchanted by even my comparatively architecturally dull neighborhood -- the Richmond District. She encouraged me to work against plans that would transform my neighborhood, uglify it, and eliminate the wonderful light that permeates the northwestern avenues.

I don't mind occasional CU authorization for taller corner buildings with high percentages of affordable housing. There are plenty of such corners along Geary Boulevard that could be so transformed. But I am also concerned about small, neighborhood serving-businesses -- my grocery stores, such as Del Rio on Clement Street (formerly "El Chico"), the market on 25th and Clement, the wonderful variety of stores on Lower Clement Street, east of Park Presidio. I am concerned about my corner cafes, my nearby hardware stores, the pottery studios that have been popping up throughout the neighborhood, my bicycle shops, pet stores, stationary and gift stores such as Gables, and the Eastern European delis. We also have a rich restaurant scene here. What happens when the buildings they are in are demolished? They are unlikely to be able to afford the rent in the buildings that replace them.

When I first came to the Richmond District 35 years ago, I took the 38 Geary west on Geary Blvd when the fog was rolling in. I felt like I was in the West Coast version of Brooklyn, and I felt as if the fog were calling my name. I lived in this neighborhood ever since.

Don't destroy it.

Moreover, there is quite a bit of housing construction going on in the Richmond District. In fact, in 2020, a 12-unit condominium building opened on what had been a privately-owned parking lot one block from me. Most of the

units were not yet occupied in 2020, but at least one was occupied by a woman who had another home in San Jose. This is NOT the kind of housing that San Francisco needs. We need permanent housing for people of average income. In addition, the retail space on the ground floor remains unoccupied. What small businesses can afford the rent in these new buildings?

Sincerely,
Susan Vaughan
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: jtomkins@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of James Tomkins
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Thursday, August 7, 2025 11:15:10 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): Clearly a rich interests power grab. There are much better solutions such as utilizing the 40k or so empty properties in SF. It also ruins small business and neighborhood character. We are watching this and aware how right wing $$$ SF politics really is and we will resist this strongly!

Sincerely,
James Tomkins
San Francisco, CA 94132

From: sourcherrycomics@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Leah Morrett
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Thursday, August 7, 2025 11:50:35 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):

As a small business owner in an impacted area, my business which serves the Mission District and more specifically a historically marginalized and underserved community (LGBTQ+, BIPOC), I am especially concerned for the impact that this will have on our community as it will displace my business and many residents in this community- including myself and my wife who also received this notice at our personal address. This is a major sellout to developers and greedy real estate lobby at the expense of our most vulnerable community members. Long term residents of working class background and elderly residents who have lived in their rent controlled apartments are at risk, and we cannot afford the “market rate” housing that will spring up at rates subject to the whims of greedy landlords.

The loss of my business and the many other small businesses that are in these areas will be a huge blow to the culture and community in this city- which is the very reason that people move here and visit this beautiful city to begin with.

This rezoning plan will have long lasting effects that will destroy the vibrant and diverse culture of this city, or what is left of it. This is a sell out to greed and monied interests that will leave San Francisco a lifeless husk of beige and grey.

Sincerely,
Leah Morrett
San Francisco, CA 94114

From:	mollye303@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Molly Bodrato Gentile
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Thursday, August 7, 2025 1:22:50 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We moved to the Outer Sunset as a happy medium between city and suburban living. The taller buildings currently under construction have already changed the skyline and impacted parking for those of us who have no choice but to use personal vehicles. Mayor Laurie is doing an amazing job bringing this city back to life and this would be tarnishing what I'm sure will be an incredible legacy.

Therefor, 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,
Molly Bodrato Gentile
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: kduffy217@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Karen Duffy
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Thursday, August 7, 2025 2:07:19 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 (I grew up in Manhattan and saw first hand what gentrification and indiscriminate development can do to a city. Rents become unaffordable for most people leading to a massive exit of families causing,among other things, deterioration of public schools and so much more. These were the reasons I moved to San Francisco and now I’m witnessing it happening again. Please learn from the mistake of others.

Sincerely,
Karen Duffy
San Francisco, CA 94118

From: MARYROSS.ILLUSTRATOR@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of MARY ROSS
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Thursday, August 7, 2025 2:37:13 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,
MARY ROSS
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: parrott371@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of n d
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Thursday, August 7, 2025 3:01:41 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,
n d
San Francisco, CA 94110

From: lauralou.sf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Laura Mulcrevy
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Thursday, August 7, 2025 5:47:40 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): West Portal is already congested and there is no parking even now. I couldnt even imagine adding these buildings and the damage, traffic nightmares and gridlock it will cause.

Sincerely,
Laura Mulcrevy
San Francisco, CA 94127

From:	kumasong@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Karen Kirschling
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Thursday, August 7, 2025 8:24:39 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 longtime San Francisco resident and renter of an apartment I cannot afford to leave, 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 write to 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,
Karen Kirschling

From:	swissheidi67@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Heidi Bumann-Stucky
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Thursday, August 7, 2025 8:30:48 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 NATIVE 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.

West Portal has always been known for its quaint shops. You will definitely destroy it’s charm by allowing this rezoning. It is a disgrace to dishonor the history, elegance, grace and charisma of an amazing part of San Francisco. We cherish West Portal. It means a lot to our neighborhood.

Sincerely,
Heidi Bumann-Stucky
San Francisco, CA 94127

From:	erinkcronin@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Erin Cronin
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Thursday, August 7, 2025 8:53:24 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. I especially oppose the demolition of rent controlled buildings. I live in one and I work in education and would not be able to afford to live in San Francisco without rent control.

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,
Erin Cronin
San Francisco, CA 94117

From: tap4403@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of terry perrin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Thursday, August 7, 2025 9:29:59 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.

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,
terry perrin
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: gjnear2001@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of gary near
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Thursday, August 7, 2025 9:32:39 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,
gary near
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: dedemac56@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Ashley McDevitt
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Friday, August 8, 2025 7:13:38 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): I am a homeowner in miraloma park and was born and raised in the sunset district. West Portal as you know is full of small businesses that I would sorely miss if they were disappeared. Please don’t allow our communities to succumb to the developers who want to build up so high with empty store fronts.

Sincerely,
Ashley McDevitt
San Francisco, CA 94127

From:	barbarajroos@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Barbara Roos
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Friday, August 8, 2025 9:36:10 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,
Barbara Roos
San Francisco, CA 94111

From: lowell.nicholson@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lowell Nicholson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Friday, August 8, 2025 11:44:17 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.

As a long term Sunset resident, I fear that these upzoning proposals will drastically change the neighborhood I love. I worry that upzoning will displace friends, neighbors, and businesses, and forever alter what makes this part of San Francisco so special.

Please please reconsider.

Sincerely,
Lowell Nicholson
San Francisco, CA 94122

From:	pmulholl@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Patrice Mulholland
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Friday, August 8, 2025 12:52:42 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 & historic buildings, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors. San Francisco is unique with its beautiful vistas for the public to enjoy, not just the chosen few. Height limits are necessary to stop greedy developers.

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. Such catering to the rich developers is disgusting.

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.

Please do not ruin the city!

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Patrice Mulholland

From: wei.kong@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Wei Kong
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Friday, August 8, 2025 2:03:21 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:
It is disappointing that the city officials again put its residents interests last. What the citizens need the most is reducing crime, homelessness and bring back businesses and tourism. Turning San Francisco into Miami beach is the last thing to bring back tourism.

Sincerely,
Wei Kong
San Francisco, CA 94127

From:	fentco@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Douglas Fenton
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Friday, August 8, 2025 2:06:20 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):

Sincerely,
Douglas Fenton
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: charis44@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Catherine Valentine
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Friday, August 8, 2025 2:23:53 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,
Catherine Valentine
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: matt@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Matthew McGuinness
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Friday, August 8, 2025 2:26:58 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): As a 3rd generation San Franciscan, please don't destroy the neighborhood I've enjoyed all of my life.

Sincerely,
Matthew McGuinness
San Francisco, CA 94127

From:	anniek092000@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of A Saxe
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Friday, August 8, 2025 3:05:01 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, 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,
A Saxe

From: judyt2009@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Judy Tomsic
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Friday, August 8, 2025 3:35:00 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.

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.

I am tired of Scott Weiner making demands on San Francisco that are unrealistic when public transit and other limited resources are taken into account. Nothing in the upzone plan requires Muni to continue providing the transit lines that define a "transit corridor". And nothing in the plan requires builders to get started on already approved projects. Of course they don't mind waiting for more favorable interest rates and rental markets, as Assemblyman Weiner rewards them and penalizes our city if the housing does not get built!

Please stop this madness and design a plan that is both by and for San Franciscans of all income levels. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Judy Tomsic
San Francisco, CA 94118

From: richnavro2@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Richard Navarro
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Friday, August 8, 2025 11:50:10 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,
Richard Navarro
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: richnavro2@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Richard Navarro
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Friday, August 8, 2025 11:52:02 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,
Richard Navarro
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: rosenewton@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Rosemary Newton
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Saturday, August 9, 2025 7:03:26 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.

I feel this plan will not benefit anyone but the developers and ruin the character of our city.

Sincerely,
Rosemary Newton
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: coreycatt@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of MARY MARCH
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Saturday, August 9, 2025 8:02:44 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):

Historic neighborhoods like Westwood Highlands were designed for single family occupancy with distinct architecture. Building high-rises here would ruin that. They should be built in places that make sense, like transportation corridors along places like West Portal and similar instead of destroying historic neighborhoods.

Sincerely,
MARY MARCH
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: lisa.arjes@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lisa Arjes
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Saturday, August 9, 2025 8:06:57 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.

The state mandate is an all-size-fits-one proposal that just doesn't work as it doesn't address the actual problem of affordability. San Francisco doesn't have a problem with supply as much as it has a problem with affordability. This is not a simple Econ 101 problem. Look at Vancouver. Vancouver tried to build their way out of a similar problem. Prices are still astronomically high.

Sincerely,
Lisa Arjes
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: info@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Max Ferman
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Saturday, August 9, 2025 8:07:50 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 am terrified of losing my home and apartment of 30 years.
I am retired from UCSF, and will have nowhere else to go.
Please protect us.

Sincerely,
Max Ferman
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: disp006@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Terrence McKenna
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Saturday, August 9, 2025 8:53:34 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 (optionalThere is plenty of room for new housing at the end of Geneva Ave and where the old Schlegel lock factory was. This would revitalize that part of the city. The weather is better on this side of town much less fog and more sunshine. Why destroy existing neighborhoods when there is plenty of room to build on the sunny side of the city. Some might say this is a rundown part of the city all the more reason to revitalize this area. Don’t ruin good neighborhoods. The Sunset , Westwood Park and Monterey Heights should be left alone these are great neighborhoods that do not need to change.

Sincerely,
Terrence McKenna
San Francisco, CA 94112

From:	Ryan Andrade
To:	CPC.SF.Housing.Choice
Cc:	Chen, Lisa (CPC); Yalon, Anne (CPC); Garcia, David (CPC); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Full support for Rezoning
Date:	Saturday, August 9, 2025 9:10:26 AM

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

Hello,

My partner and I recently moved to San Francisco and are happy new residents of the city and of district 8. You have our full support for the rezoning efforts to increase housing supply in San Francisco!

The process of finding a place to live was extremely difficult due to constrained supply and high demand. We are lucky that we found a place to fit our budget.

We love San Francisco and any hope of affordably renting or owning a place in the city depends on decisions like this to continually grow the city's housing supply!

Thank you,
Ryan Andrade

From:	pariscp@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Paris Paraskeva
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Saturday, August 9, 2025 9:37:00 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. This plan will do nothing to address the affordable housing problem in San Francisco

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the 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,
Paris Paraskeva
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: cdoyle@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Catherine Doyle
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Saturday, August 9, 2025 10:32:30 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: My family has lived in the West Portal area for more than 80 years. There is a neighborhood quality here that keeps us in San Francisco and supportive of our communities. The upzoning maps will destroy the look, neighborhood feel and the resulting community on this side of the city. We live here because we don't have the high rises and the bustle of downtown. We know and spend time with our neighbors. This is a special part of San Francisco that is unique and should remain that way.

Sincerely,
Catherine Doyle
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: andrew.hamill@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Andrew Hamill
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Saturday, August 9, 2025 10:44:23 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 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,
Andrew Hamill
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: lorenjjones@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Loren Jones
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Saturday, August 9, 2025 11:13:34 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.

Mayor Lurie,
My wife and I met you in Noe Valley before the election and told you you were going to win. We are native San Franciscans, we love our city, and we ask you to protect our neighborhoods.
Thank you,
Loren Jones

Sincerely,
Loren Jones
San Francisco, CA 94127

From:	pedler@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Gary Pedler
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Saturday, August 9, 2025 2:27:35 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):I live at 576 Church Street at 18th. Church Street is one of the streets that will be most affected by the proposed upzoning plan. People like living in this neighborhood because it's built on a human scale, which this plan will completely subvert. It will do little to provide reasonably priced housing, force people out of existing housing, overburden the infrastructure, and destroy the character of a city that earns a lot of money as a place tourists want to visit.

I urge you to scale this plan back drastically and find a more measured, step-by-step approach to the issue.

Sincerely,
Gary Pedler
San Francisco, CA 94114

From:	nanville@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Joe Armenta
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Saturday, August 9, 2025 3:13:09 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): SF Voters WILL REMEMBER...

Sincerely,
Joe Armenta
San Francisco, CA 94127

From:	ga366@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Gary Moran
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Saturday, August 9, 2025 3:41:41 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,
Gary Moran
San Francisco, CA 94117

From: mariannelhowell@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Marianne Howell
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Saturday, August 9, 2025 9:19:04 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.

My whole family was born and raised in San Francisco. My mom was born and raised in North Beach, dad was born and raised in the Richmond district and my brother, sister and myself were born and raised in the Sunset district. We all went to school here. The mayors plan will ruin the city my family and I love. No one wants to look out their window and see giant buildings surrounding their home. These new buildings will just be eyesores throughout the city. People will lose the views they may have had. This is a horrible idea. It is not the right way to correct the housing situation. The city will look like there are projects all over the city. It will not beautify the neighborhoods around the city. Tall buildings belong downtown, not in the neighborhoods.
Please don’t move forward with this awful plan which will ruin our city.

Sincerely,
Marianne Howell
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: judgold22@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Judith Goldstein
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Saturday, August 9, 2025 10:00:51 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,
Judith Goldstein
San Francisco, CA 94122

From:	jamielee6@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jamie Wong
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Saturday, August 9, 2025 10:32:07 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,
Jamie Wong
San Francisco, CA 94116

From:	kellydanp@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Dan Kelly
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Saturday, August 9, 2025 11:32:41 PM

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 Forest Hill and as a San Franciscan, I strongly endorse the overdue efforts to build more housing throughout the city, which has frozen housing expansion for decades, driving many families out of the city.

The proposal to utilize vacant plots along Laguna Honds Boulevard from Lawton Street is a no-brainer,
But this is a heaviy used and high-speed artery. Plans must include attention to pedestrian safety, adequate off-street parking, and increased MUNI service for the additional population.

Thje proposed development woukd be enhanced by rehabilitating the neglected open space to the north of Laguna Honda, so that it could be used for walking, birdwatching , etc.

Sincerely,
Dan Kelly
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: thanos@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Athanassios Diacakis
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Sunday, August 10, 2025 5:28:50 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.

You generally seemed to have lost the plot and are going with "more is better" rather than thinking through what you want to achieve.

More housing is not going to make cheaper housing... It's just going to make *more* housing. Look at NYC as an example.

You're just following the developer and YIMBY narrative and just plowing ahead with this silliness.

It's one thing to cause a bunch of destruction and achieve something, and a wholly different thing to create the same destruction and achieve nothing... which is where we are headed.

It's sad.

Sincerely,
Athanassios Diacakis
San Francisco, CA 94114

From:	royacary@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Cary Sunshine
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable [File No: 250700 and 250701]
Date:	Sunday, August 10, 2025 7:37:19 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 upzoning plan, which would encourage the demolition of existing homes, displace renters and small businesses, and turn our neighborhoods into corridors of unaffordable luxury towers.

This plan empowers developers, silences residents, and is being rushed to satisfy a state mandate that's outdated and out of touch with San Francisco's current reality. That mandate should be challenged — not used to justify permanent zoning changes.

You can not rewrite the city's land use overnight with most residents unaware. And once this plan is adopted, there is no going back — even if it proves disastrous.

We urge you to:

– Protect renters and small businesses
– Preserve neighborhood scale and historic character
– Require real affordability
– Slow the process and engage the public

Don't rush a decision that will reshape San Francisco forever. We need thoughtful actions that our residents and your constituents can feel proud to have supported. This is not a win for San Francisco, it's as if it's the 60s; and we are being told we need super highways running through town. Please prevent our city from turning into a view less and overbuilt eye sore. Maybe we should have a vote?

Sincerely,
Cary Sunshine
San Francisco, CA 94122

From:	coynesf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Cynthia Coyne
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Sunday, August 10, 2025 8:15:47 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Stop destroying what makes San Francisco a unique and desirable place to live. Mayor Lurie's plan will destroy the distinct character of our city and what drew my husband and I to move to District 7 thirty five years ago. There are already too many architecturally bereft monstrosities popping up in our neighborhoods, making SF no different from the cookie-cutter communities around the country. No wonder people are leaving, we are quickly losing our charm. Shame on you all for allowing this to happen. History will remember you!!!!!

San Franciscans deserve better!!! Families deserve better!!! Small businesses deserve better!!! You have over-stepped and you no longer serve the neighborhoods you represent, especially Supervisor Melgar!!!

We call on you to:
- stop hiding behind Scott Weiner's crappy bill and step up to defend our city
- stop re-zoning our neighborhoods. The Mayor's 'up-zoning' maps fast track our city's decline
- postpone the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline
- stop prioritizing real estate investors and developers
- start representing SF's small business and families for a change

We all want to see San Francisco thrive but this is NOT the way to do it. You should be ashamed!

Sincerely,
Cynthia Coyne
San Francisco, CA 94116

From:	Christian Williams
To:	Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS); ChenStaff; act+more-housing@growsf.org
Subject:	I support more housing (via GrowSF.org)
Date:	Sunday, August 10, 2025 8:54:52 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for more housing in San Francisco, including Mayor Lurie's family zoning plan.

As polling consistently shows, the vast majority of San Francisco residents across all demographics support building more housing.

San Francisco is 90% behind on our state-mandated housing goals. If we don't act soon, the state will strip our city of local control over zoning and development. We must build more housing to address our affordability crisis and ensure San Francisco becomes a place where families can afford to live.

Thank you for your leadership on this critical issue.

~Christian J. Williams
District 6 Voting Resident

From: jlm211h@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Josine LaMonica
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Sunday, August 10, 2025 9:53:35 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): I grew up in this neighborhood from the 60's to the 80's I still own my childhood home. This rezoning would destroy the area... surrounding areas like West Portal or Portola are commercial areas Forest Hills is a family neighborhood. Doing this would impact the family's and deeply change the demographic. Think hard about what you are doing, and not about the MONEY...

Sincerely,
Josine LaMonica
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: MICHAEL_DORF@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Michael Dorf
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Sunday, August 10, 2025 9:59:32 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.

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 is particularly problematic given the the bait and switch on the Covid-era street closures, which have now become permanent over the opposition of the majority of local district residents. If the City wants to add more more housing capacity, at a minimum all "Slow Streets" and the Upper Great Highway need to be reopened in order to handle the increased traffic that will result from this additional housing.

Sincerely,
Michael Dorf
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: gbirsinl@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Laura Birsinger
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Sunday, August 10, 2025 4:02:41 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 homeowner, I'm writing to express my serious concerns about the proposed rezoning that would allow 8-story buildings in single-family neighborhoods.

I'm not against addressing our housing shortage, but this plan feels like it's solving the wrong problem in the wrong way. First, the required housing numbers don't even account for the thousands of units already approved but not yet built. Why are we rushing to rezone when we haven't even seen what impact those existing approvals will have?

My bigger concern is what happens after we approve this. If affordable housing is truly the goal, where are the guarantees? How do we ensure these new buildings won't just become luxury condos that make our affordability crisis worse? I haven't seen any binding requirements or long-term oversight plans that would prevent this.

The height limit changes also seem to be painted with too broad a brush. Some areas might make sense for increased density, but others clearly don't - yet the maps don't seem to distinguish between them. You can't just draw lines on a map and call it good planning.
What really worries me is that this feels like it's setting up our neighborhoods for massive demolition and displacement of the people and small businesses that make these communities what they are. Once we make these zoning changes, they're permanent. But the January 2026 deadline feels arbitrary and rushed for something this consequential.
I'm asking you to:

Scale back these upzoning maps significantly and make them more targeted
Push for extending that deadline so we can do this right
Require real, enforceable affordability commitments, not just hopes and promises

We all want more housing, but let's make sure we're building for San Franciscans, not just for whoever can afford luxury towers. This deserves more thoughtful planning than what I'm seeing right now.

Sincerely,
Laura Birsinger
San Francisco, CA 94132

From:	noble.angulo@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sabine Angulo
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Sunday, August 10, 2025 5:49:03 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,
Sabine Angulo
San Francisco, CA 94122

From:	minnettelehmann@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Minnette Lehmann
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Sunday, August 10, 2025 6:15:08 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,
Minnette Lehmann

From:	sbogatsky@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sergei Bogatsky
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Sunday, August 10, 2025 11:33:39 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,
Sergei Bogatsky
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: bconnormurphy@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Brian Murphy
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, August 11, 2025 8:04:49 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 have seen the City change over the decades and I understand the desire and need to make the City better. These upzoning ideas are prepared to destroy the diversity of neighborhoods the City offers. Not all of SF needs to be or should be high density. no one wants that. Additionally, the 3 projects on the West Side are all very close to each other and on a congested 7th Ave corridor. How these projects would pass an EIR is beyond imagination but I am sure the City will waive the EIR to let them proceed. Should we abolish all planning rules for everyone so that it is fair or will we work to destroy our cherished neighborhoods with high density only?

Please think of the permanent impacts of these plans. once destroyed neighborhoods can never recover. San Francisco's beauty is in part the diversity of housing options and single family neighborhoods.

We have all inherited a beautiful and vibrant City, we should endeavor to preserve what we love for future generations. Do not be a part of the group takes away the City's charm.

Sincerely,
Brian Murphy
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: maryvolkov@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mary VOLKOV
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, August 11, 2025 9:42:29 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.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Mary VOLKOV
San Francisco, CA 94127

From:	robintoschi@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Robin Toschi
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Monday, August 11, 2025 11:10:42 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 third generation 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 family of Italian immigrants came here before the 1907 earthquake. We’ve never been wealthy, but we’ve always tried to make a positive impact on the City. My great grandfather helped found the crab fisherman’s association. My grandparents owned a well respected restaurant in North Beach.

Our neighborhoods have helped to make the City a special place to live and visit, helping to preserve the different groups that define it. I have lived in West Portal for 50 years and am proud to have seen it grow and change. However, I’m afraid that these zoning changes would so negatively impact our neighborhoods (not just West Portal) that they would lose the individuality that gives the City its identity.

Sincerely,
Robin Toschi
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: theharveysofsf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Thomas Harvey
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, August 11, 2025 1:20:28 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): These changes to 65' and 85' will take away the views we currently have for construction along 15th ave and the area in and around Taraval and Ulloa Sts. We barely have a view of the Farallon Islands and any height additions take that away entirely along with areas toward Lake Merced and Fort Funston. In addition even if the areas are along transit corridors, the current maps continue the area on Taraval to between Funston and Forest Side Aves. These do not have transit on the Taraval East of 15th Ave. That should be an area that is definitely removed if the criteria stated is followed. To add context as I have lived in and around this area for all of my 68 years and finished my City employment career as the Fire Marshal for the San Francisco Fire Department. I still work assisting Moscone Convention Center with fire and life safety as a part time employee. Most people I know are not against housing done in a scale and location that does not ruin the character of neighborhoods nor ruin enjoyment of these areas by changes so different than when we moved to or within these neighborhoods. The concept of few people having vehicles because little or no parking is required for these large developments that will make those developers wealthy does nothing for existing San Franciscans. People will visit these new tenants and park everywhere while increasing traffic and making it less safe for children and the elderly specifically. I have seen hundreds of stop signs and tens of signals installed of the years with many most recently. I have not stayed in San Francisco and raised my family to see the neighborhoods become more windy with little sun and lower quality of life. Many have moved from San Francisco and I do not want to be among them so please change these requirements and do not continue with the excuse of the State mandate. Housing can be built without these drastic changes to these neighborhoods.Areas around Lake Merced have apartment buildings with land adjacent where additional housing in taller buildings could be constructed without affecting the views and traffic as much as would be done with these current proposals. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Thomas Harvey
San Francisco, CA 94116

From:	thdrift@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Darin Rosas
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Monday, August 11, 2025 3:56:36 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.

This will decrease the quality of life for already financially struggling families in SF with higher costs, less resources in a densely populated area, increased power outages with more strain on the grid, more crime, more economic division, more traffic, no affordable requirements, horrible for the environment & filling the developers pockets that most aren’t even local.
Newsome & Weiner will have a very tarnished reputation after these projects, we ask you to make a difference & just say no to this type of development. Please demand a more methodical approach instead of this slapped & crammed approach. It didn’t go well for Engardio nor will it bode well for any other politician supporting it..

Sincerely,
Darin Rosas
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: rgoodman311@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Robert Goodman
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, August 11, 2025 4:56:49 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.

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,
Robert Goodman
San Francisco, CA 94117

From: tompacko@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Tom Packo
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, August 11, 2025 10:54:29 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 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 with unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

I ask that you:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the 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.

Sincerely,
Tom Packo
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: holyvo@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Holy Vo
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 10:09:46 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 of many years in this beautiful city, I'm writing to ask you strongly reconsider Mayor Lurie's upzoning plan. We call on you to:

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

What keeps me and many others who love these neighborhoods in San Francisco is the balance of close knit community and vibrant city living, and though we support the development of housing to accommodate the city's growing needs, this plan goes far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

I hope you will listen to the voices of the impacted communities while building a strong path forward for San Francisco.

Sincerely,
Holy Vo
San Francisco, CA 94116

From:	echernyak@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Eddy Chernyak
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Tuesday, August 12, 2025 12:16:48 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,
Eddy Chernyak
San Francisco, CA 94116

From:	noguera@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Hatun Noguera Hatun Noguera
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Tuesday, August 12, 2025 1:55:09 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,
Hatun Noguera Hatun Noguera
San Francisco, CA 94127

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]
Date:	Tuesday, August 12, 2025 1:55:58 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: randymazzei@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Randall Mazzei
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 1:56:59 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.

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,
Randall Mazzei
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: judigorski@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Judi Gorski
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 1:57:13 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.

Thank you in advance for hopefully considering the needs of our community and supporting our position.

Sincerely,
Judi Gorski
San Francisco, CA 94116

From:	hawaiian4life@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Vincent Arroyo
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Tuesday, August 12, 2025 2:07:53 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,
Vincent Arroyo
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: moonstar77@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Carolyn Arias
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 2:10:18 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

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,
Carolyn Arias
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: kielykids@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of LaVive Kiely
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 2:16:01 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

How the heck do developers and the City expect to come into ownership of this land?! This smells an awful lot like the scandals of Redevelopment in the 60's and 70's when owners of properties South of Market and in the Fillmore were given a pittance for their properties. Most of the African Americans who lived there were never able to come back. My father fought losing his properties South of Market for YEARS! He grew up in one of those houses. His very elderly mother libed in the other. He was given $55K for 2 houses and a lot!

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,
LaVive Kiely
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: chloeewallis@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Chloe Wallis
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 2:17:56 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,
Chloe Wallis

From: sarahvberman@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sarah Voynow-Berman
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 2:19:01 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, 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): there has not been an environmental study YET on sewage treatment, building in sand dunes and overcrowding which is unsustainable near an ocean.
Build DOWNTOWN first. I don’t see any supervisor or Weiner admitting that this drastic, knee jerk action would harm their neighborhood. Get big corporations to stop buying up properties to turn them into) to high rent or short term rentals which further erodes our community. Do that FIRST

Sincerely,
Sarah Voynow-Berman
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: forrestbice@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Forrest Bice
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 2:27:00 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): As a young person living and working in San Francisco I'm writing to you to break any preconceived notion that young people want more housing in San Francisco but even more importantly that we also can see that demand will always outstrip supply in this beautiful city we call home. More housing is _not_ a real-world solution to affordability in already dense areas and we have seen plenty of examples of that play out with severe and tragic consequences. You can only ruin a city once as they say and that's true! Manhattanization is not made up, it's a reality and it can and will happen in SF unless we act to protect our city; don't be duped or bullied into the narrative pro-housing advocates are spewing. San Francisco is beautiful and vibrant because of the way it is. I repeat: __You Can Only Ruin A City Once___

Sincerely,
Forrest Bice
San Francisco, CA 94118

From:	cablecar@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Wesley Valaris
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Tuesday, August 12, 2025 2:40:11 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: DONT LET THE DEVELOPERS TAKE OVER. This is our town and this madness has got to end. There is a reason we love our neighborhoods and San Francisco. It is simply because of its small neighborhood/town feel. Look at every neighborhood and city that has fallen under the spell of bought paid for politicians. Every project has ruined its city for the enriching of a few. At what point do we disallow the greedy power grab to continue.

Sincerely,
Wesley Valaris
San Francisco, CA 94122

From:	asmtoyou@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Amy Mc Manus
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Tuesday, August 12, 2025 3:41:16 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,
Amy Mc Manus
San Francisco, CA 94122

From:	francesca_long@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Francesca Long
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Tuesday, August 12, 2025 4:11:51 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): My family and my husband's family have worked long and hard to build lives here in the Sunset. Please do not turn these neighborhoods into endless massive apartment buildings. It does not create more affordable housing and simply forces people out. It simply destroys neighborhoods. There are other areas in the city that are vacant and can be bullt up! We will need to spend money to build out transit to those areas but it will be better spent rather than destroying existing neighborhoods.

Sincerely,
Francesca Long
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: stefano@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Stefano Carissimo
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 4:36:44 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,
Stefano Carissimo
San Francisco, CA 94118

From:	justinreplys@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Justin Dumas
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Tuesday, August 12, 2025 5:04:32 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,
Justin Dumas
San Francisco, CA 94122

From:	mshapiro49@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Marni Shapiro
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Tuesday, August 12, 2025 9:54:13 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,
Marni Shapiro
San Francisco, CA 94122

From:	tworose@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Bethellen Levitan
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Tuesday, August 12, 2025 10:06:06 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,
Bethellen Levitan
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: tworose@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Beth Levitan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 10:06:26 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):

Sincerely,
Beth Levitan
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: elyse.aylward@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Elyse Aylward
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 6:20:56 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 do not ruin my neighborhood with large multi-unit buildings. I have lived here for 67 years and I do not want more people. It's already too crowded with cars since you closed the Great Highway. Find another way. Turn all the empty office buildings downtown into housing and stay out of the Sunset neighborhood.

Sincerely,
Elyse Aylward
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: elemjw@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lin Joe
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 7:53:17 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 have lived in the Sunset for over 40 years and have seen many changes. For the most part they have been positive and I feel the neighborhood has benefitted from the gradual development. My grown children continue to reside here and raise their children in the Sunset too. We love the neighborhood.

However, this Upzoning Plan is disturbing in that it allows massive development and doesn't really address the affordability issues we have in SF. In addition, there are already approved plans for big developments in SF that haven't even started (!)

Please don't allow this extreme upzoning.

Sincerely,
Lin Joe
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: 415irisheyes@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Elizabeth Faliano
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 10:03:42 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 attack on the Sunset community is criminal. The Sunset has always been a quiet sleepy beach neighborhood. There is not a housing shortage in SF to be building such large scale, out of character buildings, there is an affordability issue. Plus the Sunset does not have the infrastructure for multiple building units nor the parking no thanks to the SFMTA.

Sincerely,
Elizabeth Faliano
San Francisco, CA 94132

From: timothy.ryan151@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Timothy Ryan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 10:12:16 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.

We have been property owners since 2004, and we dont want to see our already crowded city become more overrun, services and infrastructure overtaxed, and businesses forced to leave the city to avoid this craziness. Please be mindful, seek reasonable growth where able, and invest in the future by taking care of what we have now, not building more only to get trampled by the congestion and overgrowth. Thank you for your time

Sincerely,
Timothy Ryan
San Francisco, CA 94127

From:	bailey.kathyr@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kathy Bailey
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Wednesday, August 13, 2025 12:36:49 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 living in neighboring Haight, 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,
Kathy Bailey
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: inor@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of R. Zierikzee
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 2:08:40 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): I fear this will make more residents of San Francisco homeless ... right at the time it's becoming illegal to be unhoused. I may well be one of them. I'm a disabled senior living on a fixed income and if the owner of my building decides to demolish the building I live in to upzone to a larger building I will be out. I cannot afford to move to another apartment. I will be homeless at age 72. I do not support the mayors plan for more housing. There must be a better way.

Sincerely,
R. Zierikzee
San Francisco, CA 94118

From:	anthony@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Anthony Mazzei
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Wednesday, August 13, 2025 2:37:30 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.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): This only makes more traffic, more litter, noise and other issues. We are already dense with touching houses. We already share walls. This is one of the few places in the city we can still raise families.

Sincerely,
Anthony Mazzei
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: karenmillerwood@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Karen Wood
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 7:21:44 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):
It appears that California has been bought and paid for by the building sector, whose chief advocate is Senator Wiener. San Francisco's population "is currently declining at a rate of -2.6% annually and its population has decreased by -11.78% since the most recent census, which recorded a population of 870,518 in 2020." [https://worldpopulationreview.com/us-cities/california/san-francisco]. What justiifies the Mayor's extremist Upzoning Plan and its devastation of San Francisco's unique neighborhoods? If upzoning is such an excellent idea, put it before the voters and find out how they feel about the massive changes proposed for their city.

Sincerely,
Karen Wood
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: informationmistress@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lori H
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 7:57:40 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.

I've been a resident and homeowner in San Francisco for over 35 years, living in District 2, District 4 and now District 6. Of course, I understand there's a homeless and affordable housing crisis in my beloved city, but taking away local residents' control and say over neighborhood zoning, building heights and development in deference to developers and billionaires is the exact opposite of what San Franciscans need.

Sincerely,
Lori H
San Francisco, CA 94103

From:	sffred@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Fred McFadden
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Wednesday, August 13, 2025 11:08:29 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 49 year San Francisco 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.

This upzoning plan will not lower housing costs. It will ruin the charm of our neighborhoods. It will increase commercial rents, and discourange small business and local independent restaurants.
Entrepreneurs of all kinds, small boutiques, art galleries, restaurants, and business will not be able to afford to open and sustain their businesses.
Please don’t Manhatten-ize the Sunset.

Sincerely,
Fred McFadden
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: phil.lumsden999@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Philip Lumsden
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Thursday, August 14, 2025 9:13:33 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,
Philip Lumsden
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: food-mimosas.01@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of R Curry
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Thursday, August 14, 2025 10:14:24 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):

Forest Hill is one of the few historic neighborhoods that must be protected. Converting residential zones to commercial zones is a huge mistake.

Sincerely,
R Curry
San Francisco, CA 94116

From:	patriciacalfee@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Patricia Calfee Picache
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Thursday, August 14, 2025 1:24:54 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan.

This is a mistake and one that will greatly impact our neighborhoods and quality of life. Having grown up in San Francisco, and now choosing to raise my own three young children here, I am disappointed to see the Mayor taking such ill-planned action.

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,
Patricia Calfee Picache
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: picache@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Ian Picache
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Thursday, August 14, 2025 3:03:04 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,
Ian Picache
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: samanthamostovoy@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Samantha Mostovoy
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Thursday, August 14, 2025 9:43:41 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,
Samantha Mostovoy
San Francisco, CA 94116

From:	madatian.j@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jasmine Madatian
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Friday, August 15, 2025 7:01:05 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.

Thank you for your time and consideration - protecting the character of our city is critical.

Sincerely,
Jasmine Madatian
San Francisco, CA 94116

From:	fraley@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Michael Fraley
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Friday, August 15, 2025 9:59:53 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.

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,
Michael Fraley
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: maury.raycroft@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Maurice Raycroft
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Saturday, August 16, 2025 9:14:28 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I encourage the Mayor to watch a recording of the June public meeting, where many voices discussed clearly, and interesting, uniquely how detrimental the current rezoning plan would be, causing more harm than good.

The current plan to simultaneously upzone 13,000 acres of SF is reckless and does not address affordable housing.

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 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.

Why doesn't the City focus on getting vacant properties (40,000 vacant homes in SF, not including the growing amount of unoccupied commercial space) occupied? The City can encourage/incentivize landlords with vacant/derelict properties to update and make them available — if vacant, mandate extra taxes; if it remains vacant mandate a rent cap for affordable housing.

Sincerely,
Maurice Raycroft
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: zamarripamaz@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mary Anne Zamarripa
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Saturday, August 16, 2025 6:43:02 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 Native 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):
Mayor Lurie, I had the pleasure of meeting you when you had supported the group re The Boulevard (Sunset).
I was hopeful, excited, engaged everyone I met to make sure that they knew your name and to make sure they got out to vote!
Even when people brought up your background (financially) it was an easy response…Lurie comes from money which WORKS for us! He won't be swayed OR bought!" That resonated with people.

I request that this 'zoning' issue be seriously and not destroy the fabric of our neighborhood.
As you know, there are many, many buildings downtown. Use them. Yes I know they would need renovation…and the deep pocket 'developers' won't make their money, however, renovations would employ so many of our Bay Area people.

Think, think, think…about us, the people who believe in and voted for you. I'm counting on you!
As one Native to Another.
maz
415.987.3550

Sincerely,
Mary Anne Zamarripa
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: rachaeltauber@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Rachael Tauber
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Sunday, August 17, 2025 4:46:37 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,
Rachael Tauber
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: comradeknick@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Nicholas Fay
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Sunday, August 17, 2025 11:18:04 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.

Sincerely,
Nicholas Fay
San Francisco, CA 94102

From:	cfjohnso27@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Connie J
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Sunday, August 17, 2025 12:14:45 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.

I live in the Sunset district and this plan threatens our family-friendly community in order to blatantly benefit big developers and tech investors. Please try to make San Francisco a city for everyone — not just the super rich.

Sincerely,
Connie J
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: bilgepump100@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Robert Hall
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, August 18, 2025 1:48:11 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,
Robert Hall
San Francisco, CA 94117

From: zarina.issac@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Zarina Issac
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, August 18, 2025 2:42:42 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.

Please stop with unaffordability. The free market won’t fix this!!

Sincerely,
Zarina Issac
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: kbaum88@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Daniela Kirshenbaum
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, August 18, 2025 2:53:50 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Why are you giving away our city to developers? They aren't city planners. They certainly don't build for affordability.

This proposal, which nobody in city government including the Department of City Planning seems to have any problem with, proves the naysayers right about "neoliberals."

Sacramento also wanted to build a freeway through the Golden Gate Park panhandle. How does that sound now? Like Sacramento still has all the answers? If so, then why do we need a Dept. of City Planning at all?

The ultra-capitalist, trickle-down economics of "let the market solve the problem" displays some poorly hidden greed, I'm afraid. And that is certainly not helping with the adorable "Family Zoning" brand...

Sincerely,
Daniela Kirshenbaum
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: tkpassat97@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Tim Keefe
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, August 18, 2025 8:29:26 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Hello,
My family has lived in San Francisco for over 100 years. Blue collar, middle class, hard-working, elastic, intelligent, ready to change careers based on the environment and jobs available, kind, with strongly held beliefs that you give back as a duty to your community and country.
My family worked very hard to be able to live in an area that is safer, quieter, and more connected. Forest Hill.
Born and raised obviously, I have friends from hunters point, the Fillmore, the Mission, family in the sunset, and all over. Growing up my friends who had section 8 housing couldn't even trust their neighbors, they would get stolen from constantly, and when people can't afford what is around them, they resort to criminality in many cases.
Putting this type of housing on Laguna Honda, where are these people going to shop? Tower market? Where are they going to eat? Everything around these areas is tailored for people in middle class and upper middle-class surroundings. We worked hard to live in these areas. You're going to set these people up for failure.
Theft is barely even reported nowadays in San Francisco, every time I go to the store I still see it. I never saw it ever for years on end growing up in the city.
Putting people sandwiched between Forest Hill, West portal, UCSF, Twin Peaks, Saint Francis Wood is not setting low income folks up for success.
I volunteered with CASA, Saint Vincents home for boys, little children's aid, as did my parents before me for decades. Ask them what will happen.
San Francisco has some problems all right, but these problems require intervention way before housing issues. We live in the western banking capital of the US, the tech capital of the US, yet we graduate people or barely graduate people who can do math, who have a little understanding of what career opportunities exist in this SMALL CITY.
I fear these are Band-Aid fixes.
In your desperation to quell loud minority voices, minority in number, you are overreaching it seems on where you are putting housing, what zoning tactics you are using, what type of economics are at play, and how communities that have been around for nearly 100 years will be affected. We are the ones that make San Francisco run. I own a company that deals with ballot initiatives, referendums, I do candid work, I know better than most.
I urge you to take these things seriously, this location is not where this type of housing needs to be.

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,
Tim Keefe
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: nleong777@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Norman Leong
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 19, 2025 8:50:14 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,
Norman Leong
San Francisco, CA 94116

From:	irinakitrar68@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Irina Kitrar
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Wednesday, August 20, 2025 7:37:10 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,
Irina Kitrar
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: Lizajalalian@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Liza Jalalian
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, August 20, 2025 8:00:58 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,
Liza Jalalian
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: Lizajalalian@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Liza Jalalian
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, August 20, 2025 8:01:16 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,
Liza Jalalian
San Francisco, CA 94127

From:	randaghnaim@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Randa Ghnaim
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Wednesday, August 20, 2025 8:54:54 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 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,
Randa Ghnaim
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: ho.robt@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Robert Ho
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 7:28:34 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,
Robert Ho
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: klschulkin@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of karen schulkin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 10:29:31 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):I live on a corner that could be demolished and converted and the image of how this would make the neighborhood look is just unimaginable. This is a very bad idea and I am not in support.

Sincerely,
karen schulkin
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: hulaladog@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Toni Hur
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 6:07:20 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.

Sincerely,
Toni Hur
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: morrison.donna@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Donna Morrison
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Friday, August 22, 2025 9:41:14 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

FIFTY YEARS I've owned and lived in my Gough Street Victorian

and FIFTY years I've worked hard to keep my neighborhood a REAL neighborhood.

The deal you and like officials have made with the land speculators and developers and lobbyists will NOT help FAMILIES afford to live in this City...and it will only degrade these neighborhoods you have targeted for up-zoning.

Money is the voice that speaks now...not those of us who live here and pay taxes here and voted for you.

I say it is a sham and a disgrace to your office.

Shame on you.

Sincerely,
Donna Morrison
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: Vincent Casey
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Saturday, August 23, 2025 1:30:42 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 & Commissioners,

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.

Vincent Casey
vinmcasey@gmail.com
1441 Hyde Street
San Francisco, California 94109

From: gingerpepper@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Ginger Pepper
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Saturday, August 23, 2025 4:26:11 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.

I have lived now for over 60 years throughout San Francisco's neighborhoods, especially when as a single mother it was affordable, and that is what is so special about San Francisco. I've traveled to many cities throughout the world, but San Francisco has a character neighborhood community like no other. However, it has become out of reach for the average American worker, single mother, especially the American dream of buying a home here in the city. I have seen SF change many times culturally and economically, but present day zoning deregulations are changing the intimate community/culture of San Francisco. I live in the sunset most of my life, children went to Herbert Hoover, McAteer high school, riding Muni through out the city. Building anything more than 4-12 stories becomes intrusive to the residents blocking the infamous Sunset views we are known for. I voted for mayor Lurie because he promised to restore the city to become a city for all of us and he was going to make it more affordable. Rezoning and destroying homes is not making real estate affordable. This is not Newport Beach. Our dictates otherwise.
ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional

Sincerely,
Ginger Pepper
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: andrewchou90@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Andrew Chou
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Saturday, August 23, 2025 8:25:35 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.

Forest Hill has been my home neighborhood since I was born, it's a peaceful oasis for residents, in contrast to busy downtown. It's suburban streets, nature, and calmness creates an escape for many commuters who work in busy cities. This new plan of transforming out neighborhoods would be absolutely detrimental to the original residents of Forest Hill. These types of projects historically have never worked, and have turned the original neighborhoods into under-resourced wastelands- take Detroit for example. We beg of you, to please not push forward with this project and preserve our beautiful neighborhood.

Sincerely,
Andrew Chou
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: Jordan Enriquez
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Sunday, August 24, 2025 10:53:44 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 & Commissioners,

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.

Jordan Enriquez
pst.atev94@gmail.com
164 Hartford St
San Francisco, California 94114

From: Michael Curtian
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Sunday, August 24, 2025 10:59:01 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 & Commissioners,

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.

Michael Curtian
hi.im.mikey@gmail.com
650 Alvarado St, Apt 203
San Francisco, California 94114

From: irinakitrar68@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Irina Kitrar
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Sunday, August 24, 2025 12:10:01 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, 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:

I've been living in the outer Richmond and regularly visiting the sunset for the last 26 years, and there is a legitimate reason this community feels an immediate threat from these potential plans - it directly affects the quality of living and safety that has been so precious to us in this area, without any positive or desired outcomes for it's residents. We want to still be able to see the sun and sky from anywhere on the sidewalk. We don't want corridors of 10, or even 6 story buildings. We don't want to displace people from their homes even if its "temporary." We don't want to kill small local business. And we don't trust you to deliver actual low-income housing in these developments, particularly when there is no guarantee of that outcome.

Sincerely,
Irina Kitrar
San Francisco, CA 94121

From:	rglogau@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Richard Glogau
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Sunday, August 24, 2025 4:12:07 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):

The upcoming upcoming plan will profoundly affect the neighborhood appearance and effect a loss of open space, a commodity that has become a diminishing entity as the developers fight over the few open parcels left in the city. As anyone can see from the new construction on Stanyan Street, the aesthetics will likely be more aligned with the inhuman designs associated with the housing blocs of the former Soviet Union rather than something compatible with surrounding residential neighborhoods. These projects will further contribute to the traffic congestion along 7th avenue and will never return to tolerable levels.
If the city must comply with the mandates imposed by the State of California, then make use of the empty spaces in the defunct and derelict commercial zones in the city, e.g., the Sixth street corridor or the abandoned Westfield Mall, or the run down business sites in the South of Market area. Do not pretend that you represent the best iinterests of the residents of the West Side by shoving this down their throats.

Sincerely,
Richard Glogau
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: Nadav Wichmann
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Sunday, August 24, 2025 7:42:48 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,

To whose eyes may glance at this letter-

Thank you for all you do, as I do believe the public sector is an honorable and just service, of which is not always understood.

That being said, I am writing in support of this specific idea for more housing (Family Zoning Plan). To be frank, I wish I could voice my support more concretely, but policy writing is confusing to me and I am unfortunately- both a rather slow reader and a busy individual. I am supporting this plan, because I think it supports my hopes and aspirations for San Francisco as a city, but in case I am wrong let me write my aims here.

I moved to the city just 6 months ago from a town about an hour North, and I consider it to be one of the best decisions I have ever made. My number one objective in regards to San Francisco's politics is to allow others to do the same. My understanding is- the only way to have this be feasible for others my age, or below my level of income, or those dealt worse hands than mine, is to Build More Housing.

I realize this can't be solved with one plan and with out the commitment to change on behalf of the people, but my ask to you is, to try pushing change on your side, and we + I will trying pulling on ours.

Thank you kindly and much gratitude,
From- Nadav B. Wichmann 8/24/25

Nadav Wichmann
nadavwichmann@gmail.com
1220 14th Ave.
San Francisco, California 94122

From: Jorge Correa
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Monday, August 25, 2025 6:14:51 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 & Commissioners,

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.

Jorge Correa
mexicopatriot1810@protonmail.com
14526 Hemlock Street
San Leandro, California 94579

From:	mnchapman@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Matthew Chapman
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Monday, August 25, 2025 9:44:28 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): I understand the need for more housing, but this proposal completely ignores the character of the area and will create an ugly, congested cooridor that will become a source of regret in the coming years. I urge you to reconsider, review, and rebalance the proposal to integrate new housing into the area in a way that fits the landscape.

Sincerely,
Matthew Chapman
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: Tim Hua
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Monday, August 25, 2025 10:30:38 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 & Commissioners,

I'm writing to express my 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.

Tim Hua
cool_tim_rx@outlook.com
1920 Yolo Ave
Berkeley, California 94707

From:	john.kaman@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Kaman
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Tuesday, August 26, 2025 9:16:03 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 .

Sincerely,
John Kaman
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: jwiggsf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jessica Stein
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 26, 2025 10:04:11 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 native San Franciscan living on the West Side, 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.

Please reconsider this plan!

Sincerely,
Jessica Stein
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: dinaegoldman@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Dina Goldman
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 26, 2025 10:21:32 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.

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 do not understand why this plan cannot be implemented in a more thoughtful way. You can meet your goal of increased housing without destroying existing residential neighborhoods. We live in ingleside Terraces, which is a historic neighborhood that was thoughtfully planned. It is very walkable, has lots of natural light, many birds, and lots of beautiful landscaping. We do not want our neighborhood drastically changed. And it is not necessary to implement a plan with such a broad brush-- areas of the city that can support larger buildings exist, and you can implement there, as opposed to everywhere.

Sincerely,
Dina Goldman
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: mikejnohr@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Michael Nohr
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 26, 2025 11:20:53 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.

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 city doesn't even maintain the affordable and subsidized housing we already build. Their are several blocks in the Western Addition that were built around 2000 that are slated to be bulldozed due to mold and poor maintenance. $100s of millions wasted. And, the city population 75 years ago was 775K. Today, it is 810. We have plenty of housing. Help people who need help to stay in their homes instead of funding developers at $1.2MM per unit.

Sincerely,
Michael Nohr
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: lakkisf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Fadi Lakkis
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable [File No: 250700 and 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 26, 2025 2:17:30 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 upzoning plan, which would encourage the demolition of existing homes, displace renters and small businesses, and turn our neighborhoods into corridors of unaffordable luxury towers.

This plan empowers developers, silences residents, and is being rushed to satisfy a state mandate that's outdated and out of touch with San Francisco's current reality. That mandate should be challenged — not used to justify permanent zoning changes.

You can not rewrite the city's land use overnight with most residents unaware. And once this plan is adopted, there is no going back — even if it proves disastrous.

We urge you to:

– Protect renters and small businesses
– Preserve neighborhood scale and historic character
– Require real affordability
– Slow the process and engage the public

Don't rush a decision that will reshape San Francisco forever. We need thoughtful planning — and leadership that listens.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

I support protecting the character of San Francisco, a unique gem in the whole wide world and the reason my wife relocated here a few months despite the high living expense. We love it here and want to spend the rest of our lives here. There's is nothing like SF. Misguided upzoning stands to benefit developers who are interested in short-term gains by building monstrosities in high real estate neighborhoods and making a quick profit, and not in helping provide affordable housing. There are plenty of empty buildings in the financial district, downtown and south of market. They can be re-purposed and refurbished. Please do not surrender the city to greed, to people who have little interest in the longterm well being of SF and our communities. Haven't we learned from the lessons of the past??

Sincerely,
Fadi Lakkis
San Francisco, CA 94109

From:	mckeonsf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Susan McKeon
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Tuesday, August 26, 2025 9:12:05 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 McKeon
San Francisco, CA 94132

From: sfotrace@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Tracy Fannin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 11:30:08 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):I am born and raised in the Lakeshore District of SF. My family also has very strong Sunset roots. I still live in the house that I grew up in and would like to keep it that way. I love my neighborhood and City very much. I do not want to see it destroyed by these policies that will make it harder for native San Franciscians to continue to live here and what makes each neighborhood unique. I also would like to live out my retirement here. We don't need a bunch of apartment buildings popping up in single family home neighborhoods. It just Isn't appropriate!! There are ways and other areas besides the West Side to add more housing, but this plan is definately not the right way to do it. There needs to be a more thoughtful approach. The City and Mayor also need to be pushing back on the State and telling them NO!!! Please reconsider this plan. Thank You..

Sincerely,
Tracy Fannin
San Francisco, CA 94132

From:	robert@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Robert Caccia
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Thursday, July 24, 2025 1:46:13 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 longtime San Franciscan (born, raised, purchased our home on 76 Magnolia Street in 1993), I'm deeply concerned about Mayor Lurie's current plan. While I support smart growth, this proposal encourages the demolition of existing homes, displaces renters and small businesses, and risks turning our unique neighborhoods into rows of high-end high-rises that few can afford.

I respectfully urge you to:

- Significantly scale back the proposed upzoning maps
- Request a delay of the January 2026 upzoning deadline to allow for more thoughtful community input

The Mayor's plan would bring sweeping, permanent changes to our city's land use — going far beyond what's necessary, with no guarantees for affordability.

As it stands, this proposal seems to clear the path for widespread demolition and luxury development, putting developer interests above those of everyday San Franciscans. We deserve a city that values inclusive planning over displacement and truly reflects the needs of its communities.

Sincerely,
Robert Caccia
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: patscafesf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Patricia Darden
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Thursday, July 24, 2025 2:24:20 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

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

We love San Francisco and feel that these high buildings are a monstrosity. I feel a 4 or 5 storied building would not distract from the charm of the city. Please please reconsider your plans.

Sincerely,
Patricia Darden
San Francisco, CA 94109

From:	mkjanis@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of janis kaempfe
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Friday, July 25, 2025 1:51:03 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 renter living in District 3 in San Francisco, I am adamantly against Mayor Lurie's irresponsible upzoning plan, which will encourage demolition of existing homes, displace renters and small businesses, and transform our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.
Therefore, I am urging you to: a) Significantly scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps, and b) - Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline to allow time for more reasonable considerations.
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.
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 is one of the largest threats in the history of San Francisco to make it unaffordable for most of the San Franciscans who live and work here and have made this city the very attractive place it has become live and attract the many tourists that we depend on for our budget

Sincerely,
janis kaempfe
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: jherrod9@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Julie Herrod-Lumsden
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Friday, July 25, 2025 1:32:11 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,
Julie Herrod-Lumsden
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: nsaldou37@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Natalie Saldou
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Saturday, July 26, 2025 1:00:17 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 transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- analyze population growth projections using more recent data as well as looking at housing data (sales, prices, time on market etc) holistically and specifically for SF
- postpone the Mayor’s upzoning maps until this analysis is completed and shared publicly with time for commenting, understanding and alignment
- 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 with zero affordability guarantees. This proposal appears to serve the interests of developers and billionaire investors and not the communities they are supposed to serve.

Sincerely,
Natalie Saldou
San Francisco, CA 94115

From: rrng8@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Judith G
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Saturday, July 26, 2025 8:01:30 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,
Judith G
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: mitzi@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mitzi Johnson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Saturday, July 26, 2025 6:21:54 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 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,
Mitzi Johnson
San Francisco, CA 94133

From:	dennehyc@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Cathi Dennehy
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Sunday, July 27, 2025 8:56:11 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,
Cathi Dennehy
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: drgenemccoy@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Margaret McCoy
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Sunday, July 27, 2025 4:08:19 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,
Margaret McCoy
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: jlansing@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of James Lansing
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, July 28, 2025 10:59:38 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,
James Lansing
San Francisco, CA 94133

From:	Rhys Sullivan
To:	Melgar, Myrna (BOS)
Cc:	MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); act+sfpd-recruiting@growsf.org
Subject:	I support more housing (via GrowSF.org)
Date:	Monday, July 28, 2025 1:06:45 PM

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

Dear Supervisor Melgar,

I'm a resident of District 7. I'm writing to express my strong support for more housing in San Francisco, including Mayor Lurie's family zoning plan.

As polling consistently shows, the vast majority of San Francisco residents across all demographics support building more housing. We need to:

- Support Mayor Lurie's family zoning plan to allow more housing on the west side
- Allow taller buildings near transit stops and major corridors
- Streamline the permitting process to reduce delays and costs
- Stop letting a vocal minority of NIMBYs block housing that our city desperately needs

San Francisco is 90% behind on our state-mandated housing goals. If we don't act soon, the state will strip our city of local control over zoning and development. We must build more housing to address our affordability crisis and ensure San Francisco remains a place where families can afford to live.

Thank you for your leadership on this critical issue.

From:	m.a.tovar@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Maria Tovar
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Monday, July 28, 2025 4:58:50 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): in addition to the increase in density, there is no room for improving traffic and other infrastructure. The commute corridor from the freeway to the Marina is tapped out congested. A resounding NO!

Sincerely,
Maria Tovar
San Francisco, CA 94109

From:	julie@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Julie Giles
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Tuesday, July 29, 2025 4:12:19 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, displaces renters and small businesses, and threatens to transform our neighborhoods into corridors of unaffordable luxury high-rises.

We urge you to:

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

These proposed changes would fundamentally alter the character of San Francisco. By promoting widespread demolition, the plan risks driving out the small businesses that give each neighborhood its unique identity and charm. It also threatens to replace historic architecture with generic modern buildings that could exist in any city.

Together, these policies pave the way for mass demolition and luxury development—serving the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the communities they claim to support. This is not thoughtful urban planning; it is displacement disguised as progress, and it will not solve our housing crisis.

Sincerely,
Julie Giles
San Francisco, CA 94118

From:	npboley@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Nathan Boley
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Wednesday, July 30, 2025 5:03:52 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Hi, I found this email form on Nextdoor asking us to oppose the zoning changes. I completely disagree and oppose this type of low-effort politics.

As a 20 year resident of San Francisco, a home owner, and a parent of 3 young children that I'm raising in a 2 bedroom TIC in North Beach I *strongly* support these changes.

Again, as a San Franciscan, I strongly support Mayor Lurie's plan.

We call on you to:

- Fully support the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Fulfill the January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would help to make the city affordable to working parents and families.

Thanks for your thoughts and consideration.

Sincerely,
Nathan Boley
San Francisco, CA 94133

From:	mcdefries@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Melissa Seal
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Wednesday, July 30, 2025 6:13:59 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.

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): If you've seen this done in other areas, you know will be lost with this upzoning. Please please please scale this back. Thank you!

Sincerely,
Melissa Seal
San Francisco, CA 94108

From: lu3mwls@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Linda Hayashi
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, July 30, 2025 8:37:16 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,
Linda Hayashi
San Francisco, CA 94118

From:	rbrandi
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	Lurie, Daniel (MYR)
Subject:	Mayor Zoning Plan Bad for Small Business
Date:	Thursday, July 31, 2025 10:30:17 AM
Attachments:	image.png image.png image.png image.png

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors recently introduced three proposals to “save” small businesses in the face of the Mayor’s upzoning plan that will demolish low rise small businesses. The point of the upzoing is to replace small businesses with high-rise mixed-use commercial and residential projects. However, experience shows that small commercial businesses DO NOT move into the new mixed use high rises projects. Take Upper Market. After more than 10 years none of the businesses are family-owned or open to the general public. There are only banks, gyms or medical clinics leaving 50% vacancies.



2175 Market built 2014. A gym, a walk-in clinic and vacant storefronts.



2200 Market built 2019. A bank and a vacant storefront.



1998 Market built 2014. Walk-in clinic, H&R block, and 3 vacant storefronts.

1844 Market built 2014. A bank, a gym, and vacant storefronts.

Developers don't care if the ground floors aren't leased as they can make their profit with the residential units. Everyone knows it so two members of the Board of Supervisor's recently introduced proposals to "save" small businesses. But the measures won't work.

1. Supervisor Melgar would offer grants and small loans to offset the added costs such as moving expenses after buildings have been demolished. This is a severance payment. A business might be able to afford and find a new place to set up shop once but they can't return to the neighborhood. Many will retire, or close. IN ANY CASE, THE NEIGHBORHOOD SERVING BUSINESSES IN THAT NEIGHBORHOOD WILL BE GONE FOR GOOD.

2. Supervisor Chan would continue oversight for official "legacy businesses" — those that have operated for 30 years or more. They only protection from demolition is approval from the Planning Commission. And there are only 427 legacy businesses out of 94,000 small businesses.

3. Chan's other measure would help employees to band together to purchase the business they work

for when the owner is looking to sell. This is a non sequitur, if the building is torn down, who cares who the new owner is?

The Mayor's upzoning plan is analogous to the displacement caused by urban renewal in the

1960s. Then the government bought property under eminent domain and resold it to developers. The property owners got pennies on the dollar and the tenants got nothing. Many neighborhoods were demolished and remained deserts for decades.

This time the government is upzoning the land, enriching the property owners while giving the tenants, i.e. small businesses, nothing. Under both urban renewal and the Mayor's plan the upheaval to people's lives, the destruction of businesses, and the hollowing out of neighborhoods is justified by the greater good. Urban renewal was justified as a *housing program*. Today, we have a small business demolition plan couched as a housing program, "Family Zoning Plan." The hope is that high-rise projects will produce a lot of housing. Experience shows the apartments or condos that are actually built are too small and too expensive for middle income families. The number of "affordable" units are too few to make a dent for low-income families. And there is nothing to prevent the loss of small businesses.

Before urban renewal was finally shut down, the government made relocation payments which were inadequate, just like the Board of Supervisors is proposing today. Please don't make the same mistake and destroy the neighborhoods.

Sincerely,

Richard Brandi

From:	greta.alexander@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Greta Alexander
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Thursday, July 31, 2025 2:59:48 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,
Greta Alexander
San Francisco, CA 94111

From:	barbarajheffernan@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Barbara Heffernan
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Thursday, July 31, 2025 3:03:55 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,
Barbara Heffernan
San Francisco, CA 94123

From:	Jim Flanagan
To:	Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS); ChenStaff; act+more-housing@growsf.org
Subject:	I support more housing (via GrowSF.org)
Date:	Saturday, August 2, 2025 11:54:21 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for more housing in San Francisco, including Mayor Lurie's family zoning plan.

As polling consistently shows, the vast majority of San Francisco residents across all demographics support building more housing.

San Francisco is 90% behind on our state-mandated housing goals. If we don't act soon, the state will strip our city of local control over zoning and development. We must build more housing to address our affordability crisis and ensure San Francisco becomes a place where families can afford to live.

Thank you for your leadership on this critical issue.

From:	Bianca Dibartolo-Forrester
To:	Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS); ChenStaff; act+more-housing@growsf.org
Subject:	I support more housing (via GrowSF.org)
Date:	Sunday, August 3, 2025 10:58:07 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for more housing in San Francisco, including Mayor Lurie's family zoning plan.

As polling consistently shows, the vast majority of San Francisco residents across all demographics support building more housing.

San Francisco is 90% behind on our state-mandated housing goals. If we don't act soon, the state will strip our city of local control over zoning and development. We must build more housing to address our affordability crisis and ensure San Francisco becomes a place where families can afford to live.

Thank you for your leadership on this critical issue.
Bianca Forrester

This email message is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). It may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please alert the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message

From: zrants@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mari Eliza
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, August 4, 2025 8:04:36 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.

Sincerely,
Mari Eliza
San Francisco, CA 94110

From: knit1purl1@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of PATIENCE HUTCHINSON
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, August 4, 2025 8:15:18 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.

Sincerely,
PATIENCE HUTCHINSON
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: mail@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Josie Brown
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, August 4, 2025 9:17:09 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." In fact, allowing this will decimate low income housing since no percentage of units in the new buildings allocated for this.Why isn't that the case? Also, the heights allowed in this proposed plan will also take away all sight corridors and view vistas—the reason San Francisco is the world's number one tourist destination. Without our beautiful Victorians and Edwardians, we are as faceless as Houston and Atlanta. And taller buildings on our narrow streets will mean blocked streets even worse than they are now by delivery trucks.

Please vote to keep the narrower streets at their current zoned heights.

Sincerely,
Josie Brown
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: fhochschild@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Frances Hochschild
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 11:05:08 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I was born here and have lived here 60 years and it’s so disappointing to see this happening to my city. 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.

Please please stop this craziness!!

Sincerely,
Frances Hochschild
San Francisco, CA 94115

From: sarahssung@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sarah Sung
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 11:07:25 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 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,
Sarah Sung
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: litagent@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Cherie Fehrman
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 11:08:26 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.

ENOUGH! STOP PLEASE!

Sincerely,
Cherie Fehrman
San Francisco, CA 94118

From:	morganspierce@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Morgan Pierce
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Tuesday, August 5, 2025 11:08:52 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 Francisco Business Owner, 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,
Morgan Pierce
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: sptsantilis@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Senta Tsantilis
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 11:11:20 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,
Senta Tsantilis

From: dede.estey@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Dede Estey
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 11:11:28 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 particular concern along Fulton facing Golden Gate Park as many beautiful old homes from Edwardian times and single family residents would be demolished leaving ugly cookie cutter boxes in their place along with local residents with high costs to rent or afford to buy. In the Richmond District.):

Sincerely,
Dede Estey
San Francisco, CA 94121

From:	rbrandi@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Richard Brandi
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Tuesday, August 5, 2025 11:12:27 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): we all know this plan will destroy small neighborhood businesses witness the small business commission action and 2 board of supervisors proposals but nothing is in the plan to save our neighborhoods. This is most reckless land use dictat of the state and we must fight it in the courts if necessary. Call weiners buff.

Sincerely,
Richard Brandi

From: damianinglin@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Damian Inglin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 11:32:47 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): There is no need for additional housing in San Francisco. This push for housing is gaslighting. Stop the destruction of San Francisco!

Sincerely,
Damian Inglin
San Francisco, CA 94123

From:	okeeffengc@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Norma OKeeffe
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Tuesday, August 5, 2025 11:36:50 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,
Norma OKeeffe
San Francisco, CA 94132

From: films@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Judy Irving
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 11:42:33 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

To Mayor Lurie: Going forward, do you want to be the mayor who is blamed for demolishing the city that residents and tourists love? Or would you prefer to be remembered as the mayor who pushed back against the State's takeover of our planning and zoning process? As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose your plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and the transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on our elected and appointed representatives to:

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

The 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.

Don't buy into it. You will be sorry if you do.

Sincerely,
Judy Irving
San Francisco, CA 94133

From:	barbarajheffernan@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Barbara Heffernan
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Tuesday, August 5, 2025 11:46:54 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,
Barbara Heffernan
San Francisco, CA 94123

From:	epoole@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Edward Poole
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Tuesday, August 5, 2025 11:49:34 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.

AS a resicent of Cow Hollow, I could not be more upset at this prospect. Way to ruin the neighborhood feel of San Francisco.

Sincerely,
Edward Poole
San Francisco, CA 94123

From:	cadamb@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Brendan Cadam
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Tuesday, August 5, 2025 11:49:45 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 and bayview resident, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing, and transformation of our neighborhoods into mismatched 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 and skyline — 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,
Brendan Cadam
San Francisco, CA 94124

From: john33sf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Nulty
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 11:50:13 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.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
John Nulty
San Francisco, CA 94142

From: madatian.j@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jasmine Madatian
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 11:52:23 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 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 designed to create chaos for residents of this once beautiful city.

Sincerely,
Jasmine Madatian
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: yelsoma@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Alice Mosley
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 11:57:12 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, downgrades architectual preservation, and can transform our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

Use the power of your office 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,
Alice Mosley
San Francisco, CA 94117

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]
Date: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 12:02:43 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.

Danie Lurie is backed by construction companies/workers. This is not bringing affordable housing. It is making the construction industry richer and ruining our city. THERE IS PLENTY OF HOUSING SITTING VACANT. STOP GETTING DEVELOPERS RICHER.

Sincerely,
DIANA GIAMPAOLI
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: danolley@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of David Nolley
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 12:20:51 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 long-time San Franciscan (BA SFSU '68), 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. My wife and I call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps; and
- 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 as well as 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,
David Nolley
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: audreyrbjorklund@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Audrey Bjorklund
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 12:28:55 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.

These plans will ruin the flavor and personality of San Francisco and what makes it a special and wonderful city to live in. DO not destroy the beauty of our city for the sake profit and those who don't care about its future or the people and neighborhoods that make it all it is.

Sincerely,
Audrey Bjorklund
San Francisco, CA 94123

From:	beckyfchristian@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Becky Christian
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Tuesday, August 5, 2025 12:29:18 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,
Becky Christian
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: chamaret@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jun Ishimuro
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 12:31:45 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,
Jun Ishimuro
San Francisco, CA 94114

From:	noguera@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Hatun Noguera
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Tuesday, August 5, 2025 12:36:44 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 do not want the Westside of SF overbuilt.

Sincerely,
Hatun Noguera
San Francisco, CA 94127

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]
Date: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 12:38:27 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 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:	aschuppek@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Angelique Schuppek
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Tuesday, August 5, 2025 12:42:36 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.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):
The reason people come to visit and live in SF is because of the beautiful and historic neighborhoods like North Beach. Please reject the upzoning of North Beach!

Sincerely,
Angelique Schuppek
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: pattired12@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Patti McMahon
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 12:46:39 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):I think the first priority in new housing is dealing with empty office buildings in downtown. New homes in this area will bring more activity and improve business. The height on Lombard, Geary of 11 stories is crazy. I think empty buildings and lots should be built up but max height 5-6 floors. I’ve owned my property for years but this could adversely impact neighbors who have recently purchased their properties.

Sincerely,
Patti McMahon
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: justintruong56@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Justin Truong
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 12:47:42 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,
Justin Truong

From: andreacgalvin@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Andrea Galvin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 12:53:48 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 am a longtime resident of the Richmond District and am profoundly disgusted and disillusioned by the idea that a few out of touch politicians with no familiarity with, let alone appreciation for, my neighborhood are about to circumvent the democratic process, exclude community input, and sell out my neighborhood to real estate developers and billionaire tech interests who fund Sen. Weiner and apparently Mayor Lurie as well. There has been a lot of concern in recent years about threats to democracy. I share that concern. One of the biggest threats to democracy I see comes in the form of greedy land speculators hiding behind the language of "Abundance." Mayor Lurie's proposed blanket upzoning plan will result in major and irreversible changes to the character of our city. We must not rush to approve something with such major impact. Please take the time to consider the second order effects (e.g. displacement of businesses and long-term renters, greater traffic congestion, decreased quality of life for existing residents, loss of the unique character of our city.) What is the rush? Who benefits?

I am also the parent of young college graduates, native San Franciscans who are moving back to the city to start their careers and currently in the process of navigating the rental market. I am not removed from their challenges; and even so I question the need for massive upzoning. The young San Franciscans I know - as opposed to the Astro-turf YIMBY activists who are few but make a lot of noise - want nothing to do with the homogenized, soul-less, cheaply constructed schlock that this blanket, indiscriminate upzoning proposal will yield - with no accountability for developers and no guarantee of actual affordability.

Sincerely,
Andrea Galvin
San Francisco, CA 94121

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:	14 Letters Regarding File Nos. 250700_701_727
Date:	Thursday, July 24, 2025 12:16:20 PM
Attachments:	14 Letters Regarding File No. 250700_701_727.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached 14 letters regarding File Nos.:

250700: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan
250701: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan
250727: Opposing California State Senate Bill No. 79 (Wiener) Unless Amended - Housing Development: Transit- Oriented Development

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: cristal_parsons@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Cristal Parsons
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Thursday, July 24, 2025 10:11:59 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,
Cristal Parsons
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: fhochschild@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Frances Hochschild
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Tuesday, July 22, 2025 12:10:34 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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,
Frances Hochschild
San Francisco, CA 94115

From: lynnemerryburwell@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lynne Burwell
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Tuesday, July 22, 2025 1:12:22 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Like most San Franciscans, I hear sad stories of people being evicted from affordable rentals and forced to leave the city. The mayor's plan does nothing to address the displacement problem. Instead, it will encourage expensive housing in ever-taller buildings, with a very small amount going toward affordable housing.

The strength of San Francisco is in its neighborhoods and the community that neighborhoods foster. Plunking down high-rise buildings in low-rise neighborhoods will destroy the fabric of our city.

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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener’s SB 79 and 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.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,
Lynne Burwell
San Francisco, CA 94118

From:	nadyanomad@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Nadya Williams
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date:	Tuesday, July 22, 2025 4:17:03 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

The great majority of San Franciscans do not want the beauty, human scale, unique architecture and community character of The City destroyed for real estate wealth. We are not fooled.
It is a place for the billionaire/trillionaire class to park their money! They don't care if the Luxury condos and office spaces are largely vacant. We know the falsehoods of the promise of "affordable" housing.

We know the funding behind Mahmood, Sauter and Weiner!

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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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,
Nadya Williams
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: blindauer46@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Bonnie Lindauer
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Tuesday, July 22, 2025 4:21:02 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. This is not the San Francisco I have lived in and loved for over 30 years. Luxury or even middle-class housing is not needed. What is needed is true affordable housing for the working class.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener’s SB 79 and 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.

I don't want to join a friend who is leaving San Francisco for the reason that it's too expensive, so PLEASE do NOT support Lurie's and Weiner's actions.

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,
Bonnie Lindauer
San Francisco, CA 94134

From: rhiannonwelch@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Rhiannon Welch
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, July 23, 2025 9:54:27 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,
Rhiannon Welch
San Francisco, CA 94117

From:	Kburgigrass@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Karen Grass
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Wednesday, July 23, 2025 11:43:42 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):We have lived in Cow Hollow for over 40 years(husband natvie SFranciscan!), proud and involved neighborhood home owners who are now helping raise next generation of family...our neighborhood is already congested and crowded to maximum; please DO NOT add anymore housing to this part of the City when there are open/and or less crowded areas to consider...we would like to retire and continue to be involved here in our neighborhood, and see our grown children and grandchildren thrive here, vs. considering moving out of our beloved City...thank you for considering, please visit our neighborhood at any time and see what I am concerned about...Karen Grass, RN

Sincerely,
Karen Grass
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: baughmancardenas@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Deborah Cardenas
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, July 23, 2025 11:59:45 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 world traveling San Franciscan born in the Presidio, 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 all based on a housing study that is still challenged for accuracy.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline
- Find alternative ways to house the unhoused with the many empty housing units we currently have.

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. I have been to many countries that were made true concrete jungles due to bad and short sighted planning.

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.

Let's see some transparency here. Where is the money that is driving this and who stands to make it? There is a lot of distrust in our city government right now due to the budget overruns, fraud, missing funds, etc. Turn it around by really proving that changing the nature of our city is required and no other alternative will solve the problem.

Sincerely,
Deborah Cardenas
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: sandra.derian@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sandra Derian
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, July 23, 2025 12:21:24 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):

This plan will lead to evicting people who have lived in the community for 30+ years. You want to evict people who have contributed by caring for others in the community in various ways that benefit fellow neighbors and small businesses. Where will the people in the buildings being upzoned go when there is ZERO affordable housing that matches their current monthly rent expense? You're not evicting the wealthy. You're evicting low income and middle income, hard-working long-term residents without any solution to give them equal housing during the construction period. We are people who have made a life in the community by being employed within the city limits, by paying for SFMTA services, and furthermore, displacing us will be a detriment to each person's life, negatively impacting their relations who live within close proximity; upsetting the lives of hundreds of thousands of people who don't have first month, last month, and a security deposit in their savings to find a new place to live during construction. We don't have the funds to pay movers. We don't know a person with a truck who wants to help us move our entire apartment to a new place. Upzoning will lead to further gentrification of neighborhoods. Whole areas of the city will lose their unique character. Manhattanizing SF will only further encourage speculative real estate practices for the millionaires and foreign investores. Please do not upzone and displace the hundreds of thousands of people who have made San Francisco unique to other Bay Area cities.

Sincerely,
Sandra Derian
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: lizschenk@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Liz Schenk
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, July 23, 2025 4:27:35 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):

Sincerely,
Liz Schenk
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: catherinebehrens@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Catherine Behrens
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, July 23, 2025 4:57:25 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 affordable housing accommodations, particularly for essential workers in SF so they can live where they work. However, I oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which appears to be extreme and overshoots the mark. The heights of the buildings proposed will likely result in transforming our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors rather than providing affordable housing. In addition, the upzoning is excessive and incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses. Russian Hill/North Beach is a beautiful and historic neighborhood that is not only home to many San Franciscans who live and work here, but also attracts significant numbers of tourists who wish to enjoy the beauty and hospitality that the neighborhood offers.

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.

Please look at the bigger picture and reconsider these plans. As we are rapidly learning, in addition to the immediate impact of policy changes, there are also long-lasting and often irreversible consequences that result from myopic and hasty decisions.

Thank you for your attention to this issue and for your continued service to San Francisco.

Sincerely,
Catherine Behrens
San Francisco, CA 94133

From:	soundsationally@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Brian Ziffer
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Wednesday, July 23, 2025 5:36:53 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

BUILDING UP IS NOT THE ANSWER!!!!!!! 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): This is OUR city, not the mayors office or the developers. People's voices should be heard on any single environmental and structural change that affects our lives, for months (construction, delays, traffic, noise, pollution, destruction) and for years.. (views, sunlight, congestion, parking)

Sincerely,
Brian Ziffer
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: cadamb@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Brendan Cadsm
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Thursday, July 24, 2025 1:01:01 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,
Brendan Cadsm
San Francisco, CA 94124

From: gregg@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Gregg Butensky
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Thursday, July 24, 2025 11:07:58 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 writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed upzoning plan.

As a San Franciscan, I'm very concerned that this plan will drive up rents, displace long-term tenants, push out small businesses, and cause irreparable harm to our neighborhoods.

While change is inevitable in a city such as ours, it's critical that we collectively work for the common good. The current upzoning plan will require the demolition of many buildings, resulting in the displacement of lower income residents and small businesses.

Especially given the current national climate, it is paramount that San Francisco retains its values and cares for all of its residents.

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,
Gregg Butensky

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:	48 Letters Regarding File Nos. 250700_701_727
Date:	Tuesday, July 22, 2025 12:23:27 PM
Attachments:	48 Letters Regarding File Nos. 250700_701_727.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached 48 letters regarding File Nos.:

250700: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan
250701: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan
250727: Opposing California State Senate Bill No. 79 (Wiener) Unless Amended - Housing Development: Transit- Oriented Development

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: Josinsf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Josephine Lucchesi
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Wednesday, July 16, 2025 4:12:08 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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,
Josephine Lucchesi
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: marygassert@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mary Gassert
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Wednesday, July 16, 2025 5:18:12 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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):
These proposals go too far. They will destroy the neighborhoods that make San Francisco desirable to families. There is absolutely no guarantee that any of the new housing will benefit those who need it. There is no guarantee that the new housing will incorporate outdoor space for a more livable environment. There is no preservation of the architecture for which San Francisco is famous. The only developments that will likely be built are luxury towers along the water. San Franciscans are not naive, we know this is the result of development money that has been pouring into the politicians coffers. Stand up to the corrupting influence of big money.

Sincerely,
Mary Gassert
San Francisco, CA 94109

From:	pjduff@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Patricia J Duff
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date:	Wednesday, July 16, 2025 5:29:36 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.

I object to the destruction of historic buildings in upzoned areas that have never been formally evaluated for listing on a historic register as required by CEQA and will not be given further consideration once the upzoning imitative has been approved.

I object to the characterization by housing proponents of historic building owners. Most of us did not inherit our property but saved for years for a down payment on homes with long-deferred maintenance. It was our sweat equity that provided the homes that are so precious to us today. We do not oppose new housing. We just want to have a say in new construction that affects or destroys our historic homes and neighborhoods.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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 affordability. This is a nationwide effort by corporate real estate interests! It is happening in Seattle, WA, Denver, CO and San Diego. To name a few. The massive real estate speculation this plan is likely to ignite will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis.

Sincerely,
Patricia J Duff
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: bellacatus@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Catherine Bellin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Wednesday, July 16, 2025 6:22:15 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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,
Catherine Bellin
San Francisco, CA 94117

From:	hobb2@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sherri Samu
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date:	Wednesday, July 16, 2025 6:33:10 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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: barbarabdelaney@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Barbara Delaney
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Wednesday, July 16, 2025 7:09:58 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Please reject this bill. It is not a good fit for development in San Francisco and threatens to erase all that is unique about the city.

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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,
Barbara Delaney
San Francisco, CA 94122

From:	barakosmd@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jerome Barakos
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date:	Wednesday, July 16, 2025 7:57:34 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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): Let's build the projects that are already approved rather than starting with new zoning first.

Sincerely,
Jerome Barakos
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: abxguba@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Andrew Barakos
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Wednesday, July 16, 2025 7:58:13 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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): Let's build the projects that are already approved rather than starting with new zoning first.

Sincerely,
Andrew Barakos
San Francisco, CA 94121

From:	angryoctopus@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Stuart Barakos
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date:	Wednesday, July 16, 2025 7:58:50 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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): Let's build the projects that are already approved rather than starting with new zoning first.

Sincerely,
Stuart Barakos
San Francisco, CA 94121

From:	mark.r.berwick@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mark Berwick
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date:	Wednesday, July 16, 2025 8:04:29 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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,
Mark Berwick
San Francisco, CA 94123

From:	zike13.5@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of michael zabelle
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date:	Wednesday, July 16, 2025 8:19:03 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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 forcing of high rise apt / condo buildings is extremely bad for SF and it's citizens. If SF was just another city like LA or Sacramento then I would have a different opinion but SF is a jewel of the world. SF is arguably the most beautiful city in the world yet Scot Weiner treats it like the above mentioned cities. Please protect the beauty of each SF neighborhood and stop Scot Weiner's urban renewal plan. Please.

Sincerely,
michael zabelle
San Francisco, CA 94117

From:	artiekramer@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Arthur Kramer
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date:	Wednesday, July 16, 2025 10:20:55 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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,
Arthur Kramer
San Francisco, CA 94118

From: mtcarhart@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Matthew Carhart
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Wednesday, July 16, 2025 11:02:50 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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,
Matthew Carhart
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: racwar@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Rachel Ward
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Thursday, July 17, 2025 7:57:35 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

This is the 3rd letter I have written on this subject given I feel SO strongly about it.

I voted for Daniel Lurie - but if this plan goes through - I shall never again.

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 especially along Lombard Street.
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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.

I can only see the benefits for developers - not for those who actually currently live in the Cow Hollow & Marina communities.

Sincerely,
Rachel Ward
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: travlsprt@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Annemarie Rossi
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Thursday, July 17, 2025 8:07:54 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 or better yet eliminate the possibility of his bill passing.
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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. Planning requires consideration of resources available and repurposing empty or mostly vacant buildings.

I live at 1835 Golden Gate Ave. There is a monstrosity of a building behind my residence that has no business being there at over 9 stories high. It's out of character, out of place for the neighborhood and I can't sit silent and let this happen elsewhere in our city.

Please, I urge you to find another way.

Sincerely,
Annemarie Rossi
San Francisco, CA 94115

From: romalynschmaltz@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Romalyn Schmaltz
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Thursday, July 17, 2025 8:15:05 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Esp. Attention to my new supervisor Danny Sauter:

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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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,
Romalyn Schmaltz
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: priscillamuniz1@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Priscilla Muniz
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Thursday, July 17, 2025 9:45:27 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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,
Priscilla Muniz
San Francisco, CA 94123

From:	julssf35@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Juli Sante
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date:	Thursday, July 17, 2025 9:49:23 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 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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,
Juli Sante
San Francisco, CA 94123

From:	ntdc@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Neil Dellacava
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date:	Thursday, July 17, 2025 9:53:41 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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 think you've miss the economics. It's very expensive to build in San Francisco. How can our fireman teachers and even policeman afford the rentals in the city of San Francisco. The numbers just don't make sense. I'd love to see the affordability index that you folks create. I just read about a recent plan where developers paid the right price and were able to increase the number of units and decrease the number of local housing. You guys are kidding Going forward I don't believe I can support any politician who supports this initiative. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Neil Dellacava
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: r_bloch@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Rene Bloch
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Thursday, July 17, 2025 9:58:24 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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,
Rene Bloch
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: denisemgeorge@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Denise George
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Thursday, July 17, 2025 10:22:31 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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,
Denise George
San Francisco, CA 94117

From: buckbagot@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Buck Bagot
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Thursday, July 17, 2025 10:29:47 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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 upzoning plan is an exercise in Reagonomic tricolor down theory. Build 100% affordable housing. No marketbrate housing.

Sincerely,
Buck Bagot
San Francisco, CA 94110

From: carole.stahlkopf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Carole Stahlkopf
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Thursday, July 17, 2025 11:19:03 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Dear Lisa Chen and Myrna Melgar,

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.

As a 50+ year resident of this city, what I have loved the most about this city is its immense diversity in culture, life stye, and neighborhoods. Should you prefer living in a lively neighborhood, there is SOMA; should you prefer an area with small shops and many restaurants, there is the Sacramento Street area; should you prefer living in a quiet neighborhood, there is my neighborhood, Ingleside Terraces. Choices like these make San Francisco the fascinating and unique city that it is. The homogenization of housing as proposed will diminish the value and appeal of the choices available to residents.

Given the number of housing permits already approved, I ask that there be a thoughtful delay in making a decision on housing that will have such potentially drastic effects on the residents of San Francisco.

Sincerely,
Carole Stahlkopf
149 Moncada Way
San Francisco CA 94127

Sincerely,
Carole Stahlkopf
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: madyjones@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mady Jones
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Thursday, July 17, 2025 11:46:00 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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 have lived in SF for 55 years. I remember well the devastating effects of the Fillmore Urban Renewal. Please don't make similar mistakes now. We need more housing but we need to respect historical neighborhoods.

Sincerely,
Mady Jones
San Francisco, CA 94115

From: richard-marini@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Richard Marini
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Thursday, July 17, 2025 12:27:01 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 native San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Senator Weiner and 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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): There is no guarantee nor plan that ensures that the changes will provide "affordable" housing. It will forever change the city that we know and love into a fragmented cluster of buildings serving the rich.
The city cannot even keep up with its current issues like street and sidewalk repair, infrastructure maintenance including sewers and trees. Please tell me how it will keep up with this growth plan?
Upzoning etc. is not why I voted for the current leadership and will certainly be the reason they will be VOTED OUT when the time comes. Hopefully the damage will not be irreversible by then.

Sincerely,
Richard Marini
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: maryksullivan4@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mary Sullivan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Thursday, July 17, 2025 12:29:07 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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,
Mary Sullivan
San Francisco, CA 94133

From:	seaward94122@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of STEVE WARD
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date:	Thursday, July 17, 2025 12:50:27 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 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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.

In the most dense city west of the Hudson River we must develop with discretion to preserve SF's world renowned character and the quality of life FOR OUR CURRENT RESIDENTS! Reduce the office vacancy to 10% before approving any up zoning in neighborhoods
not desiring it through repurposing to mixed use. This is the economic and environmental best strategy.
ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
STEVE WARD
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: upzoneoverreachemail@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Vance Nesbitt
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Thursday, July 17, 2025 2:31:26 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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.

KEEP SAN FRANCISCO, SAN FRANCISCO!

Sincerely,
Vance Nesbitt
San Francisco, CA 94123

From:	padysplace@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Luis Pine
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date:	Thursday, July 17, 2025 5:44:38 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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):
How can we correct a situation whereby an Industry (Building) whose priority is profiting, gets to influence public offices about the need and parameters for building? Or, to put it another way, how do we correct our public officials (from city supervisors, state assembly and governor), who are protecting and prioritizing the will of an industry instead of the need of the citizens of a city whom they're required to represent?

Sincerely,
Luis Pine
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: ayun112@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Andersen Yun
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Thursday, July 17, 2025 7:29:52 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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): Buliding new buildings has never in the history of San Francisco resulted in the needed amount of affordable housing. We need to rethink the idea that new buildings = affordable housing if we turn over land to rich, corporate developers, who only have profits in mind. As an example, the newish building on sloat near 47 th ave is alreadyt being repaired, and the building on Ocean and Miramar has new scaffolding around it for needed repairs. Neither of these buildings offer affordable housing, yet the build quality is shoddy. Add to that the relaxation of building codes in the name of the economy and turning back CEQA regulations, and the residents of San Francisco can expect high rents, shoddy buildings and the continued growth of RV's on the street and tent cities, as well as a degraded enviornment. Please oppose SB79 and the upzoning deadline!!

Sincerely,
Andersen Yun
San Francisco, CA 94112

From: alan94117@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Alan Collins
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Thursday, July 17, 2025 11:37:16 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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,
Alan Collins
San Francisco, CA 94107

From:	quinnevent@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Phyllis Quinn
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date:	Friday, July 18, 2025 1:13:36 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:
Stop trying to make San Francisco the land of expensive Towers! Do not destroy our neighborhoods! Go somewhere else!

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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 (see above):

Sincerely,
Phyllis Quinn
San Francisco, CA 94109

From:	bailey.kathyr@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kathy Bailey
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date:	Friday, July 18, 2025 3:41:48 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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.

Have increased traffic and parking [and other infrastructure] issues been seriously considered?

Sincerely,
Kathy Bailey
San Francisco, CA 94122

From:	smoughan@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sarah Moughan
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date:	Friday, July 18, 2025 8:24:30 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 destroys the character of our most beautiful and historic neighborhoods by replacing lovely buildings with 6 story towers.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener’s SB 79 and 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,
Sarah Moughan
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: bilgepump100@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Robert Hall
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Friday, July 18, 2025 9:32:09 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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,
Robert Hall
San Francisco, CA 94117

From: diana.giampaoli@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Diana Giampaoli
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Saturday, July 19, 2025 8:28:48 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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.

Please we ask for you to keep the building to a 3 to 4 story minimium. This won't be affordable housing. People won't take the transportation along Lombard. Right now it's for Google, Facebook, etc at Silicon Valley. SF has enough buildings for housing. STOP THE UPZONING. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Diana Giampaoli
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: angieschuppek@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Angelique Schuppek
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Saturday, July 19, 2025 9:31:42 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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 live in North Beach. I love our neighborhood full of character and beautiful views! This is why I moved here. I don't want to change it into a neighborhood full of modern buildings. Thank you!

Sincerely,
Angelique Schuppek
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: schuppek@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Richard Schuppek
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Saturday, July 19, 2025 3:38:21 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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 strongly oppose the upzoning in North Beach, where we live, as that will take away from charm and community feel which we love about our neighborhood and of the City. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Richard Schuppek
San Francisco, CA 94133

From:	krf.1sf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Karen Franklin
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date:	Saturday, July 19, 2025 6:07:41 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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,
Karen Franklin
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: pennyfino@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Penelope Finocchiaro
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Sunday, July 20, 2025 5:24:04 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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 mandate.

Never disregard our elegant city and how careful planning
has added growth with reason. I don't understand the urgency for demolition and building where it is not necessary. It's about money. What about huge deserted areas that could be repurposed- like the block of the old flower mart.

I'm a longtime owner in North Beach/telegraph hill. Yes to improving long deserted properties but NOT destroying everyone's waterfront views for the few privileged. Disgusting.

Sincerely,
Penelope Finocchiaro
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: jim-connelly@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of jim connelly
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Sunday, July 20, 2025 6:31:16 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

This is insane! We have lived in Cow Hollow for nearly 50 years and have never seen such an assault on the neighborhood that we love.

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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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,
jim connelly
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: aj.t.swoboda@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of AJ Swoboda
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Monday, July 21, 2025 6:47:19 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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 wife and I are raising our family in Jordan Park, a neighborhood that is ALREADY adding 1300+ housing units without all of these insane plans the Mayor is proposing. We want development and we believe in SF, but we also can't adopt a tech policy of "move fast; break things" when it comes to something so permanent and long lasting. I have spoke at two hearings in City Hall about how thoughtless the Mayor's initial (and still current version) of zoning is. He and his administration are clearly looking to ram plans through by relying on citizens to either be unaware or to eventually give up fighting.

Sincerely,
AJ Swoboda
San Francisco, CA 94118

From:	isadore.rosenthal@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Isadore Rosenthal
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date:	Monday, July 21, 2025 12:26:15 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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,
Isadore Rosenthal
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: ericajoykatrak@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Erica Katrak
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable [File No: 250700 and 250701]
Date: Monday, July 21, 2025 1:45:21 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 and someone who would like to stay here and enjoy this beautiful and creative city throughout the rest of my life, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's upzoning plan, which would encourage the demolition of existing homes, displace renters and small businesses, and turn our neighborhoods into corridors of unaffordable luxury towers.

This plan empowers and enriches developers, silences residents, and is being rushed to satisfy a state mandate that's not only outdated and out of touch with San Francisco's current reality, but poorly thought through from the beginning and not in the interest of the average citizen. That mandate should be CHALLENGED — not used to justify permanent zoning changes.

You cannot rewrite the city's land use overnight with most residents unaware. Once this plan is adopted, there is no going back — even if it proves disastrous. You can only ruin a city once.

I, like a huge number of people who live here, urge you to:

– Protect renters and small businesses
– Preserve irreplaceable and unique historic character
– Preserve the vistas that draw visitors from around the world
– Require real affordability
– Slow the process and engage the public

Don't rush a decision that will reshape San Francisco forever. We need thoughtful planning — and leadership that listens.

Sincerely,
Erica Katrak
San Francisco, CA 94114

From:	esthermk@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Esther Marks
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date:	Monday, July 21, 2025 7:11:13 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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,
Esther Marks
San Francisco, CA 94117

From: ALSundby@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Ann Sundby
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Tuesday, July 22, 2025 9:27:26 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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,
Ann Sundby
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: vernshah@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Verna Shaheen
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Tuesday, July 22, 2025 11:13:57 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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 been active in preservation efforts in SF for at least 25 years. I am a member of SF Heritage and SF Victorian Alliance in addition to SF History Association. We must preserve our architectural gems, neighborhood character, and proper scale. Let's find more creative solutions as well as inventory all of the vacant hotels and other buildings before unnecessarily building more!!!

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Verna Shaheen
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: taylor.lint@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Taylor Lint
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable [File No: 250700 and 250701]
Date: Tuesday, July 22, 2025 10:46:09 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 upzoning plan, which would encourage the demolition of existing homes, displace renters and small businesses, and turn our neighborhoods into corridors of unaffordable luxury towers.

This plan empowers developers, silences residents, and is being rushed to satisfy a state mandate that's outdated and out of touch with San Francisco's current reality. That mandate should be challenged — not used to justify permanent zoning changes.

You can not rewrite the city's land use overnight with most residents unaware. And once this plan is adopted, there is no going back — even if it proves disastrous.

We urge you to:

– Protect renters and small businesses
– Preserve neighborhood scale and historic character
– Require real affordability
– Slow the process and engage the public

Don't rush a decision that will reshape San Francisco forever. We need thoughtful planning — and leadership that listens.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Taylor Lint
San Francisco, CA 94109

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; Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	File Nos. 250700, 250701, and 250727 - 78 letters
Date:	Thursday, July 17, 2025 12:45:52 PM
Attachments:	78 letters.pdf

Dear Supervisors,

Please see attached 78 letters from members of the public regarding:

File No. 250700 - Ordinance amending the Zoning Map to implement the Family Zoning Plan by amending the Zoning Use District Maps to: 1) reclassify certain properties currently zoned as various types of Residential to Residential Transit Oriented - Commercial (RTO-C); 2) reclassify properties currently zoned Residential Transit Oriented (RTO) to Residential Transit Oriented - 1 (RTO-1); 3) reclassify certain properties from Residential districts other than RTO to RTO-1; 4) reclassify certain properties currently zoned Neighborhood Commercial (NC) or Public (P) to Community Business (C-2); and 5) reclassify certain properties from Public to Mixed-Use or Neighborhood Commercial Districts; amending the Height and Bulk Map to: 1) reclassify properties in the Family Zoning Plan to R-4 Height and Bulk District; 2) change the height limits on certain lots in the R-4 Height and Bulk District; and 3) designating various parcels to be included in the Non-Contiguous San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Special Use District (SFMTA SUD); amending the Local Coastal Program to: 1) reclassify all properties in the Coastal Zone to R-4 Height and Bulk District; 2) reclassify certain properties to RTO-C and Neighborhood Commercial District; 3) designate one parcel as part of the SFMTA SUD; and 4) directing the Planning Director to transmit the Ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of public necessity, convenience, and welfare under Planning Code, Section 302; making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and making findings under the City's Local Coastal Program and the California Coastal Act of 1976.

File No. 250701 - Ordinance amending the Planning Code to: 1) create the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program to incent housing development through a local bonus program and by adopting a Housing Sustainability District, 2) modify height and bulk limits to provide for additional capacity in well-resourced neighborhoods, and to allow additional height and bulk for projects using the local bonus program, 3) require only buildings taller than 85 feet in certain Districts to reduce ground level wind currents, 4) make conforming changes to the RH (Residential, House), RM (Residential, Mixed), and RC (Residential-Commercial) District zoning tables to reflect the changes to density controls, and parking requirements made in this ordinance, 5) create the RTO-C

(Residential Transit Oriented-Commercial) District, 6) implement the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's Transit-Oriented Communities Policy by making changes to parking requirements, minimum residential densities, and minimum office intensities, and requiring maximum dwelling unit sizes, 7) revise off-street parking and curb cut obligations citywide, 8) create the Non-contiguous San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Sites Special Use District, 9) permit certain Legacy Businesses to relocate without a conditional use authorization and waive development impact fees for those businesses, 10) make technical amendments to the Code to implement the above changes, and 11) make conforming changes to zoning tables in various Districts, including the Neighborhood Commercial District and Mixed Use Districts; amending the Business and Tax Regulations Code regarding the Board of Appeals' review of permits in the Housing Choice Program Housing Sustainability District; amending the Local Coastal Program to implement the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program and other associated changes in the City's Coastal Zone, and directing the Planning Director to transmit the Ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment; 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 public necessity, convenience, and welfare findings under Planning Code, Section 302.

File No. 250727 - Resolution opposing California State Senate Bill 79 (Wiener) and similar future legislation, unless amended to give Local governments adequate ability to formulate local plans through its local legislative process, in which local governments and residents have adequate review and oversight of community planning, including affordability requirements, and residential and commercial tenant protections.

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:	mhesse@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Marianne Hesse
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date:	Tuesday, July 15, 2025 11:22:02 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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,
Marianne Hesse
San Francisco, CA 94117

From:	pattired12@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Patti McMahon
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date:	Tuesday, July 15, 2025 11:22:11 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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.

While I encourage more housing it should be done in a manner that preserves the look and feel of the neighborhoods.There are empty buildings all around the city that could be targeted for larger footprints - the closed movie theatre at 18th ave and Garry, the old closed restaurant next to Trader Joe's on Masonic, the closed north point movie theatre on north point - and many more. What happened to the office conversion idea to bring traffic into downtown San Francisco ? We have a 30+ % office vacancy rate.

Sincerely,
Patti McMahon
San Francisco, CA 94121

From:	barbara@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Barbara Mann
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date:	Tuesday, July 15, 2025 11:26:27 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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,
Barbara Mann
San Francisco, CA 94110

From:	johnzsf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Zlatunich
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date:	Tuesday, July 15, 2025 11:27:41 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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 Zlatunich
San Francisco, CA 94118

From: cydney1010@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Cydney DeBenedetto
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2025 11:37:06 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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,
Cydney DeBenedetto

From: carolynkenady@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Carolyn Kenady
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2025 11:46:27 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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,
Carolyn Kenady
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: marycmcf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mary McFadden
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2025 11:46:47 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 forth generation 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. Not only is this an environmental disaster, it destroys our shared history by eviscerating our communities. It is a gift to those who care nothing for the City or its residents, who see the people who built this place, who call this place home as obstacles to their increasing wealth.

I call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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,
Mary McFadden
San Francisco, CA 94115

From: nerok09@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Eugen Koren
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2025 11:47:00 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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,
Eugen Koren
San Francisco, CA 94111

From: apeichhorn@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Andrea Eichhorn
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2025 11:49:47 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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.

And this will adversely impact our personal/home experiences and property values. This will likely result in long protracted, and expensive battles. Let's work to create a mindful approach. And not make our neighborhoods into Manhattan.

Sincerely,
Andrea Eichhorn
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: familyadler@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Brian A
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2025 11:56:46 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am a 50 year resident of the Sunset District of San Francisco. Upzoning is inconsistent with our (and many) neighborhoods, and against the will of the people who have paid a fortune to live in a peaceful, well managed, family friendly neighborhood. Further, these upzoning proposals are DISCRIMINATORY - they apply to our middle class neighborhood, but NOT affluent St. Francis Woods, or Pacific Heights.

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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener’s SB 79 and 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,
Brian A
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: margaretmm@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Margaret McFarland
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2025 12:00:08 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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,
Margaret McFarland
San Francisco, CA 94114

From:	tolinhanley@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of SALLY HANLEY
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date:	Tuesday, July 15, 2025 12:09:29 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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,
SALLY HANLEY
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: savethegreathighway@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jasmine Madatian
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2025 12:23:21 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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 grossly negligent.

Residents deserve better.

Sincerely,
Jasmine Madatian
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: john.nulty@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Nulty
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2025 12:34:22 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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 Nulty
San Francisco, CA 94142

From: daviddeiwert@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of David Deiwert
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2025 12:41:53 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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 : The Western Addition, Japan Town, does not need this to happen again.

Sincerely,
David Deiwert
San Francisco, CA 94115

From: tamrob@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Tamra Marshall
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2025 12:53:08 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 30 year resident of San Francisco and have raised a family here and I strive to see our city continue to be a place where families and individuals can live, grow and thrive. I agree that we need to develop a plan for more AFFORDABLE housing in our city and state, yet I find the current plans for SF to be purposefully confusing, misleading and full of potential for corruption and not focused on the "family" part of FAMILY ZONING (as the new name would lead one to believe).

Mayor Lurie's Family Zoning Plan has very little to do with building affordable housing and enriching communities for middle class and lower-middle class residents, but much to do with enriching developers to build fast, cheap high-rise structures that will diminish neighborhood cohesiveness and the unique architecture that represents the character of our city.

I want an upzoning plan, but this one misses the mark! San Francisco's young people and families do not want to live in high rises - they want affordable and charming apartments, condos, flats and homes that have a neighborhood feel - not tall boxes with windows that offer little in the way of long term appeal and a sense of home.

Increasing the heights only along the Muni corridors will a create stark and unbalanced feel and it creates an unnecessary burden on just some neighborhoods when we have great public transportation everywhere in this city. I propose we explore raising the height limits more consistently across the entire city to keep a balanced urban landscape and include regulations that require new and higher buildings to have architectural features that blend and enhance existing neighborhood structures and retain the SF charm. Let's face it, developers will not do that unless it is required.

This plans needs much more creative thought into how to increase AFFORDABLE housing and keep our City as a visually beautiful place to live and receive visitors from all over the world.

I've raised 2 sons in the City and both of them loved growing up here and have strong ties and friends from every neighborhood around town. I grew up in the suburbs in the midwest and never had the same feeling of neighborhood belonging that I get here. Both of my adult sons are now SFUSD teachers - one a kindergarten teacher and one a high school teacher. They want to remain living here and raise their own families in this beloved city. But, I worry about the affordability problem and that is what should be the focus in a new plan. I am not against change and increasing height limits all across the city but I see NO real increase in affordability in this plan nor a way to attract and retain middle class families. I recommend a new look at this plan that really addresses the problems! Let's not take the quick-fix route based on arbitrary numbers sent down from Sacramento and the politicians who want to climb the ladder. We can surely do better!

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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79

- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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,
Tamra Marshall
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: mhuettl62@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Martha Huettl
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2025 12:53:57 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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,
Martha Huettl
San Francisco, CA 94110

From:	tvobsf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Anthony Villa
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date:	Tuesday, July 15, 2025 12:59:48 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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,
Anthony Villa
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: emmo55@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Don Emmons
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2025 1:09:10 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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,
Don Emmons
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: sfromana@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Anne-Marie Russo
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2025 1:12:58 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I've lived in San Francisco Tenderloin District for over 20 years. I believe in preserving the fabric of our city, keeping small businesses alive and not disrupting communities. Not to mention the unique charm of our neighborhoods that make living here a joy. The upzoning maps are not conducive to the type of city we all choose to live in. 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener’s SB 79 and 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): Keep San Francisco Neighborhoods as micro-communities, not mass luxury corridors.

Sincerely,
Anne-Marie Russo
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: juliepaul164@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Julie Paul
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2025 1:15:52 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

CITY OFFICIALS: Please take note--the reason I am so against these plans and proposed legislation is that they will NOT fix the problem and will DESTROY our neighborhoods in the process. Citizens are waking up and outraged that Mayor Lurie's "Family" Plan is based on faulty numbers and the scale is completely outsized. San Francisco's population is static (after significantly declining), baby boomers will be aging out of their homes and birth rates are on the decline. We do not need this much capacity, and the result will be hodge-podgey towers built randomly to the financial benefit of developers at the expense of residents. San Francisco Planning officials should not be flippantly saying, "Well, we won't have to rezone for the next 50 years." This defies the purpose of an 8-year Housing Element cycle and violates the principles of good city planning which should be interative based on actual needs. Furthermore, the elementary belief that more supply = lower prices is bogus because housing is a vastly different industry than manufacturing. Builders do not have to build housing to try to cover their fixed costs--they will only build if it is profitable which is exactly what they should do. The real solutions are more subsidized housing, more rapid transit and higher minimum wages.

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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener’s SB 79 and 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,
Julie Paul
San Francisco, CA 94118

From:	irismvbucchioni@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Iris Bucchioni
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date:	Tuesday, July 15, 2025 1:21:54 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 San Franciscan and concerned D7 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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,
Iris Bucchioni
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: tb@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Thomas Bucchioni
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2025 1:30:12 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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,
Thomas Bucchioni
San Francisco, CA 94127

From:	janesmalley1@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jane Smalley
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date:	Tuesday, July 15, 2025 1:32:09 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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 Smalley
San Francisco, CA 94118

From: lmuhlfeld@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of louise patterson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2025 1:48:05 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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 patterson
San Francisco, CA 94118

From:	billykgp@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of William Kucera
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date:	Tuesday, July 15, 2025 1:52:42 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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,
William Kucera
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: scoopfoggy@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Shirley Fogarino
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2025 1:53:01 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, 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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):

WTF!!!! Does this mean that hundreds of people will be displaced because of back-door eminent domain???? NOT ON OUR HOUSE!

Weiner and his fascist, non-inclusive, multi-billion dollar real estate and tech industry backers (the same people who support Trump) are preparing for the big steal with SB79! Stop him and stop this NOW! San Francisco went through redevelopment once. My family was here during those years. People's homes were stolen in the name of progress and a very few people made lots of money.. Weiner=Trump. He should be voted out of office and more sensible approaches to housing need to prevail.

Sincerely,
Shirley Fogarino

From: randymazzei@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Randall Mazzei
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2025 2:11:46 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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.

Please remember what urban renewal did to the Fillmore.

Sincerely,
Randall Mazzei

From: davidheran@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of David Heran
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2025 2:23:54 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 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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): SF natives, such as myself, are disgusted with those who masquerade as stewards of the public interest. It is hard to debunk the "misinformation" of 15 Minute Cities, when our politicians are raining down multiple high-rise buildings

on us to become our new "homes", when our traditional homes are bulldozed. There is no population explosion in San Francisco, or much of the Bay Area, which would justify this maniacal level of building. Stop it now! I demand a moratorium on ALL residential building,

and will never vote for those who uphold this building madness which is designed to subjugate humanity. Keep the status quo that existed
before Sacramento introduced building mandates, whereby individual communities, NOT Sacramento, determine building policies! Let

G. Newsom know that he is a failure to his masters at the World Economic Forum. Everyone knows.

Sincerely,
David Heran
San Francisco, CA 94123

From:	pepperadamsjh@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Janet Harrison
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date:	Tuesday, July 15, 2025 2:30:17 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 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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,
Janet Harrison
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: dpj@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Devon Johnson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2025 2:32:22 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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,
Devon Johnson
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: ljasminek@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of L J Kim
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2025 2:33:36 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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 J Kim
San Francisco, CA 94123

From:	vijamh@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Vija Hovgard
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date:	Tuesday, July 15, 2025 2:43:49 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.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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,
Vija Hovgard
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: jpjh@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Hopkins
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2025 2:56:20 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

San Francisco is one of Americas most unique and historic cities where preservation should be paramount. We are Americas best version of a historical European city. Replacing historic architectural buildings with glass boxes (already turning Market St into a monochromatic desert) is shortsighted. Yes, we need housing but do not go about it in a DOGE Trumpian chainsaw, building at all costs, manner which Sen Wiener has been implementing. We have already eliminated major views of the hills and bay which made us so attractive. Eliminating our historic housing stock is a travesty for future generations.
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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener’s SB 79 and 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 Hopkins
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: amy7w2m@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Amy Meyer
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2025 3:12:13 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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 Meyer
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: barbarajheffernan@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Barbara Heffernan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2025 3:25:26 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 long time resident of San Francisco. I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, the displacement of renters and small businesses, and the transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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 need to be thoughtful about housing and focus on affordable units. This upzoning plan does not provide affordable housing.

Sincerely,
Barbara Heffernan
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: johngarrity@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Garrity
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2025 3:45:22 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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 Garrity
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: ngilson@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of nina gilson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2025 3:49:51 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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,
nina gilson
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: carlas@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Carla Schlemminger
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2025 4:00:15 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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,
Carla Schlemminger
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: rkram1@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Rona Kram
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2025 4:28:45 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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,
Rona Kram
San Francisco, CA 94133

From:	pjcoats@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Philip Coats
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date:	Tuesday, July 15, 2025 5:11:57 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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,
Philip Coats
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 & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2025 5:13:42 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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): Destroying the individual flavor of our neighborhoods and hurting small businesses is not acceptable.

Sincerely,
Elise Ravel
San Francisco, CA 94131

From: rbrandi@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of richard brandi
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2025 5:23:42 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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,
richard brandi

From:	m.diane.weber@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Diane Weber
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date:	Tuesday, July 15, 2025 6:03:01 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As an Outer Richmond resident, I'm deeply concerned about the proposed blanket upzoning threatening the historic Lincoln Manor neighborhood, and request an exemption of Clement Street (west of 33rd Ave) and Geary Boulevard (36th–38th Ave) due to its historic and coastal nature.Our neighborhood provides GGNRA green space enjoyed by many throughout the city, where scenes of natural beauty and birdlife are abundant, with countless people cycling by daily, riding by in the tourist GoCars, or golfing at Lincoln Park. Upzoning would destroy the unique, historic character of Lincoln Manor and Shore View—areas that deserve the same protection as Sea Cliff and The Great Highway. Additionally, there are no buses or businesses west of 33rd on Clement, so it is neither a transit corridor nor a commercial area. Blanket upzoning here will not create affordable family housing; it will just mean more expensive, smaller units and fewer homes for families and seniors. The Richmond District suffered through an era of "Richmond Specials" not that long ago. Once existing houses are demolished and ones out of character with the district are built, it will be too late to save the character of this neighborhood. The character of different neighborhoods is an integral part of what makes San Francisco a city beloved worldwide. Instead of incentivizing developers, speculation and high-end condos, let's use existing vacant units and identify sites where larger units will fit into existing commercial and built-up areas.

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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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,
Diane Weber
San Francisco, CA 94121

From:	hhuebel@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of holly huebel
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date:	Tuesday, July 15, 2025 6:16:50 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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,
holly huebel
San Francisco, CA 94111

From: peterboothlee@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Peter Lee
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2025 6:26:04 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Outrageous shredding of the Fabric of San Francisco!
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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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: twistee2u@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Fiona Friedland
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2025 6:27:41 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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: As a 40 year resident of San Francisco, I have seen the haphazard development of luxury housing around SF. Adding more housing for rich people is not what we need. The city has already lost so many of our creatives and artists to techie hipster douchebags. We need more affordable housing to keep our city diverse and interesting. What used to be a rainbow is now an egg - white and yellow. Bring back affordable housing along with more parks, green space, schools and services that families need.

Sincerely,
Fiona Friedland
San Francisco, CA 94117

From: corex123@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Diana Kaytun
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2025 6:36:11 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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,
Diana Kaytun

From:	krf.1sf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Karen Franklin
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date:	Tuesday, July 15, 2025 6:36:32 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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,
Karen Franklin
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: gingerpepper@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Ginger Pepper
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2025 7:08:02 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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: Americans haven't learned yet that tearing down buildings & homes only to replace the country's best carpentry with dubious building construction that won't last or compliment San Francisco's unique Spanish, French, Italian & Victorian homes. It will be
destroying the history of San Francisco's artisans, architecture, Victorians and our neighborhoods unique different styles. This is why tourists come here and say "one of the most beautiful cities in the world". Real estate is out of control and it's up to you the representatives to protect San Franciscan's property rights without creating insecurity for the residents. We don't need more people crammed into a 48 square mile city. We need affordable living, improvements and security for the next hundred or more years without a huge population growth. It appears mayor Lurie is selling us out instead of rebuilding the city to what it used to be, as he promised while running for office. If you go to Europe you can see their history everywhere. They don't demolish they improve their buildings without wasting the beautiful architecture. This is how san Francisco was in the past. At least postpone the January 2026 date and include all San Franciscans in decisions of their neighborhoods.

Sincerely,
Ginger Pepper
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: dunetansy@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Greg Gaar
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2025 7:13:51 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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,
Greg Gaar
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: chamaret@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of jun ishimuro
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2025 7:28:58 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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):

This plan will destroy the unique neighghborhood characters of 24th Street near where I live. Residents have made effort for decade to 24th street shopping areas unique with independently owned businesses.
This plan also do not address the affordability and adding market rate condominiums will only displace existing residents under rent control. We can not allow real estate developers to destroy our city's unique beauty - which is our city's sustainable resource which produce money and jobs through our city's tourism.

Sincerely,
jun ishimuro
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: parrott371@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of n d
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2025 7:31:43 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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,
n d

From:	sfamc2@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Arnold Cohn
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date:	Tuesday, July 15, 2025 7:38:53 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.

Please help keep our neighborhoods and stop Senator Wiener's horrible plan to destroy our living spaces.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener’s SB 79 and 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 would you feel if a four to six story building becomes your neighbor?

Sincerely,
Arnold Cohn

From: rbinsf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Rita Pisciotta
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2025 7:53:58 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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,
Rita Pisciotta
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: amgodman@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Aaron Goodman
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2025 8:05:20 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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.

Parkmerced was one of wieners pushed density projects. It ignored obsolescence and feasibility financially. It ignored preservation and infill based options that would have allowed density and transit solutions. It ignored the other domino impacts of adjacent redevelopment institutional growth and the displacement and loss of rent controlled housing to sfsu-csu. It ignored the 11 unretrofitted towers and CEQA analysis of better alternatives and options submitted to the S.F. planning department supervisors and mayor with adequate time to meet and adjust with the owner and architectural team. They ignored everything and went forward with similar last minute legislation late at night without review or discussion (see the film "who killed Parkmerced?" No neighborhood is safe or building protected when you allow such rampant and unenvironmental demolition of sound rent controlled housing……. There was no plan, only green-$-greed…….

Sincerely,
Aaron Goodman
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: williamskewescox@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of William Skewes-Cox
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2025 8:50:22 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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 family has lived in Cow Hollow since 1960 and across 4 generations. We are horrified by the change in character that could result from these changes. People travel from all over the world to see our human scale neighborhoods. We must protect them not destroy them!

Sincerely,
William Skewes-Cox
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: gilladmin@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of pamela gill
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2025 8:53:33 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I want more input before deciding which side I am on. Please see to it that the people of San Francisco and those who love this city need to consider the hard facts, and at the moment, we don't have those hard facts.

As a San Franciscan, I don't know if I 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 wonder about:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener’s SB 79 and 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,
pamela gill
San Francisco, CA 94114

From:	elemjw@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lin Joe
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date:	Tuesday, July 15, 2025 9:29:18 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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 been residing in San Francisco since the 1980's. My children were both born here at Children's Hospital on California street and they are grown now but still reside in the City. It is our home and we love it. I have seen many changes to our beloved City and it is not change I'm concerned with but the scale and magnitude of the proposed developments and extreme upzoning that has me and many other neighbors worried and frankly, pissed off.

Please consider our concerns.

Sincerely,
Lin Joe

From: alecd69@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Alexander Davis
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2025 10:23:39 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm a long-time San Franciscan, and I'm strongly opposed to Mayor Lurie's upzoning push and Senator Wiener's SB 79. The current plan rewards tearing down existing homes, drives out renters and small neighborhood businesses, and fast-tracks a future of unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors that most of us will never be able to live in. That's not "housing policy." That's displacement with better PR.

What I'm asking you to do:

Scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps. Dramatically. Start with what's actually required—not a speculative land rush.

Back the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder, and Chen opposing SB 79. Stand with neighborhoods, not demolition incentives.

Tell Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney: Vote NO on SB 79. No blank check for permanent land-use changes without affordability or anti-displacement protections.

Push to postpone the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline. Rushing irreversible zoning is how communities get erased.

Why this matters:
SB 79 + the Mayor's maps = permanent, one-way changes to how San Francisco grows—far beyond what's required and with zero affordability guarantees. Once the zoning changes, we don't get our neighborhoods back. This clears a path for mass demolition and luxury towers that serve developers and billionaire investors while cutting local residents out of the conversation. If planning doesn't protect the people who actually live here, it's not planning—it's displacement dressed up as "growth."

Sincerely,
Alexander Davis
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: crimlaw5@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Gail Harper
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2025 10:25:51 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 and longtime resident of 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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,
Gail Harper
San Francisco, CA 94133

From:	sf.lorna@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lorna Walker
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date:	Tuesday, July 15, 2025 10:43:13 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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):
Trickle down housing doesn't work. Stand up to the developers and protect San Francisco!

Sincerely,
Lorna Walker
San Francisco, CA 94115

From: askalice@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Alice Polesky
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Wednesday, July 16, 2025 2:35:43 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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: patrica_inez@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Patrice Thompson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Wednesday, July 16, 2025 3:19:36 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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,
Patrice Thompson
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: angelanealgrove@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of angela Grove
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Wednesday, July 16, 2025 7:16:40 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, living in Cow Hollow 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener’s SB 79 and 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.

Lets not ruin San Francisco by going back to the damage done in the 60's

Sincerely,
angela Grove
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: yelsoma@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Alice Mosley
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Wednesday, July 16, 2025 7:38:10 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Please object to 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener’s SB 79 and 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 Mosley
San Francisco, CA 94117

From: dleuer@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Dennis Leuer
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Wednesday, July 16, 2025 8:22:23 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 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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,
Dennis Leuer
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: maria.bugarin7@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mary Bugarin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable [File No: 250700 and 250701]
Date: Wednesday, July 16, 2025 9:54:03 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 been a North Beach resident for over 35 years. I am a teacher with SFUSD. At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, San Franciscans voiced overwhelming opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a sweeping proposal that would double or triple building heights and density across the city, with no affordability mandates, no protections for tenants or small businesses, and no real community input.

This plan empowers developers while silencing residents.

It is being rushed to satisfy a state housing mandate that is outdated, inflated, and disconnected from San Francisco's reality. The mandate should be challenged — not used to justify a sweeping deregulation of local zoning.

You can not rewrite the city's land use overnight with most residents unaware. And once this plan is adopted, there is no going back — even if it proves disastrous.

We urge you to:
– Protect small businesses and renters
– Respect neighborhood scale and historic resources
– Require real affordability in all upzoned projects
– Extend the approval timeline and engage the public

Don't rush a decision that will reshape the city forever. San Francisco deserves better.

Sincerely,
Mary Bugarin
San Francisco, CA 94109

From:	apatterson@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Arthur Patterson
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date:	Wednesday, July 16, 2025 9:54:47 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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,
Arthur Patterson
San Francisco, CA 94118

From:	Mikalis.Faklys@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Michael Faklis
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date:	Wednesday, July 16, 2025 10:20:25 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 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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,
Michael Faklis
San Francisco, CA 94111

From: artartarta@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of michael pedroni
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Wednesday, July 16, 2025 10:22:53 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.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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,
michael pedroni
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: donna.howe@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Donna Howe
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Wednesday, July 16, 2025 10:41:03 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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 and it is irresponsible because it makes false promises and does not recognize the past valuable contributions of the very residents and businesses that built community and commerce in San Francisco.

The maps I have seen layer numerous zoning changes on existing established neighborhoods, ignore the value of preserving significant open space and architectural elements, place undue negative emphasis on archaic exclusionary policies that haven't been enforced in decades and never will be, and dismiss appeals by neighborhood groups to participate in proposed changes.

In addition, having been born in San Francisco in 1953, I have resided here in apartments, flats, and single family homes, each of which were appropriate to the various stages of my work, my financial situation, and my personal life. I have witnessed the results of both positive and disastrous decisions in San Francisco from the time my immigrant grandparents relocated here to present day when my 14 year old grandson begins his 9th grade term in SFUSD. Our family had a barber shop on Holloway Avenue in a mixed use building, worked in retail and finance and education, pooled the salaries of 3 adults working full time to finance the purchase of a home, and continue to use public transportation in its many forms to this day. It is unnecessarily and Ill-advised to move ahead with rezoning and density decontrol changes as currently proposed.

Please resist pressure from Sacramento. Don't diminish what San Francisco offers to all residents by imposing policies that will in the end make housing more restrictive and less affordable.

Sincerely,
Donna Howe
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: soong.sharon@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sharon Soong
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Wednesday, July 16, 2025 11:32:19 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. Enacting this bill will destroy the character of San Francisco. Our home is over 120 years old, as are most of the homes in my area. I can't imagine what it would be like to have a huge, ugly highrise right next to us. People travel here from all over the world to enjoy San Francisco's unique beauty. This upzoning will destroy tourism as well. When is a city saturated? When is enough, enough? We struggle to have infrastructure for the people we have now. We can't support tens of thousands more. We just can't. We voted for Weiner (several times) and Lurie and I cannot tell you how disappointed in them we are.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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,
Sharon Soong
San Francisco, CA 94123

From:	kathyhoward@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Katherine Howard
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date:	Wednesday, July 16, 2025 12:36:42 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-time 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.

Downtown is dead, and the neighborhood commercial districts are full of life. And yet, you want to turn all of SF into what downtown looks like now. This does not make sense.

Please:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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,
Katherine Howard
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: susanevans822@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Susan Evans
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Wednesday, July 16, 2025 1:16:28 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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 Evans
San Francisco, CA 94118

From: chr@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Christine Russell
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Wednesday, July 16, 2025 1:25:35 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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,
Christine Russell

From: denolacarole@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Carole De Nola
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Wednesday, July 16, 2025 1:40:42 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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,
Carole De Nola
San Francisco, CA 94121

From:	kline.jb@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jeffrey Kline
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date:	Wednesday, July 16, 2025 2:02:01 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, 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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 really hope that all of you have read some works by Jane Jacobs, who along with Lewis Mumford, is considered a founder of the New Urbanist movement. According to her ThoughtCo. biography "(s)he supported bottom-up community planning, relying on the wisdom of those who lived in the neighborhoods to know what would best suit the location.". A famous Jacobs' quote: "“There is no logic that can be superimposed on the city; people make it, and it is to them, not buildings, that we must fit our plans.”. Please listen to the majority of the people who live in and make this city of San Francisco, and reconsider this flawed upzoning plan, which will not-- and cannot-- solve the urgent problem of a lack of affordable housing, but will open the door to massive demolition and higher rise (re-)development that will destroy the character and historic vibrancy of San Francisco.

Sincerely,
Jeffrey Kline

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 Nos. 250700, 250701, and 250727 - 30 letters
Date:	Tuesday, July 15, 2025 1:41:45 PM
Attachments:	30 letters.pdf

Dear Supervisors,

Please see attached 30 letters from members of the public regarding:

File No. 250700 - Ordinance amending the Zoning Map to implement the Family Zoning Plan by amending the Zoning Use District Maps to: 1) reclassify certain properties currently zoned as various types of Residential to Residential Transit Oriented - Commercial (RTO-C); 2) reclassify properties currently zoned Residential Transit Oriented (RTO) to Residential Transit Oriented - 1 (RTO-1); 3) reclassify certain properties from Residential districts other than RTO to RTO-1; 4) reclassify certain properties currently zoned Neighborhood Commercial (NC) or Public (P) to Community Business (C-2); and 5) reclassify certain properties from Public to Mixed-Use or Neighborhood Commercial Districts; amending the Height and Bulk Map to: 1) reclassify properties in the Family Zoning Plan to R-4 Height and Bulk District; 2) change the height limits on certain lots in the R-4 Height and Bulk District; and 3) designating various parcels to be included in the Non-Contiguous San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Special Use District (SFMTA SUD); amending the Local Coastal Program to: 1) reclassify all properties in the Coastal Zone to R-4 Height and Bulk District; 2) reclassify certain properties to RTO-C and Neighborhood Commercial District; 3) designate one parcel as part of the SFMTA SUD; and 4) directing the Planning Director to transmit the Ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of public necessity, convenience, and welfare under Planning Code, Section 302; making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and making findings under the City's Local Coastal Program and the California Coastal Act of 1976.

File No. 250701 - Ordinance amending the Planning Code to: 1) create the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program to incent housing development through a local bonus program and by adopting a Housing Sustainability District, 2) modify height and bulk limits to provide for additional capacity in well-resourced neighborhoods, and to allow additional height and bulk for projects using the local bonus program, 3) require only buildings taller than 85 feet in certain Districts to reduce ground level wind currents, 4) make conforming changes to the RH (Residential, House), RM (Residential, Mixed), and RC (Residential-Commercial) District zoning tables to reflect the changes to density controls, and parking requirements made in this ordinance, 5) create the RTO-C

(Residential Transit Oriented-Commercial) District, 6) implement the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's Transit-Oriented Communities Policy by making changes to parking requirements, minimum residential densities, and minimum office intensities, and requiring maximum dwelling unit sizes, 7) revise off-street parking and curb cut obligations citywide, 8) create the Non-contiguous San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Sites Special Use District, 9) permit certain Legacy Businesses to relocate without a conditional use authorization and waive development impact fees for those businesses, 10) make technical amendments to the Code to implement the above changes, and 11) make conforming changes to zoning tables in various Districts, including the Neighborhood Commercial District and Mixed Use Districts; amending the Business and Tax Regulations Code regarding the Board of Appeals' review of permits in the Housing Choice Program Housing Sustainability District; amending the Local Coastal Program to implement the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program and other associated changes in the City's Coastal Zone, and directing the Planning Director to transmit the Ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment; 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 public necessity, convenience, and welfare findings under Planning Code, Section 302.

File No. 250727 - Resolution opposing California State Senate Bill 79 (Wiener) and similar future legislation, unless amended to give Local governments adequate ability to formulate local plans through its local legislative process, in which local governments and residents have adequate review and oversight of community planning, including affordability requirements, and residential and commercial tenant protections.

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:	jacquelineshelton@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jacqueline Shelton
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date:	Tuesday, July 15, 2025 10:01:56 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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.

Please listen to your constituents who oppose these measures.

Sincerely,
Jacqueline Shelton
San Francisco, CA 94123

From:	epml@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Michael Larsen
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date:	Tuesday, July 15, 2025 10:02:27 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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,
Michael Larsen
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: marcrabideau@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Marc Joseph Rabideau
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2025 10:03:39 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 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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,
Marc Joseph Rabideau
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: jvistnes1@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jessica Vistnes
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2025 10:09:10 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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 can't agree more with the message from Neighborhoods United SF. I am completely distressed by the upzoning map. I can't understand why you want to ruin San Francisco. The high rises on Lombard Street from Laguna to the east are particularly upsetting. They will cut off views of half of what makes San Francisco "The City by the Bay" for tourists and residents alike. It is like putting the Fontana Towers all along one of the prettiest parts of San Francisco - blocking views so that developers can see apartments for many millions of dollars. Please put a stop to this!!!!

Sincerely,
Jessica Vistnes
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: robosborn415@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Robert Osborn
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2025 10:11:58 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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,
Robert Osborn
San Francisco, CA 94131

From:	reginasneed@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Regina Sneed
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date:	Tuesday, July 15, 2025 10:12:58 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:

- allow for more community input into the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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.

As a charter city, I do not support SB 79 and think San Francisco needs an exemption from its provisions which would allow for a better plan for increasing housing in the city.

Sincerely,
Regina Sneed
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: dongaj@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Albert Dong
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2025 10:13:54 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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,
Albert Dong
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: agandi@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of ader gandi
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2025 10:14:00 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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 live in Russian Hill, a neighborhood with charm and love. The new zoning plan will destroy this beautiful neighborhood.

Sincerely,
ader gandi
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: mopugh@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mark Pugh
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2025 10:14:16 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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,
Mark Pugh
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 & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2025 10:14:17 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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: danolley@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of David Nolley
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2025 10:14:57 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 again since 1984 (and, I received my BA from SFSC in 1968), 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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.

Please cease and disist.

Sincerely,
David Nolley
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: gregory@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Gregory Stevens
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2025 10:14:58 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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,
Gregory Stevens
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: koelsch1886@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Leslie Koelsch
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2025 10:19:55 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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,
Leslie Koelsch
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: pmulholl@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Patrice Mullholland
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2025 10:20:32 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. As SF history shows, each time the city government tried to "up zone" it destroyed a thriving neighborhood.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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. No mention of low-income housing projects such as the one in North Beach on Bay Street.

SF does not need more housing, it needs the right housing. This is not being considered.

Sincerely,
Patrice Mullholland
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: campcollier86@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lori Collier
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2025 10:24:05 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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,
Lori Collier
San Francisco, CA 94109

From:	mos@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of m o"sullivan
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date:	Tuesday, July 15, 2025 10:24:17 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener’s SB 79 and 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,
m o'sullivan
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: noguera@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Hatun Noguera
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2025 10:26:29 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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:	frankblanket@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Derrick Scocchera
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date:	Tuesday, July 15, 2025 10:27:39 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 32 year resident and renter in San Francisco, I strongly oppose Billionaire 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. San Francisco is one of the few cities left in this country with distinctive neighbors, and this short sighted cash grab turns it into another generic, completely unaffordable city. Not only is it bad for the people that call this place home, it's bad for tourism, which is still one of our greatest sources of revenue. Who wants to come to a city where the landmarks and charm are obscured by endless cookie cutter condos and office buildings. Gentrification isn't renewal, it's destruction, and the evidence is plain to see in countless other communities.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener’s SB 79 and 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.

It's time for a proposition that would remove large property owners and landlords like Scott Weiner and Dan Lurie from proposing these sorts of programs that they and their associates would directly profit from. There's a clear conflict of interest here.

Sincerely,
Derrick Scocchera
San Francisco, CA 94133

From:	natashjadewolf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Natashja Dewolfe
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date:	Tuesday, July 15, 2025 10:27:39 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 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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,
Natashja Dewolfe
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: timepuzzle@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Robert Smith
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2025 10:29:50 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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: kgolata@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kathleen Golata
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2025 10:32:53 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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

I am especially concerned due to the proposal to make North Beach an "historical district". I have very little information about this other than meetings that were dominated by the "pro" contingent. As a homeowner in North Beach for over 15 years, I see no benefit at all for myself and others like me. Most of the seniors in my neighborhood are unaware of the imminent changes.The only concrete information I received was from my insurance broker, who said the homeowners' insurance will be even more difficult to obtain.
Most of the benefits were for individuals who have owned their buildings for five years or fewer.
Last year my insurance company of 14 years arbitrarily cancelled my insurance, although there was no inspection, nor have I made any claims to the company. My insurance bill more than doubled.

As if this wasn't enough, now there are plans to further gentrify this neighborhood that I know and love.
Please do not change San Francisco into a playground for billionaires.

Sincerely,
Kathleen Golata
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: darcybrown7@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Darcy Brown
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2025 10:35:48 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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,
Darcy Brown
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: kathylipscomb2@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of kathy lipscomb
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2025 10:44:25 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 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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,
kathy lipscomb

From:	verb@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Carol Verburg
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date:	Tuesday, July 15, 2025 10:46:54 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 resident of one of San Francisco's oldest, most unique, and densest neighbhorhoods -- North Beach -- I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes demolishing existing homes, displacing renters and small businesses, and transforming our diverse, distinctive city into a labyrinth of luxury high-rise corridors affordable only by corporate investors and wealthy tourists.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener’s SB 79 and 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,
Carol Verburg
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: sheila@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sheila Fifer
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2025 10:57:47 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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.

And we would greatly appreciate your holding a meeting to discuss what will happen with the Little Sisters of the Poor property. Would it be possible to hold a neighborhood meeting there? If not, we live two blocks away and would be glad to host a meeting at our home at 32 6th Avenue.

Sincerely,
Sheila Fifer
San Francisco, CA 94118

From: kpscarr@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Karen Scarr
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2025 10:58:12 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I write to express my strong opposition to Mayor Lurie's upzoning 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:

- Significantly scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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,
Karen Scarr
San Francisco, CA 94111

From: platzman@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Steven Platzman
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2025 11:04:47 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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 do not believe building towers 6/8/10 stories is the answer. it will destroy what makes Sf special. a tourist destination. a place people want to live. the answer is to allow building more easily and more efficiently. streamline the process. dont make it so hard. so bureaucratic. keep the heighten limits reasonable 4 stories and make the process easier . this will make development economically feasible and provide the units you need.

Sincerely,
Steven Platzman
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: nmorcom@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Neville Morcom
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2025 11:07:18 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 30+ year resident of the Barbary Coast section of District 3 in San Francisco and 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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.

While San Francisco struggles to recover from the pandemic, our priorities should be on attracting tourism and businesses back to our city. These initiatives will destroy the attractiveness of the city to tourists and will do nothing to attract businesses.

Sincerely,
Neville Morcom
San Francisco, CA 94111

From: loanhound@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Russell Davis
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2025 11:14:38 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
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and 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.

Remember what happened to the Fillmore in the 60's. Stop this nonsense now.

Sincerely,
Russell Davis
San Francisco, CA 94127

From:	M McF
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); MahmoodStaff
Subject:	opp;ose rezoning - it destorys the city and enriches international investors
Date:	Tuesday, July 15, 2025 12:09:50 PM

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

As a native 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 cannot build our way out of a crisis created by wealth disparity. Rezoning simply exacerbates unaffordability by granting international investors the opportunity to destroy tour home place for personal gain.

Between 2000 -2020 home prices in San Francisco rose 413%l! The population did not increase four fold. What did increase was the number of wealthy people buying property as part of an LLC or private business, then writing it off as a business expense. The other increase was in the flow of investors that tax breaks and subsidies encouraged to buy and develop homes as part of investment portfolios.

I call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener’s SB 79 and 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. If building more lowered prices, then empty offices would have been repurposed, vacant shopping malls redesigned, and housing built along 101 south of the city and near the tech hubs. That doesn't happen because investors and the politicians they purchased gain from the subsidies, tax breaks, and the destruction of strong communities.

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.

Mary McFadden

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:	5 Letters regarding File Nos. 250700 and 250701
Date:	Thursday, July 10, 2025 2:45:50 PM
Attachments:	5 Letters regarding File Nos. 250700 and 250701.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached for 5 letters regarding File Nos. 250700 and 250701.

File No. 250700: Ordinance amending the Zoning Map to implement the Family Zoning Plan by amending the Zoning Use District Maps to: 1) reclassify certain properties currently zoned as various types of Residential to Residential Transit Oriented - Commercial (RTO-C); 2) reclassify properties currently zoned Residential Transit Oriented (RTO) to Residential Transit Oriented - 1 (RTO-1); 3) reclassify certain properties from Residential districts other than RTO to RTO-1; 4) reclassify certain properties currently zoned Neighborhood Commercial (NC) or Public (P) to Community Business (C-2); and 5) reclassify certain properties from Public to Mixed-Use or Neighborhood Commercial Districts; amending the Height and Bulk Map to: 1) reclassify properties in the Family Zoning Plan to R-4 Height and Bulk District; 2) change the height limits on certain lots in the R-4 Height and Bulk District; and 3) designating various parcels to be included in the Non-Contiguous San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Special Use District (SFMTA SUD); amending the Local Coastal Program to: 1) reclassify all properties in the Coastal Zone to R-4 Height and Bulk District; 2) reclassify certain properties to RTO-C and Neighborhood Commercial District; 3) designate one parcel as part of the SFMTA SUD; and 4) directing the Planning Director to transmit the Ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of public necessity, convenience, and welfare under Planning Code, Section 302; making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and making findings under the City's Local Coastal Program and the California Coastal Act of 1976. (Mayor, Sauter, Mahmood, Dorsey)

File No. 250701: Ordinance amending the Planning Code to: 1) create the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program to incent housing development through a local bonus program and by adopting a Housing Sustainability District, 2) modify height and bulk limits to provide for additional capacity in well-resourced neighborhoods, and to allow additional height and bulk for projects using the local bonus program, 3) require only buildings taller than 85 feet in certain Districts to reduce ground level wind currents, 4) make conforming changes to the RH (Residential, House), RM (Residential, Mixed), and RC (Residential-Commercial) District zoning tables to reflect the changes to density controls, and parking requirements made in this ordinance, 5) create the RTO-C (Residential Transit Oriented-Commercial) District, 6) implement the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's Transit-Oriented Communities Policy by making changes to parking requirements, minimum residential densities, and

minimum office intensities, and requiring maximum dwelling unit sizes, 7) revise off-street parking and curb cut obligations citywide, 8) create the Non-contiguous San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Sites Special Use District, 9) permit certain Legacy Businesses to relocate without a conditional use authorization and waive development impact fees for those businesses, 10) make technical amendments to the Code to implement the above changes, and 11) make conforming changes to zoning tables in various Districts, including the Neighborhood Commercial District and Mixed Use Districts; amending the Business and Tax Regulations Code regarding the Board of Appeals' review of permits in the Housing Choice Program Housing Sustainability District; amending the Local Coastal Program to implement the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program and other associated changes in the City's Coastal Zone, and directing the Planning Director to transmit the Ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment; 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 public necessity, convenience, and welfare findings under Planning Code, Section 302. (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: rhett@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Rhett Currier
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 9:31:40 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, San Franciscans voiced overwhelming opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a sweeping proposal that would double or triple building heights and density across the city, with no affordability mandates, no protections for tenants or small businesses, and no real community input.

This plan empowers developers while silencing residents.

It is being rushed to satisfy a state housing mandate that is outdated, inflated, and disconnected from San Francisco's reality. The mandate should be challenged — not used to justify a sweeping deregulation of local zoning.

You can not rewrite the city's land use overnight with most residents unaware. And once this plan is adopted, there is no going back — even if it proves disastrous.

We urge you to:
– Protect small businesses and renters
– Respect neighborhood scale and historic resources
– Require real affordability in all upzoned projects
– Extend the approval timeline and engage the public

Don't rush a decision that will reshape the city forever. San Francisco deserves better — and leadership that listens.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): I live near Dolores Park, I think plans for development need to include retention of public spaces that get natural light all day, like Dolores Park.

Sincerely,
Rhett Currier
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: gfpedler@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Gary Pedler
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 10:38:48 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, San Franciscans voiced overwhelming opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a sweeping proposal that would double or triple building heights and density across the city, with no affordability mandates, no protections for tenants or small businesses, and no real community input.

This plan empowers developers while silencing residents.

It is being rushed to satisfy a state housing mandate that is outdated, inflated, and disconnected from San Francisco's reality. The mandate should be challenged — not used to justify a sweeping deregulation of local zoning.

You can not rewrite the city's land use overnight with most residents unaware. And once this plan is adopted, there is no going back — even if it proves disastrous.

We urge you to:
– Protect small businesses and renters
– Respect neighborhood scale and historic resources
– Require real affordability in all upzoned projects
– Extend the approval timeline and engage the public

Don't rush a decision that will reshape the city forever. San Francisco deserves better — and leadership that listens.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS: This is a Draconian, sledgehammer method of addressing the housing crisis that will cause problems rather than solving them. It's essentially a blank check to developers to do virtually whatever they want. It will destroy the very qualities of the city that make so many people want to live here.

Sincerely,
Gary Pedler
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: douglasboszhardt@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Doug Boszhardt
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Sunday, July 6, 2025 8:42:27 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, San Franciscans voiced overwhelming opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a sweeping proposal that would double or triple building heights and density across the city, with no affordability mandates, no protections for tenants or small businesses, and no real community input.

This plan empowers developers while silencing residents.

It is being rushed to satisfy a state housing mandate that is outdated, inflated, and disconnected from San Francisco's reality. The mandate should be challenged — not used to justify a sweeping deregulation of local zoning.

You can not rewrite the city's land use overnight with most residents unaware. And once this plan is adopted, there is no going back — even if it proves disastrous.

We urge you to:
– Protect small businesses and renters
– Respect neighborhood scale and historic resources
– Require real affordability in all upzoned projects
– Extend the approval timeline and engage the public

Don't rush a decision that will reshape the city forever. San Francisco deserves better — and leadership that listens.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS: The vastly expanded height limits will do huge damage to my district, the Marina. The Marina is a district that is currently very family friendly. Many families struggle with the idea of moving to Marin, to further build family structure, and educate their kids. We stayed, as it is a fantastic neighborhood, but seriously weighed that decision. The sun filled Italian courtyards in the Marina are very unique. A special feature of living here.

You can blow it up, but there will be negative consequences. These tall buildings will make families deciding whether to raise their kids in the city, the Marina in particular, more difficult, Moving to the suburbs when kids are young will be even more attractive at the margin. Ask Gavin who left Pac Heights for Marin.

But the Marina is more family friendly with its architecturally closed off Italian courtyards. Closed off to the street beautiful courtyards is a unique Italianate fortress design. They were built for sun filled gardens, and safety, as they can't be entered from the street. Great for raising small kids. I hear kid laughter in the courtyard…all weekend long.

These proposed tall buildings will ruin the sun access for the marina neighborhood. The profiteering developers are takers, and will make a lot of money stealing sun and Golden Gate Bridge views. The Pac Height elite don't care… maybe they will even be investors in the development. I'm sure they will. But it's a shame if it happens. Done in the name of families…but that's rediculous as all those new condos with views ripping off existing families…will be owned by people over the bridge. The new development will be Pied-it-teirs for suburbanites. They will be crash pads in the city for wealthy commuters, or Silicon Valley money. Their kids will be in the burbs. Such a shame. Poor planning and knowledge, understanding by planners …as there are other places in the city to do this. The Marina will be less desirable for those starting a family here…and have them staying here, as we did. We Marina families, and the city as it has been, will loose. Developers and their investors…will win. The new condo owners

are not families with young kids. But existing Marina families could leave, or just settle in Marin to begin with. To not understand this, is poor planning.

To summarize, the extreme proposed heights on Lombard is the issue, especially the massive heights on the east end of Lombard. I strongly believe current height restrictions allow for development Lombard nicely. Have at it.

Sincerely,
Doug Boszhardt
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: gioconda@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Gioconda Corral
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Saturday, July 5, 2025 12:18:04 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, San Franciscans voiced overwhelming opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a sweeping proposal that would double or triple building heights and density across the city, with no affordability mandates, no protections for tenants or small businesses, and no real community input.

This plan empowers developers while silencing residents.

It is being rushed to satisfy a state housing mandate that is outdated, inflated, and disconnected from San Francisco's reality. The mandate should be challenged — not used to justify a sweeping deregulation of local zoning.

You can not rewrite the city's land use overnight with most residents unaware. And once this plan is adopted, there is no going back — even if it proves disastrous.

We urge you to:
– Protect small businesses and renters
– Respect neighborhood scale and historic resources
– Require real affordability in all upzoned projects
– Extend the approval timeline and engage the public

Don't rush a decision that will reshape the city forever. San Francisco deserves better — and leadership that listens.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): Keep SF's perfect balance of city and nature feel in tact and please don't mess with its beauty and character. High buildings make more sense in South SF or in areas where tall buildings already exist. I am very concerned with over population, too much car traffic - air and noise pollution would be devastating affecting the feel of the city, the wildlife and nature.

Sincerely,
Gioconda Corral
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: patrica_inez@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Patrice Thompson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 8:31:04 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, San Franciscans voiced overwhelming opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a sweeping proposal that would double or triple building heights and density across the city, with no affordability mandates, no protections for tenants or small businesses, and no real community input.

This plan empowers developers while silencing residents.

It is being rushed to satisfy a state housing mandate that is outdated, inflated, and disconnected from San Francisco's reality. The mandate should be challenged — not used to justify a sweeping deregulation of local zoning.

You can not rewrite the city's land use overnight with most residents unaware. And once this plan is adopted, there is no going back — even if it proves disastrous.

We urge you to:
– Protect small businesses and renters
– Respect neighborhood scale and historic resources
– Require real affordability in all upzoned projects
– Extend the approval timeline and engage the public

Don't rush a decision that will reshape the city forever. San Francisco deserves better — and leadership that listens. Certain elected legislators seem to be working for developers and not for the people they represent. Please put a stop to this. I live in district one and what's been done for example to the great highway is a disgrace. We have no escape right now, but somebody's getting some money and I think some of the elected legislators from back east don't understand that what's different about California so we actually could be near the ocean in an equitable way such as driving
ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Patrice Thompson
San Francisco, CA 94121

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	BOS-Operations; Carroll, John (BOS); Calvillo, Angela (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Entezari, Mehran (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS)
Subject:	8 Letters Regarding File Nos. 250700 250701
Date:	Wednesday, July 2, 2025 12:18:53 PM
Attachments:	8 Letters Regarding File Nos. 250700_250701.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached 8 letters regarding File Nos. 250700 and 250701.

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: tab@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Teresa Butler
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Thursday, June 26, 2025 9:31:37 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, San Franciscans voiced overwhelming opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a sweeping proposal that would double or triple building heights and density across the city, with no affordability mandates, no protections for tenants or small businesses, and no real community input.

This plan empowers developers while silencing residents.

It is being rushed to satisfy a state housing mandate that is outdated, inflated, and disconnected from San Francisco's reality. The mandate should be challenged — not used to justify a sweeping deregulation of local zoning.

You can not rewrite the city's land use overnight with most residents unaware. And once this plan is adopted, there is no going back — even if it proves disastrous.

We urge you to:
– Protect small businesses and renters
– Respect neighborhood scale and historic resources
– Require real affordability in all upzoned projects
– Extend the approval timeline and engage the public

Don't rush a decision that will reshape the city forever. San Francisco deserves better — and leadership that listens.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS: Let the sun shine in the Outer Sunset and Outer Richmond. Do not put such high buildings past Sunset Blvd. Heights over 4-stories deface this Outer Sunset Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty; our coastal topography should be designated as a National Treasure and a San Francisco National Treasure, and it should be protected. Tourists love our coastline. Protect it. Tell the building industry and Scott Wiener 'No!'

Sincerely,
Teresa Butler
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: mopugh@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mark Pugh
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Thursday, June 26, 2025 10:56:18 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, San Franciscans voiced overwhelming opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a sweeping proposal that would double or triple building heights and density across the city, with no affordability mandates, no protections for tenants or small businesses, and no real community input.

This plan empowers developers while silencing residents.

It is being rushed to satisfy a state housing mandate that is outdated, inflated, and disconnected from San Francisco's reality. The mandate should be challenged — not used to justify a sweeping deregulation of local zoning.

You can not rewrite the city's land use overnight with most residents unaware. And once this plan is adopted, there is no going back — even if it proves disastrous.

We urge you to:
– Protect small businesses and renters
– Respect neighborhood scale and historic resources
– Require real affordability in all upzoned projects
– Extend the approval timeline and engage the public

Don't rush a decision that will reshape the city forever. San Francisco deserves better — and leadership that listens.

Sincerely,
Mark Pugh
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: dldobson@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Donna Dobson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Thursday, June 26, 2025 11:38:05 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, San Franciscans voiced overwhelming opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a sweeping proposal that would double or triple building heights and density across the city, with no affordability mandates, no protections for tenants or small businesses, and no real community input.

This plan empowers developers while silencing residents.

It is being rushed to satisfy a state housing mandate that is outdated, inflated, and disconnected from San Francisco's reality. The mandate should be challenged — not used to justify a sweeping deregulation of local zoning.

You can not rewrite the city's land use overnight with most residents unaware. And once this plan is adopted, there is no going back — even if it proves disastrous.

We urge you to:
– Protect small businesses and renters
– Respect neighborhood scale and historic resources
– Require real affordability in all upzoned projects
– Extend the approval timeline and engage the public

Don't rush a decision that will reshape the city forever. San Francisco deserves better — and leadership that listens.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): As someone who has lived a block away from Union St. for decades, I am appalled by this decision to drastically alter the ambience of Union Street and Chestnut Street. I voted Mr. Lurie for several reasons, including the fact that he lived in the area and appreciates its beauty. I believe his plans will drastically change the appearance and ambience of the area for the worse.

Sincerely,
Donna Dobson
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: padysplace@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Luis Pine
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Thursday, June 26, 2025 1:31:23 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, San Franciscans voiced overwhelming opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a sweeping proposal that would double or triple building heights and density across the city, with no affordability mandates, no protections for tenants or small businesses, and no real community input.

This plan empowers developers while silencing residents.

It is being rushed to satisfy a state housing mandate that is outdated, inflated, and disconnected from San Francisco's reality. The mandate should be challenged — not used to justify a sweeping deregulation of local zoning.

You can not rewrite the city's land use overnight with most residents unaware. And once this plan is adopted, there is no going back — even if it proves disastrous.

We urge you to:
– Protect small businesses and renters
– Respect neighborhood scale and historic resources
– Require real affordability in all upzoned projects
– Extend the approval timeline and engage the public

Don't rush a decision that will reshape the city forever. San Francisco deserves better — and leadership that listens.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS: Please reduce the allowable height on Judah St. from Sunset Blvd. to 47th to higher than 60' and on Irving and Lincoln reduce heights to no higher than 48' (so we can get light in the part and the neighborhood in the fall and the winter). This Outer Sunset area is an area of outstanding natural beauty where tourists delight in the amount of sunlight it offers. Please do not ruin the tourism industry in favor of the construction industry or our city will lose greatly.

Sincerely,
Luis Pine
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: kristen@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kristen Borsetti
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Thursday, June 26, 2025 11:45:01 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, San Franciscans voiced overwhelming opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a sweeping proposal that would double or triple building heights and density across the city, with no affordability mandates, no protections for tenants or small businesses, and no real community input.

Instead of keeping the generic script sent to us regarding our opposition, I want to add how a world.class process can take place. In the updates we receoas residents, we are shown only two things: 1) a map where the impact locations will be (in this case D20 along Lombard and Fillmore), and 2) a very simplified drawing of what 'tall buidlings' would look like. This does not detail how the neighborhoods will be transformed and individuals supported - both families and business owners - with their needs to make this a vibrant community. This is one dimensional at best.

Having traveled and lived in other parts of the world, I have seen and felt the positive impact of world class planning. Look at Singapore. On June 25, they just launched their 2025 draft master plan, which was a result of engaging over 220k community members over a two year review. The detailed plan, which makes the SF planning process look like an elementary school process, goes into detail on: 1) engagement journey for creating the plan, 2) developing a healthy/happy city, 3) Enabling Sustainable Growth, 4) Demonstrating the importance of community ideas and input, 5) detailing supporting transportation infrastructure, 6) ensuring the impact fits into the overall heritage and narrative of the city, and 7) promoting sustainable growth and green spaces. You can access more information here: A Singapore that is liveable, inclusive and endearing for generations: URA unveils Draft Master Plan 2025
https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___https://share.google/Hk0LUnbqUwyFz3cNE___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzovNjFiNTNmNGI1OTVkYjIxMzVkYTg2OTUwOGU3ZmJlZTo3OmM3OGQ6ZGZmMGI0ZTNiMmEwNTUyYzZjOWY4YmRhYmRkZDg3OGExNWM2ZTU1YWYzZWM0MDgxMzMyMDE3NzY3ZDUyODZkNTpwOlQ6Tg

Mayor Lurie and his team are talented enough to understand what a comprehensive review looks like and how they have fallen short. We, as a community, deserve better and thoughtful planning to this change and impact.

Sincerely,
Kristen Borsetti
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: marchand.philippe@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Philippe Marchand
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Friday, June 27, 2025 5:47:07 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I want to express my support for changes to zoning that would lead to more medium-density options for families using walking and transit, especially in the large portions of the city currently restricted to single homes.

I moved here with my family in 2022, I am not a homeowner, and I use walking and transit to get around the city and take my children to/from school on weekdays. As a new resident of SF, I was surprised by just how much of the housing in residential neighborhoods was composed of single homes, with so much of the built spaces occupied by garages. Having previously lived in Montreal, Canada, I had an image of a residential urban neighborhoods primarily composed of small multiplex units, which despite unequivocally worse weather than SF, made those neighborhoods less car-reliant.

To be clear: I support rent control, affordable housing, and expansion of transit and pedestrian-friendly programs to match development, and I think it's important for renting families to have a voice in this issue, especially if they don't fit in the dominant debate between real-estate interests and landowners trying to maintain their "property values" (i.e. the group whose webform I'm using to send this).

Sincerely,
Philippe Marchand
San Francisco, CA 94124

From:	yelsoma@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Alice Mosley
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date:	Sunday, June 29, 2025 3:18:34 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 resident without a car, I rely on the small shops in haight street and the neighborhood to fulfill my shopping needs.
Many of these shops already contend with high rents and competition from Amazon and online tech delivery companies. Up zoning can only intensify the pressures on them, as the value of land will incentivize property owners to empty their buildings in favor of large developers.
At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, I, along with my fellow a. Franciscans, voiced overwhelming opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a sweeping proposal that would double or triple building heights and density across the city, with no affordability mandates, no protections for tenants or small businesses, and no real community input.

This plan hands over more power to developers, and disempowers residents.

Why rush to satisfy a state housing mandate that is outdated, inflated, and disconnected from San Francisco's reality?

The mandate must be
challenged — not used to justify a sweeping deregulation of local zoning.

You can not rewrite the city's land use overnight with most residents unaware. And once this plan is adopted, there is no going back — even if it proves disastrous.

We urge you to:
– Protect small businesses and renters
– Respect neighborhood scale and historic resources
– Require real affordability in all upzoned projects
– Extend the approval timeline and engage the public

Don't rush a decision that will reshape the city forever. San Francisco deserves better — and leadership that listens.

Sincerely,
Alice Mosley
San Francisco, CA 94117

From:	sfsarnot@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Susan Arnot
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date:	Monday, June 30, 2025 10:54:46 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, San Franciscans voiced overwhelming opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a sweeping proposal that would double or triple building heights and density across the city, with no affordability mandates, no protections for tenants or small businesses, and no real community input.

This plan empowers developers while silencing residents.

It is being rushed to satisfy a state housing mandate that is outdated, inflated, and disconnected from San Francisco's reality. The mandate should be challenged — not used to justify a sweeping deregulation of local zoning.

You can not rewrite the city's land use overnight with most residents unaware. And once this plan is adopted, there is no going back — even if it proves disastrous.

We urge you to:
– Protect small businesses and renters
– Respect neighborhood scale and historic resources
– Require real affordability in all upzoned projects
– Extend the approval timeline and engage the public

Don't rush a decision that will reshape the city forever. San Francisco deserves better — and leadership that listens.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Susan Arnot
San Francisco, CA 94109

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
SAN FRANCISCO

DANIEL LURIE
MAYOR

TO: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
FROM: Adam Thongsavat, Liaison to the Board of Supervisors
RE: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan
DATE: September 30, 2025

Ordinance amending the Planning Code to: 1) create the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program to incent housing development through a local bonus program and by adopting a Housing Sustainability District, 2) modify height and bulk limits to provide for additional capacity in well-resourced neighborhoods, and to allow additional height and bulk for projects using the local bonus program, 3) require only buildings taller than 85 feet in certain Districts to reduce ground level wind currents, 4) make conforming changes to the RH (Residential, House), RM (Residential, Mixed), and RC (Residential-Commercial) District zoning tables to reflect the changes to density controls, and parking requirements made in this ordinance, 5) create the RTO-C (Residential Transit Oriented-Commercial) District, 6) implement the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's Transit-Oriented Communities Policy by making changes to parking requirements, minimum residential densities, and minimum office intensities, and requiring maximum dwelling unit sizes, 7) revise off-street parking and curb cut obligations citywide, 8) create the Non-contiguous San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Sites Special Use District, 9) permit businesses displaced by new construction to relocate without a conditional use authorization and waive development impact fees for those businesses, 10) make technical amendments to the Code to implement the above changes, 11) make conforming changes to zoning tables in various Districts, including the Neighborhood Commercial District and Mixed Use Districts, and 12) reduce usable open space and bicycle parking requirements for senior housing; amending the Business and Tax Regulations Code regarding the Board of Appeals' review of permits in the Housing Choice Program Housing Sustainability District; also, amending the Local Coastal Program to implement the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program and other associated changes in the City's Coastal Zone, and directing the Planning Director to transmit the ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment; 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 public necessity, convenience, and welfare findings under Planning Code, Section 302.

This is a substitute Ordinance for file 250701.

Should you have any questions, please contact Adam Thongsavat at adam.thongsavat@sfgov.org