San Francisco Planning

49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400
San Francisco, CA 94103
628.652.7600
www.sfplanning.org

September 18, 2025

Ms. Angela Calvillo, Clerk
Board of Supervisors
City and County of San Francisco
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: **Transmittal of Planning Department Case Number: 2021-005878 PCA MAP**
Housing Element 2022 Rezoning Initiatives – Family Zoning Plan
Board File Nos: 250700 (Map Amendment), 250701 (Planning Code Text Amendment)

Planning Commission Recommendation: **Approval with Modification**

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Mayor Lurie:

On September 11, 2025, the Planning Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting to consider the proposed Planning Code Text and Map Amendments for the Family Zoning Plan, which implements the Housing Element 2022 Update. The Planning Code Text Amendment and Map Amendment were introduced by Mayor Lurie on June 26, 2025 with substitute legislation introduced on July 29, 2025.

At the September 11, 2025 hearing the Planning Commission adopted a recommendation for approval for the Map Amendments and a recommendation of approval with modifications for the Planning Code Text Amendments. The recommended modifications are provided in Exhibit 3.a.1. of Resolution No. 21810.

The Commission certified the Housing Element 2022 Update EIR on November 17, 2022 in motion 21206, and adopted CEQA findings, a Statement of Overriding Considerations, and a Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting program (MMRP) for the Housing Element 2022 Update on December 15, 2022 in resolution 21220. The Planning Department prepared an addendum to the Housing Element 2022 Update FEIR, which was published on September 3, 2025 and found that the proposed Family Zoning Plan, including the General Plan, Planning Code and Zoning Map amendments, would not create any new or substantially more severe significant impacts than those described in the FEIR.

Mayor Lurie, please advise the City Attorney at your earliest convenience if you wish to incorporate the changes recommended by the Commission.

Please find attached documents relating to the actions of the Commission. If you have any questions or require further information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Aaron D. Starr
Manager of Legislative Affairs

cc: Audrey Williams Pearson, Deputy City Attorney
Giulia Gualco-Nelson, Deputy City Attorney
Austin Yang, Deputy City Attorney
Adam Thongsavat, Aide to Mayor Lurie
Jon Carroll, Office of the Clerk of the Board
Lisa Chen, Principal Planner, Planning Department

ATTACHMENTS :

Planning Commission Resolution Nos. R-21809 and R-21810

Planning Commission Recommended Modification to the Planning Code Text Amendments

Local Coastal Program Amendments Consistency Analysis

Planning Department Executive Summary

Letters submitted to the Planning Commission from the Department of Housing and Community Development, the Historic Preservation Commission, and various neighborhood organizations

San Francisco Planning

49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400
San Francisco, CA 94103
628.652.7600
www.sfplanning.org

PLANNING COMMISSION RESOLUTION NO. 21809

HEARING DATE: September 11, 2025

Project Name: Family Zoning Plan (Housing Element Rezoning Program)
Case Number: 2021-005878GPA MAP PCA
Initiated by: Mayor Lurie, Supervisor Sauter, Supervisor Mahmood, and Supervisor Dorsey
BOS File No: 250700
Staff Contacts: Lisa Chen, Principal Planner
lisa.chen@sfgov.org, 628-652-7422
Reviewed by: Rachael Tanner, Director of Citywide Planning
Rachael.tanner@sfgov.org, 628-652-7471

RESOLUTION APPROVING AMENDMENTS TO THE SAN FRANCISCO ZONING MAP OF THE PLANNING CODE TO GIVE EFFECT TO THE FAMILY ZONING PLAN, AMENDMENTS TO THE IMPLEMENTATION PLAN OF THE CITY'S CERTIFIED LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM, AND MAKING FINDINGS OF PUBLIC NECESSITY, CONVENIENCE, AND WELFARE PURSUANT TO PLANNING CODE SECTION 302, FINDINGS OF CONSISTENCY WITH THE GENERAL PLAN AND PLANNING CODE SECTION 101.1, AND FINDINGS UNDER THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT.

WHEREAS, on June 24, 2025, Mayor Lurie, Supervisor Sauter, Supervisor Mahmood, and Supervisor Dorsey introduced an ordinance for Zoning Map Amendments (Board File No 250700) as a part of the San Francisco Family Zoning Plan ("Family Zoning Plan" or "Plan"); and

WHEREAS, on July 29, 2025, Mayor Lurie, Supervisor Sauter, Supervisor Mahmood, and Supervisor Dorsey introduced a substitute ordinance for the same Zoning Map Amendments; and

WHEREAS, the Zoning Map Amendments along with the related Planning Code Amendments (Board File 250701), and General Plan Amendments (collectively "the 2025 Actions" or "the Project") implement the Housing Element, as it was finally adopted in January 2023 ("the Housing Element 2022 Update"); and

WHEREAS, the Housing Element 2022 Update was prepared pursuant to Government Code 65583, which, in part, requires that the Housing Element provide: (a) an assessment of housing needs and an inventory of resources and constraints relevant to meeting these needs; (b) a statement of community's goals, quantified objectives, and policies relative to affirmatively furthering fair housing and to the maintenance, preservation, improvement, and development of housing; and (c) a program setting forth a schedule of actions during the planning period to achieve the goals and objectives of the housing element, including the need to revise certain General Plan objectives and policies and rezone portions

of the City to increase development capacity to meet the City's housing needs; and

WHEREAS, the Housing Element 2022 Update was certified as compliant with state housing element law by the California Department of Housing and Community Development on February 1, 2023; and

WHEREAS, as required by the Housing Element 2022 Update, the Planning Department has embarked on a multi-year community-based planning effort to revise land use policies, the Planning Code and Zoning Maps to assure sufficient and equitable development capacity to create a variety of housing types in areas of the City that are particularly well suited to accommodate additional housing; the rezoning effort is commonly referred to as the Family Zoning Plan. As called for in the Housing Element 2022 Update, the rezoning focuses on the well-resourced neighborhoods of the western and northern portions of San Francisco (also referred to as Housing Opportunity Areas); and

WHEREAS, throughout this process, the Family Zoning Plan has been developed based on robust public input, including, but not limited to, four public open houses; 11 presentations at the Planning Commission; seven focus groups targeting populations facing greater housing insecurity; 62 housing education workshops in District 1 and District 4; five field walks; multiple presentations at City Commissions and Board of Supervisors committee hearings; two webinars open to a general audience; four online surveys; over 90 meetings with individual neighborhood organizations and advocacy groups; a robust interactive web page presence; a mailed notice to all residents, business owners and property owners within the rezoning area and within 300 feet of its boundary; and thousands of individual meetings, phone calls, and emails with stakeholders; and

WHEREAS, the Family Zoning Plan aims to expand housing affordability and diversity, including housing suitable for families, seniors, people with disabilities, essential workers, and low- and moderate-income households, to create a more predictable process to approve and build housing, to ensure inspiring urban design and architecture, to support small businesses and neighborhood vitality, and to plan for infrastructure and services to serve growth; and

WHEREAS, the Family Zoning Plan aims to expand housing affordability and diversity, including housing suitable for families, seniors, people with disabilities, essential workers, and low- and moderate-income households; to create a more predictable process to approve and build housing; to ensure inspiring urban design and architecture; to support small businesses and neighborhood vitality; and to plan for infrastructure and services to serve growth; and

WHEREAS, a draft ordinance, substantially in the form attached hereto as Exhibit 4.b., approved as to form by the City Attorney's office would amend the Zoning Maps of the San Francisco Planning Code. The draft ordinance incorporates by reference Zoning Tables which identify each parcel being affected by the Zoning Map Amendment, and are included in Board File 250700. The Zoning Map Amendments would: 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; amend 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). These changes correspond to conforming amendments to Sectional Maps ZN01, ZN02, ZN03, ZN04, ZN05, ZN06, ZN07, and ZN11; and HT01, HT02, HT03, HT04, HT05, HT06, HT07, and HT11 of the Zoning Maps of the City and County of San Francisco.; and

WHEREAS, collectively, the General Plan Amendments, the Zoning Map Amendments, and the Planning Code Amendments will affect approximately 92,000 of the approximately 150,000 parcels in the City where residential development is permitted; the Family Zoning Plan will allow increased density on all of those 92,000 parcels (approximately 60% of those 150,000 parcels), and increase the permitted heights on approximately 17% of parcels citywide; and

WHEREAS, the draft ordinance also proposes amendments to the Implementation Plan of the City's certified Local Coastal Program ("LCP"). On August 1, 2025 the Department issued a Notice of Availability of an LCP Amendment ("NOA") in accordance with California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Section 13515 requirements for public participation and agency coordination. The Department mailed the NOA to all neighborhood organizations that requested notice of hearings and applications in the Coastal Zone; individuals who have made a specific written request to be notified of hearings and applications pertaining to the Coastal Zone; local governments contiguous with the area that is the subject of the LCP Amendment; regional, state, and federal agencies that may have an interest in or may be affected by the proposed LCP Amendment; and the local library. The Department has completed a Consistency Analysis of the proposed LCP Amendment, attached hereto as Exhibit 7, in accordance with California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Sections 13511 and 13552; and

WHEREAS, the Commission certified the Housing Element 2022 Update EIR on November 17, 2022 in motion 21206, and adopted CEQA findings, a Statement of Overriding Considerations, and a Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting program (MMRP) for the Housing Element 2022 Update on December 15, 2022 in resolution 21220. The Planning Department has prepared an addendum to the Housing Element 2022 Update FEIR, which was published on September 3, 2025 and found that the proposed Family Zoning Plan, including the General Plan, Planning Code and Zoning Map amendments, would not create any new or substantially more severe significant impacts than those described in the FEIR; and

WHEREAS, on September 11, 2025, the Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting on the Zoning Map Amendments; and

WHEREAS, Planning Department staff recommends adoption of this Resolution adopting and recommending that the Board of Supervisors approve the Zoning Map Amendments with modifications; and

WHEREAS, the Commission has heard and considered the testimony presented to it at the public hearing and has further considered written materials and oral testimony presented on behalf of Department staff and other interested parties; and

WHEREAS, all pertinent documents may be found in the files of the Department, as the custodian of records, at 49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco; and

WHEREAS, the Commission has reviewed the proposed Ordinance; and

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, pursuant to Planning Section 302, that the Commission finds from the facts presented that the public necessity, convenience, and general welfare require the proposed Zoning Map Amendments.

Findings

Having reviewed the materials identified in the preamble above, and having heard all testimony and arguments, this Commission finds, concludes, and determines as follows:

1. The Zoning Map Amendments along with the Family Housing Zoning Plan will create development capacity for more than 36,200 additional housing units by 2030 by increasing realistic zoned capacity for housing and removing current constraints on new housing in the City's well-resourced neighborhoods, in satisfaction of Housing Element Action 7.1.1.

2. The Zoning Map Amendments will increase the supply of housing units, helping to alleviate the City's housing shortage and affordability crisis. Allowing for greater density and heights encourages the construction of a wide range of housing typologies, thereby providing greater accessibility to housing for residents of all incomes, household types, and needs throughout the city. The increased capacity will also generate more subsidized, permanently-affordable units through the City's inclusionary housing program and by increasing the geographic availability of sites zoned for the scale and type of buildings feasible for 100% affordable housing development.

3. The Zoning Map Amendments will advance the production of housing in state-designated Housing Opportunity Areas, where, over the past two decades, only about 10% of new housing units were built, even though they comprise more than 50% of the City's land. Building more residential units in these areas – which have higher incomes, good access to jobs, well-performing public schools, and low levels of environmental pollution – will create housing and economic opportunities for low- and moderate-income households.

4. The Zoning Map Amendments will enable increased housing production, which will generate more tax revenue and other public revenue to support public services and facilities. This increased revenue will ensure that vital infrastructure and services such as transit, schools, parks, and fire stations support healthy and complete communities, and that these facilities can increase in capacity as our population grows, in addition to supporting reinvestment in existing facilities.

5. The Zoning Map Amendments will include increasing housing capacity in mixed-use and commercial areas and corridors, which will benefit local businesses by generating more customers and demand for their goods and services.

6. The Zoning Map Amendments will include increasing housing capacity along major transit corridors and near job, schools and services, which will reduce reliance on automobile trips and reduce greenhouse gas emissions, while providing additional ridership to support higher levels of transit service to benefit both existing and future residents, workers and visitors.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the Planning Commission hereby find that the subject Zoning Map Amendments are consistent with the General Plan and Planning Code Section 101.1 as provided in Planning Commission Resolution No. 21808 concerning the proposed General Plan Amendments related to the Family Zoning Plan, and incorporates those findings by reference; and,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Commission finds that the Zoning Map Amendments do not impose any new governmental constraints on the development of housing, as those terms are defined in Policies 7.1.1 and 8.1.6 of the 2022 Housing Element, nor do they lessen the intensity of land use within the meaning of Government Code Section 66300(h)(1). The Commission further finds that collectively, the General Plan Amendment, the Zoning Map Amendments and the Planning Code Amendments, provide capacity for more than 36,200 additional units, which would more than offset any constraint or reduction in intensity on specific parcels, if any; and,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Commission finds the amendments to the Implementation Plan of the City's certified LCP conform 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 LCP Land Use Plan—the Western Shoreline Area Plan—for the reasons set forth in the Consistency Analysis, attached hereto as Exhibit 7. The Commission further finds that the amendments will be implemented in full conformance with the Coastal Act's provisions; and,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Commission has reviewed and considered the FEIR and CEQA Findings as modified by Addendum No. 1, and related findings previously adopted by the Commission for the Project, including the statement of overriding considerations and mitigation monitoring and reporting program, the findings as set forth in Addendum No. 1, and the findings related to amendments to adopted mitigation measures set out in Exhibit 8 to this Resolution. The Commission adopts the findings made in Addendum No. 1 and adopts the amendments to mitigation measures as proposed by Addendum No. 1 and identified in Exhibit 8; and,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Commission finds and determines that the Project as modified by the 2025 Actions is within the scope of the Project analyzed in the FEIR as modified by the subsequent Addendum No. 1 and require no further environmental review pursuant to CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines Section 15180, 15162, and 15163 for the following reasons: (1) implementation of the 2025 Actions does not require major revisions in said FEIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; and, (2) no substantial changes have occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the actions analyzed in said FEIR will be undertaken that would require major revisions to the FEIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects, or a substantial increase in the severity of effects identified in the FEIR; and, (3) no new information of substantial importance to the actions analyzed in said FEIR has become available which would indicate that (A) the Project as modified by the 2025 Actions will have significant effects not discussed in the FEIR; (B) significant environmental effects will be substantially more severe; (C) mitigation measures or alternatives found not feasible, which would reduce one or more significant effects, have become feasible; or (D) mitigation measures or alternatives, which are considerably different from those in the FEIR, will substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment; and,

NOW THEREFORE BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Commission hereby APPROVES the proposed Ordinance as described in this Resolution.

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was adopted by the Commission at its meeting on September 11, 2025.

Jonas P. Ionin
Commission Secretary

AYES:	Campbell, McGarry, Braun, So
NOES:	Williams, Imperial, Moore
ABSENT:	None
ADOPTED:	September 11, 2025

[Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan]

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.

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. Land Use and Environmental Findings.

(a) On November 17, 2022, the Planning Commission, in Motion No. 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 Planning Commission Motion No. M-21206 and the 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 No. 21220.

(c) The Planning Commission then adopted the proposed 2022 Housing Element in Resolution No. 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 No. 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 indicates 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 measures 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. ___ and is incorporated herein 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 amends several of the Zoning Maps of the San Francisco Planning Code to implement the height, bulk, and zoning district changes in the Family Zoning Plan. The Family Zoning Plan consists of three parts: San Francisco General Plan amendments, found in the ordinance in Board file No. 250701, Planning Code amendments, found in the

ordinance in Board file No. 250701, and these Zoning Map Amendments. Together, the Family Zoning Plan Planning Code, Zoning Map, and General Plan amendments implement commitments made in San Francisco's 2022 Housing Element Update, approved in Ordinance No. 10-23 on January 31, 2023. The Family Zoning Plan modifies zoning requirements primarily in well-resourced neighborhoods in San Francisco's west and north sides, and aims to increase capacity for multi-family housing. The Family Zoning Plan ordinances satisfy San Francisco's Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) shortfall of approximately 36,200 housing units.

(b) Because the number of parcels to be rezoned in this Zoning Map amendment is extensive, this ordinance does not include a table indicating the Assessor's Block and Lot numbers, Use or Height and Bulk Districts to be Superseded, and Use or Height and Bulk Districts Approved, except for the Zoning Map amendments required to implement the Non-Contiguous San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Sites Special Use District. Zoning Map amendments implementing the Non-Contiguous San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Sites Special Use District, which is established in Section 249.11 of the Planning Code, as proposed by the ordinance in Board File No. 250701, are included in Section 5 of this ordinance, below.

(c) Instead of including a table with the parcels included in the Zoning Map amendments in the body of this ordinance, the proposed changes to each parcel are included in the Family Zoning Plan Map Ordinance Parcel Tables (hereinafter, "Zoning Tables"), which is a spreadsheet included in Board File No. 250700, and is incorporated by reference as though fully set forth herein. The Zoning Tables are based on San Francisco Assessor's Office information as of January 1, 2022, and any changes made to any lot after January 1, 2022 may not appear in the Zoning Tables. In the event a parcel was subdivided and/or merged, or vice versa, after January 1, 2022 (each a Modified Parcel), it is the intent of

the Board of Supervisors that the zoning changes shown in the Zoning Tables shall apply to each of the Modified Parcels. The text of this ordinance includes descriptions of the changes to the Zoning Maps, and the general locations of those changes.

(d) While most Assessor's Parcel Blocks (also referred to as Assessor's Blocks and identified by the first four digits of any Assessor's Parcel Number in this ordinance) are subdivided horizontally, in some instances, property owners may have subdivided the Assessor's Parcel Block into vertical subdivision lots or through the creation of condominiums units. All Assessor's lots, including vertical lots and condominium units, located in the same Assessor's Parcel Block are subject to the same Planning Code provisions applicable to the Assessor's Parcel Block. Individual Assessor lots are identified by the last three digits of the Assessor's Parcel Number in the Zoning Table. To the extent the Zoning Table identifies a vertical subdivision lot or condominium unit that is created in the same Assessor Parcel Block as another vertical subdivision lot or condominium unit not identified in the Zoning Table (each a "Related Lot"), the proposed changes apply to all Related Lots.

(e) Section 3 of this Ordinance describes generally the amendments to the Zoning Use District Maps. The amendments to the Zoning Use District maps include: (i) reclassifying certain properties currently zoned as various Residential districts to a new zoning district called Residential Transit Oriented – Commercial (RTO-C), which is established in Section 209.4 of the Planning Code, as proposed by the ordinance in Board File No. 250701; (ii) reclassifying properties currently zoned RTO to a new zoning district called Residential Transit Oriented – 1 (RTO-1), established in Section 209.4 of the Planning Code, as proposed by the ordinance in Board File No. 250701; (iii) reclassifying certain properties from various Residential districts other than RTO to RTO-1; (iv) reclassifying certain properties currently zoned Neighborhood Commercial (NC) or Public (P) to C-2; and (v) reclassifying certain properties from Public to other mixed-use or Neighborhood Commercial district designations.

(f) Section 4 of this Ordinance describes generally the amendments to the Height and Bulk Maps. Changes to the Height and Bulk District map include (i) reclassifying properties in the Family Housing Zoning Plan to Height and Bulk District R-4 (as established in Section 270 of the Planning Code proposed in the ordinance found in Board File No. 250701); and, (ii) increasing the height limits on certain lots. The height limit increases include, on some properties, the establishment of a height limit applicable only to projects that use the Housing Choice – San Francisco Program, established in Section 206.10 and 263.19 of the Planning Code, as proposed by the ordinance found in Board File No. 250701.

(g) Section 5 of this Ordinance adopts the Non-Contiguous San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Sites Special Use District. The Non-Contiguous San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Sites Special Use District is included in the Family Zoning Plan – Planning Code amendments, new Planning Code Section 249.11, as proposed by the ordinance found in Board File No. 250701.

(h) Section 6 of this Ordinance amends the Local Coastal Program to designate all parcels in the Coastal Zone as part of the Height and Bulk District R-4 and rezone certain parcels to RTO-C, Neighborhood Commercial, and the Non-Contiguous San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Sites Special Use District.

(i) 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.

(j) As noted above, the text of this ordinance includes descriptions of the changes to the Zoning Maps, and the general locations of those changes. The specific amendments to individual parcels are noted in the Zoning Tables which can be found in Board File No. 250700. Maps showing a visual image of the proposed amendments to the Zoning Maps are also included in Board File No. 250700. Sections 3, 4, and 6 of this Ordinance _____, and the maps in Board File No. 250700, are general descriptions only; to the extent the text of this ordinance or the maps differ from the amendments shown in the Zoning Tables, the Zoning Tables shall control.

Section 3. The Zoning Map of the San Francisco Planning Code is hereby revised by amending Zoning Use District Maps ZN01, ZN02, ZN03, ZN04, ZN05, ZN06, ZN07, ZN11, ZN12, and ZN13 of the Zoning Map of the City and County of San Francisco as set forth in the Zoning Tables in Board File No. 250700, which is incorporated by reference as though fully set forth herein. The following paragraphs generally describe the revisions to the Zoning Use district maps.

(a) The Family Zoning Plan – Map Amendment implements the changes identified in the Housing Element by reclassifying certain properties in certain commercial districts and along transit corridors from Residential to Residential Transit Oriented - Commercial (RTO-C). These commercial districts and transit corridors include, or are adjacent to, the following streets: Franklin Street between O'Farrell Street and Francisco Street; Gough Street between O'Farrell Street and Francisco Street; Van Ness Avenue between Union Street and Beach Street; certain parcels north of Francisco Street and east of Van Ness Avenue; Chestnut Street between Polk Street and Baker Street; Lombard Street between Broderick Street and Lyon Street; California Street between Van Ness Avenue and 27th Avenue; the areas between Geary Boulevard, Steiner Street, California Street, and Broderick Street; Geary

Boulevard between Franklin Street and 48th Avenue; Point Lobos Avenue between 42nd Avenue and 48th Avenue; Balboa Street between Arguello Boulevard and Point Lobos Avenue; Fulton Street between Central Avenue and La Playa Street; Stanyan Street between Grattan Street and McAllister Street; Carl Street between Cole Street and Willard Street; Parnassus Avenue between Clayton Street and Willard Street; Shrader Street between Grattan Street and McAllister Street; Haight Street between Steiner Street and Clayton Street; Duboce Avenue between Church Street and Steiner Street; Church Street between 29th Street and Hermann Street; Lincoln Way between Arguello Boulevard and 48th Avenue; Irving Street between Arguello Boulevard and 48th Avenue; Judah Street between 6th Avenue and 48th Avenue; 7th Avenue between Lawton Street and Lake Street; 19th Avenue between Winston Drive and Lake Street; Funston Avenue between Vicente Street and Lake Street; 14th Avenue between Vicente Street to Lake Street; 15th Avenue between Portola Drive and Lake Street; 17th Avenue through 21st Avenue between Winston Drive to Lake Street; Noriega Street between 16th Avenue and 48th Avenue; Taraval Street between 12th Avenue and 46th Avenue; Ulloa Street between West Portal Avenue and 22nd Avenue; Vicente Street between 18th Avenue and 47th Avenue; Sloat Boulevard between Portola Drive and 44th Avenue; Eucalyptus Drive between Ocean Avenue and 23rd Avenue; West Portal Avenue between Sloat Boulevard and 15th Avenue; Ocean Avenue between San Jose Avenue and 20th Avenue; Winston Drive between Junipero Serra Boulevard and Lake Merced Boulevard; Brotherhood Way between Junipero Serra Boulevard and Lake Merced Boulevard; Chenery Street between Natick Street and Lippard Avenue; Brompton Avenue between Joost Avenue and Chenery Street; Wilder Street between Natick Street and Diamond Street; Joost Avenue between Monterey Boulevard and Lippard Avenue; Laguna Honda Boulevard between Merced Avenue and Clarendon Avenue; Dewey Boulevard between Pacheco Street and Laguna Honda Boulevard; Woodside Avenue between Portola Drive and Laguna Honda

Boulevard; and Portola Drive between Woodside Avenue and Sloat Boulevard; the areas bound by Riverton Drive, Ocean Avenue, 20th Avenue, and Eucalyptus Drive; the area bounded by 19th Avenue, Rossmoor Drive, Junipero Serra Boulevard, and Ocean Avenue; the area bounded by Geneva Avenue, Howth Street, Mount Vernon Avenue, San Miguel Street, and Interstate 280; the area bounded by Delano Avenue, Oneida Avenue, San Jose Avenue, and Mount Vernon Avenue; the area bounded by 7th Avenue, Kirkham Street, 3rd Avenue, and Irving Street; the area bounded by Arguello Boulevard, Frederick Street, Stanyan Street, Farnsworth Lane, Hill Point Avenue, and Hillway Avenue; the area bounded by Stanyan Street, Anza Street, Masonic Avenue, and Geary Boulevard; the area bounded by Fillmore Street, Washington Street, Van Ness Avenue, and Greenwich Street; the area bounded by Golden Gate Avenue, Gough Street, Market Street, and Diamond Street; and the area bounded by Market Street, Valencia Street, Castro Street, and 18th Street.

(b) The Rezoning Program reclassifies all properties currently zoned RTO located in the Market & Octavia Area Plan area, which is generally bounded by 16th Street, Noe Street, Waller Street, Webster Street, Oak Street, Buchannan Street, Grove Street, Laguna Street, Golden Gate Avenue, Gough Street, Fulton Street, Octavia Street, 14th Street, and Guerrero Street, to RTO-1.

(c) The Family Zoning Plan – Map Amendment reclassifies certain properties currently zoned Neighborhood Commercial or Public to Community Business (C-2). Properties being reclassified to C-2 include are the entirety of Assessor's Block 0019 at Stockton Street and North Point Street; Block 1072 at Geary Boulevard and Presidio Avenue, and Block 1094 at Geary Boulevard and Masonic Avenue.

(d) The Family Zoning Plan – Map Amendment reclassifies other properties under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Municipal Transit Agency (SFMTA) from P (Public) or R (Residential) to various Neighborhood Commercial Districts. These properties, most of which

operate as parking lots, include properties at La Playa Street and Cabrillo Street; on 19th Avenue near Geary Boulevard; on 8th Avenue and 9th Avenue south of Clement Street; on 18th Street and Castro Street within the Castro Street NCD; on Noe Street within the 24th and Noe Valley NCD; on 19th Avenue and Ocean Avenue adjacent to the Lakeside Village NCD; at San Jose Avenue and Geneva Avenue; and on the west side of Laguna Honda Boulevard north of Dewey Boulevard.

(e) The Board of Supervisors finds that the Zoning Map amendments in this ordinance constitute an amendment to the City's Local Coastal Program ("LCP"). The Board of Supervisors finds that the LCP amendment conforms with the applicable provisions of the California Coastal Act of 1976 (Public Resources Code Section 30000 et seq.), and that the amendment is 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 amendment will be implemented in full conformance with the Coastal Act's provisions.

Section 4. The Zoning Map of the San Francisco Planning Code is hereby revised by amending Height Maps HT01, HT02, HT03, HT04, HT05, HT06, HT07, HT11, HT12, and HT13 of the Zoning Map of the City and County of San Francisco as set forth in the Zoning Tables found in Board of Supervisors File No. 250700, which is incorporated by reference as though fully set forth herein. The following paragraphs generally describe the revisions to the Height District maps; for specific amendments to specific parcels, refer to the Zoning Tables.

(a) The Family Zoning Plan – Map Amendment rezones properties to the Height and Bulk District R-4 that are generally located in the Well-Resourced areas, as described in the Housing Element. Properties located in the area north of Haight Street, west of Octavia Street, east of Fillmore Street, and south of Fulton Street will also be rezoned to the Height and Bulk District R-4. The R-4 District is established in Section 270 of the Planning Code proposed in

the ordinance found in Board File No. 250701. The Zoning Map also increases the height limits on certain lots. The height limit increases include, on some properties, the establishment of a height limit applicable only to projects that use the Housing Choice – San Francisco Program, established in Section 206.10 and 263.19 of the Planning Code, as proposed by the ordinance found in Board File No. 250701. Where height districts are noted with a double slash ("//") separating two numbers or sets of numbers (e.g. 55-R-4//85-R-4, or 120/400-R-4//120/650-R-4), the number or set of numbers preceding the double slash is the permitted height limit for projects not using the HC-SF program (Base Height), and the number or set of numbers after the double slash is the permitted height limit for projects using the HC-SF Program. Where numbers are separated by a single slash ("/"), the first number is the maximum height for podium buildings and the number following the slash is the maximum tower height.

(b) In the Family Zoning Plan area, all height districts less than 40 feet are increased to 40 feet. These areas include, but are not limited to, the following areas, and/or along or adjacent to the following streets: the area between Junipero Serra Boulevard and 19th Avenue south of Eucalyptus Drive; the Westwood Park area north of Ocean Avenue, south of Monterey Boulevard, east of Faxon Avenue, and west of Frida Kahlo Way; Monterey Boulevard between Edna Street and Northgate Drive; and the area north of Turk Street, west of Saint Joseph's Street, south of O'Farrell Street, and east of Nido Avenue.

(c) Properties being reclassified to a "HC-SF Program" height of 50 feet, but typically maintaining a Base Height limit of 40 feet, include certain properties along or within approximately one block of certain Neighborhood Commercial districts and major transit corridors, and certain other areas, including but not limited to: Church Street between 30th Street and Hermann Street; 24th Street between Dolores Street and Diamond Street; Market Street between Octavia Boulevard and Eureka Street; Castro Street between 19th Street and

Clay Street; Haight Street between Webster Street and Stanyan Street; Parnassus Avenue between Clayton Street and Hillway Avenue; the area between Clayton Street and Stanyan Street south of Haight Street and north of Parnassus Avenue; Divisadero Street between Duboce Avenue and Clay Street; Sacramento Street between Fillmore Street and Arguello Boulevard; Columbus Avenue between Green Street and Bay Street; certain areas north of Broadway, west of Leavenworth, south of Chestnut and west of Van Ness Avenue; certain areas within approximately one-quarter mile from the Glen Park BART station and north of San Jose Avenue, generally bounded by Monterey Boulevard, Acadia Street, the parcels on the west site of Chilton Avenue, Surrey Street, Sussex Street, Roanoke Street, and Arlington Street.

(d) Properties being reclassified to a “HC-SF” height of 65 feet, where the Base Height limit typically remains at 40 feet or will be reclassified to 40 feet, include properties in all Neighborhood Commercial districts not otherwise being reclassified to a Local Program height greater than 65 feet, as well as certain major transit corridors, major arterials, portions of streets that extend from commercial or mixed use districts, and certain other areas adjacent to major institutional or commercial activity, including portions or all of the following streets or areas: Ocean Avenue between Victoria Street and Clearfield Drive; Sloat Boulevard between 19th Avenue and 44th Avenue; Vicente Street between 22nd Avenue and 47th Avenue; Taraval Street between 12th Avenue and 21st Avenue; Ulloa Street between Claremont Boulevard and 21st Avenue; 15th Avenue between Vicente Street to Lake Street; 17th Avenue between Vicente Street to Lake Street; 18th Avenue between Vicente Street and Lake Street; 20th Avenue between Buckingham Way and Lake Street; 21st Avenue between Buckingham Way and Lake Street; Noriega Street between Sunset Boulevard and 48th Avenue; Lawton Street between Lockley Avenue and 43rd Avenue; Judah Street between 5th Avenue and 8th Avenue; Parnassus Avenue between Clayton Street

and 21st Avenue; Irving Street between 6th Avenue and 48th Avenue; Lincoln Way between Arguello Boulevard and 48th Avenue; 7th Avenue between Lawton Street and Cornwall Street; Frederick Street between Clayton Street and Arguello Boulevard; Carl Street between Clayton Street and Arguello Boulevard; Willard Street between Woodland Avenue and Frederick Street; Stanyan Street between Grattan Street and Geary Boulevard; Shrader Street between Grattan Street and Page Street; Cole Street between Grattan Street and Page Street; Haight Street between Webster Street and Stanyan Street; Balboa Street between Arguello Boulevard and La Playa Street; Clement Street between Arguello Boulevard and El Camino Del Mar; California Street between Park Presidio Boulevard and 27th Avenue; Arguello Boulevard between Irving Street and Cornwall Street; the area bounded by Geary Boulevard, Stanyan Street, Anza Street, and Masonic Avenue; Masonic Avenue between Waller Street and California Street; Presidio Avenue between Geary Boulevard and Clay Street; Sacramento Street between Webster Street and Maple Street; Fillmore Street between Waller Street and Bay Street; Broadway between Laguna Street and Fillmore Street; Union Street between Leavenworth Street and Pierce Street; Lombard Street between Pierce Street and Lyon Street; Chestnut Street between Mason Street and Baker Street; Van Ness Avenue between Lombard Street and Beach Street; Jefferson Street between Powell Street and Hyde Street; Beach Street between Leavenworth Street and Van Ness Avenue; North Point Street between Leavenworth Street and Van Ness Avenue; Bay Street between Columbus Avenue and Franklin Street; Columbus Avenue between Lombard Street and Beach Street; Leavenworth Street between Pacific Avenue and Jefferson Street; Hyde Street between Jackson Street and Jefferson Street; Larkin Street between Jackson Street and Beach Street; Filbert Street between Leavenworth Street and Pierce Street; Green Street between Leavenworth Street and Polk Street; Vallejo Street between Leavenworth Street and Octavia Street; Pacific Avenue between Leavenworth Street and Polk Street; Church Street

between 30th Street and 15th Street; 24th Street between Chattanooga Street and Douglass Street; Chenery Street between Castro Street and Lippard Avenue; Natick Street between Wilder Street and Chenery Street; Wilder Street between Natick Street and Carrie Street; and Diamond Street between Bosworth Street and Elizabeth Street.

(e) Properties being reclassified to a "HC-SF" height of 85 feet, where the Base Height will typically be reclassified to 50 feet except in some locations where the existing height limit is greater than 50 feet, include properties in several Neighborhood Commercial districts, as well as certain major transit corridors, major arterials, and certain other areas adjacent to major institutional or commercial activity, including portions or all of the following streets or areas: the area generally bounded by Delano Avenue to the east, Mount Vernon Avenue to the south, Nahua Avenue and San Jose Avenue to the west, and Oneida Avenue to the north; the area generally bounded by Mount Vernon Avenue to the south, Howth Street to the west, Ocean Avenue to the north and Interstate 280 and San Miguel Street to the east; Ocean Avenue between Howth Street and Manor Drive; Ocean Avenue between Paloma Avenue and 19th Avenue; Sloat Boulevard between Junipero Serra Boulevard and 20th Avenue; the south side of Belle Avenue opposite Chester Avenue; Monterey Boulevard between Foerster Street and Gennessee Street; the south side of Brotherhood Way between Junipero Serra Boulevard and Lake Merced Boulevard; 19th Avenue between Sargent Street and Banbury Drive; the northern and southern corners of Buckingham Way and Winston Drive; Eucalyptus Drive between Junipero Serra Boulevard and 20th Avenue; Sloat Boulevard between Everglade Drive and Clearfield Drive; West Portal Avenue between Sloat Boulevard and Dorchester Way; Ulloa Street between Dorchester Way and Wawona Street; Claremont Boulevard between Ulloa Street and Portola Drive; the area generally bounded by Sloat Boulevard to the south, 19th Avenue to the west, Wawona Street to the north and 15th Avenue to the east; 19th Avenue between Eucalyptus Drive and Lincoln Way; Taraval Street

between 14th Avenue and 47th Avenue; Noriega Street between 16th Avenue and Sunset Boulevard; Judah Street between 7th Avenue and 48th Avenue; Irving Street between Arguello Boulevard and 27th Avenue; Lincoln Way between 8th Avenue and 21st Avenue; 9th Avenue between Kirkham Street and Lincoln Way; 7th Avenue between Judah Street and Hugo Street; Woodside Avenue between Portola Drive and Laguna Honda Boulevard; Laguna Honda Boulevard between Woodside Avenue and Clarendon Avenue; Dewey Boulevard between Pacheco Street and Laguna Honda Boulevard; Merced Avenue between Pacheco Street and Laguna Honda Boulevard; the area bounded by 7th Avenue to the west, Lawton Street to the north and Locksley Avenue to the east; Portola Drive between Evelyn Way and Woodside Avenue and O'Shaughnessy Boulevard; Fulton Street from Central Avenue to 48th Avenue; O'Farrell Street between Lyon Street and Masonic Avenue; Geary Boulevard between 14th Avenue and 43rd Avenue; California Street between Leavenworth Street and Funston Avenue; Lake Street between 2nd Avenue and 5th Avenue; Divisadero Street between Waller Street and Sacramento Street; the area generally bounded by Bush Street on the south, Larkin Street on the west, California Street on the north and Leavenworth Street on the east; Post Street between Steiner Street and Scott Street; Bush Street between Steiner Street and Broderick Street; Sutter Street between Steiner Street and Broderick Street; Scott Street between Post Street and Pine Street; Pierce Street between Post Street and Pine Street; Steiner Street between Post Street and Pine Street; Vallejo Street between Larkin Street and Gough Street; Pacific Avenue between Larkin Street and Octavia Street; Green Street between Larkin Street and Franklin Street; Gough Street between Pacific Avenue and Greenwich Street; Franklin Street between Pacific Avenue and Greenwich Street; Lombard Street between Pierce Street and Laguna Street; Filbert Street between Hyde Street and Gough Street; the area generally bounded by Larkin Street to the east, California Street to the south, Polk Street to the west and Greenwich Street to the north; the area generally

comprised of the eastern half of the blocks bounded by Polk Street to the east, California Street to the south, Van Ness Avenue to the west and Greenwich Street to the north; Greenwich Street between Polk Street and Gough Street, the area generally bounded by Francisco Street to the south, Columbus Avenue to the west, Beach Street to the north and the Embarcadero to the east; Church Street between 15th Street and Herman Street; Duboce Avenue between Church Street and Castro Street; Castro Street between 19th Street and 16th Street; 16th Street between Market Street and Flint Street; miscellaneous parcels within the area bounded by 14th Street to the south, Dolores Street to the west, Market Street to the north and Guerrero Street to the east; 14th Street between Landers Street and Market Street; 17th Street between Noe Street and Castro Street; Chenery Street between Carrie Street and Brompton Avenue; Wilder Street between Carrie Street and Diamond Street; Diamond Street between Monterey Boulevard and Chenery Street; Bosworth Street between Diamond Street and Brompton Avenue; Brompton Avenue between Joost Avenue and Chenery Street; and Joost Avenue between Monterey Boulevard and Lippard Avenue.

(f) Properties being reclassified to a general height limit of 85 feet include parcels along 11th Street between Mission Street and Folsom Street; 12th Street between Harrison Street and Howard Street; 13th Street between Harrison Street and Folsom Street; Harrison Street between 13th Street and Norfolk Street; Folsom Street between13th Street and 11th Street; and Howard Street between 13th Street and 11th Street.

(g) Properties being reclassified to “HC-SF” heights ranging from 120 feet to 180 feet, where the Base Height will be reclassified to heights ranging from 60 feet to 80 feet, include properties in several Neighborhood Commercial districts, as well as certain major transit corridors, major arterials, intersections of major corridors, and certain other areas adjacent to major institutional or commercial activity, including portions or all of the following streets or areas: Cambon Drive; the intersections of Eucalyptus Drive with Junipero Serra Boulevard

and with 19th Avenue; the intersections of 19th Avenue with Taraval Street, Noriega Street, Judah Street, and Irving Street; Geary Boulevard between 2nd Avenue and Divisidero Street; the west side of Presidio Avenue between Euclid Avenue and Post Street; Masonic Avenue between Geary Boulevard and Anza Street; the north side of O'Farrell Street between Wood Street and Anzavista Avenue; Lombard Street between Laguna Street and Van Ness Avenue; Broadway between Laguna Street and Van Ness Avenue; Gough Street between Vallejo Street and Washington Street; Franklin Street between California Street and Vallejo Street; Van Ness Avenue between Lombard Street and Broadway; Market Street between South Van Ness Avenue and Diamond Street; South Van Ness Avenue between 12th Street and 13th Street; Otis Street between Duboce Avenue and South Van Ness Avenue; and Mission Street between 13th Street and South Van Ness Avenue.

(h) Properties being reclassified to "HC-SF" heights of between 240 feet to 350 feet, where the Base Height will be reclassified to between 100 feet and 140 feet, include parcels and portions of the following areas or locations: Church Street at Market Street; Gough Street at McCoppin Street; Mission Street at South Van Ness Avenue; Geary Boulevard between Lyon Street and Wood Street; Masonic Avenue between Euclid Avenue and Anza Street; the area bounded by Geary Boulevard, Scott Street, Sutter Street, and Broderick Street; Franklin Street between Broadway and California Street; Van Ness Avenue between Sutter Street and Green Street; Van Ness Avenue between Redwood Street and Ellis Street; and Polk Street between California Street and Geary Street.

(i) Properties being reclassified to a "HC-SF" height of 450 feet, where the Base Height will be increased to 140 feet, include parcels, groups of parcels, and portions of the following area or location: Oak Street at Van Ness Avenue.

(j) Properties being reclassified to "HC-SF" heights of between 490 feet to 650 feet, where the Base Heights will be increased to between 195 feet and 260 feet, include parcels,

groups of parcels, and portions of the following areas or locations: Van Ness Avenue and Market Street; the area generally bounded by Polk Street, Ellis Street, Gough Street and Sutter Street, and parcels near Geary Boulevard and Masonic Avenue.

Section 5. Zoning Map. The Planning Code is hereby amended by revising Special Use District Maps SU01, SU02, SU03, SU04 and SU05, SU06, SU07, SU11, and SU12 of the Zoning Map of the City and County of San Francisco as follows:

Description of Property (Assessor's Block/Lot)	**Special Use District Hereby Approved**
0019/001; 1596/044; 1596/045; 1453/020; 1526/028A; 1526/028; 1526/002; 1440/028; 1440/029; 1440/030; 1439/045; 1439/048; 1439/049; 1439/036; 1439/035; 1072/001; 0490/013; 0490/012; 0490/011; 0490/010; 0490/009; 06350/09A; 0635/009; 1730/050; 1763/044; 2647/017; 2647/034; 3582/087; 6507/023; 7226/016; 7225/013; 2988A/007; 2979A/034; 2979A/002; 0669/012; 2864/050; 6972/036	Non-Contiguous SFMTA Sites Special Use District

Section 6. Local Coastal Program. The Local Coastal Program is hereby amended to reflect the following changes to Zoning Use District Map ZN13, Height and Bulk District Map HT13, and Special Use District Map SU13, as set forth in the Zoning Tables in Board File No. 250700, which is incorporated by reference as though fully set forth herein. The following paragraphs generally describe the revisions to the Zoning Use, Height and Bulk, and Special Use District maps.

(a) RTO Changes: The Family Zoning Plan – Map Amendment implements the changes identified in the Housing Element by reclassifying certain properties along or adjacent to certain commercial districts and transit corridors from various Residential Districts (including RH-1(D), RH-2, RH-3 and RM-1) to Residential Transit Oriented - Commercial (RTO-C) District. These corridors include, or are adjacent to, the following streets: Brotherhood Way between Thomas More Way and Lake Merced Boulevard; Judah Street between 47th Avenue and 48th Avenue; 47th Avenue and 48th Avenue between Kirkham Street and Judah Street; Irving Street between 47th Avenue and 48th Avenue; 47th Avenue and 48th Avenue between Judah Street and Irving Street; Lincoln Way between 47th Avenue and 48th Avenue; 47th Avenue and 48th Avenue between Irving Street and Lincoln Way; Fulton Street between 46th Avenue and 48th Avenue; 46th Avenue, 47th Avenue, and 48th Avenue between Fulton Street and Cabrillo Street; Balboa Street between 46th Avenue and La Playa Street; 46th Avenue, 47th Avenue, and 48th Avenue between Cabrillo Street and Sutro Heights Avenue; and El Camino Del Mar between Point Lobos Avenue and Seal Rock Drive.

(b) NC-2 Changes: The Rezoning Program reclassifies certain properties currently zoned Residential-Mixed Low Density (RM-1) or Neighborhood Commercial-Shopping Center (NC-S) to Small-Scale Neighborhood Commercial (NC-2). Properties being reclassified to NC-2 include certain parcels on Assessor's Block 1596 on La Playa Street between Cabrillo

Street and Balboa Street, and Block 1691 between La Playa Street, 48th Avenue, Fulton Street, and Cabrillo Street.

(c) Height and Bulk District R-4. The Rezoning Program implements changes to the Height and Bulk District maps. All properties in the Coastal Zone are in the new Height and Bulk District R-4. The Rezoning Program also increases the height limits on certain lots. All lots in the R-4 will have their height limits mapped with a general height limit and a height limit applicable to eligible projects that utilize the Housing Choice – San Francisco Program ("HC-SF," or "Local Program") established in Section 263.19 and 206.10 of the Planning Code, found in Board of Supervisors file No. 250701. In some cases, the two height limits are the same and may or may not represent an increase from the existing height limits. Height districts in the R-4 are noted with a double slash ("//") separating two numbers or sets of numbers (e.g. 55//85-R-4, or 120/400//120/650-R-4); the number or set of numbers preceding the double slash is the generally prevailing height limit, and the number or set of numbers after the double slash is the "Local Program" height limit. Where numbers are separated by a single slash ("/"), whether before or after a double slash, the first number is the podium height limit and the second number is the tower height limit, as set forth in Planning Code Section 263.19.

Properties within the R-4 whose general height limits are not being reclassified and where the Local Program height will be the same as the existing height limit include all areas north of Sloat Boulevard that are not otherwise described below, and all areas that are east of the Great Highway, Point Lobos Avenue and El Camino del Mar, and that are not currently zoned with a height limit of OS. Properties being reclassified to a "Local Program" height of 65', where the general height limit typically remains at 40 feet or will be reclassified to 40 feet, include properties in all Neighborhood Commercial Districts not otherwise being reclassified to a Local Program height greater than 65 feet, as well as certain major transit

corridors, major arterials, portions of streets that extend from commercial or mixed use districts, and certain other areas adjacent to major institutional or commercial activity, including portions or all of the following streets or areas: Irving Street between 47th Avenue and 48th Avenue; 47th Avenue and 48th Avenue between Judah Street and Irving Street; 47th Avenue and 48th Avenue between Irving Street and Lincoln Way; Lincoln Way between 47th Avenue and 48th Avenue; the area north of Fulton Street, west of 48th Avenue, east of La Playa Street and south of Cabrillo Street; Balboa Street between 46th Avenue and La Playa Street; 46th Avenue, 47th Avenue, and 48th Avenue between Cabrillo Street and Sutro Heights Avenue; and El Camino Del Mar between Point Lobos Avenue and Seal Rock Drive.

Properties being reclassified to a “HC-SF” height of 85’, where the general height will typically be reclassified to 50 feet except in some locations where the existing height limit is greater than 50 feet, include properties in several Neighborhood Commercial districts, as well as certain major transit corridors, major arterials, and certain other areas adjacent to major institutional or commercial activity, including portions or all of the following streets or areas: Brotherhood Way between Thomas More Way and Lake Merced Boulevard; Judah Street between 47th Avenue and 48th Avenue; 47th Avenue and 48th Avenue between Kirkham Street and Judah Street; Fulton Street between 46th Avenue and 48th Avenue; 46th Avenue, 47th Avenue, and 48th Avenue between Fulton Street and Cabrillo Street; and Cabrillo Street between 48th Avenue and La Playa Street.

Properties being reclassified to a “HC-SF” height of 100 feet, with a typical base height of 55 feet, include properties in Neighborhood Commercial districts, including portions or all of the following streets or areas: Sloat Boulevard between 44th Avenue and Great Highway.

(d) Special Use District. The Family Zoning Plan – Map Amendment reclassifies certain properties under the jurisdiction of the SFMTA at La Playa and Cabrillo Streets to the Non-Contiguous SFMTA Sites Special Use District.

Section 7. Effective Date 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 8. Effective and Operative Dates in the Coastal Zone.

(a) In the portions of the City that are 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) 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.

Section 9. Transmittal of Ordinance. 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. 250700. The Planning Department shall also retain a copy of the certified Local Coastal Program Amendment in its Local Coastal Program files.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
DAVID CHIU, City Attorney

By: /s/
AUSTIN M. YANG
Deputy City Attorney

n:\legana\as2025\2500203\01857889.docx

San Francisco Planning

49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400
San Francisco, CA 94103
628.652.7600
www.sfplanning.org

EXHIBIT 7

FAMILY ZONING PLAN – LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM AMENDMENTS CONSISTENCY ANALYSIS

Purpose

This document provides an analysis of the consistency of amendments to the City's Local Coastal Program (LCP), proposed as part of the Family Zoning Plan, with relevant provisions of the California Coastal Act (Public Resources Code Division 20) and the certified LCP in accordance with California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Sections 13511 and 13552.

LCP Land Use Plan (LUP) Amendments

Summary of Proposed LUP Amendments

The proposed LUP amendments pertain to residential and commercial development in the Coastal Zone portions of residential neighborhoods in the Richmond and Sunset districts. The amendments revise Objective 11 of the LUP, which currently calls for preservation of the scale of development in those districts, to call for advancing housing and community development goals in a place-sensitive manner. Policy 1 under Objective 11, which currently calls for regulating the density and appearance of development in order to preserve the scale and character of residential neighborhoods, would be revised to call for regulation of the form, design, and use of development in a manner that takes into consideration both the Coast and the larger City context. The proposed amendments are necessary for the City to accommodate its Regional Housing Needs Allocation shortfall of 36,200 units under Housing Element law.

Standard of Review

Pursuant to Coastal Act Section 30512.2 (Chapter 6 Article 2), the standard of review for LUP amendments is that they must conform with the requirements of Chapter 3 policies of the Coastal Act to the extent necessary to achieve the basic state goals specified in Section 30001.5.

Relevant Coastal Act Requirements

The proposed LUP amendments concern high-level policy regarding regulation of residential and commercial development in existing developed areas located inland from the first public road. Relevant

Coastal Act requirements are therefore concentrated in Articles 6 (Development) and 2 (Public Access) of Chapter 3 (Coastal Resources Planning and Management):

Article 6: Development

Section 30250: Location; existing developed area

(a) New residential, commercial, or industrial development, except as otherwise provided in this division, shall be located within, contiguous with, or in close proximity to, existing developed areas able to accommodate it or, where such areas are not able to accommodate it, in other areas with adequate public services and where it will not have significant adverse effects, either individually or cumulatively, on coastal resources. In addition, land divisions, other than leases for agricultural uses, outside existing developed areas shall be permitted only where 50 percent of the usable parcels in the area have been developed and the created parcels would be no smaller than the average size of surrounding parcels.

(b) Where feasible, new hazardous industrial development shall be located away from existing developed areas.

(c) Visitor-serving facilities that cannot feasibly be located in existing developed areas shall be located in existing isolated developments or at selected points of attraction for visitors.

Section 30251: Scenic and visual qualities

The scenic and visual qualities of coastal areas shall be considered and protected as a resource of public importance. Permitted development shall be sited and designed to protect views to and along the ocean and scenic coastal areas, to minimize the alteration of natural land forms, to be visually compatible with the character of surrounding areas, and, where feasible, to restore and enhance visual quality in visually degraded areas. New development in highly scenic areas such as those designated in the California Coastline Preservation and Recreation Plan prepared by the Department of Parks and Recreation and by local government shall be subordinate to the character of its setting.

Section 30252: Maintenance and enhancement of public access

The location and amount of new development should maintain and enhance public access to the coast by (1) facilitating the provision or extension of transit service, (2) providing commercial facilities within or adjoining residential development or in other areas that will minimize the use of coastal access roads, (3) providing nonautomobile circulation within the development, (4) providing adequate parking facilities or providing substitute means of serving the development with public transportation, (5) assuring the potential for public transit for high intensity uses such as high-rise office buildings, and by (6) assuring that the recreational needs of new residents will not overload nearby coastal recreation areas by correlating the amount of development with local park acquisition and development plans with the provision of onsite recreational facilities to serve the new development.

Article 2: Public Access

Section 30211: Development not to interfere with access

Development shall not interfere with the public's right of access to the sea where acquired through use or legislative authorization, including, but not limited to, the use of dry sand and rocky coastal beaches to the first line of terrestrial vegetation.

Section 30212: New development projects

(a) Public access from the nearest public roadway to the shoreline and along the coast shall be provided in new development projects except where: (1) it is inconsistent with public safety, military security needs, or the protection of fragile coastal resources, (2) adequate access exists nearby, or (3) agriculture would be adversely affected. Dedicated accessway shall not be required to be opened to public use until a public agency or private association agrees to accept responsibility for maintenance and liability of the accessway. […]

Section 30213: Lower cost visitor and recreational facilities; encouragement and provision; overnight room rentals

Lower cost visitor and recreational facilities shall be protected, encouraged, and, where feasible, provided. Developments providing public recreational opportunities are preferred.

The commission shall not: (1) require that overnight room rentals be fixed at an amount certain for any privately owned and operated hotel, motel, or other similar visitor-serving facility located on either public or private lands; or (2) establish or approve any method for the identification of low or moderate income persons for the purpose of determining eligibility for overnight room rentals in any such facilities.

Consistency Analysis

The proposed LUP amendments would apply to the Coastal Zone portions of residential neighborhoods in the Richmond and Sunset districts, which are existing developed areas extending well inland from the Coastal Zone and identified as well-resourced neighborhoods in the Housing Element of the San Francisco General Plan. As articulated in the Housing Element, it is the City's goal to expand housing choice within well-resourced neighborhoods and promote neighborhoods that are well-connected, healthy, and rich with community culture. The proposed amendment to LUP Objective 11 aims to ensure that development in these neighborhoods advances the City's housing and community development goals as appropriate for the location of each parcel. The proposed amendment to Policy 1 would further clarify that the location of each parcel relative to both the coast and the city context should be considered when establishing standards for development, and that the city context includes major commercial and transit corridors.

Article 6: Development

The proposed LUP amendments identify existing developed areas as locations for advancing the City's housing and community development goals, and are therefore consistent with Section 30250 which encourages infill development by calling for new residential and commercial development to be located within such areas.

The amendments require that both the coast and the city context be considered when establishing standards for development, thus reconciling the need for housing and community development in these neighborhoods with Section 30251's requirement that scenic and visual qualities of coastal areas be considered and protected as a resource of public importance. The established street pattern

in the Sunset and Richmond districts is a rectilinear grid with frequent uninterrupted streets arrayed orthogonally to the coast. All existing developed areas are inland from the first public road, which is generally parallel to the coast, and all land between the coast and first public road is publicly owned open space. These street and land-use patterns ensures that public views to and along the coast, generally available from public streets and open space, are protected from development impacts consistent with Section 30251. Furthermore, by requiring consideration of the city context when establishing development standards, the amendments are compatible with Section 30251's requirement that development be visually compatible with the character of surrounding areas, where these surrounding areas are considered as established City neighborhoods with boundaries that extend well inland of the Coastal Zone.

Section 30252 requires that the location and amount of new development maintain and enhance public access to the coast, including via transit and other non-automotive modes. The Richmond and Sunset districts include several transit corridors with high-quality rail and bus lines that connect the Coastal Zone with the rest of the City and with regional transit. The City's housing and community development goals as articulated in the Housing Element call for expanding housing choices and neighborhood commercial activity along these corridors. Implementing these goals in the Coastal Zone neighborhoods, as called for in the proposed LUP amendments, would help support this transit service, consistent with Section 30252. Furthermore, the established neighborhood street grid is fine grained and highly walkable, thus providing residents and visitors with abundant opportunities for non-vehicular circulation as required by this Section.

Article 2: Public Access

The existing street pattern of the Sunset and Richmond districts, discussed above, ensures that development will not interfere with access to the sea consistent with **Section 30211**. Likewise, since the proposed LUP amendments pertain to existing developed areas that are all inland from the nearest public roadway to the shoreline, the proposed LUP amendments are consistent with **Section 30212**.

The coast adjacent to the Sunset and Richmond districts is publicly owned and includes beaches, parks, and other recreational facilities that are free to all, consistent with **Section 30213** which calls for the provision of lower cost recreational facilities. In addition, the Richmond and Sunset districts include several commercial corridors that extend into the Coastal Zone and include establishments that provide lower cost services useful to visitors, such as grocery stores and take-out food establishments. The proposed LUP amendments would require consideration of these existing commercial corridors when establishing development standards, facilitating the continued presence of such establishments in the Coastal Zone.

LCP Implementation Plan (IP) Amendments

Summary of Proposed IP Amendments

The proposed IP amendments would modify development controls in the westernmost portions of the City's Richmond and Sunset districts. These are existing developed areas, inland of the first public road, and are

largely residential with moderate amounts of neighborhood- and visitor-serving commercial uses. These areas are designated for residential and commercial uses under the current IP, and the proposed amendments would continue this designation while allowing more housing and complete neighborhood amenities as appropriate in both the City and Coastal context. In particular, the amendments would:

- create the Housing Choice – San Francisco (HC-SF) program which includes a local residential bonus program that is similar to the State Density Bonus law in that it allows additional residential development opportunities in certain circumstances. The HC-SF program also includes a Housing Sustainability District to encourage housing production on certain infill sites near public transportation;
- create the R-4 Height and Bulk District, which will provide for form-based density, and increased height limits for projects using the HC-SF Program;
- reclassify certain properties as Residential Transit Oriented, Commercial District (RTO-C), which permits a wide array of neighborhood-serving uses at limited sizes along with housing, subject to form-based density;
- require minimum densities in transit-rich locations and impose maximum size limits on residential units;
- create the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Special Use District (SFMTA SUD), which 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; and
- modify the zoning controls in Neighborhood Commercial (NC-1, NC-2, NC-S) Districts in the Coastal Zone to allow for form-based density and reclassify certain properties as NC-2.

Standard of Review

The standard of review for IP amendments is that they must be consistent with and adequate to carry out LCP Land Use Plan (LUP) provisions. The proposed IP amendments will be paired with LUP amendments that will be adopted locally and submitted for Coastal Commission certification concurrently with the IP amendments. The standard of review for the proposed IP amendments is therefore the LUP as amended by the accompanying LUP amendments.

Relevant LUP Provision

The proposed IP Amendments concern residential and commercial development in the Coastal Zone portions of residential neighborhoods in the Richmond and Sunset districts. The applicable LUP provisions are in the Richmond and Sunset Residential Neighborhoods section (Objective 11 and related policies, as proposed to be amended), with additional provisions in the Transportation section (Objective 1 and related policies) and the Coastal Hazards section (Objective 12 and related policies):

> **RICHMOND AND SUNSET RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOODS**
>
> OBJECTIVE 11: ENSURE DEVELOPMENT IN THE COASTAL ZONE ADVANCES HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GOALS APPROPRIATE FOR THE LOCATION OF EACH PARCEL.

Policy 1: Consider the location of each parcel relative to both the city context, including major commercial and transit corridors, as well as the coast, when establishing standards for the form, design, and use of new development.

Policy 2: Develop the former Playland-at-the-Beach site as a moderate density residential apartment development with neighborhood commercial uses to serve the residential community and, to a limited extent, visitors to the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

Policy 3: Continue the enforcement of citywide housing policies, ordinances and standards regarding the provision of safe and convenient housing to residents of all income levels, especially low- and moderate-income people.

Policy 4: Strive to increase the amount of housing units citywide, especially units for low- and moderate-income people.

Policy 7: Maintain a community business district along Sloat Boulevard within the Coastal Zone to provide goods and services to residents of the outer Sunset and visitors to the Zoo and Ocean Beach.

TRANSPORTATION

OBJECTIVE 1: IMPROVE PUBLIC TRANSIT ACCESS TO THE COAST.

Policy 1: Improve crosstown public transit connections to the coastal area, specifically Ocean Beach, the Zoo and the Cliff House.

Policy 5: Consolidate the Municipal Railway turnaround at the former Playland-at-the-Beach site.

COASTAL HAZARDS

OBJECTIVE 12: PRESERVE, ENHANCE, AND RESTORE THE OCEAN BEACH SHORELINE WHILE PROTECTING PUBLIC ACCESS, SCENIC QUALITY, NATURAL RESOURCES, CRITICAL PUBLIC INFRASTRUCTURE, AND EXISTING DEVELOPMENT FROM COASTAL HAZARDS.

Policy 12.4: Develop the Shoreline in a Responsible Manner.

Consistency Analysis

Richmond and Sunset Residential Neighborhoods section

The proposed IP amendments would establish eligibility for the HC-SF Local Program (Local Program), which qualifies eligible projects for certain height, density, and code flexibility. Eligible projects would generally be required to meet inclusionary housing requirements, thus increasing the amount of housing for residents of all income levels, especially low- and moderate-income people, consistent with Policies 3 and 4 of this section.

Allowable building heights under the current IP are generally 40 feet. The proposed IP amendments include moderate increases in allowable heights along transit and commercial corridors, mostly for projects using the Local Program. Most height limit increases proposed within the Coastal Zone are located at least one block inland from the first public road and are components of larger district-wide patterns that extend beyond the Coastal Zone, consistent with Objective 11 and Policy 1.

Consistent with Policy 2, the proposed IP amendments would facilitate redevelopment of under-developed portions of the former Playland-at-the-Beach site with moderate density residential and neighborhood commercial uses by allowing moderate height increases under the Local Program and for SFMTA Joint Development (see below), and by reclassifying certain properties from the Neighborhood Commercial Shopping Center (NC-S) zoning use district to the Small-Scale Neighborhood Commercial (NC-2) zoning use district.

The amendments would retain the existing NC-2 zoning use district along Sloat Boulevard, consistent with Policy 7. Furthermore, the amendments would reclassify certain properties along other established transit and commercial corridors from various residential zoning use districts to the RTO-C zoning use district, allowing for additional commercial uses to serve the residential community and visitors in addition to the two commercial clusters named in Policies 2 and 7.

Transportation

The proposed IP amendments would allow and encourage denser residential and mixed-use development in existing walkable neighborhoods that are well-served by existing high-quality public transit, particularly along crosstown transit corridors that connect the Coastal Zone to the rest of the city and to regional transit. The amendments are consistent with Objective 1 and related Policies since transit can achieve greater ridership and cost-effectiveness by serving areas with higher densities and other complementary elements such as mixed uses and pedestrian connectivity.

The SFMTA's La Playa/Cabrillo Terminal Loop at 780 La Playa Street is located at the former Playland-at-the-Beach site and supports crosstown public transit connections to the Coastal Zone including the northern portion of Ocean Beach and the Cliff House. The proposed IP amendments would reclassify the Terminal site from the Low Density Mixed Residential (RM-1) zoning use district to the NC-2 zoning use district, and into the Non-Contiguous SFMTA Special Use District in implementation of the SFMTA Joint Development Policy. The proposed zoning reclassification, base height increase to 50', and Local Program height increase to 85' would all facilitate residential mixed-use redevelopment of the site while retaining the ability to maintain and improve transit-related uses, consistent with Objective 1 and related Policies.

Coastal Hazards

Objective 12 and related Policies are mostly concerned with the shoreline, while the proposed IP amendments would only apply to existing developed areas inland from the first public road. Policy 12.4 states that development in the Coastal Zone should be sited to avoid coastal hazard areas when feasible, and requires design and construction mitigations where avoidance is not feasible. As of this time the City has not identified any coastal hazard areas overlapping the areas to which the proposed IP amendments apply, and the amendments are thus not in conflict with Policy 12.4. In accordance with California Senate Bill No. 272 the City is developing a Sea Level Rise Plan (SLR Plan), as part of the City's LCP, including vulnerability assessment, adaptation strategies, and recommended projects. The SLR Plan may identify new coastal hazard areas, in which case it may propose new development controls or other guidance to minimize impacts to public safety and property from relevant hazards.

FAMILY ZONING PLAN

Exhibit 8

Addendum No. 1 to the Housing Element 2022 Update FEIR

San Francisco Planning

49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400
San Francisco, CA 94103
628.652.7600
www.sfplanning.org

ADDENDUM NO. 1 TO ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

Date of Publication of Addendum:	September 3, 2025
Date of EIR Certification:	November 17, 2022
Case Nos.	2019-016230ENV, 2021-005878CWP, and 2021-005878GPA
Project Title:	Family Zoning Plan – Housing Element Rezoning Program
Block/Lot:	Multiple
Project Sponsor:	San Francisco Planning Commission
Project Sponsor Contact:	Lisa Chen, (628) 652-7422, sf.housing.choice@sfgov.org
Lead Agency:	San Francisco Planning Department
Environmental Staff Contact:	Ryan Shum, (628) 652-7542, CPC.FamilyZoningCEQA@sfgov.org

Background

Overview

On November 17, 2022, the San Francisco Planning Commission (planning commission, and project sponsor) certified the San Francisco Housing Element 2022 Update Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) (San Francisco Planning Department Case No. 2019-016230ENV).[1] On December 15, 2022, the planning commission adopted the mitigation monitoring and reporting program (MMRP) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Findings: Findings of Fact, Evaluation of Mitigation Measures and Alternatives, and Statement of Overriding Considerations, and recommended the San Francisco Board of Supervisors' (board of supervisors') adoption of the City and County of San Francisco's (city's) housing element update. The board of supervisors adopted and the mayor signed the San Francisco Housing Element 2022 Update (housing element update) on January 31, 2025. The FEIR evaluated the impacts on the environment that could result from adoption and implementation of the housing element update, described below. Revisions and clarifications to the draft EIR were provided as part of the responses to comments (RTC) document prepared to address comments on the draft EIR. Together, the draft EIR and RTC document comprise the FEIR. Upon certifying the FEIR and approving the housing element update, the planning commission updated the 2014 housing element of the San Francisco General Plan (general plan) and made conforming amendments to the air quality, commerce and industry, environmental protection, and urban design elements of the general plan.

[1] San Francisco Planning Department, San Francisco Housing Element 2022 Update Final Environmental Impact Report, Planning Department Case No. 2019-016230ENV, State Clearinghouse No. 2021060358, certified January 31, 2023. The FEIR is available at: *https://sfplanning.org/environmental-review-documents?title=Housing+Element+2022&field_environmental_review_categ_target_id=All&items_per_page=10*.

As noted in the FEIR, adoption of the housing element update would lead to future actions, such as San Francisco Planning Code (planning code) amendments, designation of housing sustainability districts, and approval of development projects consistent with the goals, policies, and actions of the housing element update. These reasonably foreseeable changes are the subject of the FEIR analysis, which determined that the housing element update would not result in any direct physical changes to the environment but would result in reasonably foreseeable changes from these future actions. The proposed action evaluated in the FEIR is hereafter referred to as the "adopted housing element."

The subject of this addendum to the FEIR is the future actions that the city proposes to take to implement the housing element update. As anticipated in the FEIR, these include a set of planning code amendments and the designation of a housing sustainability district. These current proposals are encompassed within the Family Zoning Plan – Housing Element Rezoning Program, hereafter referred to as the "proposed rezoning program." More information about the proposed rezoning program is available at: *https://sfplanning.org/sf-family-zoning-plan.* These changes, some of which are required by state law and some of which are a required implementation action of the adopted housing element, focus on property in the Downtown, Marina, Mission,[2] Northeast, and Western Addition planning districts of San Francisco—specifically, in and near the areas designated by the state as Housing Opportunity Areas, referred to in the adopted housing element and in the FEIR as well-resourced areas.[3] The purpose of this addendum is to evaluate the environmental impacts of the rezoning program and document the San Francisco Planning Department's (department's) determination that these impacts are adequately addressed in the FEIR.

San Francisco Housing Element 2022 Update

The city (including the planning commission, the board of supervisors, and the mayor) updated the 2014 housing element of the general plan with the adopted housing element. The adopted housing element was prepared as required by housing element law pursuant to California Government Code section 65583. The FEIR was prepared to evaluate impacts on the environment that could result from adoption and implementation of the adopted housing element.

The adopted housing element establishes goals, policies, and actions to address the existing and projected housing needs of San Francisco. The goals, policies, and actions were required to plan for the regional housing targets allocated to San Francisco by regional agencies for the 2023 to 2031 cycle (82,070 units) and meet future housing demand in San Francisco. The adopted housing

---

[2] The projected growth in the Mission Planning District would primarily occur in the Hub and Upper Market area, as shown in Figures 2 and 3. For the purposes of this addendum, these areas are within the Mission Planning District boundary.

[3] *Well-resourced areas* are high- and highest-resource areas, which are neighborhoods identified by the State of California that provide strong economic, health, and educational outcomes for its residents. More information is available at: *https://www.treasurer.ca.gov/ctcac/opportunity.asp. San Francisco Planning Department*. Well-Resourced Neighborhoods: State Department of Housing and Community Development. *https://sfplanning.org/sites/default/files/documents/citywide/housing-choice/housingchoice_well-resourced_neighborhoods_map.pdf*. Accessed August 28, 2025.

element includes policies to improve housing affordability and advance racial and social equity in accordance with directives from the planning commission and historic preservation commission in summer 2020. The adopted housing element includes overarching goals for the future of housing in San Francisco that respond both to state law requirements as well as local community values, as understood from community engagement conducted for the housing element update. The underlying policies and actions guide development patterns and the allocation of resources to San Francisco neighborhoods. In general, the adopted housing element shifts an increased share of the city's future housing growth to transit corridors and low-density residential districts within, but not limited to, well-resourced areas.

FEIR ENVIRONMENTAL BASELINE AND PROJECTED GROWTH

As stated on pp. 4-6 and 4-7 in Chapter 4, Environmental Setting and Impacts, of the FEIR, because the adopted housing element is a long-term plan with no direct impacts, the use of an existing, current conditions, or 2020 baseline would have been misleading to the public and decision makers. Instead, the environmental impact analysis in the FEIR acknowledged some growth would occur regardless of an updated housing element and used a future 2050 baseline to better inform decision makers as to the impacts of adopting the housing element update rather than continuing with the status quo.

In the FEIR, the department projected that approximately 150,000 housing units would be constructed in the city by 2050, compared to 2020 conditions. The department projected approximately 102,000 housing units would be constructed by 2050 under the 2014 housing element. In other words, the department predicted that approximately 50,000 more housing units would be constructed by 2050 if the adopted housing element was implemented compared with the development anticipated under the 2014 housing element.

Review of Implementation Actions and Projects Since the FEIR

When preparing the FEIR, the department assumed that adoption of the housing element update would lead to future actions such as planning code amendments to increase height limits along transit corridors and modify density controls in low-density areas, which are located primarily on the west and north sides of the city; the designation of housing sustainability districts; the removal of other constraints on the maintenance, improvement, or development of housing; and the approval of development projects consistent with the goals, policies, and actions of the adopted housing element. The proposed rezoning program is one such implementation action and includes a suite of proposed changes.

Other implementation actions and projects that are not part of the proposed rezoning program but which have occurred or are in process since the FEIR, include:

- **Tribal Notification and Consultation.** Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-TCR-1: Tribal Notification and Consultation from the FEIR, which requires notification of Native American tribal representatives regarding environmental review of future development under the

adopted housing element. The department sent out a notification concerning the proposed rezoning program to local Native American tribal representatives on February 29, 2024. Three tribal groups responded to the notification and the department is consulting with these tribal groups on implementation of tribal notification and tribal cultural resources measures for future development under the adopted housing element.

- **Development Projects.** Review and approval of residential and mixed-use development projects consistent with the development density established by the adopted housing element; project-level review for such projects is conducted using the streamlined process provided under Public Resources Code (PRC) section 21083.3 and CEQA Guidelines section 15183. The resulting documents issued by the department are known as "general plan evaluations."
- **Downtown Office to Residential Conversion Zoning Program.** The city passed zoning legislation in July 2023 to reduce the regulatory barriers to make it easier to convert underutilized office buildings into housing. The Commercial to Residential Adaptive Reuse Program is contained in planning code section 210.5 and provides for a slew of zoning waivers and modifications for conversion of non-residential buildings in the greater downtown area to housing. To supplement the zoning program and as part of ongoing efforts to improve the feasibility of adaptive reuse projects, San Francisco voters approved Measure C on the March 2024 ballot. The city's transfer tax is now waived on the first transfer of a property after a conversion from commercial to residential use. In March 2025, the city passed legislation which waives the inclusionary housing requirement and impact fees for eligible adaptive reuse projects.
- **Housing Legislation.** Implementation of local housing legislation to facilitate housing development. **Table 1** identifies approved and pending legislative proposals to facilitate housing development that increase development capacity at sites since certification of the FEIR that relied on the FEIR. Housing Element implementation actions to improve the development review process that would not result in environmental impacts are not included; others were proposed by members of the board of supervisors. Some of these proposals have passed and are in effect. Those legislative proposals that are pending are noted as such.

Table 1: Legislative Proposals to Facilitate Housing Development Since the FEIR that Relied on the FEIR

Board File	Planning Case No.	Title	Description [Sponsor of Legislation]	Notes
Approved				
240787 and 250003	2024-006988PCAMAP and 2024-007906GPA	Central SoMa and Transit Center District Commercial Development Requirements	Ordinance Nos. 037-25 and 42-25 were signed on April 3, 2025, to enact zoning changes that would allow additional housing in the Central SoMa Plan and Transit Center District Plan areas by lifting zoning requirements for certain large sites to include a certain amount of non-residential development. As a result, large sites can pursue projects that are 100 percent residential. [Mayor, Dorsey]	Environmental review through Central SoMa and Transit Center District Plan EIRs 01/09/25
231258	2023-003676PCA	Housing Production (Constraints Reduction)	Ordinance 053-24, signed on March 22, 2024, to encourage housing production by exempting specified housing projects from the notice and review procedures of section 311 in areas outside of Priority Equity Geographies; and removing the Conditional Use requirement for several types of housing projects, including housing developments on large lots in areas outside the Priority Equity Geographies Special Use District. [Mayor, Melgar]	Determined within scope of the FEIR 11/13/23
230446	2023-003676PCA	Housing Production (Constraints Reduction)	In certain zoning districts, this ordinance allows construction of more units than currently principally permitted on larger lots in residential (RH-1, RH-2, and RH-3) districts, based on the lot area, removing the current requirement for conditional use authorization. [Engardio, Melgar, Dorsey, and Safai]	Determined within scope of the FEIR 07/14/23
230026	2023-006326PCA	Family Housing Opportunity Special Use District	Creates the Family Housing Opportunity Special Use District (SUD). Qualifying projects receive a density exception of up to four dwelling units per lot, eight units on a lot resulting from a two-lot merger, or 12 units on a lot resulting from a three-lot merger. In addition, corner lots are permitted up 6 units (and commensurately more for lot mergers) and up to 6 stories in height, among other provisions. [Melgar, Engardio]	Determined within scope of the FEIR 05/31/23

Board File	Planning Case No.	Title	Description [Sponsor of Legislation]	Notes
230732	2023-005431PCA	Planning and Building Codes - Commercial to Residential Adaptive Reuse and Downtown Economic Revitalization	Amended the Planning and Building Codes to achieve seven policy outcomes: Facilitate Residential Uses Downtown (planning code amendments), Economically Revitalize Downtown, Streamline Signage Permitting in C-3 Districts and Citywide, Streamline Historic Preservation Review for certain types of work, Provide Alternatives to Onsite Open Space Requirements in Certain C-3 Districts, Facilitate Residential Adaptive Reuse in the Building Code (Building Code Amendments), and Rezone a Portion of the Showplace Square Plan Area to C-2. [Mayor, Peskin, Safai, and Dorsey]	Determined within scope of the FEIR 05/09/23
Pending				
230734	2023-006115PCA	Planning Code - Density Exception on Specified Lots with Numerical Density Limits	Change the density requirements for dwelling units, group housing and senior housing in RC, RTO, NC and certain Named NC District's to form-based density. However, if a lot in an RC, RTO, NC, or certain Named NC District is within the Priority Equity Geographies Special Use District (planning code section 249.97), existing numerical density limits would continue to apply. Although also within the Priority Equity Geographies SUD, form-based density would control in the Excelsior Outer Mission Neighborhood Commercial District, the Polk Street Neighborhood Commercial District, and the Van Ness Special Use District. [Mayor, Melgar]	Determined within scope of the FEIR 03/18/2024

Source: San Francisco Planning Department, 2025.
Notes: FEIR = San Francisco Housing Element 2022 Update Environmental Impact Report

CEQA Review of the Proposed Rezoning Program

At the time the FEIR was prepared, a zoning proposal had not yet been developed. Therefore, the exact locations and physical parameters of the additional 50,000 housing units were unknown. To analyze the indirect impacts of the adopted housing element in the FEIR, it was necessary to develop assumptions for a rezoning program scenario that established the locations and physical parameters of subsequent development projects. As stated in Response PD-1 on pp. 4-10 and 4-11 of the RTC document, the FEIR includes maps (i.e., RTC Figure 4-1, p. 4-12; RTC Figure 4-2, p. 4-13; and RTC Figure 4-3, p. 4-14) that present hypothetical scenarios developed by the department for where future development consistent with the housing element could occur under the adopted housing element. The rezoning program scenarios reflected in the maps show increased height limits along transit corridors and modification of density controls in low-density areas that are primarily located on the west and north sides of the city.

The FEIR also included assumptions regarding the types of buildings that could be developed under the housing element update. The FEIR assumed that future development consistent with the adopted housing element would consist predominately of residential projects, some with ground-floor neighborhood services (e.g., retail or small medical offices), and was anticipated to include buildings with heights ranging from 55 to 300 feet, with the tallest buildings projected for locations along Geary Boulevard and Van Ness Avenue. In the FEIR analysis for transportation, noise, and air quality impacts, the department identified and quantitatively evaluated seven representative building types ranging from accessory dwelling units to a 590-foot-tall residential mixed-use building with 984 housing units that would be consistent with the housing element update.[4] Thus, the programmatic analysis in the FEIR accounted for subsequent development projects that could include a range of building types.

The FEIR stated that future actions that would implement the housing element update, such as future zoning programs, would provide more specificity to the hypothetical scenarios evaluated in the FEIR. The FEIR stated that when a future zoning change is proposed, the department would conduct a CEQA review, as needed. Accordingly, the department prepared this addendum for the proposed rezoning program, which was anticipated as part of the housing element update evaluated in the FEIR, as discussed below under “Proposed Rezoning Program (Proposed Revisions to Project).”

The proposed rezoning program is evaluated in accordance with CEQA Statute section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines sections 15162–15163. When an EIR has been certified for a project, the guidelines state that no new, subsequent, or supplemental EIR shall be required unless one or more of the following events occurs: (1) substantial changes to a project are proposed that will require major revisions to the EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; (2) substantial changes will occur due to the circumstances under which the project is being undertaken, requiring major revisions to the previous EIR due to new significant

[4] The building types in the FEIR included residential or mixed-use residential buildings at the following heights with the number of housing units in parentheses: 590 feet (984 housing units), 240 feet (495 housing units), 120 feet (200 housing units), 85 feet (50 housing units), 65 feet (29 housing units), and 40 feet (30 housing units). Additionally, construction of accessory dwelling units (ADUs) was analyzed. The quantitative evaluation was based on construction phases, durations, and equipment required to construct the range of building types. Appendices G, H, and I of the FEIR provide additional information on the types of buildings that were analyzed.

environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or (3) new information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified, has become available. In addition, San Francisco Administrative Code section 31.19(c)(1) states that a modified project must be reevaluated and that "if, on the basis of such reevaluation, the Environmental Review Officer determines, based on the requirements of CEQA, that no additional environmental review is necessary, this determination and the reasons therefor shall be noted in writing in the case record, and no further evaluation shall be required by this Chapter."

CEQA Guidelines section 15164 provides for the use of an addendum to document the basis for a lead agency's decision not to require a subsequent EIR for a project that is already adequately covered in a previously certified final EIR provided that none of the conditions described in CEQA Guidelines section 15162 that call for preparation of a supplemental or subsequent final EIR have occurred. Accordingly, this addendum documents the department's determination that the environmental impacts of the proposed rezoning program are adequately addressed in the FEIR and that none of the criteria set forth in CEQA Guidelines sections 15162–15163 requiring further environmental review have been met.

Housing Element Rezoning Statutory Exemption

On June 30, 2025, California Senate Bill (SB) 131 was signed into law and immediately took effect. Among other changes, the bill amended CEQA by adding PRC section 21080.085, a provision that statutorily exempts from CEQA "a rezoning that implements the schedule of actions contained in an approved housing element pursuant to subdivision (c) of section 65583 of the Government Code." The exemption does not apply to a rezoning that would allow for construction to occur within the boundaries of any natural and protected lands as defined pursuant to new PRC section 21067.5, among other exclusionary conditions. Further, the rezoning of any parcel or portions of a parcel that is excluded from a rezoning under the exemption "shall be considered a separate project subject" to CEQA.

Following adoption of SB 131, the department considered whether the proposed rezoning program is eligible for a statutory exemption in accordance with new PRC section 21080.085. The department determined that the proposed rezoning program implements an action in the approved housing element and therefore meets that criterion for the statutory exemption. However, approximately 3.4 percent of the parcels included in the rezoning program meet the definition of "natural and protected lands," which means those parcels would not qualify for the exemption. The rezoning of the excluded parcels, which are distributed throughout and adjacent to the boundaries of the well-resourced areas at the time the FEIR was prepared, would be considered a separate project requiring separate environmental review.

Given that the entire proposed rezoning program is eligible for an addendum to the FEIR, as supported by substantial evidence in this document, a rezoning of approximately 3.4 percent of the parcels (i.e., those that would not qualify for the exemption) would also likely qualify for an addendum to the FEIR. The impacts of the rezoning of the parcels ineligible for the exemption would likely be less than, and not different from, those impacts analyzed in the FEIR and discussed below under "Analysis of Potential Environmental Effects," beginning on p. 32.

The department therefore considered a two-pronged approach to environmental review for the proposed rezoning program: a statutory exemption for the rezoning of the parcels qualifying for an exemption under PRC section 21080.085, and an addendum to the FEIR for the rezoning of the parcels ineligible for the exemption. However, by the time SB 131 went into effect, preparation of an addendum for the entirety of the rezoning was almost complete. The department determined that pivoting to a two-pronged approach to the environmental review would be methodologically challenging to prepare because it would require extensive and detailed revisions to the addendum, based primarily on the fact that the parcels that are excluded from the exemption (and which would have required separate environmental review) are not clustered in discrete locations, but rather distributed throughout the boundaries of the proposed rezoning. The department also determined that a two-pronged approach could have been confusing for decision makers and the public and would have required considerable staff time and consultant effort, which could not be accomplished within the required rezoning timeline.

For these reasons, the department concluded that reviewing the entirety of the rezoning program in this addendum remained the best approach to environmental review to meet the requirements of CEQA. Nevertheless, the department finds that the rezoning of the parcels that qualify for an exemption under PRC section 21080.085 is statutorily exempt from environmental review. That is because it would implement the schedule of actions contained in an approved housing element under California Government Code section 65583(c)—in particular, Housing Element Implementing Action 7.1.1. Moreover, any impacts of the rezoning of the non-exempt parcels would be of a lesser magnitude than those documented in this addendum for the entire proposed rezoning program, and would therefore likely not require additional environmental review.

Proposed Rezoning Program (Proposed Revisions to Project)

Overview of the Proposed Rezoning Program

The proposed rezoning program was developed subsequent to certification of the FEIR. As previously discussed, implementation actions and zoning changes were anticipated as part of the proposed action evaluated in the FEIR. Growth that would be anticipated to occur under the proposed rezoning program is generally similar to the hypothetical scenarios as well as land use density and distribution assumptions presented for the adopted housing element in the FEIR, which are described above under “CEQA Review of the Proposed Rezoning Program,” with some changes, as described below.

Similar to the adopted housing element, adoption of the proposed rezoning program would not constitute an approval of any development projects. In accordance with CEQA Guidelines section 15064(d), this addendum identifies the reasonably foreseeable environmental impacts that could occur as a result of future actions that would implement the proposed rezoning program, as well as development projects that would be consistent with it, and determines whether the impacts are within the scope of the FEIR analysis.

The proposed rezoning program[5] would include the following changes:

- Establishment of a specific housing sustainability district;
- Amendments to base zoning,[6] including reclassification of lots across the rezoning area to a new R-4 height and bulk district;
- Establishment of a Residential Transit Oriented-Commercial (RTO-C) zoning district;
- Establishment of a local program;
- Reclassification of certain SFMTA properties into the Non-Contiguous SFMTA Special Use District; and
- Codification of certain FEIR mitigation measures identified as being the city's responsibility.

As previously discussed, in the FEIR, the department anticipated that, in general, the adopted housing element would shift an increased share of San Francisco's projected future housing growth to transit corridors and low-density residential districts within well-resourced areas. The land use density and distribution anticipated under the proposed rezoning program would be generally very similar in geography and basic rezoning concepts (e.g., heights, densities, and distribution thereof) to what was evaluated in the FEIR. However, there would be some differences in the exact location and the degree of the various height limit and density changes, such that there would be some modest shifts in projected growth in a few specific locations. Thus, the housing growth distribution assumptions under the proposed rezoning program include growth evaluated in the FEIR as well as some limited adjacent areas. The changes described below under "Effects of Proposed Rezoning Program on FEIR Housing Growth Assumptions" and "Effects of Proposed Rezoning Program on FEIR Land Use Density, Land Use Distribution, and Building Height Assumptions" are based on the planning code amendments to increase height limits at certain locations and the modifications to density controls in low-density areas in the proposed rezoning program including the Housing Choice – San Francisco Program (referred to hereinafter as "local program").

Table 2 compares the proposed rezoning program and the adopted housing element, highlighting the primary similarities and differences. The proposed rezoning program is described in more detail below.

---

[5] San Francisco Board of Supervisors. July 29, 2025. The proposed ordinances to implement the Family Zoning Plan and related information include amending the Zoning Map, Board of Supervisor's file 250700 available at: *https://sfgov.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=7449404&GUID=0F95C63F-86D3-433A-8B92-069CAB240942&%20Options=ID|Text|&Search=250700*, amending the Planning Code, Board of Supervisor's file 250701 available at: *https://sfgov.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=7449405&GUID=DDD973ED-4B60-44D3-B7E9-3EC31487D470&Options=ID|Text|&Search=250701*, and General Plan amendments in Planning Case file 2021-005878GPA available at: *https://citypln-m-extnl.sfgov.org/Commissions/CPC/7_17_2025/Commission%20Packet/2021-005878GPA.pdf*. All are available online at the links included herein. Accessed August 2, 2025.

[6] The zoning map amendments would reclassify the height limits across the rezoned area, including the establishment of a base height limit and a separate height limit for projects utilizing the local program (a local program to incentivize housing).

Table 2: Comparison of the Adopted Housing Element Assumptions in the FEIR to the Proposed Rezoning Program

Category	Adopted Housing Element Assumptions in the FEIR	Proposed Rezoning Program
Housing Growth	Approximately 50,000 net new housing units	**Incremental Increase:** Approximately 54,000 net new housing units
Growth Distribution	Growth primarily in well-resourced areas, heavily concentrated in the Inner Sunset, Outer Sunset, and Richmond planning districts	**Slightly Different:** More growth in well-resourced areas in the Downtown, Marina, Mission, Northeast, and Western Addition planning districts; overall, growth would be distributed more broadly across the well-resourced areas and in limited areas adjacent to well-resourced areas compared to the rezoning analysis assumptions in the FEIR
Heights	Buildings with heights ranging from 55 to 300 feet high[c]	**Slightly Different:** Buildings with heights ranging from 40 to 500 feet high, with two limited areas up to 650 feet high[a]
Density	Increased land use density and building heights projected along certain transit and commercial corridors, including certain residential areas adjacent to (but not immediately along) transit corridors	**Similar:** Further increase in the allowable land use density and building heights along certain transit and commercial corridors (e.g., Geary Boulevard, Van Ness Avenue, Lombard Street, North Point Street, western portion of Market Street, Ocean Avenue, Irving Street, etc.) Reduction in the allowable land use density and building heights in certain residential areas adjacent to (but not immediately along) transit corridors (e.g., some areas adjacent to Geary Boulevard, Van Ness Avenue, Taraval Street, Judah Street, etc.)
Project-Level Approvals	Did not approve any development projects	**Same:** Does not approve any development projects
Housing Sustainability Districts	Anticipated areas for a possible housing sustainability district within the anticipated rezoned area	**Similar:** Establishes a specific housing sustainability district for an area similar to the area anticipated in the FEIR
Zoning Amendments	Did not include amendments to base zoning[b]	**Different:** Includes amendments to base zoning[b] (e.g., applying form-based density, establishing base-height limit changes, creating new zoning for some parcels, etc.)

Source: San Francisco Planning Department, 2025.
Notes: FEIR = San Francisco Housing Element 2022 Update Environmental Impact Report

a. Under the proposed rezoning program, buildings with heights generally up to 500 feet, except in two areas where up to 650 feet would be allowed in very limited areas within the city (i.e., near the intersections of Van Ness Avenue and Geary Boulevard and Van Ness Avenue and Market Street).

b. *Base zoning* refers to the general zoning requirements for an individual parcel. Modifications allowed pursuant to the Housing Choice – San Francisco Program, the State Density Bonus law, or other program allowing modifications to zoning controls, are modifications from the base zoning.

c. The FEIR analysis utilized seven representative building types for some technical topics, such as air quality. See FEIR Appendix I – Air Quality for more information.

Establishment of a Specific Housing Sustainability District

A housing sustainability district is a designated area in a city created by ordinance and within 0.5 mile of public transit in which at least 20 percent of all housing units would be affordable for very low-, low-, and moderate-income households for at least 55 years. As discussed on p. 2-27 in Chapter 2, Project Description, of the FEIR, a foreseeable future outcome of the housing element update would be the designation of one or more of the areas identified as a housing sustainability district under California Government Code sections 66200 through 66210, which could be used to streamline the environmental review and approval of residential development projects. No specific housing sustainability districts were proposed as part of the housing element update, but the FEIR identified where such districts may be considered in the future.

The proposed rezoning program includes the establishment of a specific housing sustainability district, albeit with slightly different boundaries from the areas considered for possible housing sustainability districts in the FEIR. The establishment of a specific housing sustainability district is a mechanism for creating a ministerial process for some development projects. The housing units that would occur within the housing sustainability district are already included in the assumptions developed for the proposed rezoning program. **Figure 1** compares the areas that would be included in the specific housing sustainability district under the proposed zoning program to those areas anticipated for a possible housing sustainability district in the FEIR. Under the proposed rezoning program, the housing sustainability district would include areas that were not considered for potential housing sustainability districts as part of the adopted housing element, including the area near the intersection of Van Ness Avenue and Market Street, historically known as The Hub; portions of the Fisherman's Wharf area; portions of the Castro/Dolores Heights; portions of the Glen Park neighborhood near the Glen Park BART station north of San José Avenue; and portions of the Balboa Park neighborhood near the Balboa Park BART station.

The supporting ordinance would include zoning and design review standards as well as affordability requirements. Eligible projects seeking entitlement under the proposed housing sustainability district that meet the zoning and design review standards would be approvable through a ministerial process. Pursuant to California Government Code sections 66202 to 66210 and CEQA sections 21155.10 and 21155.11, subsequent projects in the designated housing sustainability district areas that meet the requirements of a housing sustainability district would not require further environmental review but would be required to implement the applicable mitigation measures determined to be necessary to reduce the significant impacts identified in the FEIR.



Family Zoning Plan – Housing Element Rezoning Program

Case Nos. 2019-016230ENV, 2021-005878CWP, and 2021-005878GPA

Figure 1

Housing Sustainability District Under the Proposed Rezoning Program Compared to Areas Considered for Possible Housing Sustainability Districts Under the Adopted Housing Element

Amendments to Base Zoning

The proposed rezoning program includes the following amendments to the base zoning[7] in areas of the city that would be rezoned:

- Applying form-based density (also known as density decontrol)[8] to parcels in neighborhood commercial/mixed-use districts and certain parcels along and adjacent to certain corridors
- Establishing base-height limit changes on some parcels
- Creating new zoning for some parcels, including a newly created RTO-C (Residential Transit-Oriented, Commercial) designation, which would be applied to some parcels along certain transit corridors, and extending certain NC (Neighborhood Commercial) districts; renaming the existing RTO district as RTO-1 and applying it to some additional parcels near certain transit corridors and employment hubs; changing the height limits on certain lots in the R-4 Height and Bulk district; reclassifying a small number of parcels from various R (Residential), NC and P (Public) designations to various NC designations; and reclassifying two parcels at the intersection of Geary Boulevard and Masonic Avenue and one in Fisherman's Wharf to C-2 (Community Business).
- Codifying certain design standards[9]
- Establishing curb-cut restrictions on certain neighborhood commercial and transit frontages
- Creating a special use district for certain sites under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) to enable continued use of the sites for transportation, as needed, and permit joint development (residential uses) in furtherance of the SFMTA's Joint Development Policy.

The proposed rezoning program includes the following amendments to base zoning that would apply citywide:

- Establishing minimum housing densities for residential and office uses within 0.5 mile of certain transit stations, in compliance with Metropolitan Transportation Commission's (MTC's) Transit-Oriented Communities Policy, as well as reused sites or low-income sites in the housing element sites inventory
- Establishing maximum unit sizes for new construction
- Codifying existing residential flats policy

---

[7] *Base zoning* refers to the general zoning requirements for an individual parcel. Modifications allowed pursuant to the local program, the State Density Bonus law, or other program allowing modifications to zoning controls, are modifications from the base zoning.

[8] *Form-based density* refers to where residential density is regulated by the permitted building volume – either the maximum floor area ratio (FAR) or a maximum building volume controlled by height, bulk, and setback controls.

[9] Some objective design standards are being codified as part of the proposed zoning program, such as bulk controls. However, the code amendments also refer to the department's adopted design standards and guidelines, which are available at: *https://sfplanning.org/design-review*, accessed August 26, 2025.

- Reducing maximum accessory parking limits, including within 0.5 mile of certain transit stations in compliance with the MTC's Transit-Oriented Communities Policy
- Consolidating all existing wind controls in the planning code into a single section, deleting the requirement to meet wind comfort criteria, and modifying the wind hazard criterion. Wind controls would continue to apply to areas with existing wind controls.
- Expanding the requirement for large projects to develop and implement a driveway and loading operations plan
- Cleaning up the planning and conforming amendments, including:
  - Removing obsolete code sections related to efficiency dwelling units
  - Eliminating the analyzed state density bonus from the planning code
  - Where relevant, updating tables and other language to note applicability of adopted citywide design standards and other objective standards

The proposed revisions to the planning code and associated amendments to the business and tax codes, as well as amendments to the zoning map, to implement the Family Zoning Plan are available in San Francisco Board of Supervisors files 250700 and 250701.[10]

Establishment of a Residential Transit Oriented-Commercial Zoning District

The proposed rezoning program includes the establishment of an RTO-C zoning district on portions of transit and commercial streets that are currently zoned Residential.

Establishment of a Local Program

STATE DENSITY BONUS PROGRAM

Under Government Code section 65915, the state density bonus law, cities are required to grant density bonuses, waivers, concessions, and incentives[11] when a developer of a housing project with five or more units makes at least 5 percent of those units onsite affordable to very low-, low-, or moderate-income

---

[10] More information regarding Ordinance 250700 is available at: *https://sfgov.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=7449404&GUID=0F95C63F-86D3-433A-8B92-069CAB240942&Options=ID|Text|&Search=250700*, and Ordinance 250701 is available at: *https://sfgov.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=14322322&GUID= B227117C-69AA-4164-85E7-B98814B244FD*.

[11] *Concessions and incentives* mean (1) a reduction in site development standards or a modification of zoning requirements or architectural design requirements that exceeds the minimum building standards approved by the California Building Standards Commission, as provided in part 2.5 (commencing with section 18901) of division 13 of the Health and Safety Code, including, but not limited to, a reduction in setback and square footage requirements and the ratio of vehicular parking spaces that would otherwise be required that results in identifiable, financially sufficient, and actual cost reductions; (2) approval of mixed-use zoning in conjunction with the housing project if commercial, office, industrial, or other land uses will reduce the cost of the housing development and if the commercial, office, industrial, or other land uses are compatible with the housing project and the existing or planned development in the area where the proposed housing project will be located; or (3) other regulatory incentives or concessions proposed by the developer or the city, county, or city and county that result in identifiable, financially sufficient, and actual cost reductions (see Government Code section 65915).

households (i.e., income between 50 and 120 percent of the area median income). The amount of the density bonus and the number of concessions and incentives varies, depending on the percentage of affordable units onsite proposed and the level of affordability, and is based on a sliding scale; generally, however, state law requires cities to grant a density bonus of 5 to 100 percent, and up to four concessions and incentives, if a developer designates a specified number of the units as affordable. In addition, project sponsors can receive waivers from development standards if the standards physically preclude a project with the additional density and/or the requested concessions and incentives.

Local jurisdictions can adopt an ordinance to implement the state density bonus law. The city's State Density Bonus Law is the Individually Requested State Density Bonus Program in planning code section 206.6 and Planning Director's Bulletin Number 6. Projects that implement the state density bonus law would use the base height limits and other aspects of the base zoning described above to establish their "base project" (i.e., the starting point for calculating bonus allowances and layering code waivers or incentives).

LOCAL PROGRAM (HOUSING CHOICE-SAN FRANCISCO PROGRAM)

The proposed rezoning program would establish a local program to incentivize housing, the Housing Choice – San Francisco Program (referred to hereinafter as "local program") in planning code section 206.10 et al. Projects that use the local program must opt out of state bonus programs or other state laws that grant relief from local planning standards and must meet local objective code requirements and design standards. Under the local program, eligible projects would be granted a range of automatic, pre-determined modified development standards. Eligible projects would also have the ability to vary by up to 15 percent from the quantitative development standards not already modified in the specific list and not explicitly prohibited by the program.

Local program projects may still use provisions in state law that provide for process streamlining (i.e., ministerial review), such as those created by Assembly Bill 2011 and Senate Bill 423, provided they meet a program's eligibility criteria.

The local program would be applicable to a project that:

- Consists of new construction, additions, or conversions of existing structures and adds net new housing units or group housing bedrooms;
- Contains two or more housing units or group housing bedrooms, exclusive of accessory dwelling units (ADUs) (though ADUs can be included in the project);
- Is located on a lot in the R-4 Height and Bulk District;
- Does not demolish a historic building that is designated as a landmark or as a contributor to a historic district under Article 10, is listed as a significant or contributory building under Article 11 of the planning code or is listed in the California Register or National Register of Historic Places;
- Does not seek or receive any density or development bonuses or relief from applicable planning code standards in any other State or local law or program under state law;

- Complies with objective standards, except as provided for or allowed through the local program;
- Is at least two-thirds new or converted residential square footage or at least 50 percent residential in cases where some existing non-residential space is converted to residential and the existing non-residential use is not expanded by more than 25 percent; and
- Is not located in a special use district that implements a development agreement.

LOCAL PROGRAM PROVISIONS AND CODE FLEXIBILITY

Projects that are eligible for and seeking entitlement under the local program could choose an unlimited number of benefits from the menu of "local modified development standards" provided below.

- Height: Projects could build up to the local program height limit established for that parcel, which is consistent with the heights for the proposed rezoning program identified in **Figure 3**, p. 22, discussed below under "Effects of Proposed Rezoning Program on FEIR Land Use Density, Land Use Distribution, and Building Height Assumptions." The highest heights under the proposed rezoning program are those that are allowed via opting into the local program. Corner lots and lots larger than 8,000 square feet may allow structures up to 65 feet tall.
- Inclusionary (Affordable) Housing: In addition to standard provisions under section 415 (onsite, fee, offsite), may also satisfy inclusionary requirements through land dedication within the Housing Opportunity Areas, or provide 100% rent control for a rental property (for projects with 24 or fewer units).
- Density: Form-based density for any parcel not already subject to such rules.
- Dwelling Unit Mix: Qualifying projects of five or more net new dwelling units shall include at least 25% of units as two bedrooms or more.
- Rear Yard and Lot Coverage: Reduction to the greater of 18 percent or 15 feet for lots except for lots in certain R districts and certain large lots.
- Street-Facing Legislated and Front Setback: Projects on 19th Avenue may reduce legislated and front setback if a project would expand the sidewalk to at least 15 feet.
- Usable Open Space: Reduction to 36 square feet/dwelling unit.
- Dwelling Unit Exposure: 30 percent of units can use a standard equivalent to the current lower California building code requirement.
- Non-Residential Use Size Limits: No conditional use authorization required for uses on the ground floor.
- Height limits for architectural elements: Additional height allowance for non-habitable decorative elements.
- Large Lot Development: no conditional use authorization required.

- Additional bonus square footage and height (above the local program limits) for provision of Micro-retail and/or certain Community Benefit Uses, including (among others specified) Child Care, Community Facilities, Grocery, etc. or space for Legacy Businesses or other businesses displaced by development, limited to 2 square feet for every square foot of Community Benefit Use and not more than one additional story (i.e., 10 feet).
- Any quantitative Objective Standard not otherwise modified by the local program directly can be varied up to 15 percent from that standard, except as explicitly prohibited by the local program (e.g., height limits, parking maximum limits, and other certain code provisions).
- Additional Major Modifications: a project may pursue additional deviation from any quantitative standard in the planning code or any applicable Objective Standard not otherwise allowed by the local program, pursuant to discretionary approval from the planning commission.

LOCAL PROGRAM PROVISIONS FOR 100 PERCENT AFFORDABLE HOUSING PROJECTS

In addition to the above code flexibility for projects that are eligible for and using the local program, 100 percent affordable housing projects can receive additional flexibility, as follows:

- Minimum ground-floor ceiling height requirements in code section 145.1(c)(4) shall not apply
- Active use requirement shall be reduced by 20 percent
- Micro-retail requirements shall not apply
- Curb-cut restrictions in code section 155(r) shall not apply, but alternative frontages are encouraged
- An additional height bonus of two stories (20 feet) above the local program height limit shall be available

Effects of Proposed Rezoning Program on FEIR Housing Growth Assumptions

Similar to the housing growth assumptions in the FEIR, it is anticipated that the proposed rezoning program would result in the construction of approximately 54,000 more housing units in the city by 2050, albeit distributed slightly differently from what was assumed in the FEIR. **Table 3** compares the change in housing units by planning district under the adopted housing element and the proposed rezoning program. **Figure 2**, p. 20, compares the projected housing growth and distribution under the proposed zoning program to the projected housing growth and distribution for the adopted housing element evaluated in the FEIR. As shown in **Table 3** and **Figure 2**, p. 20, the proposed rezoning program would distribute housing growth more broadly across the well-resourced areas and in limited areas adjacent to well-resourced areas compared to the rezoning analysis assumptions in the FEIR.

Table 3: Comparison of Housing Units between the Adopted Housing Element FEIR and the Proposed Rezoning Program by Planning District

Planning District	Net New Housing Units[a,b]		Net Change between Proposed Rezoning Program and Adopted Housing Element
	Adopted Housing Element in the FEIR[c]	Proposed Rezoning Program	
Bernal Heights	-200	-200	0
Buena Vista	1,600	2,800	1,200
Central	2,900	3,000	100
Downtown	-1,800	500	2,300
Golden Gate Park	0	0	0
Ingleside	6,800	7,900	1,100
Inner Sunset	11,000	7,600	-3,400
Marina	4,200	5,800	1,500
Mission	-1,300	1,500	2,700
Northeast	800	5,900	5,200
Outer Sunset	14,300	7,400	-7,000
Presidio	0	0	0
Richmond	12,400	9,400	-3,100
South Bayshore	-600	-600	0
South Central	-600	-200	400
South of Market	-5,800	-5,800	0
Treasure Island	0	0	0
Western Addition	6,100	8,900	2,800
Total	**50,000**	**54,000**	**4,000**

Source: San Francisco Planning Department, 2021 and 2025.
Notes:

a. Numbers have been rounded and will not sum to the total.

b. The negative numbers in this table indicate that the planning district is anticipated to have fewer new housing units under the adopted housing element or the proposed rezoning program compared to the 2050 environmental baseline. The negative numbers do not indicate that the planning district would lose existing housing units or that any zoning changes would reduce development capacity compared to existing zoning. Rather, these numbers reflect the department's assumptions that because of the proposed rezoning, a certain portion of housing growth would shift away from these districts and to the proposed rezoned area.

c. The net new housing units in the Adopted Housing Element in the FEIR column (i.e., approximately 50,000) are in addition to the housing units that would be constructed under the 2050 environmental baseline. The net new housing units in the Adopted Housing Element in the FEIR column are consistent with the San Francisco County Transportation Authority's San Francisco Chained Activity Modeling Process (SF-CHAMP) travel demand model data used in the FEIR.



Graphics ... Gy_SF_Planning Rezoning 104844 (8-25-25) tg

Family Zoning Plan - Housing Element Rezoning Program

Case Nos. 2019-016230ENV, 2021-005878CWP, and 2021-005878GPA

Figure 2

Projected Housing Growth and Distribution under the Proposed Rezoning Program Compared to the Adopted Housing Element

Regarding housing growth assumptions, the proposed rezoning program would include the following primary differences compared to the hypothetical scenario presented for the adopted housing element in the FEIR:

- Increased growth projections in the Downtown, Marina, Mission, Northeast, and Western Addition planning districts due primarily to the increased housing capacity in Fisherman's Wharf, Russian Hill, and the Van Ness corridor;
- Increased growth projections for the far southwestern part of the city due primarily to the increased housing capacity on the large parcels on Brotherhood Way between Lake Merced Boulevard and Junipero Serra Boulevard in the Ingleside planning district; and
- Reduced growth projections for the Richmond, Inner Sunset, and Outer Sunset planning districts due primarily to the reduced housing capacity in the residential areas off major transit corridors as well as a revised distribution for projected housing citywide.

As discussed on p. 2-30 in Chapter 2, Project Description, of the FEIR, the adopted housing element focuses on housing production and distribution and does not include policies or actions that would substantially change the number or location of jobs in the city relative to the 2050 environmental baseline. The FEIR assumed that the number and distribution of jobs in the city would be essentially the same under both the 2050 environmental baseline and the adopted housing element update. Similarly, the proposed rezoning program would not include policies or actions that would substantially change the number or location of jobs compared to the adopted housing element update.

Similar to the FEIR's analysis of the housing element update, this addendum may represent a conservative environmental analysis because it likely overestimates the growth anticipated under the proposed rezoning program due to uncertainties associated with housing production over the long term. Specifically, the types and amount of future development would depend on, among other things, local economic conditions, market demand, and other financing considerations. However, in no case would growth exceed the maximum growth permitted under the proposed rezoning program.

Effects of Proposed Rezoning Program on FEIR Land Use Density, Land Use Distribution, and Building Height Assumptions

Figure 3 compares the proposed heights under the proposed zoning program to the heights evaluated for the adopted housing element in the FEIR.



Graphics ... Gy_SF_Planning Rezoning 104844 (8-22-25) tg

Family Zoning Plan - Housing Element Rezoning Program

Case Nos. 2019-016230ENV, 2021-005878CWP, and 2021-005878GPA

Figure 3

Proposed Heights under the Proposed Rezoning Program Compared to the Adopted Housing Element

Regarding land use density and distribution, the proposed rezoning program would have the following primary differences compared to the hypothetical scenario presented for the adopted housing element in the FEIR:

- The proposed rezoning program would increase the allowable land use density and building heights along certain transit and commercial corridors (e.g., Geary Boulevard, Van Ness Avenue, Lombard Street, North Point Street, western portion of Market Street, Ocean Avenue, Irving Street, etc.) compared to the assumptions for the adopted housing element, as shown in **Figure 3**, p. 22;
- The proposed rezoning program would reduce the allowable land use density and building heights in certain residential areas adjacent to (but not immediately along) transit corridors (e.g., some areas adjacent to Geary Boulevard, Van Ness Avenue, Taraval Street, Judah Street, etc.) compared to the adopted housing element, as shown in **Figure 3**, p. 22; and
- The proposed rezoning program would result in housing growth within the boundaries of the well-resourced areas at the time the FEIR was prepared, as well as within some limited additional adjacent areas outside of the well-resourced areas. In addition, the anticipated density and housing growth within the boundaries of the well-resourced areas under the proposed rezoning program would be different than what was analyzed in the FEIR. The adjacent areas include the area near the intersection of Van Ness Avenue and Market Street, historically known as The Hub; portions of the Fisherman's Wharf area; portions of the Castro/Dolores Heights; portions of the Glen Park neighborhood near the Glen Park Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) station north of San José Avenue; portions of the Balboa Park neighborhood near the Balboa Park BART station; and portions of the Oceanview neighborhood near the intersection of 19th Avenue and Sargent Street and along Brotherhood Way). **Figure 3**, p. 22, shows the difference between the proposed heights under the proposed rezoning program and the adopted housing element.

Regarding building heights, it is anticipated that the proposed rezoning program would result in buildings with heights ranging from 40 to 500 feet, with two limited areas of up to 650 feet, which would be slightly lower than the lowest assumption in the FEIR and higher than the highest assumption in the FEIR.[12,13] Under the proposed rezoning program, buildings with heights up to 650 feet would be allowed in very limited areas within the city (i.e., near the intersections of Van Ness Avenue and Geary Boulevard and Van Ness Avenue and Market Street).

In addition to the proposed rezoning program, this addendum considers two small areas for potential future rezoning in Supervisor District 3 in the northeastern part of the city. The potential environmental impacts of this potential rezoning are analyzed in Appendix D of this addendum.

---

[12] As discussed above under "CEQA Review of the Proposed Rezoning Program," the programmatic analysis in the FEIR accounted for subsequent development projects that could include a range of building types. The department identified and quantitatively evaluated seven representative building types ranging from accessory dwelling units to a 590-foot-tall residential mixed-use building with 984 housing units to analyze the indirect impacts of the adopted housing element for transportation, noise, and air quality.

[13] More information is available at: *https://sfplanning.org/sf-family-zoning-plan*.

Codification of Certain FEIR Mitigation Measures

The proposed rezoning program includes planning code amendments (i.e., codification) to incorporate the following mitigation measures from the FEIR as planning code requirements:

Mitigation Measure M-TR-4a: Parking Maximums and Transportation Demand Management.

The city shall reduce vehicle trips from future planning code amendments (e.g., future rezonings or housing sustainability district designations) to implement the proposed action or future development projects that contribute considerably to or result in a significant transit delay impact, as defined in the Housing Element 2022 Update EIR's transit analysis for future development. This mitigation measure shall not apply to future planning code amendments, or future development projects implementing the proposed action, that do not contribute considerably to or result in a significant transit delay impact.

The city may achieve this vehicle trip reduction through one of the following measures A, B, or C:

- Measure A: Amend planning code parking maximums for residential uses (sections 151 and 151.1) by a 50 percent or more reduction than such maximums as of April 2022; OR
- Measure B: Amend planning code transportation demand management requirements (section 169) for residential uses or its associated program standards for residential uses by an equivalent amount to achieve the vehicle trip reduction estimated by implementation of a 50 percent reduction in planning code parking maximums, compared to parking maximums as of April 2022; OR
- Measure C: The department shall apply vehicle trip reduction measures A or B on future development projects consistent with the housing element on project-by-project basis until the city amends the planning code consistent with measures A or B.

Mitigation Measure M-TR-4b: Driveway and Loading Operations Plan and Curb-Cut Restrictions.

The city shall reduce potential conflicts between driveway and loading operations, including passenger and freight loading activities, and people walking, bicycling, riding transit, and driving, from future planning code amendments to implement the proposed action (e.g., future rezonings or housing sustainability district designations) or future development projects that would contribute considerably to or result in a significant transit delay or significant loading impacts, as defined in the Housing Element 2022 Update EIR's transit and loading analysis for future development. This mitigation measure shall not apply to future planning code amendments, or future development projects implementing the proposed action, that do not contribute considerably to or result in a significant transit delay or significant loading impacts.

The city may achieve this through one of the following measures A or B:

- Measure A.1: Amend planning code section 155(r) to not permit curb cuts for garage entries, driveways, or other vehicular access to off-street parking or loading along the street(s) of the significant transit delay and significant loading impacts (may not apply to streets with protected center-running transit-only lanes); AND

- Measure A.2: Amend the geographic applicability of planning code section 155(u) for projects to prepare and implement a Driveway and Loading Operations Plan (DLOP). Applicable projects shall prepare and submit a draft DLOP to the department for their review and approval, in consultation with the SFMTA. The DLOP shall be written in accordance with any guidelines issued by the department and shall respond to any applicable SFMTA curb management plans (e.g., see Mitigation Measure M-TR-6: Curb Management Plans); OR
- Measure B: The department shall apply measures A.1 and A.2 on a development project by development project basis until the city amends the planning code consistent with measures A.1 and A.2.

The proposed rezoning program would amend planning code sections 151 and 151.1 to codify Mitigation Measure M-TR-4a, which is discussed on pp. 4.4-114 and 4.4-115 in Section 4.4, Transportation and Circulation, in the FEIR. This measure would reduce the number of vehicle parking spaces permitted for applicable future development projects consistent with the adopted housing element that would contribute considerably to the significant transit delay impact. This would reduce vehicle trips associated with the proposed rezoning and reduce projected increases in congestion and transit travel times (i.e., transit will be faster) at intersections through which Muni routes travel. This measure would reduce the significant transit delay impact of the proposed action. As further explained in the transportation section below, the codification of Mitigation Measure M-TR-4a would partially fulfill the requirements of the mitigation measure.

The proposed rezoning program would amend planning code sections 155(r) and 155(u) to codify Mitigation Measure M-TR-4b, which is discussed on p. 4.4-115 in Section 4.4, Transportation and Circulation, in the FEIR. This measure would expand the geographic applicability to include streets where significant transit delay and significant loading impacts occur and future development projects consistent with the adopted housing element that would contribute considerably to the significant transit delay impact. In addition, on streets where significant transit delay impacts are identified, Mitigation Measure M-TR-4b may not permit curb cuts and driveways to off-street loading facilities for applicable projects. This measure would reduce the potential for conflicts between transit vehicles and passenger or onsite freight loading activities or vehicles turning into or out of driveways, and thus reduce or minimize the severity of the transit delay associated with future development consistent with the proposed action.

The codification of M-TR-4b as part of the proposed rezoning program would fulfill the requirements of the mitigation measure.

The mitigation monitoring and reporting program for the proposed rezoning program is included in Appendix A of this addendum. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15097, the MMRP is designed to ensure implementation of the mitigation measures identified in the FEIR and this addendum and adopted by decision makers.

Proposed Rezoning Program Approvals and Related Amendments

The board of supervisors will consider adopting a set of ordinances to amend the planning code and zoning maps to adopt the proposed rezoning program as well as amend the planning code and business and tax code to adopt the housing sustainability district.[14] In addition, the board of supervisors will consider adopting a set of amendments to the general plan and planning code to modify text and maps that relate to height and density in the relevant area plans that overlap the proposed rezoning program as well as a general plan elements, including the Urban Design Element. Other planning code changes would include a new section 148 consolidating existing wind controls and amending various criteria. Furthermore, some of the general plan amendments and zoning changes constitute amendments to the city's Local Coastal Plan because the proposed rezoning program would apply to parcels in the Coastal Zone.

The planning commission will review and make recommendations on these ordinances, and forward their recommendation to the board of supervisors for their consideration. The planning commission and board of supervisors will also consider adopting amendments to the general plan[15] and the planning code. The California Coastal Commission will consider approving amendments to the city's Local Coastal Plan.

Project Setting

Project Location

The project location is described on p. 2-12 in Chapter 2, Project Description, in the FEIR.

Cumulative Development

CEQA requires an evaluation of a proposed project's potential contributions to cumulative impacts, in addition to proposed project-specific impacts. CEQA Guidelines section 15130(a)(1) states that a "cumulative impact consists of an impact which is created as a result of the combination of the project evaluated in the EIR together with other projects causing related impacts." Other proposed projects include reasonably foreseeable future projects. CEQA Guidelines section 15130(b)(1) states that the approach to the cumulative impact analysis may be based on either a list of past, present, and probable future projects producing related or cumulative impacts or a summary of projections contained in an adopted general plan or related planning document that describes or evaluates conditions that contribute to the cumulative effect.

---

[14] More information regarding Ordinance 250700 is available at: *https://sfgov.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=7449404&GUID=0F95C63F-86D3-433A-8B92-069CAB240942&Options=ID|Text|&Search=250700* and Ordinance 250701 is available at: *https://sfgov.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=14322322&GUID= B227117C-69AA-4164-85E7-B98814B244FD*.

[15] San Francisco Planning Commission. July 17, 2025. The planning commission initiated the general plan amendments and amendments to the Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan on July 17, 2025. The proposed amendments are reflected in Planning Department record 2021-005878GPA available at: *https://citypln-m-extnl.sfgov.org/Commissions/CPC/7_17_2025/Commission%20Packet/2021-005878GPA.pdf*, accessed August 20, 2025.

As discussed in "E. Cumulative Impacts" in Chapter 4, Environmental Setting and Impacts, of the FEIR, because the projections for the housing element update included all anticipated housing and employment growth in the city through 2050, the analysis of the housing element update's environmental impacts is largely a cumulative impact analysis by nature. While the project-level impact analysis identifies the impacts that would result from the construction and operation of approximately 50,000 housing units by 2050 (i.e., the difference between growth anticipated under the 2050 environmental baseline and the additional housing growth projected under the housing element update), the cumulative impact analysis in the FEIR considered the impacts that would result from the addition of approximately 150,000 housing units and 111,000 jobs in the city through 2050 compared to 2020 conditions. Thus, the cumulative impact analysis in the FEIR identified the impacts that would result from the housing and job growth that would occur in the city through 2050 without the housing element update in combination with the additional growth anticipated with the housing element update. The analysis is based primarily on modeled projections, including housing and employment growth projections and transportation (travel demand and mode) projections.

Since completion of the FEIR, the cumulative context has largely remained unchanged, with the Great Highway Mobility Improvements Project (Case No. 2024-010317ENV) and SFMTA's Vision Zero Quick-Build program being the only substantial projects implemented that were not evaluated in the FEIR.[16] **Table 4** describes the Great Highway Mobility Improvements Project and SFMTA's Vision Zero Quick-Build program, which are considered as part of the cumulative analysis for the proposed rezoning program in this addendum, as applicable; in addition, **Table 4** lists the cumulative projects evaluated in the FEIR. The Great Highway Mobility Improvements Project and the Vision Zero Quick-Build program are roadway modification projects and do not substantially alter the cumulative setting.

[16] The FEIR stated that the sites identified for potential development under the Port of San Francisco's (port's) Waterfront Plan Update would be geographically separate from the well-resourced neighborhoods where future housing construction would occur consistent with the adopted housing element. The proposed rezoning program projects more housing units in the Downtown, Marina, Mission, Northeast, and Western Addition planning districts compared to the adopted housing element. The Northeast Planning District is adjacent to the area covered by the Fisherman's Wharf subarea, a portion of the Waterfront Plan Update area. However, the potential impacts of the Waterfront Plan Update, which does not propose residential uses, would not substantially spatially overlap with housing growth anticipated under the proposed rezoning program in the Northeast Planning District. In addition, the proposed rezoning program would not rezone any port-owned land.

Table 4: Cumulative Projects

Project	Description
Cumulative Projects that were not Evaluated in the FEIR	
Great Highway Mobility Improvements Project Case No. 2024-010317ENV	San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) proposed traffic changes in conjunction with improvements proposed by the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department (SFRPD); together, these traffic changes and improvements comprise the Great Highway Mobility Improvements Project. The SFMTA would make the following traffic modifications on Sloat Boulevard from Upper Great Highway to 47th Avenue and on Lincoln Way from Upper Great Highway to Martin Luther King Jr. Drive: • Turn restrictions to prohibit vehicular access to the Upper Great Highway, between Lincoln Way and Sloat Boulevard, excepting emergency and other authorized vehicles • New protected (Class IV) bicycle facilities on Sloat Boulevard and Lincoln Way for connections to the Upper Great Highway • Minor bus stop relocation for the Muni route 18 46th Avenue (on Lincoln Way) SFRPD proposed minor roadway modifications to Upper Great Highway from a point 400 feet north of Lincoln Way to the intersection of Sloat Boulevard and Great Highway to improve wayfinding and ensure the safety of all non-vehicular users of the space and to reduce social trails on the dunes, as follows: • Pedestrian-only signage and stencils on the upper west side of the Upper Great Highway; bicycle-only signage and stencils on the east side of the Upper Great Highway • New protected bikeway for connections from the O'Shaughnessy Ocean Beach Parking Lot to Lincoln Way • Intersection safety barriers (at Lincoln Way and Sloat Boulevard) to reinforce traffic and turn restrictions • Low-profile fencing and signage along the length of the Upper Great Highway's west side to reduce pedestrians walking on the duns and support visitors to stay on non-dune surfaces The project was officially approved on January 3, 2025.
SFMTA's Vision Zero Quick-Build Program	SFMTA's effort to quickly implement pedestrian and bicycle safety improvements on the Vision Zero High Injury Network comprise the Vision Zero Quick-Build program. The Vision Zero Quick Build program includes the following corridors that have been implemented subsequent to publication of the FEIR: • Hyde Street – (Geary to McAllister streets) – transit-only lane, pedestrian safety • Winston Drive – Bicycle and concrete island • 13th Street (Mission to Isis streets) and Duboce Avenue (Otis to Valencia streets)– Bikeway and pedestrian safety

Project	Description
Cumulative Projects that were Evaluated in the FEIR[a]	
Waterfront Plan Update Case No. 2019-023037ENV	The Port of San Francisco's (port's) proposed 2019 Waterfront Plan Update would update and amend the 1997 Waterfront Land Use Plan, which sets long-term goals and policies to guide the use, management, and improvement of 7.5 miles of properties under the port's jurisdiction, from Fisherman's Wharf to India Basin. The 2019 plan provides a long-range policy framework to guide future port improvement projects, programs, and stewardship initiatives. The nine goals and polices proposed by the plan include, but are not limited to, preserving and enhancing the waterfront's function as a maritime port, hosting a diversity of activities and people, enhancing public access and open space along the waterfront, designing quality new development and preserving the waterfront's historic character, strengthening the port's resilience to climate change impacts, and cultivating an environmentally sustainable port to limit the impacts of climate change. The 2019 plan would focus on changes in land use and redevelopment and would not result in a substantial amount of residential development. The EIR for the Waterfront Plan Project was certified on March 16, 2023.
Second Transbay Tube Project (included in Link21)	Link21 is a program of system improvements for Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) and regional rail operations. Link21's program would include a second transbay tube crossing between Oakland and San Francisco that would increase BART's transbay capacity and connect regional rail services across San Francisco Bay. Additional improvements throughout the region would be included in Link21 to address issues that affect system performance and the passenger experience, such as travel time, reliability, and capacity in high-demand corridors. The Second Transbay Tube Project, which is the cumulative project relevant to the analysis and is one part of Link21's program of improvements, is currently being studied.
Downtown Congestion Pricing	The San Francisco County Transportation Authority is studying downtown congestion pricing which would include charging a toll to drive into the congestion pricing zone in northeast San Francisco and investing revenues to increase transit service and improve bicycle, pedestrian, and transit infrastructure. The project is currently being studied and has not undergone environmental review.
Increased Caltrain Service and Pennsylvania Avenue Extension	Under Caltrain's 2040 Service Vision, Caltrain service during peak hours would grow to a minimum of eight trains per direction per hour which is two trains per hour per direction higher than assumed in the 2050 environmental baseline. The vision would also include all-day express service every 15 minutes as well as increased off-peak and weekend services as compared to the 2050 environmental baseline. The Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board adopted the vision on October 3, 2019. The Pennsylvania Avenue extension would put Caltrain (and High-Speed Rail) under Pennsylvania Avenue from the future Fourth and Townsend station to just north of 22nd Street. The extension project is currently being designed and has not undergone environmental review.

Source: San Francisco Planning Department, 2025.

Notes: The list of cumulative projects in the FEIR was prepared at the time of publication of the notice of preparation for the EIR (June 16, 2021). The list of cumulative projects not evaluated in the FEIR was prepared at the time of the publication of this addendum (August 2025).

a. These cumulative projects were already evaluated in the cumulative impact analysis FEIR and the cumulative context has largely remained unchanged; thus, these cumulative projects are not required to be evaluated in the cumulative impact analysis in this addendum.

The cumulative analysis for each topic is included in each topical subsection below under "Analysis of Potential Environmental Impacts," p. 32.

Approach to Analysis of Potential Environmental Effects

Approach

The proposed rezoning program is evaluated in accordance with CEQA Statute section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines sections 15162–15163. When an EIR has been certified for a project, the guidelines state that no new, subsequent, or supplemental EIR shall be required unless one or more of the following events occurs: (1) substantial changes to a project are proposed that will require major revisions to the EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; (2) substantial changes will occur due to the circumstances under which the project is being undertaken, requiring major revisions to the previous EIR due to new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or (3) new information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified, has become available. In addition, San Francisco Administrative Code section 31.19(c)(1) states that a modified project must be reevaluated and that "if, on the basis of such reevaluation, the Environmental Review Officer determines, based on the requirements of CEQA, that no additional environmental review is necessary, this determination and the reasons therefor shall be noted in writing in the case record, and no further evaluation shall be required by this Chapter."

CEQA Guidelines section 15164 provides for the use of an addendum to document the basis for a lead agency's decision not to require a subsequent final EIR for a project that is already adequately covered in a previously certified final EIR. An addendum to a certified final EIR may be prepared if some changes or additions are necessary, but none of the conditions described in section 15162 calling for preparation of a supplemental or subsequent final EIR have occurred. This addendum evaluates whether the environmental impacts of the modified project are addressed in the FEIR that was certified on November 17, 2022. As shown in the analysis below, the proposed rezoning program, which is the subject of this addendum, would not result in new environmental impacts, substantially increase the severity of previously identified environmental impacts, or require new mitigation measures. In addition, no new information has emerged that would materially change the analyses or conclusions set forth in the FEIR. Therefore, as discussed in more detail below, the proposed rezoning program would not change the analysis or conclusions reached in the FEIR, and no subsequent or supplemental EIR is required.

Analysis

The FEIR identified less than significant impacts or no impact/not applicable for the following environmental topic areas:

- Land use and planning
- Aesthetics
- Population and housing

- Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions
- Recreation
- Public services
- Biological resources
- Geology and soils
- Hydrology and water quality
- Hazards and hazardous materials
- Energy
- Agriculture and forestry resources
- Mineral resources
- Wildfire

The FEIR found impacts to be less than significant with mitigation for archeological resources (project and cumulative), human remains (project and cumulative), tribal cultural resources (project and cumulative), groundborne vibration (project), criteria pollutant emissions (project), new or expanded electric or telecommunication facilities (project), and paleontological resources (project). Mitigation measures were incorporated for these topics to reduce the impacts to less than significant.

Impacts were determined to be significant and unavoidable with mitigation for built-environment historical resources (project and cumulative), public transit delay (project and cumulative), loading (project and cumulative), construction noise (project and cumulative), operational noise (project), criteria pollutant emissions for which the project region is in nonattainment status under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (project and cumulative), health effects (project), wind (project), shadow (project), new or expanded wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage facilities (project), and wastewater treatment capacity (project). Mitigation measures were incorporated for these topics, but it was determined that impacts would remain significant and unavoidable with mitigation.

Significant and unavoidable impacts were found for transportation impacts during construction (project and cumulative) and water supply (project). There were no feasible mitigation measures identified in the FEIR for these topics.

This addendum evaluates the proposed rezoning program with respect to the resource topics discussed in the FEIR. This addendum also documents the assessment and determination that the proposed rezoning program is within the scope of the FEIR and confirms that no additional environmental review is required.

Analysis of Potential Environmental Effects

This section evaluates the potential environmental effects in the same order as they appear in the FEIR. Specifically, this section begins with the topics that were found to have no impact or a less-than-significant impact that were addressed in Section 4.1, Effects Found Not to Be Significant, of the FEIR. This section then evaluates the topics that were found to have impacts that are less than significant with mitigation, significant and unavoidable with mitigation, or significant and unavoidable that were addressed in Section 4.2, Cultural Resources, through Section 4.10, Paleontological Resources, in the FEIR.

The primary similarities and differences between the adopted housing element and the proposed rezoning program are summarized above under "Overview of the Proposed Rezoning Program," p. 9. Consistent with the adopted housing element, because the proposed rezoning program would not authorize any new development, the proposed rezoning program itself would have no direct physical environmental impacts. Therefore, this analysis identifies the reasonably foreseeable environmental impacts that could occur as a result of the proposed rezoning program—primarily impacts that are influenced by land use density, growth distribution, and building heights. The analysis also considers impacts related to codification of FEIR mitigation measures related to transportation, as applicable.

As discussed above under "CEQA Review of the Proposed Rezoning Program," p. 7, the department identified and quantitatively evaluated seven representative building types ranging from accessory dwelling units to a 590-foot-tall residential mixed-use building with 984 housing units to analyze the indirect impacts of the adopted housing element for transportation, noise, and air quality. As discussed below under "Transportation and Circulation," "Noise and Vibration," and "Air Quality," the analysis of the indirect impacts of the proposed rezoning program for transportation, noise, and air quality relies on the seven representative building types analysis in the FEIR.

Land Use and Planning

FEIR FINDINGS

The potential land use and planning impacts of the adopted housing element are analyzed under "Land Use and Planning" in Section 4.1, Effects Found Not to Be Significant, of the FEIR. The FEIR determined that implementation of the adopted housing element would result in less-than-significant impacts on land use and planning.

Although the adopted housing element would allow for different types of residential development throughout the city and at higher density, the FEIR found that future development would still occur within established lot boundaries. Thus, the adopted housing element would not create any new physical barriers that would divide established neighborhoods or isolate any areas within the city.

The adopted housing element, as discussed in the FEIR, would not substantially conflict with general plan policies or the planning code. Although the adopted housing element includes housing production levels and development patterns different from those under Plan Bay Area 2050, it would not conflict with implementation of the plan. The adopted housing element would be consistent with other local plans and policies, such as air quality plans. Overall, future residential development, as well as any related work involving street networks or open space, as a result of implementation of the adopted housing element would be required to conform to or comply with specific city, state, and federal plans, policies, and regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. Any secondary impacts that would occur as a result of implementation of the adopted housing element were discussed throughout this FEIR at a programmatic level. Therefore, the FEIR determined that the adopted housing element would not result in substantial impacts on land use and planning.

PROPOSED REZONING PROGRAM IMPACTS

The approach to evaluating the proposed rezoning program is described above under "Analysis of Potential Environmental Effects," p. 32. The changes under the proposed rezoning program that would affect land use are addressed below.

DIVISION OF A COMMUNITY

Actions that would directly or indirectly divide established neighborhoods include the creation of physical barriers, or future roadways (e.g., freeways), that would divide the city or isolate planning areas or individual neighborhoods within it. As with the adopted housing element, all actions under the proposed rezoning program would result in development within established lot boundaries, in most cases at a scale and density somewhat greater than currently permitted. The proposed rezoning program would result in an incremental increase in overall units and a slightly different growth distribution compared to the adopted housing element. Under the proposed rezoning program, more growth would occur in well-resourced areas in the Downtown, Marina, Mission, Northeast, and Western Addition planning districts compared to the rezoning analysis assumptions in the FEIR, which projected that growth would be heavily concentrated in the Inner Sunset, Outer Sunset, and Richmond planning districts, as shown in **Table 3**, p. 19, and **Figure 2**, p. 20. Similarly, changes to building heights under the rezoning program would occur within the well-resourced areas and adjacent areas, which were projected to occur only within the well-resourced areas, as shown in **Figure 3**, p. 22. This change would provide more broadly distributed residential growth in existing areas but would not alter the FEIR's findings related to the division of a community. Similarly, the creation of a housing sustainability district, establishment of a local program, and amendments to base zoning that provide individual property control adjustments would each allow for a diversity of residential development throughout the city. Therefore, the proposed rezoning program would have a less-than-significant impact related to the division of an established community, and no mitigation measures are necessary.

CONFLICT WITH A POLICY

The specific changes under the proposed rezoning program serve to implement the vision of the adopted housing element and comply with state government code requirements. The specific features of the program would alter the zoning code, creating control adjustments that would allow a diversity of residential development throughout the city and ensuring consistency for future development. Plans, policies, and regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect are those that directly address environmental issues and/or contain targets or standards that must be met in order to maintain or improve characteristics of the city's physical environment. As addressed in detail in the FEIR, examples of such plans, policies, and regulations include the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's (air district's) 2010 Clean Air Plan and the San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board's San Francisco Basin Plan. As addressed in other sections of this addendum, the proposed rezoning program would not directly conflict with any plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. Individual development projects proposed under the proposed rezoning program would be evaluated by city decision makers for their consistency with such plans, policies, or regulations; conflicts would need to be addressed prior to the approval of any entitlements. The codification of certain FEIR mitigation measures for parking maximums, requirement for driveway and loading operation plans (as applicable), and curb-cut restrictions, as addressed below under "Transportation and Circulation," would not result in new environmental impacts.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The FEIR determined that the adopted housing element, in combination with cumulative projects, would not result in a significant cumulative land use impact. The new cumulative projects implemented subsequent to publication of the FEIR, the Great Highway Mobility Improvements Project and the Vision Zero Quick-Build program (see **Table 4**, p. 28), do not substantially alter the cumulative setting due to the nature of the cumulative projects (i.e., the creation of new open space and recreation facilities via traffic and roadway modifications and pedestrian and bicycle safety improvements in the right-of-way). Thus, the inclusion of the new cumulative projects would not alter the findings related to cumulative land use impacts in the FEIR. Because the proposed rezoning program would not generate new land use impacts that were not previously identified in the FEIR, and the new cumulative projects would not alter the FEIR's cumulative analysis, there would be no new significant cumulative land use impact.

CONCLUSION

In summary, the proposed rezoning program would not result in new significant land use and planning impacts that were not previously identified in the FEIR, nor would it result in more severe impacts than those previously identified. No new mitigation measures or changes to existing mitigation measures are required.

Aesthetics

FEIR FINDINGS

The potential aesthetic impacts of the adopted housing element are analyzed under "Aesthetics" in Section 4.1, Effects Found Not to Be Significant, of the FEIR. The FEIR determined that implementation of the adopted housing element would result in less-than-significant impacts on aesthetics. The FEIR concluded that the adopted housing element would allow noticeable changes related to increased building height from various scenic vistas but that impacts on scenic vistas would not be substantial. The FEIR also concluded that the adopted housing element would not substantially damage scenic resources, including scenic highways and other natural features within San Francisco, because development would not occur on natural features but in the existing urban context of the city. Future development under the adopted housing element would comply with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality, ensuring no substantial damage to scenic quality. Similar adherence to planning and building codes would ensure that light and glare impacts from future development under the adopted housing element would remain less than significant.

PROPOSED REZONING PROGRAM IMPACTS

The approach to evaluating the proposed rezoning program is described above under "Analysis of Potential Environmental Effects," p. 32. The changes under the proposed rezoning program that would affect aesthetics are addressed below.

The changes to growth distribution under the proposed rezoning program would result in impacts on visual character similar to those addressed under the FEIR, though with development and visual changes located in slightly different locations. The changes to building heights, the new housing sustainability district, the amendments to base zoning, and establishment of the local program provided under the proposed rezoning program would each support the increased density and massing of future development within the city. By allowing qualifying projects to exceed existing height limits in certain locations throughout San Francisco, the proposed rezoning program would result in buildings that could be taller than what is currently permitted under existing regulations, which could indirectly affect the visual character of the areas of development. Future development consistent with the proposed rezoning program would result in increased building heights compared to the 2050 environmental baseline and in more areas than what was considered in the FEIR.[17] Although these changes would be noticeable from various scenic vistas, impacts on scenic vistas would not be substantial and would remain similar to those addressed in the FEIR.

As with the adopted housing element, the changes under the proposed rezoning program would limit development to the existing urban context of the city (and not on natural features). Therefore, consistent with the adopted housing element, future development under the proposed rezoning program would not substantially damage scenic resources.

---

[17] The adjacent areas include the area near the intersection of Van Ness Avenue and Market Street, historically known as The Hub; portions of the Fisherman's Wharf area; portions of the Castro/Dolores Heights; portions of the Glen Park neighborhood near the Glen Park Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) station north of San José Avenue; portions of the Balboa Park neighborhood near the Balboa Park BART station; and portions of the Oceanview neighborhood near the intersection of 19th Avenue and Sargent Street and along Brotherhood Way.

As noted above, the proposed rezoning program would increase the allowable building heights and shift a greater share of anticipated growth to well-resourced and adjacent areas along transit corridors and in low-density areas. Adoption of the proposed rezoning program would authorize changes in zoning as detailed above under "Amendments to Base Zoning," p. 14, but does not approve specific development projects. Physical effects that would result from future actions consistent with the proposed rezoning program are analyzed as reasonably foreseeable effects throughout this addendum. Therefore, the proposed rezoning program would not result in any direct physical changes to scenic quality. Consistent with the findings of the FEIR, future development under the proposed rezoning program would be required to comply with all applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality and new development consistent with the proposed rezoning program would be subject to policies in the general plan, governing area plans, applicable design guidelines, and planning codes. Therefore, the proposed rezoning program would not conflict with applicable zoning or other regulations governing scenic quality.

With respect to light and glare, as well as the brightness of the nighttime sky, the same policies that were applicable to the adopted housing element would be applicable to the proposed rezoning program. Therefore, although development density under the proposed rezoning program would result in more development adjacent to well-resourced areas and transit corridors, the net change in light and glare, as well as the brightness of the nighttime sky, due to future development consistent with the proposed rezoning program compared to the adopted housing element and the 2050 environmental baseline would be minimal.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The FEIR determined that the adopted housing element, in combination with cumulative projects, would not result in a significant cumulative aesthetic impact. The new cumulative projects implemented subsequent to publication of the FEIR, the Great Highway Mobility Improvements Project and the Vision Zero Quick-Build program (see **Table 4**, p. 28), do not substantially alter the cumulative setting due to the nature of the cumulative projects (i.e., the creation of new open space and recreation facilities via traffic and roadway modifications and pedestrian and bicycle safety improvements in the right-of-way). Thus, the inclusion of the new cumulative projects would not alter the findings related to cumulative aesthetics impacts in the FEIR. Because the proposed rezoning program would not generate new aesthetics impacts that were not previously identified in the FEIR, and the new cumulative projects would not alter the FEIR's cumulative analysis, there would be no new significant cumulative aesthetic impact.

CONCLUSION

In summary, the proposed rezoning program would not result in new significant aesthetic impacts that were not previously identified in the FEIR, nor would it result in more severe impacts than those previously identified. No new mitigation measures or changes to existing mitigation measures are required.

Population and Housing

FEIR FINDINGS

The potential population and housing impacts of the adopted housing element are analyzed under "Population and Housing" in Section 4.1, Effects Found Not to Be Significant, of the FEIR. The FEIR determined that implementation of the adopted housing element would result in less-than-significant impacts on population and housing.

According to the FEIR, the adopted housing element would increase housing production and shift a greater share of anticipated growth from the east side of the city to well-resourced areas along transit corridors and in low-density areas, which are located primarily on the west and north sides of the city. Although there may be a small increase in demand for neighborhood services where increased residential growth would be directed, the resulting number of jobs across planning districts would be negligible relative to the total number of jobs under the 2050 environmental baseline and jobs were not analyzed further. The FEIR determined that, regardless of the adopted housing element, the population of San Francisco would continue to grow through 2050. The FEIR estimated that implementation of the adopted housing element would result in an estimated 50,000 additional units to address an existing need for housing and plan for future housing demand in San Francisco. "The increases in population in San Francisco are forecast to continue through 2050, regardless of whether the housing element update is adopted. The city's existing zoning would not preclude the development density required to fully accommodate planned population growth in the city through 2050." As such, the adopted housing element is the city's proposed plan to accommodate anticipated growth; it would not induce unplanned population growth, either directly or indirectly, and the FEIR determined the impact would be less than significant.

With regard to housing displacement, the FEIR noted that new market-rate housing development may contribute to indirect displacement of lower-income communities in San Francisco. However, the adopted housing element includes policies and actions that focus on advancing equitable housing access, promoting racial and social equity, and eliminating displacement with strategies such as tenant protections, preservation of affordability, production of affordable housing, and advancing equitable access to housing resources and affordable units. The FEIR determined that, because of these policies and actions, the adopted housing element would strengthen the city's anti-displacement policies and increase housing production for all income levels to accommodate projected population growth, which would reduce both direct and indirect displacement compared to the environmental baseline. Therefore, the FEIR determined that the adopted housing element would not displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing units, necessitating the construction of replacement housing, and the impact would be less than significant.

PROPOSED REZONING PROGRAM IMPACTS

The approach to evaluating the proposed rezoning program is described above under "Analysis of Potential Environmental Effects," p. 32. The changes under the proposed rezoning program that would affect population and housing are addressed below.

UNPLANNED GROWTH

The proposed rezoning program implements the vision of the adopted housing element. The proposed rezoning program would result in an incremental increase in overall units and a slightly different growth distribution compared to the adopted housing element. Under the proposed rezoning program, more growth would occur in well-resourced areas in the Downtown, Marina, Mission, Northeast, and Western Addition planning districts compared to the rezoning analysis assumptions in the FEIR, which projected that growth would be heavily concentrated in the Inner Sunset, Outer Sunset, and Richmond planning districts. A slight redistribution of growth to other areas in the city would not result in a new or more severe impact to population growth since growth is a citywide impact, not a localized neighborhood impact. Relatedly, changes to building heights under the proposed rezoning program would not directly drive population growth; rather, density would, and as described above the overall population growth across the city would not substantially increase due to the proposed rezoning program.

Ultimately, as with the FEIR, the increases in population in San Francisco are forecast to continue through 2050, regardless of whether the proposed rezoning program is adopted. Implementation of the proposed rezoning program and future development consistent with it would not directly induce substantial unplanned population growth but, rather, would address an existing need for housing and plan for future housing demand in San Francisco. Thus, as with the FEIR, the proposed rezoning program would not induce substantial unplanned population growth, either directly or indirectly, and the impact would be less than significant.

DISPLACEMENT

There could be a connection between market rate housing development and displacement. As discussed in the FEIR, the adopted housing element update is San Francisco's first housing plan centered in racial and social equity; with the majority of the update's policies and actions focus on advancing equitable housing access, racial and social equity, and eliminating displacement. Specifically, Objective 3.c seeks to: "Eliminate community displacement within areas vulnerable to displacement." The proposed rezoning program would establish a local program to provide more diversity of affordable housing (on-site, fee, off-site, land dedication, rent control). In addition, the proposed rezoning program would distribute housing growth more broadly across the well-resourced areas and in limited areas adjacent to well-resourced areas compared to the rezoning analysis assumptions in the FEIR so that a diversity of housing options would be available throughout the entire city. Thus, the proposed rezoning program (similar to the adopted housing element) would strengthen the city's anti-displacement policies and increase housing production for all income levels to accommodate projected population growth, which would reduce both direct and indirect displacement compared to the environmental baseline. The proposed rezoning program would not displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing units, necessitating the construction of replacement housing, and the impact would be less than significant.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The FEIR determined that the adopted housing element, in combination with cumulative projects, would not result in a significant cumulative impact from unplanned growth or displacement. The new cumulative projects implemented subsequent to publication of the FEIR, the Great Highway Mobility Improvements Project, and the Vision Zero Quick-Build Program (see **Table 4**, p. 28) would not substantially alter the cumulative setting due to the nature of the cumulative projects (i.e., the creation of new open space and recreation facilities through traffic and roadway modifications and pedestrian and bicycle safety improvements in the right-of-way). Therefore, the inclusion of the new cumulative projects would not alter the findings related to cumulative unplanned growth or displacement impacts in the FEIR. Because the proposed rezoning program would not generate new impacts related to unplanned growth or displacement that were not previously identified in the FEIR, and because the new cumulative projects would not alter the FEIR's cumulative analysis, there would be no new significant cumulative impact related to unplanned growth or displacement.

CONCLUSION

In summary, the proposed rezoning program would not result in new significant population and housing impacts that were not previously identified in the FEIR, nor would it result in more severe impacts than those previously identified. No new mitigation measures or changes to existing mitigation measures are required.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

FEIR FINDINGS

The potential GHG emissions impacts of the adopted housing element are analyzed under "Greenhouse Gas Emissions" in Section 4.1, Effects Found Not to Be Significant, of the FEIR. The FEIR concluded that the adopted housing element would not generate GHG emissions that would have a significant impact on the environment. The FEIR also evaluated the effect of the adopted housing element on several emissions sectors. The emissions sectors are transportation, building energy, waste, and water and wastewater. For each emissions sector, the FEIR demonstrates how the adopted housing element would comply with regulations and ordinances to minimize emissions.

With respect to GHG plan consistency, the FEIR determined that the adopted housing element would be consistent with city ordinance 81-08 from May 2008; the updated ordinance from July 2021, which established the "0-80-100-Roots" climate action framework; and the 2017 GHG reduction strategy update.[18] Since adoption of the FEIR, the city adopted an updated GHG reduction strategy in October 2023. The updated GHG strategy carries forward the goals of previous

[18] San Francisco Planning Department. 2017 Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy Update. July 2017. *https://sfplanning.s3.amazonaws.com/sfmea/GHG/GHG_Strategy_October2017.pdf*. Accessed October 29, 2021.

efforts to reduce GHG emissions.[19] The FEIR also found that the adopted housing element would be consistent with the air district's Clean Air Plan, along with various statewide executive orders and laws.

PROPOSED REZONING PROGRAM IMPACTS

The approach to evaluating the proposed rezoning program is described above under "Analysis of Potential Environmental Effects," p. 32. The changes under the proposed rezoning program that would affect GHG are addressed below.

Although the adopted housing element and the proposed rezoning program have some differences with respect to the distribution of growth in the city, they are fundamentally similar, particularly in terms of their potential to result in GHG impacts. The proposed rezoning program would, like the adopted housing element, increase the portion of future housing growth in the city near transit corridors relative to the baseline. Thus, the proposed rezoning program would result in a pattern of land use similar to that of the adopted housing element, which would facilitate a similar pattern of daily per capita vehicle miles traveled (VMT) for new residents and employees. The FEIR notes that, for the adopted housing element, daily per capita VMT would be between 47 to 53 percent below the regional average, which is well below the 15 percent threshold recommend by the Governor's Office of Land Use and Climate Innovation. As such, the proposed rezoning program would very likely result in per capita VMT in the range of 47 to 53 percent below the regional average because of its general similarities to the adopted housing element. As such, transportation emissions from the proposed rezoning program would be consistent with the state's long-term climate goals and would not be considered substantial.

With respect to other sources of GHG emissions, such as those associated with building energy, waste, and water and wastewater, compliance with the city's existing ordinances and requirements, which would apply to future development under both the adopted housing element and the proposed rezoning program, regardless of where the growth occurs, would minimize GHG emissions. The all-electric new construction ordinance would prevent emissions from natural gas appliances from occurring. Similarly, the recycling and composting ordinance, construction and demolition debris recovery ordinance, and green building code would minimize waste-related emissions. The green building requirements for reductions in water use would minimize water- and wastewater-related emissions.

Because of the nature of the proposed growth under the proposed rezoning program, GHG emissions from transportation sources would not be considered substantial. Compliance with existing regulations would ensure that emissions from other sources would be minimized. This conclusion is the same as the conclusion in the FEIR.

---

[19] San Francisco Planning Department. 2023 Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy Update. October 2023. *https://citypln-m-extnl.sfgov.org/SharedLinks.aspx?accesskey=02df0ca3679c50c014fea50e2c99f69567b11125c0d60cb1eb53ecaaabe39dab&VaultGUID=A4A7DACD-B0DC-4322-BD29-F6F07103C6E0*. Accessed August 11, 2025.

For GHG plan consistency, the reasoning described previously applies. This is because the adopted housing element and proposed rezoning program would result in a similar type of development, and development under both would be subject to future programs and regulations to reduce GHG emissions, including the city's climate action plan. As noted in the FEIR, the addition of housing units aligns the city's 2017 *GHG Reduction Strategy*, because future development would be required to comply with regulations that have been effective at meeting the city's GHG reduction targets; thus, the proposed rezoning program would also be aligned with that framework, as updated in 2023. In addition, both the adopted housing element and proposed rezoning program seek to increase density in the city, which is consistent with, and advances, the GHG reduction target of the Bay Area's sustainable communities strategy and Plan Bay Area 2050. The proposed rezoning program's consistency with the city's GHG emission reduction strategy means that it would also be consistent with statewide GHG reduction goals, which were considered in development of the GHG emission reduction strategy (e.g., Executive Orders S-3-05, B-30-15, and B-55-18; the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2016; and the Bay Area 2017 Clean Air Plan). As such, the proposed rezoning program would not result in a conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions, which is the same conclusion reached for the adopted housing element in the FEIR.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The analysis of GHG impacts in the FEIR is inherently cumulative because climate change is a global issue, and GHG impacts are, by definition, cumulative. The project-level analysis in the FEIR is inclusive of cumulative impacts. Similarly, the discussion of impacts for the proposed rezoning program is inherently cumulative. The conclusion would be the same as in the FEIR; that is, the impact would not be cumulatively considerable.

CONCLUSION

In summary, the proposed rezoning program would not result in new significant GHG emissions impacts that were not previously identified in the FEIR, nor would it result in more severe impacts than those previously identified. No new mitigation measures or changes to existing mitigation measures are required.

Recreation

FEIR FINDINGS

The potential recreation impacts of the adopted housing element are analyzed under "Recreation" in Section 4.1, Effects Found Not to Be Significant, of the FEIR. The FEIR determined that implementation of the adopted housing element would result in impacts that would be less than significant on existing recreational facilities; impacts on the development of future recreational facilities would be less than significant with mitigation.

The FEIR noted that the adopted housing element would shift housing growth to the western and northern portions of the city, and that existing recreational facilities already experience high demand, which would likely be exacerbated from increased use. However, the San Francisco Recreation & Parks Department's (SFRPD) would continue to maintain, expand existing recreational facilities and/or acquire new open spaces and recreational facilities to accommodate the anticipated increase in demand for recreational facilities generated by future housing development

Any potential new facilities would be subject to project-level environmental review in accordance with CEQA at the time they are proposed. Although it is not currently possible to identify exact project-specific impacts and mitigation measures, projects would have impacts similar to those associated with the FEIR and be subject to the same regulatory requirements and mitigation measures. The mitigation measures would include typical construction-related mitigation measures such as M-CR-2a, Archeological Resources Requirements for Projects Involving Soil Disturbance; M-CR-2b, Archeological Monitoring Program; M-CR-2c, Archeological Testing Program; and M-CR-2d, Treatment of Submerged and Deeply Buried Resources, in Section 4.2, Cultural Resources; M-TCR-1, Tribal Notification and Consultation, in Section 4.3, Tribal Cultural Resources; M-NO-1, Construction Noise Control; M-NO-3a, Protection of Adjacent Buildings/ Structures and Vibration Monitoring during Construction; and M-NO-3b, Prevent Damage to Vibration-Sensitive Equipment, in Section 4.5, Noise and Vibration; and M-AQ-3, Construction Air Quality, in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Therefore, the FEIR concluded this impact would be less than significant with mitigation.

PROPOSED REZONING PROGRAM IMPACTS

The approach to evaluating the proposed rezoning program is described above under "Analysis of Potential Environmental Effects," p. 32. The changes under the proposed rezoning program that would affect recreation are addressed below.

INCREASED DEMAND ON RECREATIONAL FACILITIES

Changes under the proposed rezoning program would generate a similar demand for recreational resources across the city upon buildout in 2050, but the intensity of new development would be more broadly distributed across the well-resourced areas and in limited areas adjacent to those rather than concentrated in the western portion of the city. As shown in **Table 3**, p. 19, the proposed rezoning program would result in an incremental increase in overall units and a slightly different growth distribution compared to the adopted housing element. Under the proposed rezoning program, more growth and the corresponding demand on recreational facilities would occur in well-resourced areas in the Downtown, Marina, Mission, Northeast, and Western Addition planning districts compared to the rezoning analysis assumptions in the FEIR, which projected that growth and demand on recreational facilities would be heavily concentrated in the Inner Sunset, Outer Sunset, and Richmond planning districts. Overall, population growth generated by the proposed rezoning program would be incrementally increased compared to the level considered under the FEIR, and the proposed rezoning program would result in a similar incremental increase in demand for recreational facilities to that considered under the FEIR. Similar to the FEIR findings, the existing SFRPD facilities that already experience high levels of demand would continue to experience exacerbated demand compared to the

2050 environmental baseline, but this would be similar to that found under the FEIR for the adopted housing element. It is expected there would still be exceedances above the existing capacity for recreational facilities overall. As considered in the FEIR, continued adherence to the general plan and the SFRPD Strategic Plan would ensure that the Recreation and Parks Department would acquire new parkland as needed and that existing parks would continue to receive preventative maintenance and renovations. In addition, since publication of the FEIR, the city has constructed or is planning for new parks and recreational facilities that were not previously considered. For example, the first phase of the Great Highway Sunset Dunes is complete and the planning and design for the India Basin Waterfront Park at 900 Innes Avenue is underway. New parks and recreational facilities completed but not previously considered in the FEIR include Gene Friend Extension (at 240 6th Street), Francisco Park Guy Place, Noe Valley Town Square, and Rachel Sullivan Park (at 11th and Natoma streets). These new facilities, similar to those noted in the FEIR, would further offset future demand for recreational facilities in the city. Ultimately, continued adherence to the general plan and the SFRPD Strategic Plan would ensure that the Recreation and Parks Department would be able to acquire new parkland as needed and to perform preventative maintenance and renovations at existing parks and facilities. Because this practice would continue under the proposed rezoning program, the impact would continue to be less than significant impact with mitigation, and no new mitigation is required.

IMPACT OF NEW RECREATIONAL FACILITIES

As noted above, the proposed rezoning program, as with the adopted housing element, does not propose new recreational facilities. Overall, population growth generated by the proposed rezoning program would be incrementally increased compared to the level considered under the FEIR, and the proposed rezoning program would result in a similar increase in demand for recreational facilities to that considered under the FEIR. As with the FIER, when new open spaces and recreational facilities are proposed for development they would be subject to project-level environmental review in accordance with CEQA at the time they are proposed, as applicable. It is anticipated that the analysis would result in findings similar to those under the FEIR for construction-related environmental impacts, thereby requiring mitigation. As described in the FEIR, compliance with mitigation measures would be the responsibility of SFRPD. Therefore, the proposed rezoning would continue to result in a less-than-significant impact with mitigation with respect to construction or expansion of recreational facilities.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The FEIR determined that the adopted housing element, in combination with cumulative projects, would not result in a significant cumulative impact on recreation. The new cumulative projects implemented subsequent to publication of the FEIR, the Great Highway Mobility Improvements Project and the Vision Zero Quick-Build program (see **Table 4**, p. 28), do not substantially alter the cumulative setting due to the nature of the cumulative projects (i.e., the creation of new open space and recreation facilities via traffic and roadway modifications and pedestrian and bicycle safety improvements in the right-of-way). Thus, the inclusion of the new cumulative projects would not alter the findings related to cumulative impacts on recreation in the FEIR. Because the proposed rezoning

program would not generate new impacts on recreation that were not previously identified in the FEIR, and the new cumulative projects would not alter the FEIR's cumulative analysis, there would be no new significant cumulative impact on recreation.

CONCLUSION

In summary, the proposed rezoning program would not result in new significant recreational impacts that were not previously identified in the FEIR, nor would it result in more severe impacts than those previously identified. No new mitigation measures or changes to existing mitigation measures are required.

Public Services

FEIR FINDINGS

The potential public services impacts of the adopted housing element are analyzed under "Public Services" in Section 4.1, Effects Found Not to Be Significant, of the FEIR. The FEIR determined that implementation of the adopted housing element would lead to an increase in demand for public services. As a result, the construction of new or the expansion of existing fire protection, police protection, school, library, or park facilities may be required to accommodate future demand. These facilities would be subject to project-level environmental review in accordance with CEQA, if applicable, at the time that they are proposed and would be constructed by public agencies. The FEIR identified that significant environmental impacts could result from construction and operation of the facilities. Although it is not currently possible to identify exact project-specific impacts and mitigation measures, projects would have impacts similar to those in the FEIR and be subject to the same regulatory requirements and mitigation measures. The mitigation measures would include M-CR-2a, Archeological Resources Requirements for Projects Involving Soil Disturbance; M-CR-2b, Archeological Monitoring Program; M-CR-2c, Archeological Testing Program; and M-CR-2d, Treatment of Submerged and Deeply Buried Resources, in Section 4.2, Cultural Resources; M-TCR-1, Tribal Notification and Consultation, in Section 4.3, Tribal Cultural Resources; M-NO-1, Construction Noise Control; M-NO-3a, Protection of Adjacent Buildings/Structures and Vibration Monitoring during Construction; and M-NO-3b, Prevent Damage to Vibration-Sensitive Equipment, in Section 4.5, Noise and Vibration; and M-AQ-3, Construction Air Quality, in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Therefore, impacts on public services would be less-than-significant with mitigation.

PROPOSED REZONING PROGRAM IMPACTS

The approach to evaluating the proposed rezoning program is described above under "Analysis of Potential Environmental Effects," p. 32. The changes under the proposed rezoning program that would affect public services are addressed below.

On July 17, 2025, the planning commission held an informational hearing regarding key municipal infrastructure systems, including how the city's infrastructure agencies and departments are positioned to accommodate additional housing growth as a result of the proposed rezoning program

and how the City is planning for any upgrades needed in the future. As part of this presentation, the department prepared the Family Zoning Plan (Housing Element Rezoning Program): Infrastructure Memo.[20] Analysis included in the memo is considered below.

FIRE PROTECTION AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL FACILITIES

The proposed rezoning program would result in moderate, distributed population growth—primarily in neighborhoods that already have robust fire station coverage and service levels. According to the citywide nexus study, the level of fire station service in these areas is more than enough to accommodate projected growth. Although the potable water system has adequate future fire protection capacity for day-to-day fires, expansion of the Emergency Firefighting Water System (EFWS), especially in the city's western neighborhoods, would improve citywide emergency resilience in case of large multi-fire events. The Westside EFWS Expansion Project, paired with ongoing seismic upgrades and strategic capital investment, ensures that both existing and future communities would be protected during large-scale emergencies. Through proactive coordination between the San Francisco Fire Department (SFFD), SFPUC, and the department, San Francisco's fire safety infrastructure would continue to evolve to meet population growth, seismic threats, and climate risks, ensuring that resilience and response capacity would remain strong across all neighborhoods. Consistent with the findings of the FEIR, development of the proposed rezoning program would increase demand on SFFD resources gradually, and the department would continuously assess and address the need for additional facilities and services as the population grows.[21]

POLICE PROTECTION

The distribution of growth under the proposed rezoning program generally fall within the jurisdiction of existing district stations that already meet or exceed the citywide staffing and response benchmarks. Although existing stations could serve an increased number of officers, varying levels of investment may be needed for improvements at some existing stations in the future. Changes in policing techniques, priorities, and policies have also heavily influenced decisions on staffing levels. As addressed in the FEIR, the San Francisco Police Department evaluates district workload, response times, and geographic coverage when assessing capital and staffing needs. As with the adopted housing element, new housing enabled by the proposed rezoning program is expected to result in a modest increase in demand, potentially requiring personnel adjustments but not new station construction in the foreseeable future. Coordination with the department and the Office of Resilience and Capital Planning would ensure ongoing monitoring of the service alignment with residential patterns.[22]

---

[20] San Francisco Planning Department. Family Zoning Plan (Housing Element Rezoning Program): Infrastructure Memo, July 17, 2025, Record No.: 2021-005878CWP. *https://citypln-m-extnl.sfgov.org/Commissions/CPC/7_17_2025/Commission%20Packet/2021-005878CWP.pdf*. Accessed August 18, 2025.

[21] Ibid., pp. 13–14 in Attachment A.

[22] Ibid, p. 16 in Attachment A.

SCHOOLS

As with the adopted housing element, the proposed rezoning program is expected to generate modest population growth, including some increase in the number of families with school-aged children. Consistent with the FEIR analysis the San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD) currently has significant excess capacity in its K–12 public school system due to sustained declines in enrollment over the past several years, particularly following the COVID-19 pandemic. New housing in many neighborhoods under the proposed rezoning program may help stabilize or reverse declining student populations in local schools.

While SFUSD is not part of the city's capital planning process because the district operates under an independent governance structure and is not part of the city's financial and budgeting authority, city departments and SFUSD regularly coordinate on development trends, student generation forecasts, and long-range facilities planning to ensure that housing and school planning are aligned. As such, there is significant collaboration between SFUSD and the city in general.[23] The city and SFUSD will continue to share data and planning assumptions to coordinate decision-making. At this time, no new school construction projects or facility expansions are anticipated as a direct result of rezoning, and existing school capacity is expected to accommodate new demand within the current network of schools for the foreseeable future.[24]

LIBRARIES

New housing units introduced through the proposed rezoning program would be expected to incrementally increase the demand on public libraries, particularly in already well-served areas within well-resourced areas. However, the well-resourced areas already meet or exceed the citywide standard for library access (i.e., one large library branch per 25,000 to 50,000 people or one small branch that serves 10,000 to 15,000 people in a low-density area). Overall, existing number and distribution of libraries is well positioned to serve a significant additional population in the proposed rezoned area, with the majority of this area being within 1 mile of two or more libraries. The San Francisco Public Library Branch Library Improvement Program continues to prioritize seismic, Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), and capacity upgrades systemwide. Infill growth would be monitored through planning and building permit data and if significant population increases cluster in specific areas. The San Francisco Public Library may consider programmatic expansions (e.g., extended hours, programming) rather than capital-intensive new branches or branch expansion or reconstruction. According to San Francisco Public Library's service model, facility planning is largely focused on renovations and capacity upgrades rather than new branch construction or significant expansion.[25]

---

[23] Ibid., p. 17 in Attachment A.

[24] Ibid.

[25] Ibid., p. 16 in Attachment A.

SUMMARY

Under the adopted housing element, there would be an increase in housing production, with a shift in growth from the east side of the city to well-resourced areas along transit corridors and in low-density areas that are located primarily on the west side of the city. The proposed rezoning program would maintain a similar distribution but with the density spread more broadly across the well-resourced areas and limited areas adjacent to those, as shown in **Table 2**, p. 11, and **Table 3**, p. 19. That is, the proposed rezoning program would result in an increase in the allowable land use density and building heights along certain transit and commercial corridors (e.g., Geary Boulevard, Van Ness Avenue, Lombard Street, North Point Street, the western portion of Market Street, Ocean Avenue, Irving Street) and a reduction in the allowable land use density and building heights in certain residential areas adjacent to, but not immediately along, transit corridors (e.g., some areas adjacent to Geary Boulevard, Van Ness Avenue, Taraval Street, Judah Street). Overall, with incorporation of applicable mitigation measures similar to those identified in the FEIR and in this addendum, impacts associated with construction of the new or expanded public facilities (fire/emergency services, police, schools, libraries, and parks) required to accommodate anticipated future demand under the proposed rezoning program are anticipated to be less than significant with mitigation.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The FEIR determined that the adopted housing element, in combination with cumulative projects, would not result in a significant cumulative impact on public services. The new cumulative projects implemented subsequent to publication of the FEIR, the Great Highway Mobility Improvements Project and the Vision Zero Quick-Build program (see **Table 4**, p. 28), do not substantially alter the cumulative setting due to the nature of the cumulative projects (i.e., the creation of new open space and recreation facilities via traffic and roadway modifications and pedestrian and bicycle safety improvements in the right-of-way). Thus, the inclusion of the new cumulative projects would not alter the findings related to cumulative impacts on public services in the FEIR. Because the proposed rezoning program would not generate new impacts on public services that were not previously identified in the FEIR, and the new cumulative projects would not alter the FEIR's cumulative analysis, there would be no new significant cumulative impact on public services.

CONCLUSION

In summary, the proposed rezoning program would not result in new significant public services impacts that were not previously identified in the FEIR, nor would it result in more severe impacts than those previously identified. No new mitigation measures or changes to existing mitigation measures are required.

Biological Resources

FEIR FINDINGS

The potential biological resource impacts of the adopted housing element are analyzed under "Biological Resources" in Section 4.1, Effects Found Not to Be Significant, of the FEIR. The FEIR determined that the implementation of the adopted housing element would have less-than-significant impacts on biological resources.

The FEIR determined that future development associated with the adopted housing element would not affect any candidate, sensitive, or special-status species; riparian habitat; other sensitive natural communities; or federally protected wetlands, nor would it interfere with the movement of species. Specifically, the FEIR found that there would be potential for development under the adopted housing element to interact with the following resources: peregrine falcon, nesting birds, Townsend's big-eared bat, and western red bat. However, with respect to peregrine falcons, the FEIR found that, because falcons that nest in the city are acclimated to an already highly disturbed environment and heavy human disturbance, peregrine falcons would be able to continue to forage and nest on human-made structures. For nesting birds, compliance with existing state and federal regulations would ensure that future development consistent with the adopted housing element would have less-than-significant impacts on nesting birds, and no mitigation is required. For bats, required compliance with the open space element of the general plan, Chapter 8 of the San Francisco Environment Code, would avoid potential impacts.

The FEIR concluded that future development consistent with the adopted housing element would not be near riparian habitats, sensitive natural communities, or designated critical habitat areas. That is, future development consistent with the adopted housing element would be located on developed sites or urban infill sites without the riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). Similarly, development would not occur on sites close (i.e., within 100 feet) to state or federally protected wetlands, nor would it alter the course of a stream. In addition, all future development would be required to adhere to federal, state, and local regulations, as discussed above and in FEIR Impact BIO-1 and Impact HY-1. Therefore, compliance with policies and regulations would ensure that impacts from future actions consistent with the adopted housing element would be less than significant with respect to effects on riparian habitats, sensitive natural communities, and protected wetlands.

Lastly, for biological resources, the FEIR found that future development within the city consistent with the adopted housing element would abide by applicable regulations and obtain any necessary permits; therefore, it would not conflict with local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources.

PROPOSED REZONING PROGRAM IMPACTS

The approach to evaluating the proposed rezoning program is described above under "Analysis of Potential Environmental Effects," p. 32. The changes under the proposed rezoning program that would affect biological resources are addressed below.

An incremental increase in growth and a slightly different growth distribution under the proposed rezoning program could generate biological impacts if they were to result in future development near or in sensitive habitats (e.g., riparian habitats, sensitive natural communities, or designated critical habitat areas), as discussed in the FEIR. Although future development under the proposed rezoning would be more broadly distributed across the well-resourced areas and limited areas adjacent to

those compared to the adopted housing element, the development would continue to be limited to urban infill sites, as analyzed in the FEIR. Changes to growth distribution under the proposed rezoning program applicable to both species and habitats, as well as consistency with regulations, would not alter the FEIR's analysis regarding future projects and their being subject to plans, policies, ordinances, and regulations that protect biological resources.

Changes to building heights could result in new impacts on migratory species if they result in flight paths being obstructed, more bird strikes, or impacts on falcon nesting habitat. However, as discussed in the FEIR, future development under the proposed rezoning program would be subject to the same regulatory measures that are applicable to the identified species. This includes, as addressed in the Aesthetics section of the FEIR, planning code section 139, and the adopted Standards for Bird-Safe Buildings, in addition to all requirements noted above under "FEIR Findings" in this section.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The FEIR determined that the adopted housing element, in combination with cumulative projects, would not result in a significant cumulative impact on biological resources. The new cumulative projects implemented subsequent to publication of the FEIR, the Great Highway Mobility Improvements Project and the Vision Zero Quick-Build program (see **Table 4**, p. 28), do not substantially alter the cumulative setting due to the location of the cumulative projects compared to the proposed rezoned area and the nature of the cumulative projects (i.e., the creation of new open space and recreation facilities via traffic and roadway modifications and pedestrian and bicycle safety improvements in the right-of-way). Thus, the inclusion of the new cumulative projects would not alter the findings related to cumulative impacts on biological resources in the FEIR. Because the proposed rezoning program would not generate new biological resources impacts that were not previously identified in the FEIR, and the new cumulative projects would not alter the FEIR's cumulative analysis, there would be no new significant cumulative impact on biological resources.

CONCLUSION

In summary, the proposed rezoning program would not result in new significant biological resources impacts that were not previously identified in the FEIR, nor would it result in more severe impacts than those previously identified. No new mitigation measures or changes to existing mitigation measures are required.

Geology and Soils

FEIR FINDINGS

The potential geology and soil impacts of the adopted housing element are analyzed under "Geology and Soils" in Section 4.1, Effects Found Not to Be Significant, of the FEIR. The FEIR determined that implementation of the adopted housing element would result in less-than-significant impacts on geology and soils. With respect to earthquake-related impacts, the city is not within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone and does not cross any active faults. Future development resulting from the

adopted housing element would comply with state and local building regulations for seismic safety, ensuring compliance with the standards. With respect to soil erosion impacts, future development anticipated under the adopted housing element would occur in areas that are already built out and covered with impervious surfaces. Such development would comply with applicable regulations related to the prevention of soil erosion. With respect to unstable geologic units/soils or expansive soils, the FEIR concluded that the applicable regulations would ensure that people or structures would not be exposed to substantial adverse effects, including a risk of loss from rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic ground shaking, seismically related ground failure, landslides, unstable soil, or expansive soils.

PROPOSED REZONING PROGRAM IMPACTS

The approach to evaluating the proposed rezoning program is described above under "Analysis of Potential Environmental Effects," p. 32. The changes under the proposed rezoning program that would affect geology and soils are addressed below.

Although development under the proposed rezoning program could result in some taller buildings in some locations, as well as overall changes to the location of future growth, (with more development adjacent to well-resourced areas and transit corridors), there are no changes to the regulatory requirements surrounding individual building development. That is, as considered in the FEIR, development under the proposed rezoning program would be subject to the same policies and regulations detailed in the FEIR. Specifically, consistent with the state building code and Information Sheet S-05, Geotechnical Report Requirements, future development pursued under the proposed rezoning program would be required to conduct project-specific geotechnical site investigations. Pursuant to Administrative Bulletin 082, certain projects would also be subject to independent engineering design review by qualified engineering and geotechnical professionals and geologists, if appropriate, to review the geotechnical reports prepared for foundation design and construction. The required project-specific geotechnical review would consider foundation type (shallow or deep), foundation design, geotechnical and geological investigations, soil/foundation/structure interaction under static and seismic loading conditions, effects of dewatering and construction-related activities on the site and in the vicinity, and anticipated foundation or building settlement. In addition, for buildings greater than 240 feet in height, project sponsors may be required to contract qualified monitoring surveyors and instrumentation engineers to monitor the effects of settlement on the building and foundations for a period of 10 years after the issuance of the certificate of final completion and occupancy. Thus, development consistent with the proposed rezoning program, even new taller buildings in different locations, would comply with the state and local building codes and San Francisco's local building department implementing procedures to ensure building construction throughout the city is conducted with minimum life safety standards. would. Therefore, the impacts of development under the proposed rezoning program would continue to be less than significant for geology and soils.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The FEIR determined that the adopted housing element, in combination with cumulative projects, would not result in a significant cumulative impact on geology and soils. The new cumulative projects implemented subsequent to publication of the FEIR, the Great Highway Mobility Improvements Project and the Vision Zero Quick-Build program (see **Table 4**, p. 28), do not substantially alter the cumulative setting due to the nature of the cumulative projects (i.e., the creation of new open space and recreation facilities via traffic and roadway modifications and pedestrian and bicycle safety improvements in the right-of-way). Thus, the inclusion of the new cumulative projects would not alter the findings related to cumulative impacts on geology and soils in the FEIR. Because the proposed rezoning program would not generate new geology and soils impacts that were not previously identified in the FEIR, and the new cumulative projects would not alter the FEIR's cumulative analysis, there would be no new significant cumulative impact on geology and soils.

CONCLUSION

In summary, the proposed rezoning program would not result in new significant geology and soil impacts that were not previously identified in the FEIR, nor would it result in more severe impacts than those previously identified. No new mitigation measures or changes to existing mitigation measures are required.

Hydrology and Water Quality

FEIR FINDINGS

The potential hydrology and water quality impacts of the adopted housing element are analyzed under "Hydrology and Water Quality" in Section 4.1, Effects Found Not to Be Significant, of the FEIR. The FEIR determined that the implementation of the adopted housing element would result in less-than-significant impacts on hydrology and water quality. Specifically, because future development consistent with the adopted housing element would be served by the city's combined sewer system, wastewater treatment plant operators would comply with the water quality standards and waste discharge requirements specified in the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits for the city's wastewater treatment plants. In addition, stormwater runoff, construction site runoff, and construction dewatering discharges associated with future development consistent with the adopted housing element would be subject to water quality regulations designed to reduce the volume and pollutant load of stormwater and construction site wastewater in the city's combined system. Thus, the adopted housing element would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, or otherwise substantially degrade surface water or groundwater quality, by following the applicable water quality standards and regulations.

With respect to groundwater recharge, development under the adopted housing element could lead to an incremental increase in impervious surface coverage in areas of the city that could affect groundwater recharge (e.g., Westside Groundwater Basin and the Presidio). However, the FEIR

found that the changes in impervious surface coverage in these areas would be negligible relative to the total groundwater recharge areas of the groundwater basins. Therefore, future development consistent with the adopted housing element would not interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the proposed action would impede sustainable groundwater management.

The FEIR calculated that the proposed action would result in an increase of up to 5 percent in impervious surface coverage compared to the 2050 environmental baseline; however, stormwater runoff associated with this increase would not exceed the capacity of the city's stormwater collection and conveyance system. The FEIR concluded that future development would occur in a primarily built-out area and would not alter the course of streams or rivers, substantially increase stormwater runoff, or cause a capacity exceedance within stormwater drainage systems. For these reasons, development under the adopted housing element would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation onsite or offsite; substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner the would result in flooding onsite or offsite; create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or impede or redirect floodflows.

With respect to the release of pollutants from inundations due to flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, by shifting a greater portion of future growth away from low-lying areas near the bay on the east side of the city to transit corridors and well-resourced areas that are less vulnerable to water-related hazards, the FEIR found that development under the adopted housing element would reduce the risk from a release of pollutants due to these hazards relative to the 2050 environmental baseline. Therefore, the adopted housing element would not result in an increased risk from the release of pollutants due to inundation in flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones.

Lastly, the city does not require a groundwater management plan. Future development consistent with the adopted housing element would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan.

PROPOSED REZONING PROGRAM IMPACTS

The approach to evaluating the proposed rezoning program is described above under "Analysis of Potential Environmental Effects," p. 32. The changes under the proposed rezoning program that would affect hydrology and soils are addressed below.

Although development under the proposed rezoning program could result in some taller buildings in some locations, an incremental increase in overall units, and slightly different growth distribution with more development adjacent to well-resourced areas and transit corridors, there are no changes to the regulatory requirements surrounding individual building development related to hydrology and water quality. That is, as considered in the FEIR, development under the proposed rezoning program would be subject to the same policies and regulations detailed in the FEIR to reduce

impacts related to stormwater runoff from project construction and operation throughout the city. Namely, future development consistent with the proposed rezoning program would also be served by the city's combined sewer system, and wastewater treatment plant operators would comply with the water quality standards and waste discharge requirements specified in the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits for the city's wastewater treatment plants. In addition, stormwater runoff, construction site runoff, and construction dewatering discharges associated with future development consistent with the proposed rezoning program would be subject to water quality regulations designed to reduce the volume and pollutant load of stormwater and construction site wastewater in the city's combined system. Similarly, more concentrated development would not increase area exposure to hydrologic hazards, as discussed in the FEIR. The slight increase in projected growth under the proposed rezoning would not substantially increase impervious surfaces citywide as most new growth would consist of multifamily buildings, which means that additional housing units would be accommodated vertically rather than laterally and thus would not substantially increase impervious surface assumptions compared to the FEIR. Therefore, the FEIR's calculation of a 5 percent increase in new impervious surface area would still apply and the impacts of development under the proposed rezoning program would be less than significant for hydrology and water quality.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The FEIR determined that the adopted housing element, in combination with cumulative projects, would not result in a significant cumulative impact on hydrology and water quality. The new cumulative projects implemented subsequent to publication of the FEIR, the Great Highway Mobility Improvements Project and the Vision Zero Quick-Build program (see **Table 4**, p. 28), do not substantially alter the cumulative setting due to the location of the cumulative projects compared to the proposed rezoned area and the nature of the cumulative projects (i.e., the creation of new open space and recreation facilities via traffic and roadway modifications and pedestrian and bicycle safety improvements in the right-of-way). Thus, the inclusion of the new cumulative projects would not alter the findings related to cumulative impacts on hydrology and water quality in the FEIR. Because the proposed rezoning program would not generate new hydrology and water quality impacts that were not previously identified in the FEIR, and the new cumulative projects would not alter the FEIR's cumulative analysis, there would be no new significant cumulative impact on hydrology and water quality.

CONCLUSION

In summary, the proposed rezoning program would not result in new significant hydrology and water quality impacts that were not previously identified in the FEIR, nor would it result in more severe impacts than those previously identified. No new mitigation measures or changes to existing mitigation measures are required.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

FEIR FINDINGS

The potential impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials from the adopted housing element are analyzed under "Hazards and Hazardous Materials" in Section 4.1, Effects Found Not to Be Significant, of the FEIR. The FEIR determined that the implementation of the adopted housing element would result in less-than-significant impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials.

The FEIR determined that construction of future development would require the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials and hazardous wastes; however, hazardous materials uses associated with future development would adhere to applicable federal and state regulations. In addition, compliance with the city's Construction Site Runoff Control ordinance requires implementation of best practices to prevent contaminated runoff at construction sites. Construction on larger project sites require an erosion sediment control plan (ESCP) or a stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) would reduce or eliminate pollutants in stormwater as well as non-stormwater discharges. Moreover, hazardous materials used during operations would consist of commercial products that would be used in small or moderate amounts and would be cleaned up if releases occur.

Although numerous State Water Resources Control Board leaking underground storage tank (LUST) cleanup sites, cleanup program sites, military cleanup sites, Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) cleanup sites, and Cortese List[26] and Maher sites[27] exist throughout the city, the FEIR concluded that compliance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations would ensure that impacts associated with construction within contaminated media (from any of the listed hazardous materials site categories) would be less than significant. Similarly, adherence with existing regulations associated with hazardous waste disposal and demolition would also be required during construction and would reduce potential impacts to less than significant.

---

[26] The provisions in Government Code section 65962.5 are commonly referred to as the Cortese List. The list— specifically, a site's presence on the list—has bearing on the local permitting process as well as compliance with CEQA. The following sites fit the criteria of a Cortese List site:

- Hazardous waste and substances sites from the DTSC EnviroStor database
- LUST sites from the State Water Resources Control Board's GeoTracker database
- Solid waste disposal sites identified by the State Water Resources Control Board with waste constituents above hazardous waste levels outside the waste management unit
- Active "cease and desist orders" (CDO) and "cleanup and abatement orders"(CAO) from the State Water Resources Control Board
- Hazardous waste facilities subject to corrective action pursuant to section 25187.5 of the Health and Safety Code, as identified by DTSC.

[27] The Site Assessment and Mitigation Program (known as the Maher Program or Maher Ordinance), as authorized under article 22A of the San Francisco Health Code, applies to sites where there is potential to encounter hazardous materials, primarily industrial or formerly industrial zoning districts, sites with current or former industrial uses or USTs, sites with historic bay fill, and sites close to freeways. The Maher Ordinance, which is implemented by the San Francisco Department of Public Health, requires investigation and, if necessary, proper remediation of contaminated soils, groundwater, and soil vapors that are encountered in the building construction process. All projects in the city that disturb 50 cubic yards or more of soil on sites with potentially hazardous soil or groundwater are subject to this ordinance.

Universities, colleges, public schools, and private and charter schools are located throughout the city; thus, the FEIR concluded that construction of future development could occur within or immediately adjacent to hazardous material sites that are within a 0.25-mile radius of a school. As stated in the FEIR, compliance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations would ensure that impacts associated with the potential handling of hazardous materials near a school would be less than significant.

Lastly, the FEIR determined that development associated with the adopted housing element would not obstruct the implementation of the city's emergency response plan or interfere with emergency evacuation planning because future development would not include permanent road closures or other components that would physically impair or otherwise interfere with emergency access, response, or evacuation.

PROPOSED REZONING PROGRAM IMPACTS

The approach to evaluating the proposed rezoning program is described above under "Analysis of Potential Environmental Effects," p. 32. The changes under the proposed rezoning program that would affect hazards and hazardous materials are addressed below. The analysis generally follows a similar format as the FEIR: routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, results of reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions along with potential hazardous materials impacts associated with development on a Cortese site, hazardous emissions or the handling of hazardous materials near a school, and potential impacts to an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

The proposed rezoning program would change the distribution of where city population growth would occur compared to the FEIR. Additionally, the degree of growth would be similar, albeit slightly higher, compared to growth evaluated in the FEIR. As such, the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials and hazardous waste, both during construction and operations, would be similar to what was described in the FEIR; thus, the handling of hazardous materials and waste would adhere to applicable federal and state regulations. Similarly, a SWPPP would be implemented, as applicable, during construction to reduce or eliminate potential contaminant discharges, including those associated with hazardous materials use, into local waterways.

As mentioned, the FEIR considered LUST cleanup sites, cleanup program sites, military cleanup sites, DTSC cleanup sites, and Cortese List and Maher sites in all areas of the city. Because development under the proposed rezoning program would also occur throughout the city, the FEIR analysis related to potential impacts from the hazardous materials sites would also apply to this analysis. Whether as part of the FEIR study area or as part of the program elements being analyzed in this document, the city is an urban environment that contains numerous hazardous materials sites with a history of releases, thus housing development may require remediation of a site or multiple sites (under the direction and oversight of the appropriate agency and applicable programs) to required standards. Compliance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations associated with construction within contaminated media from onsite or nearby hazardous materials sites, along with regulations

pertaining to hazardous waste disposal and demolition, would reduce potential impacts associated with reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving hazardous material releases along with development within a documented Cortese site to less than significant. Compliance with applicable regulations would also ensure that impacts associated with hazardous materials handling near a school would be less than significant.

Similar to what was described in the FEIR analysis, future development under the proposed rezoning program would not include permanent road closures or other components that would physically impair or otherwise interfere with emergency access, response, or evacuation. Thus, potential impacts associated with interfering with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan would be less than significant.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The FEIR determined that the adopted housing element, in combination with cumulative projects, would not result in a significant cumulative impact on hazards. The new cumulative projects implemented subsequent to publication of the FEIR, the Great Highway Mobility Improvements Project and the Vision Zero Quick-Build program (see **Table 4**, p. 28), do not substantially alter the cumulative setting due to the location of the cumulative projects compared to the proposed rezoned area and the nature of the cumulative projects (i.e., the creation of new open space and recreation facilities via traffic and roadway modifications and pedestrian and bicycle safety improvements in the right-of-way). Thus, the inclusion of the new cumulative projects would not alter the findings related to cumulative impacts on hazards in the FEIR. Because the proposed rezoning program would not generate new hazards impacts that were not previously identified in the FEIR, and the new cumulative projects would not alter the FEIR's cumulative analysis, there would be no new significant cumulative impact on hazards.

CONCLUSION

In summary, the proposed rezoning program would not result in new significant hazards and hazardous materials impacts that were not previously identified in the FEIR, nor would it result in more severe impacts than those previously identified. No new mitigation measures or changes to existing mitigation measures are required.

Energy

FEIR FINDINGS

The potential energy impacts of the adopted housing element are analyzed under "Energy" in Section 4.1, Effects Found Not to Be Significant, of the FEIR. Future development associated with the adopted housing element would increase demand for energy resources in the city. However, temporary construction impacts would be less than significant with use of energy-efficient construction equipment. In addition, future development would be designed to adhere to current energy and efficiency standards and would not result in the wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during operations. The FEIR also concluded that future development consistent with the housing element

update would comply with energy and water efficiency standards and would not conflict with a plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. The FEIR determined that implementation of the housing element update would result in less-than-significant impacts on energy.

PROPOSED REZONING PROGRAM IMPACTS

The approach to evaluating the proposed rezoning program is described above under "Analysis of Potential Environmental Effects," p. 32. The changes under the proposed rezoning program that would affect energy are addressed below.

WASTEFUL, INEFFICIENT, OR UNNECESSARY CONSUMPTION OF ENERGY RESOURCES

As described in the FEIR, construction of future development consistent with the proposed rezoning program would result in a temporary increase in demand for energy resources. However, the increase in demand associated with construction of an additional 54,000 housing units under the proposed rezoning program over a period of approximately 30 years would be considered a small, temporary increase, occurring only during construction. The projected housing growth would not be constructed all at once but, rather, at an average rate of approximately 5,000 units per year through 2050, similar to the adopted housing element. This would be infill development in areas that are already served by existing energy infrastructure.[28] In addition, construction activities under future development consistent with proposed rezoning program would use the most energy-efficient construction equipment available at the time to meet state and local goals for criteria air pollutant and GHG emissions reductions. As such, construction activities associated with the proposed rezoning program would not result in the wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. Impacts would be less than significant, consistent with the adopted housing element.

Consistent with the adopted housing element, energy consumption associated with the operation of future development consistent with the proposed rezoning program would not include natural gas or propane due to the city's all-electric building ordinance requirements; rather, energy in the form of electricity would power the housing units. Diesel and gasoline would power vehicles. Electricity consumption resulting from future development consistent with the proposed rezoning program may be slightly higher than the approximately 696,350,000 kilowatt-hours (kWh) of electricity assumed under the adopted housing element for the operation of 50,000 housing units. In addition, as discussed above under "Transportation and Circulation," anticipated VMT per capita in San Francisco would be more than 15 percent below the regional average as a result of the proposed rezoning program, ensuring that the transportation-related consumption of gasoline and diesel fuel as a result of future development consistent with the proposed rezoning program would not be significant. Furthermore, future development consistent with the proposed rezoning program would be required to comply with all applicable city and state green building measures, including the California Green

[28] San Francisco Planning Department. Family Zoning Plan (Housing Element Rezoning Program): Infrastructure Memo, July 17, 2025, Record No.: 2021-005878CWP. *https://citypln-m-extnl.sfgov.org/Commissions/CPC/7_17_2025/Commission%20Packet/2021-005878CWP.pdf*. Accessed August 18, 2025.

Building Standards Code (CALGreen); the city's TDM program; electric-vehicle infrastructure requirements; and other energy and water efficiency standards, which are likely to become increasingly stringent over the coming years. Therefore, consistent with the adopted housing element, the proposed rezoning program would not result in the wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during operation. Impacts would be less than significant.

CONFLICT OR OBSTRUCT A STATE OR LOCAL RENEWABLE ENERGY OR ENERGY EFFICIENCY PLAN

Similar to the adopted housing element, future development under the proposed rezoning program would comply with Title 24 requirements, the San Francisco Green Building Code, and other energy and water efficiency standards in effect at the time that the future development is proposed. In addition, consistent with the FEIR, future development would be required to comply with the city's all-electric building code requirements, which applies to new buildings for which permits were filed after June 1, 2021.[29] Furthermore, future development under the proposed rezoning program would direct new housing to areas near transit infrastructure and transit corridors. Therefore, the proposed rezoning program would continue to result in less-than-significant impacts with regard to conflicts with or obstruction of a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency, consistent with the FEIR.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The FEIR determined that the adopted housing element, in combination with cumulative projects, would result in less-than-significant cumulative impacts related to energy. Consistent with the FEIR, it is anticipated that future development under the proposed rezoning program would become more energy efficient and less wasteful over time due to increasingly stringent regulations pertaining to renewable energy and energy efficiency, such as the 100 Percent Clean Energy Act of 2018 and the Pavley standards. Given this, and that future development would be infill projects in energy-efficient areas that are already served by existing energy infrastructure, it is likely that energy use on a per unit basis would decrease under the proposed rezoning program, similar to the adopted housing element. Furthermore, future development under the proposed rezoning program, like the adopted housing element, would be subject to energy and water efficiency standards in effect at the time the projects are proposed, as applicable. Therefore, consistent with the adopted housing element conclusions, the potential for future development under the proposed rezoning program to combine with other cumulative projects and create a significant cumulative impact related to energy would be less than significant.

CONCLUSION

In summary, the proposed rezoning program would not result in new significant energy impacts that were not previously identified in the FEIR, nor would it result in more severe impacts than those previously identified. No new mitigation measures or changes to existing mitigation measures are required.

---

[29] San Francisco Planning Department. Family Zoning Plan (Housing Element Rezoning Program): Infrastructure Memo, July 17, 2025, Record No.: 2021-005878CWP. *https://citypln-m-extnl.sfgov.org/Commissions/CPC/7_17_2025/Commission%20Packet/2021-005878CWP.pdf*. Accessed August 18, 2025.

Agricultural and Forest Resources, Mineral Resources, and Wildfire

FEIR FINDINGS

As discussed under "Not Applicable" in Section 4.1, Effects Found Not to Be Significant, of the FEIR, San Francisco does not contain any mineral resources that are of value on the state, regional, or local level. Furthermore, it does not contain prime farmland, other agricultural resources, or forest resources and is not located in a wildfire hazard zone. Therefore, mineral resources, agricultural and forest resources, and wildfire were not discussed further in the FEIR and are not applicable to the proposed action.

PROPOSED REZONING PROGRAM IMPACTS

There are no changes to the environmental setting or regulatory setting that would alter conditions relative to agricultural or forest resources, mineral resources, or wildfire. Therefore, consistent with the FEIR findings, agricultural resources, forestry and mineral resources, or wildfire are not applicable to the proposed rezoning program, and no mitigation measures are required.

CONCLUSION

In summary, agricultural and forest resources, mineral resources, or wildfire are not applicable to the proposed rezoning program. There would be no impacts in these topic areas.

Cultural Resources

FEIR FINDINGS

The potential cultural resources impacts of the adopted housing element are analyzed in Section 4.2, Cultural Resources, of the FEIR. At a program-level, the FEIR determined that implementation of the adopted housing element would lead to a significant and unavoidable impact with mitigation for built-environment cultural resources[30] (Impact CR-1: The proposed action would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to section 15064.5.). In addition, the FEIR determined that implementation would lead to significant impacts (Impact CR-2 [the proposed action has the potential to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource pursuant to section 15064.5] and Impact CR-3 [the proposed action has the potential to disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries]). Both impacts were determined to be less than significant with mitigation.

BUILT-ENVIRONMENT CULTURAL RESOURCES

Future development consistent with adopted housing element would have the potential to result in the demolition or alteration of historic resources in an adverse manner. Therefore, it is reasonable to anticipate that future development consistent with the adopted housing element would materially impair

[30] *Cultural resources* can be classified as built-environment resources, archeological resources, or human remains. *Built-environment resources* generally refer to above-ground constructed and landscape features that support an understanding of human history through historical, social, cultural, aesthetic/design, or construction qualities.

and diminish the significance of individual historic resources and historic districts, including previously known and yet-to-be-identified resources. Preservation-oriented policies in the adopted housing element would not prevent future development from demolishing or adversely altering significant built-environment resources—specifically, in those neighborhoods with a greater share of future housing compared to the 2050 environmental baseline. As a result, impacts of future development consistent with the adopted housing element on built-environment resources would be significant.

The FEIR included Mitigation Measures M-CR-1a through M-CR-1l (12 sub-measures). These measures present a range of possible mitigation measures that may be deemed suitable in reducing but not necessarily mitigating to less than significant the impacts of future projects consistent with the adopted housing element. Not all measures would be required for an individual project. During project-level environmental review for future projects, if applicable, the department would assess an individual project's impact. If a project's impact would be less than significant, no mitigation would be required. If a project's impact would be significant, the department would determine which aspects of Mitigation Measures M-CR-1a through M-CR-1l would be appropriate to implement, given the specific characteristics of the project and the affected resource.

The mitigation measures would partially compensate for impacts associated with future development consistent with the adopted housing element through feasible design changes, avoidance, preservation, relocation, comprehensive documentation, and memorialization of the affected resource. In some cases, one of the measures or a combination of measures may reduce the impact to less than significant. However, these measures may not fully avoid, rectify, reduce, or compensate for the loss of built-environment historic resources. Because demolition of built-environment historic resources or alteration in an adverse manner could still occur, the impact would be significant and unavoidable with mitigation.

ARCHEOLOGICAL CULTURAL RESOURCES AND HUMAN REMAINS

Soil disturbance associated with the construction of future development consistent with the adopted housing element has the potential to disturb and destroy archeological resources and human remains. The loss of significant historical, scientific, and cultural information about California, the region, and San Francisco would be a significant impact. Archeological sensitivity varies geographically throughout the city. Archeological sensitivity varies by location. The density of development as well as the volume and depth of soil excavation at a particular project site affects the potential for archeological resource impacts. Table 4.2-9 in the FEIR identified the relative potential impact on archeological resources under the adopted housing element by planning district.

The FEIR included Mitigation Measures M-CR-2a through M-CR-2d and M-TCR-1 for archeological cultural resources. The four sub-mitigation measures (a–d) are designed to mitigate impacts on archeological resources to less than significant through a range of avoidance, testing, documentation, and monitoring measures. M-TCR-1 requires tribal notification and consultation for projects identified by the department as affecting Native American archeological resources, which are considered potential tribal cultural resources, to reduce impacts on archeological tribal cultural resources to less than significant.

Not all measures would be required for an individual project. During project-level environmental review for future projects, as applicable, the department would assess an individual project's impact. If a project's impact would be less than significant, no mitigation would be required. If a project's impact would be significant, the department would determine which aspects of Mitigation Measures M-CR-2a through M-CR-2d and M-TCR-1 would be appropriate to implement, given the specific characteristics of the project and the affected resource.

PROPOSED REZONING PROGRAM IMPACTS

The approach to evaluating the proposed rezoning program is described above under "Analysis of Potential Environmental Effects," p. 32. The changes under the proposed rezoning program that would affect cultural resources are addressed below.

BUILT-ENVIRONMENT HISTORIC RESOURCES

Housing development throughout the city has the potential to affect areas with known and as yet unidentified built-environment historic resources, depending on the location. Although housing distribution would be different under the proposed rezoning program, the differences in housing distribution would not change the impact on built-environment cultural resources identified in the FEIR. Building heights may affect the setting of built-environment historical resources. Where new housing construction could occur within the vicinity of known individual resources, it is possible that new construction could materially impair the significance of a resource by removing or altering important features of that resource's historic setting or carrying out construction activities that damage historically or architecturally significant features of adjacent historic resources. The construction of new buildings with heights ranging from 40 to 500 feet, with two limited areas up to 650 feet, rather than 55 to 300 feet could result in significant and unavoidable impacts with mitigation related to built-environment cultural resources.

Specifically addressing the impacts of vibration during construction, according to the FEIR, groundborne vibration from the use of heavy equipment during construction of individual projects would result in a significant impact to built-environment historic resources because equipment would be used in proximity to historic buildings, vibration-sensitive structures, and buildings containing vibration-sensitive equipment. Implementation of Mitigation Measures M-NO-3a and M-NO-3b would reduce impacts from vibration through vibration protection measures and vibration monitoring as well as measures to prevent interference with sensitive equipment. This impact would be less than significant with mitigation. Even though the heights proposed by the rezoning are greater in some limited areas, the significance of the impact due to vibration would not substantially increase under the proposed rezoning program compared to the FEIR because the same methods for mitigating vibration effects would be available.

Similar to the adopted housing element, the proposed rezoning program would result in significant and unavoidable impacts with mitigation related to built-environment historic resources due to the potential for material impairment or demolition of known and not yet known built-environment historic resources. Previously developed mitigation measures would continue to apply.

ARCHEOLOGICAL RESOURCES AND HUMAN REMAINS

Sensitivity for archeological cultural resources varies by both geography and project element. Areas identified as sensitive for archeological cultural resources identified in the FEIR (refer to Tables 4.2-8 and 4.2-9 in the FEIR) would be affected by the adopted housing element. Because of the differences in housing distribution and proposed heights between the FEIR and proposed rezoning program, the proposed rezoning program would affect discreet but different project locations compared to the adopted housing element's program-level effect. However, the effects would be similar in nature so the differences would not affect the impact conclusions or mitigation measures identified in the FEIR. Implementation of Mitigation Measures M-CR-2a through M-CR-2d, as applicable, and M-TCR-1 for archeological cultural resources would reduce impacts. Those impacts were determined to be less than significant with mitigation.

For the consideration of archeological cultural resources, building heights can relate to the depth of the impact. Generally, taller buildings require deeper foundations and/or use of soil improvement measures to ensure stability and support the increased load. The depth of excavation is influenced by factors such as soil type and properties, load-bearing capacity, and environmental conditions. For high-rise buildings, pile or pier foundations are often used. These involve driving or drilling deep load-bearing elements into the soil. The depth of these piles or piers is determined by the building's height and the soil's properties. The sensitivity for buried archeological cultural resources varies throughout San Francisco, including submerged resources in the vicinity of the bay.

As with the adopted housing element, if human remains are encountered during soil disturbance associated with the proposed rezoning program, the treatment of human remains must comply with the provisions of state laws and codes, which identify protocols to be followed upon discovery of human remains (Public Resources Code section 5097.98 and Health and Safety Code section 7050.5). Previously developed mitigation measures, as applicable, would continue to apply. Those impacts were determined to be less than significant with mitigation.

For the reasons above, the proposed rezoning program would not have new or substantially greater environmental impacts on archeological resources and human remains, and new mitigation measures are not required.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The FEIR determined that the adopted housing element, in combination with cumulative projects, would result in a significant and unavoidable cumulative impact related to built-environment historical resources even with implementation of Mitigation Measures M-CR-1a through M-CR-1l. The new cumulative projects implemented subssquent to publication of the FEIR, the Great Highway Mobility Improvements Project and the Vision Zero Quick-Build program (see **Table 4**, p. 28), do not substantially alter the cumulative setting due to the location of the cumulative projects compared to the proposed rezoned area and the nature of the cumulative projects (i.e., the creation of new open space and recreation facilities via traffic and roadway modifications and pedestrian and bicycle safety improvements in the right-of-way). Thus, the inclusion of the new cumulative projects would not alter

the findings related to cumulative impacts on historical resources in the FEIR. Because the proposed rezoning program would not generate new impacts related to historical resources that were not previously identified in the FEIR, and the new cumulative projects would not alter the FEIR's cumulative analysis, there would be no new significant cumulative impact related to historical resources.

The FEIR determined that the adopted housing element, in combination with cumulative projects, would result in a significant cumulative impact related to archeological resources and human remains but that the impact would be reduced to less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures M-CR-2a through M-CR-2d and M-TCR-1. The new cumulative projects implemented subsequent to publication of the FEIR, the Great Highway Mobility Improvements Project and the Vision Zero Quick-Build program (see **Table 4**, p. 28), do not substantially alter the cumulative setting due to the location of the cumulative projects compared to the proposed rezoned area and the nature of the cumulative projects (i.e., the creation of new open space and recreation facilities via traffic and roadway modifications and pedestrian and bicycle safety improvements in the right-of-way). Thus, the inclusion of the new cumulative projects would not alter the findings related to cumulative impacts on archeological resources and human remains in the FEIR. Because the proposed rezoning program would not generate new impacts related to archeological resources and human remains that were not previously identified in the FEIR, and the new cumulative projects would not alter the FEIR's cumulative analysis, there would be no new significant cumulative impact related to archeological resources and human remains.

CONCLUSION

In summary, the proposed rezoning program would not result in new significant cultural resources impacts that were not previously identified in the FEIR, nor would it result in more severe impacts than those previously identified. No new mitigation measures or changes to existing mitigation measures are required.

Tribal Cultural Resources

FEIR FINDINGS

Section 4.3 of the FEIR, Tribal Cultural Resources, provides an evaluation of the proposed action's impacts on tribal cultural resources. The FEIR determined that the project area was highly sensitivity for precolonial tribal cultural resources and that the project could affect such resources during excavation (Impact TCR-1 [the proposed action would result in a substantial adverse change to an archeological tribal cultural resource] and Impact TCR-2 [the proposed action would result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of a non-archeological tribal cultural resource]). The FEIR also determined that impacts TCR-1 and TCR-2 would be less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures M-CR-2a–d and M-TCR-1.

The FEIR, on pp. 4.3-13 and 4.3-14, summarized a tribal outreach and consultation program conducted by the department in 2021 for the EIR that built on previous consultations performed in 2015 under CEQA section 21080.3.1. During these consultations between the department and local tribes, it was

determined that all archeological sites and human remains of Native American origin in San Francisco are potential tribal cultural resources. Native American representatives also noted the importance of historical water sources, such as areas in the vicinity of creeks, streams, and historical shoreline zones. These are culturally important to the Ohlone and have the potential to contain tribal cultural resources and possess symbolic cultural value. Based on Native American consultation, the following locations are identified as culturally important to local Ohlone and, therefore, determined to be potential tribal cultural resources:

- Locations modeled as having high sensitivity for Native American archeological resources
- The shoreline and marsh zones associated with natural environmental changes over the period between about 8,000 years ago and 170 years ago, including areas modeled as having high sensitivity for archeological resources that were submerged by the rising bay
- Known historic locations of creek channels, ponds, marshes, and other wetlands
- The modern San Francisco Bay and ocean shoreline as well as the shores of remnant creek channels, lakes, and ponds that are characterized by aboveground water today

As noted above, all Native American archeological resources in San Francisco are presumed to be potential tribal cultural resources. Construction activities associated with future development consistent with the adopted housing element have the potential to disturb or destroy both documented and previously undocumented Native American archeological resources. This would constitute a significant impact on archeological tribal cultural resources (Impact TCR-1). Because the locations identified above have also been identified as potential sites of symbolic cultural value, construction activities associated with the adopted housing element have the potential to disturb or destroy non-archeological tribal cultural resources. This would constitute a significant impact on non-archeological tribal cultural resources (Impact TCR-2).

The FEIR presented Mitigation Measures M-CR-2a–d and M-TCR-1. The four sub-mitigation measures (a–d) are designed to mitigate impacts on archeological tribal cultural resources to less than significant through a range of avoidance, testing, data collection, education, documentation, and monitoring measures. Mitigation measure M-TCR-1 requires tribal notification and consultation for projects identified by the department as affecting Native American archeological resources to reduce impacts on non-archeological tribal cultural resources to less than significant.

Not all measures would be required for an individual project. During project-level environmental review for future projects, as applicable, the department would assess an individual project's impact. If a project's impact would be less than significant, no mitigation would be required. If a project's impact would be significant, the department would determine which aspects of Mitigation Measures M-CR-2a–d and M-TCR-1 would be appropriate to implement, given the specific characteristics of the project and the affected resource.

PROPOSED REZONING PROGRAM IMPACTS

The approach to evaluating the proposed rezoning program is described above under "Analysis of Potential Environmental Effects," p. 32. The changes under the proposed rezoning program that would affect tribal cultural resources are addressed below.

The department sent out a notification concerning the proposed rezoning program to local Native American tribal representatives on February 29, 2024. Three tribal groups responded to the notification and the department is consulting with these tribal groups on implementation of tribal notification and tribal cultural resources measures for future development under the adopted housing element. Local Native American tribal groups did not identify new potential tribal cultural resources or an increased impact to tribal cultural resources as part of this consultation. Consultation has focused on coordination and implementation of FEIR mitigation measures.

Housing development throughout the city has the potential to affect areas with sensitivity for tribal cultural resources, depending on the location and sensitivity of the area. The proposed rezoning program would result in an incremental increase in overall units and a slightly different growth distribution compared to the adopted housing element. Under the proposed rezoning program, more growth would occur in well-resourced areas in the Downtown, Marina, Mission, Northeast, and Western Addition planning districts compared to the rezoning analysis assumptions in the FEIR, which projected that growth would be heavily concentrated in the Inner Sunset, Outer Sunset, and Richmond planning districts. These differences would not change the impact on tribal cultural resources identified in the FEIR. The impacts of the adopted housing element on areas identified as sensitive for tribal cultural resources, as identified in the FEIR and mapped in Figure 4.3-1, were determined to be less than significant with mitigation.

Building heights relate to the depth of the impact due to the types of foundations that support taller structures. Generally, taller buildings require deeper foundations to ensure stability and support the increased load. The depth of excavation is influenced by factors such as soil type and properties, load-bearing capacity, and environmental conditions. For high-rise buildings, pile or pier foundations are often used. These involve drilling or driving deep load-bearing elements into the soil. The depth of these piles or piers is determined by the building's height and the soil's properties. As discussed above, tribal representatives have identified the past and modern San Francisco shoreline; the historical corridors of creek networks, ponds, marshes, and other wetland locations; and modern locations of aboveground remnants of creeks and natural ponds and their associated shorelines as highly sensitive for the presence of tribal cultural resources. Additionally, as discussed above, all Native American archeological sites are also considered to be potential tribal cultural resources. The sensitivity for buried tribal cultural resources varies throughout San Francisco, including the potential for submerged tribal cultural resources within the vicinity of the bay.

The proposed rezoning program would affect discreet but different project locations compared to the adopted housing element's program-level effect. However, the differences in the distribution of development as well as higher building heights between the FEIR and proposed rezoning program

would not change the nature of the impact on archeological or other buried tribal cultural resources identified in the FEIR. Areas identified as sensitive for tribal cultural resources, as identified in the FEIR (refer to Table 4.2-9 in the FEIR), would be affected by the adopted housing element. Those impacts were determined to be less than significant with mitigation. Previously developed mitigation measures would continue to apply.

The proposed rezoning program would not have any new or substantially more severe environmental impacts on tribal cultural resources, and new mitigation measures are not required.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The FEIR determined that the adopted housing element, in combination with cumulative projects, would result in a significant cumulative impact related to tribal cultural resources but that the impact would be reduced to less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures M-CR-2a–d and M-TCR-1. The new cumulative projects implemented subsequent to publication of the FEIR, the Great Highway Mobility Improvements Project and the Vision Zero Quick-Build program (see **Table 4**, p. 28), do not substantially alter the cumulative setting due to the location of the cumulative projects compared to the proposed rezoned area and the nature of the cumulative projects (i.e., the creation of new open space and recreation facilities via traffic and roadway modifications and pedestrian and bicycle safety improvements in the right-of-way). Thus, the inclusion of the new cumulative projects would not alter the findings related to cumulative impacts on tribal cultural resources in the FEIR. Because the proposed rezoning program would not generate new impacts related to tribal cultural resources that were not previously identified in the FEIR, and the new cumulative projects would not alter the FEIR's cumulative analysis, there would be no new significant cumulative impact related to tribal cultural resources.

CONCLUSION

In summary, the proposed rezoning program would not result in new significant tribal cultural resources impacts that were not previously identified in the FEIR, nor would it result in more severe impacts than those previously identified. No new mitigation measures or changes to existing mitigation measures are required.

Transportation and Circulation

FEIR FINDINGS

The potential transportation and circulation impacts of the adopted housing element are analyzed in Section 4.4, Transportation and Circulation, of the FEIR. The FEIR identified less-than-significant impacts related to potentially hazardous conditions, accessibility, vehicle miles traveled (VMT), and parking. Mitigation measures were not required. The FEIR identified significant impacts related to construction, transit delay, and loading; mitigation measures were identified for transit delay and loading impacts and no feasible mitigation was identified for construction impacts. Even with implementation of the mitigation measures (i.e., Mitigation Measures M-TR-4a through M-TR-4d and M-TR-6), impacts related to transit delay and loading would remain significant and unavoidable. The FEIR

also identified construction-related transportation impacts as significant and unavoidable. The FEIR noted that the identification of significant travel delay, loading, and construction-related transportation impacts would not preclude finding less-than-significant or less-than-significant-with-mitigation impacts for future residential development projects consistent with the adopted housing element, based on the circumstances of such future development.

PROPOSED REZONING PROGRAM IMPACTS

The approach to evaluating the proposed rezoning program is described above under "Analysis of Potential Environmental Effects," p. 32. The changes under the proposed rezoning program that would affect transportation and circulation are addressed below.

As shown in **Table 3**, p. 19, the proposed rezoning program would result in an incremental increase in overall units and a slightly different growth distribution compared to the adopted housing element. The number of daily and peak-hour person trips generated by the approximately 54,000 units[31] under the proposed rezoning program would also be incrementally higher than the number of daily and peak-hour person trips generated under the adopted housing element. However, because growth under the proposed rezoning program would be more concentrated in the Downtown, Marina, Mission, Northeast, and Western Addition planning districts and would not shift as much future residential development to the west side of the city (e.g., Inner Sunset, Outer Sunset, and Richmond planning districts) as under the adopted housing element, there would be some shifts between ways of travel. The Downtown, Marina, Mission, Northeast, and Western Addition planning districts have a denser land use pattern and a greater concentration of commercial land uses than the west side; therefore, under the proposed rezoning program, more trips would rely on walking or taxis/transportation network company (TNC) vehicles and fewer trips would be in private automobiles compared to the adopted housing element. However, the overall number of vehicle trips under the proposed rezoning program is likely to be slightly more to that of the adopted housing element.

CONSTRUCTION

Like the adopted housing element, most individual development projects consistent with the proposed rezoning program would not result in significant construction-related transportation impacts, given their anticipated construction duration and intensity (e.g., most likely less than two years) and the city regulations and orders governing safety and access in and around construction sites. However, similar to the adopted housing element, given the potential magnitude of future development consistent with the proposed rezoning program and the uncertainty concerning construction schedules, construction activities associated with multiple overlapping projects could substantially delay transit or result in potentially hazardous conditions.

---

[31] Changes in housing units under the adopted housing element and proposed rezoning program are from the 2050 environmental baseline conditions. The FEIR used a future 2050 environmental baseline for the analysis of impacts associated with the adopted housing element.

The proposed rezoning program would result in an incremental increase in overall units and a slightly different growth distribution compared to the adopted housing element. Under the proposed rezoning program, more growth would occur in well-resourced areas in the Downtown, Marina, Mission, Northeast, and Western Addition planning districts compared to the rezoning analysis assumptions in the FEIR, which projected that growth would be heavily concentrated in the Inner Sunset, Outer Sunset, and Richmond planning districts. An incremental increase in the overall units and a slightly different growth distribution under the proposed rezoning program compared to the adopted housing element would not substantially increase the severity of the construction-related transportation impacts identified in the FEIR due to the localized nature of construction impacts; rather, the same types of impacts would occur in different locations in the city. No feasible mitigation measures for construction-related transportation impacts were identified in the FEIR for the adopted housing program. Therefore, consistent with the adopted housing element, the construction-related transportation impacts of future residential development consistent with the proposed rezoning action would be significant and unavoidable.

POTENTIALLY HAZARDOUS CONDITIONS AND ACCESSIBILITY

Consistent with the adopted housing element, the proposed rezoning program would not include street network changes. Any changes to the street network proposed as part of future development consistent with the proposed rezoning program would conform with city design standards and undergo review by city agencies. In addition, transportation features (e.g., curb cuts, sidewalk widening, changes to on-street parking regulations) would not change emergency access compared to 2050 environmental baseline conditions. Therefore, consistent with the adopted housing element, the proposed rezoning program would have less-than-significant impacts related to potentially hazardous conditions and accessibility, and no mitigation measures are required.

PUBLIC TRANSIT DELAY

The analysis provided in this section is based on the supporting information related to transit delay prepared by Fehr & Peers and LCW Consulting in support of the proposed rezoning program; it is included in Appendix B of this addendum.

Modified Transit Delay Methodology. Transit delay impacts of the adopted housing element were measured in terms of increases in weekday a.m. and p.m. peak-hour transit travel times for seven study corridors. The routes analyzed included seven representative bus routes (14 Mission, 14R Mission Rapid, 19 Polk, 28 19th Avenue, 28R 19th Avenue Rapid, 38 Geary, 38R Geary Rapid) and three representative light rail lines (K Ingleside, N Judah, and T Third) that run along the study corridors. As stated previously, housing units in the city would slightly increase and would be distributed somewhat differently under the proposed rezoning program compared to the adopted housing element. Therefore, the transit delay assessment for the proposed rezoning program analyzed seven of the 10 San Francisco Municipal Railway (Muni) bus routes/light rail lines on the seven study corridors in terms

of changes in transit travel times from those developed for the adopted housing element.[32] In addition, for the proposed rezoning program, three additional bus routes (7 Haight-Noriega route along Haight Street, the section of the 28 19th Avenue route along Lombard and North Point streets, and the 58 Lake Merced along Brotherhood Way) are included in the transit delay analysis to capture areas with a greater increase in housing units compared to the 2050 environmental baseline condition analyzed for the adopted housing element.

To determine the potential change in transit delay compared to the housing element, the proposed rezoning program analysis implements a ratio method approach. This approach is based on the change in housing units along the corridor[33] relative to the 2050 environmental baseline condition that was then applied to scale the transit delay calculated for the adopted housing element. A ratio of the delay increase per housing unit was calculated for each Muni route and used to determine the likely transit delay for the proposed rezoning program. The same thresholds of significance used in the transit delay analysis for the adopted housing element were used for the proposed rezoning program.

The 28 19th Avenue on Park Presidio Boulevard, Crossover Drive and 19th Avenue (analyzed in the FEIR) was selected as representative of transit operations and delay on the 28 19th Avenue route along Lombard and North Point streets. The segments were determined to be comparable because:

- It is the same transit route;
- Both segments include major arterials and highways (i.e., State Route 1 and U.S. 101) with multiple traffic lanes in each direction; and
- The population density[34] on both segments are generally similar.

The northern portion of the 19 Polk bus route[35] (i.e., north of Market Street) evaluated was selected as representative of transit operations and delay for the 7 Haight-Noriega route between Stanyan and Webster streets. The route was determined comparable because:

- Both routes travel within mixed-traffic lanes through commercial corridors that have one traffic lane in each direction;

---

[32] The 14 Mission and 14R Mission Rapid bus routes on the Mission Corridor and the T Third Street light rail line on the Third Street Corridor were not included in the analysis because the proposed rezoning program would not substantially change the number of housing units from that analyzed in the South Central or South Bayshore planning districts for the adopted housing element.

[33] A catchment area was defined for each corridor, comprising all transportation analysis zones that intersected a 0.25-mile buffer from the corridor.

[34] According to the American Community Survey (ACS) 2021 data, the census blocks groups immediately adjacent to the 19th Avenue corridor total to an average density of 20,000 persons per square mile, while the census block groups immediately adjacent to the Lombard and North Point corridor total to an average density of 19,000 persons per square mile.

[35] For the 19 Polk route, the transit delay calculated for the Plan Bay Area 2050 analysis (see EIR Chapter 6, Section E) was used for the proposed rezoning program because the Plan Bay Area 2050 analysis of housing unit growth along the 19 Polk route is more comparable to the proposed rezoning program.

- Both routes run parallel to major arterials (e.g., Van Ness Avenue for the 19 Polk route and Fell and Oak streets for the 7 Haight-Noriega bus route); and
- The population density[36] along both routes are generally similar.

The adopted housing element transit delay analyses for these comparable routes were then used as a basis for the ratio method approach.

For the 58 Lake Merced bus route along Brotherhood Way, a qualitative assessment rather than a quantitative analysis of transit travel time changes was deemed appropriate because none of the study corridors analyzed for the adopted housing element are comparable to conditions along Brotherhood Way (e.g., longer distances between signalized intersections along Brotherhood Way, limited land uses with direct access to Brotherhood Way, 30-minute headways on the 58 Lake Merced bus route, limited (three) bus stops over the 3,900 feet between Lake Merced Boulevard and the Junipero Serra Boulevard ramps, and higher speed limit of 45 miles per hour[37] (between Lake Merced Boulevard and Chumasero Drive). The qualitative assessment considered the location of housing unit increases within the Ingleside planning district, level of travel activity, roadways used to access future development consistent with the proposed rezoning program, and proximity of transit routes to the zones[38] where the proposed rezoning program would increase housing units relative to the adopted housing element. The department's screening criterion for the types of development projects that would typically not result in significant transit delay impacts was also considered in the qualitative assessment.[39]

Quantitative Transit Delay Analysis. Compared to the 2050 environmental baseline, the proposed rezoning program would result in approximately 54,000 housing units in the city (approximately 4,000 more housing units than the adopted housing element. As shown in **Table 3**, p. 19, and **Figure 2**, p. 20, the incremental increase in overall housing units would be distributed slightly different under the proposed rezoning program compared to the adopted housing element (e.g., fewer housing units than the adopted housing element in the Inner Sunset, Outer Sunset, and Richmond planning districts and incrementally more housing units in the Downtown, Marina, Mission, Northeast, and Western Addition planning districts).

---

36 According to the ACS 2021 data, the census block groups immediately adjacent to the Polk Street corridor total to an average density of 54,000 persons per square mile, while the census block groups immediately adjacent to the Haight Street corridor total to an average density of 45,0000 persons per square mile.

37 The speed limit on Brotherhood Way is 25 mph when children are present.

38 Planners use transportation analysis zones (TAZs, or zones) as part of transportation planning models for transportation analyses and other planning purposes. The zones vary in size from single city blocks in the downtown core to multiple blocks in outer neighborhoods or even larger in historically industrial areas such as the Hunters Point Shipyard area.

39 San Francisco Planning Department, Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines, *https://files.sfplanning.org/documents/environmental/Transportation_Impact_Analysis_Guidelines-October2019.pdf*. Appendix I describes the transit delay screening criteria.

Table 5 presents the:

- Change in transit travel times between the 2050 environmental baseline and the adopted housing element;
- Change in transit travel times between the 2050 environmental baseline and the proposed rezoning program on the study corridor bus routes and light rail lines for the a.m. and p.m. peak hours; and
- Comparison of the change in transit travel times between the adopted housing element and the proposed rezoning action.

Table 6, p. 74, presents this information for the Geary and the 19th Avenue corridors.

As shown in **Table 5**, compared to the adopted housing element, the proposed rezoning program would increase a.m. and p.m. peak-hour transit travel times on the 7 Haight-Noriega, 19 Polk, 28 19th Avenue (north segment), 38 Geary, and 38R Geary Rapid and decrease a.m. and p.m. peak-hour transit travel times on the 28 19th Avenue (west segment) and 28R 19th Avenue Rapid bus routes and the K Ingleside and N Judah light rail lines. Similar to the adopted housing element, under the proposed rezoning program, the 38R Geary Rapid route would exceed the threshold of significance in both the inbound and outbound directions during both peak hours. In addition, because the proposed rezoning program projects more housing units in the Northeast and Downtown planning districts compared to the adopted housing element, the proposed rezoning program would result in greater increases in the number of vehicle trips and delay for transit along the Polk-Potrero Hill corridor. Furthermore, the 19 Polk route would exceed the threshold of significance in the outbound direction (i.e., toward Hunters Point) during the a.m. peak hour and both directions during the p.m. peak hour.

As shown in **Table 6**, p. 74, similar to the adopted housing element, the corridor analysis of the 38 Geary and 38R Geary Rapid bus routes combined shows that the corridor would exceed the corridor threshold of significance for the proposed rezoning action during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours. However, under the proposed rezoning program, the 19th Avenue study corridor (i.e., the 28 19th Avenue [west] and 28R 19th Avenue Rapid bus routes combined) would not exceed the corridor threshold of significance during the p.m. peak hour (i.e., transit travel times would decrease under the proposed rezoning action compared to the adopted housing element). Thus, consistent with the adopted housing element, the proposed rezoning program could result in substantial transit delay impacts on certain study corridors while significance criteria would not be exceeded on other corridors.

Table 5: Muni Transit Travel Times by Route for Weekday A.M. and P.M. Peak Hours for 2050 Conditions

Muni Route/Line[a]	Threshold of Significance[b] (min:sec)	Adopted Housing Element Travel Time Change from 2050 Baseline (min:sec)		Proposed Rezoning Program Travel Time Change from 2050 Baseline (min:sec)		Travel Time Change between Adopted Housing Element and Proposed Rezoning Program (min:sec)	
		Inbound	Outbound	Inbound	Outbound	Inbound	Outbound
A.M. Peak Hour							
7 Haight-Noriega[c]	3:45	0:48	0:45	1:32	1:28	0:44	0:42
19 Polk[d]	4:00	0:33	0:45	3:57	**4:22**	3:24	3:37
28 19th Avenue – west[e]	4:00	1:28	1:21	0:55	0:51	-0:32	-0:30
28 19th Avenue – north[e]	4:00	0:16	0:15	0:37	0:34	0:21	0:19
28R 19th Avenue Rapid[e]	4:00	1:04	1:11	0:40	0:45	-0:24	-0:26
38 Geary[f]	2:45	2:04	1:49	2:31	2:13	0:27	0:24
38R Geary Rapid[f]	1:20	**2:41**	**1:45**	**3:17**	**2:07**	0:35	0:23
K Ingleside[g]	4:00	0:20	0:20	0:17	0:17	-0:02	-0:02
N Judah[h]	2:45	0:33	0:18	0:21	0:11	-0:12	-0:07
P.M. Peak Hour							
7 Haight-Noriega[c]	3:45	0:55	0:51	1:46	1:37	0:51	0:47
19 Polk[d]	4:00	1:31	0:57	**4:45**	**5:08**	3:14	4:11
28 19th Avenue – west[e]	4:00	2:10	2:12	1:22	1:23	-0:48	-0:49
28 19th Avenue – north[e]	4:00	0:23	0:24	0:54	0:55	0:31	0:31
28R 19th Avenue Rapid	4:00	1:52	1:44	1:11	1:05	-0:42	-0:38
38 Geary[f]	2:45	1:45	1:45	2:08	2:08	0:23	0:23
38R Geary Rapid[f]	1:20	**1:48**	**2:31**	**2:11**	**3:04**	0:24	0:33
K Ingleside[g]	4:00	0:28	0:28	0:25	0:25	-0:04	-0:04
N Judah[h]	3:00	0:34	0:49	0:22	0:31	-0:13	-0:18

Source: Fehr & Peers, 2025.

Muni Route/Line[a]	Threshold of Significance[b] (min:sec)	Adopted Housing Element Travel Time Change from 2050 Baseline (min:sec)		Proposed Rezoning Program Travel Time Change from 2050 Baseline (min:sec)		Travel Time Change between Adopted Housing Element and Proposed Rezoning Program (min:sec)	
		Inbound	Outbound	Inbound	Outbound	Inbound	Outbound

Bold and shaded text indicates the increase in transit travel time exceeds the significance threshold for the route (i.e., four minutes for routes and lines with service headways of more than eight minutes and half of the service headway for routes and lines with service headways of eight minutes or less).

Notes:

a. Inbound direction generally means headed toward downtown San Francisco. It is the opposite of the outbound direction. Routes that do not go downtown have a consistent definition for inbound and outbound, as noted for each route below. See Figure 4.4-4 for location of corridors.

b. The threshold of significance for Muni routes with service headways of eight minutes or more is four minutes. For Muni routes with service headways of less than eight minutes, the threshold of significance is half of the headway, rounded down to the nearest five seconds.

c. The study limits for the 7 Haight-Noriega bus route extends between Stanyan and Webster streets. The 7 Haight-Noriega route's inbound direction is toward downtown, and the outbound direction is toward Ocean Beach.

d. The Polk-Potrero Hill Corridor study limits for the 19 Polk bus route extends between North Point and 23rd streets. The 19 Polk route's inbound direction is toward Fisherman's Wharf/Marina, and the outbound direction is toward Hunters Point.

e. The 19th Avenue Corridor study limits for the 28 19th Avenue (west) and the 28R 19th Avenue Rapid 19 Polk bus routes extend between California Street and Junipero Serra Boulevard. The study limits for the 28 19th Avenue (north) route extend between Lyon and Powell streets. The 28 19th Avenue and the 28R 19th Avenue Rapid routes' inbound direction is toward the Marina/Van Ness Avenue, and the outbound direction is toward the Daly City BART station.

f. The Geary Corridor study limits for the 38 Geary and the 38R Geary Rapid extends between 34th Avenue and Powell Street. The 38 Geary and the 38R Geary Rapid routes' inbound direction is toward downtown, and the outbound direction is toward the Richmond District.

g. The West Portal-Ocean Corridor study limits for the K Ingleside light rail line extends between Ulloa Street and San José Avenue. The K Ingleside line's inbound direction is toward downtown, and the outbound direction is toward Balboa Park.

h. The Judah-Irving Corridor study limits for the N Judah light rail line extends between 43rd Avenue and Cole Street. The N Judah line's inbound direction is toward the Caltrain station via downtown, and the outbound direction is toward Ocean Beach.

Table 6: Muni Transit Travel Time Analysis for the 19th Avenue and Geary Corridors for 2050 Conditions

Representative Study Corridor	Threshold of Significance[a] (min:sec)	Adopted Housing Element Travel Time Change from 2050 Baseline (min:sec)		Proposed Rezoning Program Travel Time Change from 2050 Baseline (min:sec)		Proposed Rezoning Program Travel Time Change from Adopted Housing Element (min:sec)	
		Inbound	Outbound	Inbound	Outbound	Inbound	Outbound
A.M. Peak Hour							
19th Avenue Corridor[b]	2:20	1:28	1:21	0:55	0:51	-0:32	-0:30
Geary Corridor[c]	0:50	**2:41**	**1:49**	**3:17**	**2:13**	0:35	0:24
P.M. Peak Hour							
19th Avenue Corridor[b]	2:10	**2:10**	**2:12**	1:22	1:23	-0:48	-0:49
Geary Corridor[c]	0:50	**1:48**	**2:31**	**2:11**	**3:04**	0:24	0:33

Source: Fehr & Peers, 2025.

Bold and shaded text indicates the increase in transit travel time exceeds the significance threshold for the corridor.

a. The threshold of significance is based on the combined headway of the two routes that travel on each corridor and is half of the combined headway, rounded down to the nearest five seconds.

b. The 19th Avenue Corridor includes the 28 19th Avenue and the 28R 19th Avenue Rapid routes. The 28 19th Avenue and the 28R 19th Avenue Rapid routes' inbound direction is toward the Marina/Van Ness Avenue, and the outbound direction is toward the Daly City BART station.

c. The Geary Corridor includes the 38 Geary and the 38R Geary Rapid routes. The 38 Geary and the 38R Geary Rapid routes' inbound direction is toward downtown, and the outbound direction is toward the Richmond District.

In some cases, study corridors (e.g., Polk-Potrero Hill, Geary Corridor) would have greater increases in transit delay than the adopted housing element, while in other cases, study corridors (e.g., 19th Avenue, West Portal Ocean, Judah-Irving) would have decreases in transit delay. A similar mix of effects would be expected on other transit corridors that were not included as study corridors in the FEIR or this Addendum. The FEIR acknowledges that significant transit delay impacts could occur on bus routes along the Polk-Potrero Hill corridor due to changed circumstances, such as decreases in the headway on the 19 Polk route, which would reduce the significance threshold (FEIR p. 4.4-108), or a different distribution of housing units compared to the adopted housing element, such as greater housing unit growth in the Northeast planning district (FEIR p. 6-55). The study corridors analyzed in the FEIR represent a citywide cross-section of different transportation facilities and were selected to contextualize the transportation impacts of the adopted housing element, including on similar corridors in San Francisco. A similar mix of effects would be expected on other transit corridors that were not included as study corridors in the FEIR or this Addendum. Therefore, the proposed rezoning program would not result in more severe impacts on the study corridors than those previously identified for the adopted housing element.

Qualitative Transit Delay Analysis. A qualitative transit delay analysis was conducted for the 58 Lake Merced bus route along Brotherhood Way between Lake Merced and Junipero Serra boulevards because the proposed rezoning program projects a greater increase in housing units in the Lakeshore area of the Ingleside planning district compared to the 2050 environmental baseline conditions analyzed for the adopted housing element. Specifically, in the zone that encompasses the Lakeshore area between Stonestown and the county line, the proposed rezoning program projects an increase of approximately 2,400 housing units compared to none under the adopted housing element. The proposed rezoning program also projects fewer housing units in multiple zones in the northern and eastern portions of the Ingleside planning district compared to the adopted housing element. Overall, compared to the adopted housing element, the proposed rezoning program would slightly increase the number of housing units in the Ingleside planning district (i.e., by about 1,100 housing units, as shown in **Table 3**, p. 19).[40]

The Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines (transportation guidelines)[41] set forth a screening criterion for projects that would typically not result in significant public transit delay impacts. Any one residential development within the zone that includes the segment of Brotherhood Way between Lake Merced and Junipero Serra boulevards would not generate peak-hour vehicle trips

[40] The adopted housing element projects an increase of 6,800 housing units from 2050 environmental baseline conditions for the Ingleside planning district (composed of 62 transportation analysis zones), while the proposed rezoning program projects an increase of 7,900 housing units.

[41] San Francisco Planning Department, Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines, Appendix I, Public Transit, October 2019, *https://sfplanning.org/project/transportation-impact-analysis-guidelines-environmental-review-update#impact-analysis-guidelines*.

that would exceed the screening criterion of 300 vehicle trips during the peak hour;[42] however, vehicle trips associated with multiple projects with more than 1,900 housing units would exceed the screening criterion.

Brotherhood Way between Lake Merced and Junipero Serra boulevards is a major arterial connector with two traffic lanes each way, right- and/or left-turn lanes at intersections, and synchronized traffic signals. Within the 0.75-mile segment of Brotherhood Way, there are three stops for the 58 Lake Merced bus route (at Grace Community Church, Summit Way, and Chumasero Drive). The bus route operates with 30-minute service headways[43] during the peak periods. This segment of Brotherhood Way is part of the San Francisco County Transportation Authority's Congestion Management Program network. Monitored travel speeds on Brotherhood Way indicate a free flow of traffic (i.e., not experiencing congestion) during both a.m. and p.m. peak hours.[44] Thus, the additional peak-hour vehicles on Brotherhood Way associated with future residential development under the proposed rezoning program would not be considered a substantial increase relative to existing traffic volumes that would cause substantial delay.[45] In addition, the right- and left-turn lanes allow vehicles to change lanes and pass transit vehicles pulling out of the bus stops on the segment.

The transit travel times for the 58 Lake Merced bus route are not anticipated to increase under the proposed rezoning program to an extent that would exceed the threshold of significance of four minutes for the following reasons:

- There are multiple traffic lanes each way, dedicated turn lanes, and traffic signal synchronization on Brotherhood Way;
- There are limited bus stops and the relatively low service frequency on the 58 Lake Merced bus route; and
- There is a limited distance that vehicles generated by the new housing units would travel on Brotherhood Way.

Therefore, the proposed rezoning program would not substantially delay the 58 Lake Merced route.

---

[42] Future residential projects in the western part of the city with about 1,900 or fewer housing units (an estimated 2,850 bedrooms) would generate about 300 vehicle trips during the peak hour. An increase of 2,400 housing units (an estimated 3,657 bedrooms), as projected for the transportation zone that includes Brotherhood Way, would generate about 384 vehicles during the peak hour (see Appendix B of this addendum, pp. B-1 to B-5).

[43] Service headway is the number of minutes between buses or trains on a particular bus route or light rail line.

[44] San Francisco County Transportation Authority. San Francisco Congestion Dashboard *https://congestion.sfcta.org*. Accessed July 9, 2025.

[45] Peak-hour traffic volumes on Brotherhood Way west of Chumasero Drive collected in February and April 2023 and between Alemany Boulevard and Arch Street collected in October 2023 were used in the qualitative assessment. One-way traffic volumes on Brotherhood Way west of Chumasero Drive (i.e., within the zone where the proposed rezoning program projects new housing units) are between 1,080 and 1,250 vehicles per hour, depending on the peak hour (i.e., a.m. or p.m. peak hour) and peak direction of traffic (see Appendix B of this addendum, p. B-6).

Regional Transit Service. The proposed rezoning program would result in an incremental increase in overall units and a slightly different growth distribution compared to the adopted housing element. Under the proposed rezoning program, more growth would occur in well-resourced areas in the Downtown, Marina, Mission, Northeast, and Western Addition planning districts compared to the rezoning analysis assumptions in the FEIR, which projected that growth would be heavily concentrated in the Inner Sunset, Outer Sunset, and Richmond planning districts. This would result in more vehicles on the streets where Golden Gate Transit operates, such as along Lombard Street and Van Ness Avenue. Golden Gate Transit bus routes on Van Ness Avenue would continue to operate within the median transit-only lanes and stop at median platforms on Van Ness Avenue; therefore, the routes would not experience additional transit delay. On Lombard Street, Golden Gate Transit bus routes would continue to operate in mixed-traffic lanes.[46] As shown in **Table 5**, p. 72, the proposed rezoning program would increase transit travel times on the 28 19th Avenue bus route that operates along Lombard Street, but the increase would not exceed the threshold of significance of four minutes. Therefore, the threshold of significance for regional transit routes of half the service headways (i.e., generally between 10 and 30 minutes for Golden Gate Transit bus routes on Lombard Street) would also not be exceeded. Thus, the redistribution of vehicles on city streets and the passengers associated with future development consistent with the proposed rezoning program, compared to the adopted housing element, would not result in increases in regional transit travel times that would exceed the threshold of significance for regional transit or substantial passenger delay. Therefore, consistent with the adopted housing element, the proposed rezoning program would not substantially delay regional transit.

Conclusion. Consistent with the adopted housing element, the additional vehicles on city streets and the passengers associated with future development consistent with the proposed rezoning program could result in substantial delays for transit on certain corridors. In some instances, study corridors (e.g., Polk-Potrero Hill, Geary Corridor) would have greater increases in transit delay than the adopted housing element, while in other cases, study corridors (e.g., 19th Avenue, West Portal Ocean, Judah-Irving) would have decreases in transit delay. A similar mix of effects would be expected on other transit corridors that were not included as study corridors in the FEIR or this Addendum. Areawide increases in vehicle congestion under the proposed rezoning program could result in significant delays for transit, such as along the Geary, 19th Avenue, and Polk-Potrero Hill corridors. The study corridors that would experience significant transit delay impacts under the proposed rezoning program are consistent with those identified for the adopted housing element. Therefore, the slight shifts in distribution of future housing units and the incremental increases in some planning districts and associated vehicle trips and transit delay between the adopted housing element and the proposed rezoning program, as described above, do not represent a substantial worsening of the significant transit delay impact identified in the FEIR. Thus, consistent with the adopted housing element, the

[46] The SFMTA implemented a pilot project on Park Presidio Boulevard and Lombard Street to improve transit reliability. The project converted a curbside mixed-traffic lane to a high-occupancy vehicle 2+ lane in each direction. Only transit vehicles and private passenger vehicles with two or more people are allowed to use the lanes. The SFMTA is in the process of applying to Caltrans to make these changes permanent. For more information, see the project page at: *https://www.sfmta.com/projects/park-presidio-lombard-temporary-hov-lanes*.

proposed rezoning program could substantially delay Muni transit service but the impact would be similar and not substantially more severe. This would be a significant transit delay impact on Muni transit service.

With regards to regional transit service, the proposed rezoning program would not substantially affect regional transit operations or cause substantial traffic congestion or delay for regional transit. Therefore, consistent with the adopted housing element, the proposed rezoning program's impacts on regional transit would be less than significant.

To mitigate transit delay impacts to Muni vehicles, the FEIR identified Mitigation Measures M-TR-4a and M-TR-4b, which are included as planning code amendments as part of the proposed rezoning program. The discussion below identifies the extent to which the mitigation measures are met through the planning code amendments:

- Mitigation Measure M-TR-4a required the city to amend the planning code sections 151 and 151.1 to reduce the number of vehicle parking spaces permitted for applicable future development consistent with the adopted housing element by 50 percent or more compared to parking maximums as of April 2022. Alternately, the city could amend the planning code transportation demand management requirements in section 169 for applicable future development projects consistent with the adopted housing element to achieve a vehicle trip reduction equivalent of a 50 percent decrease in parking maximums.[47]

  The proposed rezoning program includes reductions in the maximum permitted vehicle parking spaces that range from 0 to 75 percent of the existing planning code requirements citywide rather than only for applicable future development projects consistent with the proposed rezoning program that would contribute considerably to or result in a significant transit delay impact. Because the proposed parking ratio change would affect all future development in the city, rather than only for applicable future development consistent with the housing element, the effect of the parking maximums reduction may be greater than what was anticipated under the FEIR. However, similar to the adopted housing element, it is uncertain to what degree the proposed parking maximum reductions would reduce vehicle trips that contribute to transit delay. As a result, this mitigation measure would partially meet the requirement identified in Measure A of M-TR-4a, but the degree to which it would meet the requirement is unknown as of publication of this addendum. Conservatively, subsequent individual development projects would still be required to implement Measure B of M-TR-4a as it is uncertain whether the planning code amendments to parking maximums fully met the vehicle trip reduction as specified in Measure A. This determination may be reevaluated in the future if new information comes to light regarding the correlation between parking and vehicle miles traveled,

[47] As discussed in the FEIR (Mitigation Measure Effectiveness and Conclusion, p. 4.4-114), Mitigation Measure M-TR-4a was developed based on the correlation between the availability of parking and vehicle miles traveled such that a reduction in parking supply generally results in a reduction in vehicle miles traveled. However, as discussed in the EIR, it is difficult to quantify with precision the exact degree that parking reduction would have on vehicle miles traveled since a person's decision to own a car and drive varies depending on a variety of neighborhood factors (e.g., proximity to transit, geography, personal preference, etc.). Furthermore, given the relative uncertainty that the city would adopt planning code amendments and to what degree, and the relative uncertainty of the precise effect of parking reduction on transit delay, the FEIR concluded that the proposed action future development would result in a significant impact on transit delay.

or regarding the effectiveness of the city's proposed parking maximums reduction. Therefore, consistent with the adopted housing element, substantial delay to public transit may continue to occur under the proposed rezoning program, even with implementation of the proposed vehicle parking restrictions.

- The proposed rezoning program includes amendments to the planning code sections 155(r) and 155(u) consistent with mitigation measure M-TR-4b to expand the geographic applicability for development projects required to prepare and implement a Driveway and Loading Operations Plan (DLOP) and to not permit curb cuts for garage entries, driveways, or other vehicular access along transit corridors. The proposed rezoning program's DLOP requirements and curb cut restrictions would be for applicable development projects citywide rather than only for applicable future development projects consistent with the proposed rezoning program that would contribute considerably to or result in a significant transit delay impact. Therefore, the amendments to the planning code fully comply with Measures A.1 and A.2 as specified in Mitigation Measure M-TR-4b and Measure B in the measure is not required to be implemented on a project-by-project basis.

  Consistent with the assessment of mitigation measure M-TR-4b conducted in the FEIR for the adopted housing element, DLOP requirements and curb cut restrictions would reduce significant transit delay impacts. Although the requirements of M-TR-4b are met through the planning code amendments, the DLOP requirements and curb cut restrictions may not always be feasible or may not reduce the significant impact to less-than-significant levels.

In addition to Mitigation Measures M-TR-4a and M-TR-4b, the FEIR identified Mitigation Measure M-TR-4c to reduce transit delay. Mitigation Measure M-TR-4c, which requires the city to implement measures to reduce transit delay on transit corridors where planning code amendments to implement the adopted housing program (i.e., the proposed rezoning program) would contribute considerably to or result in significant transit delay impacts, would be applicable to the proposed rezoning program. However, because approval by the SFMTA board and/or other transit agencies of the transit network improvements developed as part of mitigation measure M-TR-4c is uncertain and full funding for future transit network improvements has not been identified, implementation of this measure remains uncertain. Therefore, this mitigation measure remains applicable to the proposed rezoning program. Therefore, consistent with the adopted housing element, the proposed rezoning program's impacts related to transit delay on Muni transit service would remain significant and unavoidable with mitigation, as identified in the FEIR for the adopted housing element. With the application of the mitigation measures and the proposed planning code amendments for sections 155 (r) and 155 (u), there will not be a substantial increase in the severity of these already identified impacts.

VEHICLE MILES TRAVELED

Compared to the adopted housing element, the proposed rezoning program would result in slight increase in overall growth and a change in the distribution of housing units in the city. Despite the slight increase in unit growth compared to the adopted housing element, citywide and planning district average daily VMT per capita for residential uses under the proposed rezoning program would still be similar to that of the adopted housing element and more than 15 percent less than the regional average (i.e., the significance threshold). Consistent with the adopted housing element, individual development projects

under the proposed rezoning program would continue to be in zones where average daily VMT per capita for residential uses would be more than 15 percent below regional VMT. However, the proposed rezoning program would add more housing units than the adopted housing element in two of the three zones that do not meet the map-based screening criterion for residential uses (i.e., zones 99, 400 and 402).[48]

Within zone 99, in the Outer Sunset planning district, the proposed rezoning program projects an s of 240 housing units compared to an increase of 268 housing under the adopted housing element. Within zone 402, in the Ingleside planning district, the proposed rezoning program projects an increase of 2,442 housing units compared to a minor reduction in housing units under the adopted housing element. Consistent with the adopted housing element, the proposed rezoning program does not project new residential development in zone 400 in the Ingleside planning district.

Consistent with the adopted housing element, future development consistent with the proposed rezoning program in zones 99 and 402 may meet the department's map-based screening criterion for the following reasons:

- Average daily VMT per capita for residential uses in both zones 99 and 402 is close to meeting the map-based screening criterion. Average daily VMT per capita for residential uses under 2050 conditions is 13.5 percent below the regional average (i.e., compared to the below 15 percent threshold).
- Residential development would occur in areas where there are multiple Muni bus routes. For example, zone 99 is served by the 18 46th Avenue and 23 Monterey bus routes along Sloat Boulevard and the L Taraval light rail line. Zone 402 is served by the 58 Lake Merced bus route along Brotherhood Way, which connects with other nearby Muni bus routes (e.g., 14 Mission, 14R Mission Rapid, 28 19th Avenue, 28R 19th Avenue Rapid, 54 Felton, 57 Parkmerced), SamTrans bus routes (e.g., 110, 120, 121, 130, 130B, ECR, PCW, SKY), and BART lines that serve the BART Daly City station (e.g., Blue, Yellow, Green, and Red lines). In addition, these zones are within transit priority areas.[49, 50]
- Individual buildings with 10 or more housing units would be subject to planning code section 169 regarding TDM program requirements. This planning code section requires certain new development projects to incorporate design features, incentives, and tools to reduce VMT. Development projects must choose measures from a menu of options to develop an overall TDM plan. Some options overlap requirements elsewhere in the planning code (e.g., bicycle parking, car-share parking). Each development's TDM plan requires routine monitoring and reporting to the department to demonstrate compliance.

---

[48] Zone 99 is bounded by Sloat Boulevard, Lower Great Highway, Vicente Street, and 43rd Avenue. Zone 400 is bounded by Ocean Beach/Fort Funston, Lake Merced, and the San Francisco-San Mateo county line; it includes the San Francisco Zoo, San Francisco Public Utilities Commission water treatment facilities, and The Olympic Club golf course. Zone 402 is bounded by Lake Merced Boulevard, Brotherhood Way, Junipero Serra Boulevard, and the San Francisco-San Mateo county line; it includes primarily the San Francisco Golf Club and religious institutions.

[49] Transit priority areas are areas in which parcels are within 0.5 mile of a major transit stop, either existing or planned.

[50] Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), Transit Priority Areas (2021) for the nine-County Bay Region as defined in the California Public Resources Code, Section 21099. *https://opendata.mtc.ca.gov/datasets/transit-priority-areas-2021-1/explore?location=37.726809%2C-122.463571%2C14.68*. Accessed August 5, 2025.

- The proposed rezoning program includes planning code amendments to reduce maximum accessory parking limits and reduce parking maximums for certain development projects that would result in significant transit delay impacts. These planning code requirements would further reduce VMT from future residential development.

Consistent with the adopted housing element, the proposed rezoning program would not cause substantial additional VMT.

With respect to induced automobile travel, consistent with the adopted housing element, the transportation features of individual development projects consistent with the proposed rezoning program would be the types of projects that would not substantially induce automobile travel. In addition, consistent with the adopted housing element, the proposed rezoning program would be consistent with the region's sustainable communities strategy (Plan Bay Area 2050). Therefore, consistent with the adopted housing element, the proposed rezoning program would have less-than significant impacts related to VMT and induced automobile travel, and no mitigation measures are required.

LOADING

Consistent with the adopted housing element, most development projects consistent with the proposed rezoning program, by themselves, would not result in a loading deficit, and significant loading impacts would not occur. However, consistent with the adopted housing element, in some circumstances, the proposed rezoning program could result in a loading deficit (i.e., the demand for loading spaces cannot be accommodated within the supply, therefore resulting in a loading deficit) that could create potentially hazardous conditions for people walking, bicycling, or driving or potentially delay public transit. The proposed rezoning program would result in an incremental increase in overall units and a slightly different growth distribution compared to the adopted housing element. Under the proposed rezoning program, more growth would occur in well-resourced areas in the denser Downtown, Marina, Mission, Northeast, and Western Addition planning districts compared to the rezoning analysis assumptions in the FEIR, which projected that growth would be heavily concentrated in the Inner Sunset, Outer Sunset, and Richmond planning districts. The incremental increase in overall units as well as the slightly different growth distribution under the proposed rezoning program compared to the adopted housing element would not substantially increase the severity of the loading impacts identified in the FEIR for the adopted housing element. Rather, similar types of impacts would occur in different areas of the city.

The proposed rezoning program includes amendments to the planning code to require a driveway and loading operations plan (DLOP) as part of new development projects that are identified by the department as having significant loading impacts (FEIR Mitigation Measure M-TR-4b). In addition, Mitigation Measure M-TR-6 would require the department and SFMTA to develop a curb management plan for geographic areas in the proposed rezoning program that could result in significant loading

impacts (as detailed on FEIR pp. 4.4-127 and 4.4-128).[51] Implementation of the DLOP and Mitigation Measure M-TR-6 would reduce the significant loading impacts, but the measures may not always be feasible or may not reduce the significant loading impacts to less-than-significant levels. Therefore, consistent with the adopted housing element, the proposed rezoning program's loading impacts would be significant and unavoidable with mitigation.

PARKING

Future development consistent with the proposed rezoning program would be within the department's map-based screening area[52] for residential uses, except for zone 99 in the Outer Sunset planning district and zone 402 in the Ingleside planning district.[53] These two zones are in areas where there are multiple Muni bus routes and within transit priority areas. Furthermore, future development projects would be subject to planning code section 169, TDM program requirements, and the proposed rezoning program's planning code amendments to sections 151 and 151.1 which would further reduce parking demand. Thus, consistent with the adopted housing element, future development consistent with the proposed rezoning program within zones 99 and 402 may meet the department's map-based screening criterion.

Consistent with the adopted housing element, and in accordance with the transportation guidelines, future building projects consistent with the proposed rezoning program that comply with planning code requirements for parking (i.e., do not exceed maximum permitted vehicle parking space requirements) would not create a substantial vehicular parking deficit (i.e., demand for parking spaces that exceeds the available supply by 600 vehicle parking spaces), which could result in secondary effects, such as potentially hazardous conditions for people walking or bicycling or inadequate access for emergency vehicles, or substantially delay transit. Thus, the proposed rezoning program would not result in a substantial vehicle parking deficit that could result in secondary effects in the two zones. Therefore, consistent with the adopted housing element, the proposed rezoning program would have less-than significant impacts related to parking, and no mitigation measures are required.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The FEIR determined that the adopted housing element, in combination with cumulative projects, would not result in significant impacts related to potentially hazardous conditions, accessibility, VMT, or parking and would not require mitigation measures. The FEIR identified cumulative impacts related to transit delay and loading that would be significant and unavoidable with mitigation, along with

---

[51] Mitigation Measure M-TR-6, curb management plans, are required to be developed within 2 years of the Planning Department receiving applications for 200,000 gross square feet in the plan's geographic area.

[52] San Francisco Planning Department, Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines, *http://default.sfplanning.org/publications_reports/TIA_Guidelines.pdf*. Appendix L of the transportation guidelines describe VMT thresholds of significance. The map-based screening area refers to transportation analysis zones where existing VMT per capita is more than 15 percent below existing regional VMT per capita and/or where future VMT per capita is less than 15 percent below 2040 regional VMT per capita.

[53] Zone 400 in the Ingleside planning district is also not within the department's map-based screening area; however, neither the adopted housing element nor proposed rezoning program projects housing units in this zone.

cumulative significant and unavoidable construction-related transportation impacts. The cumulative context for the proposed rezoning element would be similar to that presented in the FEIR, with the exception of two transportation projects: the Great Highway Mobility Improvements Project and SFMTA's Vision Zero Quick-Build projects (see **Table 4**, p. 28). The SFMTA's Vision Zero Quick-Build projects are traffic safety improvements to enhance bicycle and pedestrian safety and improve transit operations and would not substantially affect the transportation network adjacent to future development consistent with the proposed rezoning program. The permanent closure of the Upper Great Highway between Lincoln Way and Sloat Boulevard in 2025 resulted in a shift in vehicles to multiple other north–south roadways on the west side of the city, including Sunset Boulevard, Chain of Lakes Drive, and 19th Avenue.[54] The shift in traffic volumes due to the Great Highway closure would not result in substantial changes to vehicle circulation or accessibility for people walking, bicycling or driving, or for emergency vehicles on these streets. Thus, for the same reasons described in the FEIR for the adopted housing element, the proposed rezoning program would have less-than-significant cumulative impacts related to potentially hazardous conditions, accessibility, VMT, and parking.

With respect to cumulative construction-related transportation impacts, similar to the adopted housing element, construction activities associated with future development consistent with the proposed rezoning program could overlap with simultaneous construction of other nearby projects. Under the proposed rezoning program, more growth would occur in well-resourced areas in the Downtown, Marina, Mission, Northeast, and Western Addition planning districts compared to the rezoning analysis assumptions in the FEIR, which projected that growth would be heavily concentrated in the Inner Sunset, Outer Sunset, and Richmond planning districts. Thus, the proposed rezoning program would have greater potential to overlap cumulative construction activities than the adopted housing element in the denser Downtown, Marina, Mission, Northeast, and Western Addition planning districts and lower potential to overlap cumulative construction activities than the adopted housing element on the west side of the city. Thus, consistent with the adopted housing element, the proposed rezoning program would contribute considerably to significant cumulative construction-related transportation impacts, which would be significant and unavoidable.

With respect to cumulative transit delay impacts, compared to the adopted housing element, growth under the proposed rezoning program would result in more vehicles in the Downtown, Marina, Mission, Northeast, and Western Addition planning districts and fewer vehicles on the west side of the city. Thus, compared to the adopted housing element, the proposed rezoning program would have greater potential for significant cumulative transit delay impacts in the denser Downtown, Marina, Mission, Northeast, and Western Addition planning districts than on the west side of the city. The permanent closure of the Upper Great Highway between Lincoln Way and Sloat Boulevard in 2025 resulted in a shift in vehicles to other north–south roadways on the west side of the city, including the 19th Avenue study corridor, along which

[54] SFMTA. New Data on Great Highway Road Closure. *https://www.sfmta.com/blog/new-data-great-highway-road-closure-how-were-supporting-your-trips*. Accessed August 5, 2025.

the 28 19th Avenue and the 28R 19th Avenue Rapid operate.[55] These bus routes experienced some additional travel times in the southbound direction because of the closure, however, the SFMTA is working on traffic signal adjustments that would reduce the transit travel times.[56]

As shown in **Table 5**, p. 72, and **Table 6**, p. 74, the proposed rezoning program would reduce transit delay on the 19th Avenue corridor bus routes compared to the adopted housing element; therefore, the proposed rezoning program would not combine with the Upper Great Highway closure to result in cumulative significant transit delay impacts. The Hyde Street Quick-Build Project between Geary and McAllister streets (completed in 2023) included a transit-only lane on Hyde Street between Eddy and McAllister streets, with the goal of improving transit reliability and reducing transit delay. This transportation project could offset some of the travel time increases identified for the 19 Polk bus route under the proposed rezoning program. The planning code amendments included as part of the proposed rezoning program (i.e., Mitigation Measures M-TR-4a and M-TR-4b) and Mitigation Measure M-TR-4c would reduce or minimize transit delay impacts associated with future development. However, due to the uncertainty about adoption of Mitigation Measure M-TR-4c and its effectiveness, it is not likely that transit delay impacts would be reduced to less-than-significant levels. Therefore, consistent with the adopted housing element, the proposed rezoning program would contribute considerably to significant cumulative transit delay impacts, which would be significant and unavoidable with mitigation.

With respect to cumulative loading impacts, compared to the adopted housing element, growth under the proposed rezoning program would result in more units in the Downtown, Marina, Mission, Northeast, and Western Addition planning districts and fewer units on the west side of the city. Thus, compared to the adopted housing element, the proposed rezoning program would have greater potential for overlap at locations with loading impacts from other residential and non-residential development in the denser Downtown, Marina, Mission, Northeast, and Western Addition planning districts than on the west side of the city. Consistent with the adopted housing element, the planning code amendment related to the driveway and loading operation plan included as part of the proposed rezoning program (Mitigation Measure M-TR-4b) and Mitigation Measure M-TR-6 would not reduce the loading impacts to less-than-significant levels. Thus, consistent with adopted housing element, the proposed rezoning program would contribute considerably to significant loading impacts, which would be significant and unavoidable with mitigation.

CONCLUSION

In summary, the proposed rezoning program would not result in new significant transportation and circulation impacts that were not previously identified in the FEIR, nor would it result in more severe impacts than those previously identified. No new mitigation measures or changes to existing mitigation measures are required.

---

55 SFMTA Memorandum, Spring 2025 Outer Sunset Traffic Data. *https://www.sfmta.com/reports/outer-sunset-traffic-report-spring-2025*. Accessed August 5, 2025.

56 SFMTA. New Data on Great Highway Road Closure. *https://www.sfmta.com/blog/new-data-great-highway-road-closure-how-were-supporting-your-trips*. Accessed August 5, 2025.

Noise and Vibration

FEIR FINDINGS

The potential noise and vibration impacts of the adopted housing element are analyzed in Section 4.5, Noise and Vibration, of the FEIR. The analysis covered development of seven representative building types ranging from accessory dwelling units to a 590-foot-tall residential mixed-use building with 984 housing units. The FEIR concluded that the adopted housing element would generate a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels due to noise from heavy equipment used for the construction of individual projects, resulting in a significant impact. This is largely due to the potential for the construction of multiple projects in proximity to sensitive receptors, which is likely given the compact, dense urban setting of the city. Individual projects may also result in a significant noise impact, depending on frequency, intensity, and duration of equipment use and proximity to sensitive receptors. For individual projects requiring night work, a significant noise impact may occur due to the potential proximity between an individual project and sensitive receptors. Mitigation measure M-NO-1 would reduce the severity of noise impacts through implementation of construction noise control mitigation. However, the FEIR determined that in situations where multiple projects would be constructed simultaneously in proximity to one another, the impact was determined to be significant and unavoidable with mitigation. However, the FEIR noted that this conclusion would not preclude a finding of less than significant or less than significant with mitigation for future projects consistent with the adopted housing element, including projects that meet the construction noise screening criteria identified under the discussion of Impact NO-1 in the FEIR, or projects for which a detailed noise analysis demonstrates that an established noise standard would not be exceeded.

Regarding operational impacts, the FEIR concluded the adopted housing element would result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient levels due to traffic noise on roadways in the city, primarily in the Central and Western planning districts, resulting in a significant impact. Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-TR-4a, Parking Maximums and Transportation Demand Management, could reduce vehicle trips on roadways where traffic noise impacts would occur, but there is uncertainty about the extent of the reduction that could be realized through this measure. Due to this uncertainty, operational impacts related to traffic noise would be significant and unavoidable with mitigation. However, the FEIR notes that residents of new development projects would not be affected by traffic noise resulting from operation of the adopted housing element because new buildings would be required to meet interior noise standards under title 24.

For permanent operation of buildings, heating, ventilation, and air-conditioning (HVAC) equipment could exceed the limits in section 2909(a) and 2909(d) of the city noise ordinance, resulting in a significant impact on existing sensitive receptors. Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-NO-2 would reduce impacts from HVAC equipment through use of noise attenuation to comply with noise ordinance limits. This impact would be less than significant with mitigation. Emergency backup generators would be operated infrequently and would be housed in attenuating enclosures, and as such noise from emergency generators would result in a less than significant impact. Loading activities

at buildings would not be noticeable above ambient sound levels and would generally occur during the day when people are less sensitive to noise. As such noise from loading activities would result in a less than significant impact.

According to the FEIR, groundborne vibration from the use of heavy equipment during construction of individual projects would result in a significant impact because equipment would be used in proximity to historic buildings, vibration-sensitive structures, and buildings containing vibration-sensitive equipment. Implementation of Mitigation Measures M-NO-3a and M-NO-3b would reduce impacts from vibration through vibration protection measures and vibration monitoring as well as measures to prevent interference with sensitive equipment. This impact would be less than significant with mitigation.

PROPOSED REZONING PROGRAM IMPACTS

The approach to evaluating the proposed rezoning program is described above under "Analysis of Potential Environmental Effects," p. 32. The changes under the proposed rezoning program that would affect noise and vibration are addressed below.

CONSTRUCTION

The proposed rezoning program would generate a substantial temporary increase in ambient levels due to noise from the heavy equipment used for the construction of individual projects, resulting in a significant impact for the same reasons as disclosed in the FEIR for the adopted housing element. However, under the proposed rezoning program, there would be an incremental increase in the amount and distribution of growth in some places compared to the adopted housing element. The intensity of construction would be greatest in the Downtown, Marina, Mission, Northeast, and Western Addition planning districts, whereas the adopted housing element would have greater intensity in the Ingleside, Inner Sunset, Outer Sunset, and Richmond planning districts on the west side of the city. As described in the FEIR, construction of multiple individual projects could potentially overlap within a single construction influence zone, resulting in an increased frequency, duration, and intensity of construction noise at existing sensitive receptors in these areas. For this reason, the proposed rezoning could result in a substantial temporary increase in ambient levels due to construction noise, even with implementation of Mitigation Measure M-NO-1. This significant and unavoidable impact is the same as the adopted housing element, except construction noise impacts would be expected to occur more frequently in the Downtown, Marina, Mission, Northeast, and Western Addition planning districts, rather than in the west side of the city. As a citywide effect, there would be no new or more severe impacts due to construction noise under the proposed rezoning program compared to the FEIR. For this reason, the proposed rezoning could result in a substantial temporary increase in ambient levels due to construction noise, even with implementation of Mitigation Measure M-NO-1. Therefore, this impact would be significant and unavoidable with mitigation, which is the same conclusion found in the FEIR.

TRAFFIC

The proposed rezoning program would result in an incremental increase in overall units and a slightly different growth distribution compared to the adopted housing element. There would be a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels due to traffic noise on roadways in the city under the proposed rezoning program due to the same factors found under the adopted housing element. Under the proposed rezoning program, more growth and the corresponding increase in traffic noise levels would occur in well-resourced areas in the Downtown, Marina, Mission, Northeast, and Western Addition planning districts compared to the rezoning analysis assumptions in the FEIR, which projected that growth and the corresponding increase in traffic noise levels would be heavily concentrated in the Inner Sunset, Outer Sunset, and Richmond planning districts. Traffic noise levels under the proposed rezoning program would be most similar to the Eastside Alternative evaluated in the FEIR. The analysis of SF-CHAMP data for the Eastside Alternative indicated that by 2050 traffic noise levels would increase by up to 10 dBA compared to environmental baseline conditions, with the location of greatest increase within the Northeast planning district, as well as increases above 7 dB in Central, Downtown, and South of Market planning districts (see Appendix H, Table H.8-4 of the FEIR). Overall the maximum increase of 10 dBA for the Eastside Alternative is lower than the adopted housing element, which had a maximum increase of 21.1 dBA compared to Environmental Baseline (Table 4.5-14 of the FEIR). Citywide, the average increase in traffic noise would be 0.2 dBA for both the Eastside Alternative and the proposed rezoning program in 2050. However, the substantial permanent increase due to traffic noise would still result in a significant impact. Due to uncertainty regarding how vehicle trips would be reduced with implementation of Mitigation Measure M-TR-4a, Parking Maximums and Transportation Demand Management, the impact would be significant and unavoidable with mitigation, which is the same conclusion as the FEIR, except traffic noise impacts would be expected to occur more frequently in the Downtown, Marina, Mission, Northeast, and Western Addition planning districts, rather than in the the west side of the city. As a citywide effect, there would be no new or more severe impacts due to traffic noise under the proposed rezoning program compared to the FEIR.

STATIONARY NOISE

Once operational, buildings constructed under the proposed rezoning would generate noise from sources such as HVAC systems, emergency backup generators, and loading activity. The noise levels generated by building systems would be similar to the adopted housing element, but the buildings where these systems would be operated would be concentrated more in the Downtown, Marina, Mission, Northeast, and Western Addition planning districts rather than the west side of the city. Operation of HVAC systems would result in a significant impact, and emergency generators and loading activity would result in a less than significant impact.

Regarding HVAC equipment, there would be a significant impact due to the same factors found under the adopted housing element. With implementation of Mitigation Measure M-NO-2, the impact from operation of HVAC systems would be less than significant with mitigation. These impact conclusions are the same as the FEIR, and as a citywide effect, there would be no new or more severe impacts due to stationary noise under the proposed rezoning program compared to the FEIR.

CONSTRUCTION VIBRATION

Groundborne vibration would occur due to heavy equipment operating in proximity to historic buildings, vibration-sensitive structures, and buildings with vibration-sensitive equipment under the same factors found under the adopted housing element. Vibration associated with construction under the proposed rezoning program would occur primarily in the Downtown, Marina, Mission, Northeast, and Western Addition planning districts rather than in the west side of the city. With implementation of Mitigation Measure M-NO-3a: Protection of Adjacent Buildings/Structures and Vibration Monitoring During Construction and Mitigation Measure M-NO-3b: Prevent Interference with Vibration-Sensitive Equipment, impacts would be less than significant with mitigation. As a citywide effect, there would be no new or more severe impacts due to groundborne vibration under the proposed rezoning program compared to the FEIR.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The FEIR determined that the adopted housing element, in combination with cumulative projects, would result in a significant and unavoidable cumulative construction noise impact even with implementation of Mitigation Measure M-NO-1. The new cumulative projects implemented subsequent to publication of the FEIR, the Great Highway Mobility Improvements Project and the Vision Zero Quick-Build program (see **Table 4**, p. 28), do not substantially alter the cumulative setting due to the location of the cumulative projects compared to the proposed rezoned area and the nature of the cumulative projects (i.e., the creation of new open space and recreation facilities via traffic and roadway modifications and pedestrian and bicycle safety improvements in the right-of-way). Thus, the inclusion of the new cumulative projects would not alter the findings related to cumulative construction noise impacts in the FEIR. Under the proposed rezoning program, there would be a greater potential for increased construction noise in the Downtown, Marina, Mission, Northeast, and Western Addition planning districts, rather than in the west side of the city. Similar to the adopted housing element, construction under the proposed rezoning program could occur at the same time as cumulative projects. Because the proposed rezoning program would not generate new construction noise impacts that were not previously identified in the FEIR, and the new cumulative projects would not alter the FEIR's cumulative analysis, there would be no new significant cumulative construction noise impact.

The FEIR determined that the adopted housing element, in combination with cumulative projects, would not result in a significant cumulative operational noise impact. The new cumulative projects implemented subsequent to publication of the FEIR, the Great Highway Mobility Improvements Project and the Vision Zero Quick-Build program (see **Table 4**, p. 28), do not substantially alter the cumulative setting due to the location of the cumulative projects compared to the proposed rezoned area and the nature of the cumulative projects (i.e., the creation of new open space and recreation facilities via traffic and roadway modifications and pedestrian and bicycle safety improvements in the right-of-way). Thus, the inclusion of the new cumulative projects would not alter the findings related to cumulative operational noise impacts in the FEIR. Regarding traffic noise, as discussed above under "Cumulative Impacts" in the "Transportation and Circulation" section, growth under the proposed rezoning program would result in more vehicles in the Downtown, Marina, Mission, Northeast, and

Western Addition planning districts and fewer vehicles on the west side of the city. However, the increase in vehicle trips would not result in a doubling of vehicle traffic relative to the Waterfront Plan Update, because areas of employment growth would not overlap spatially with the proposed rezoning area. Because the proposed rezoning program would not generate new impacts related to operational noise that were not previously identified in the FEIR, and the new cumulative projects would not alter the FEIR's cumulative analysis, there would be no new significant cumulative operational noise impact.

CONCLUSION

In summary, the proposed rezoning program would not result in new significant noise and vibration impacts that were not previously identified in the FEIR, nor would it result in more severe impacts than those previously identified. No new mitigation measures or changes to existing mitigation measures are required.

Air Quality

FEIR FINDINGS

The FEIR concluded that adopted housing element policies would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the air district's 2017 Clean Air Plan because the adopted housing element would support measures that achieve the goals of the Clean Air Plan. Subsequent development built under the adopted housing element would generally promote high-density land use patterns, allow or require reductions in off-street parking, encourage tree planting and water and energy conservation, divert waste, and promote transit, walking, and bicycling as primary modes of transport, which are goals that are consistent with the Clean Air Plan.

With respect to plan-level impacts resulting from net increases in criteria pollutants for which the region is in nonattainment, the FEIR evaluated the growth in VMT compared to the growth in service population in the city, which is the air district's recommend approach for evaluating plan-level impacts. The FEIR concluded that, because the increase in VMT relative to the baseline (6.4 percent) would be greater than the increase in service population (5.4 percent), which is the sum of population and employment, there would be a significant and unavoidable impact. Mitigation Measure M-TR-4a, Parking Maximums and Transportation Demand Management, from the FEIR would reduce the impact, but it would remain significant.

In addition to the plan-level analysis described above, the FEIR also identified the extent to which future development consistent with the adopted housing element could result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to criteria air pollutant emissions. The FEIR presented quantitative analysis of criteria air pollutant emissions from seven representative building types, ranging in size from an accessory dwelling unit to a 590-foot-tall residential mixed-use building with 984 housing units. Construction criteria air pollutants from projects involving up to a 240-foot-tall building with 495 units and a 4,000-square-foot commercial use would be below the level of significance. However, a significant construction impact was identified in the FEIR for future development for the largest building type, a 590-foot-tall building with 984 dwelling units. Accordingly, the FEIR determined that development projects resulting from adopted housing element policies that exceed 240 feet and

propose more than 495 dwelling units have the potential to contribute considerably to regional criteria pollutants during construction. However, the FEIR identified Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3, Clean Construction Equipment, to reduce the impact to less than significant. Similarly, the FEIR presented quantitative analysis of operational criteria air pollutant emissions from the seven representative building types. The FEIR concluded that operational criteria air pollutant impacts from future development under the adopted housing element would be below the level of significance for criterial air pollutants for all building types analyzed.

The FEIR evaluated health risks at two scales: a programmatic citywide evaluation that focused primarily on on-road vehicles and a project-level evaluation for construction and operation of the seven building types. The programmatic health risk assessment presented the estimated changes in cancer risk as well as concentrations of localized particulate matter 2.5 microns or less in diameter ($PM_{2.5}$) throughout the city due to on-road traffic anticipated with development under the adopted housing element. The programmatic health risk assessment in the FEIR estimates that the cancer risk and $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations from vehicles would decrease in some areas and increase in others. The maximum increase in cancer risk and $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations was found to be substantial in the FEIR, resulting in a significant and unavoidable air quality health risk impact, even though there would be health risk improvements in other areas of the city.

The project-level evaluation of health risks evaluated whether construction and operation of future development as a result of the legislation could expose sensitive receptors to substantial levels of $PM_{2.5}$ and toxic air contaminants and result in an excess cancer risk. The FEIR presented the range of health risk impacts that could occur from implementing the adopted housing element and concluded that health risks would be significant and unavoidable in some circumstances. The FEIR noted that future development would need to be evaluated on an individual basis at the time a specific project is proposed. Those site-specific studies may demonstrate less-than-significant impacts. Health risks would be reduced but not to a less-than-significant level by Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3: Clean Construction Equipment; Mitigation Measure M-TR-4a: Parking Maximums and Transportation Demand Management; and Mitigation Measure M-AQ-5: Best Available Control Technology for Diesel Engines. Odor impacts were found to be less than significant in the FEIR.

PROPOSED REZONING PROGRAM IMPACTS

The approach to evaluating the proposed rezoning program is described above under “Analysis of Potential Environmental Effects,” p. 32. The changes under the proposed rezoning program that would affect air quality are addressed below.

CONSISTENCY WITH THE BAY AREA AIR DISTRICT CLEAN AIR PLAN

For impacts pertaining to conflicts with the air district’s Clean Air Plan, the proposed rezoning program would result in impacts similar to those of the adopted housing element. Although there would be an incremental increase in overall units and slightly different growth distribution under the proposed rezoning program compared to the adopted housing element, the differences do not

appreciably change the consistency of future development in the city with respect to the Clean Air Plan. As noted in the FEIR, p. 4.6-42, new development in the city generally incorporates many control measures from the Clean Air Plan through planning code provisions and/or local and state policies. In addition, the policies from the adopted housing element that support the air district's goals to reduce transportation-related emissions would remain in place, even with the different growth distribution. Those policies encourage multi-family development in key transit areas (Policy 20), prioritization of neighborhoods that minimize the need for vehicular travel (Policy 32), and coordination between transit planning and housing development (Policy 33). Furthermore, p. 4.6-43 of the FEIR concludes that the adopted housing element would increase housing densities and thus be consistent with transportation control measures from the Clean Air Plan, such as TR3 (Local and Regional Bus Service), TR5 (Transit Efficiency and Use), and TR9 (Bicycle and Pedestrian Access and Facilities). That conclusion is also true of the proposed rezoning program because the associated densities would be similar overall to those of the adopted housing element. Another difference between the adopted housing element and the proposed rezoning program is that the proposed rezoning program would establish housing sustainability districts, whereas the adopted housing element identified potential areas for the districts for future consideration. The housing sustainability districts are areas located within 0.5 mile of public transit where at least 20 percent of all housing units would be designated as affordable; thus, the proposed rezoning program would be more consistent with the transportation and land use goals of the Clean Air Plan.

The proposed rezoning program would, like the adopted housing element, be consistent with the Clean Air Plan's applicable building energy– and solid waste–related measures because future development in the city would be subject to the energy efficiency and waste diversion requirements from the San Francisco Green Building Code, the all-electric new construction ordinance, and Policy 34 from the adopted housing element, which will facilitate the transition of existing homes in the city from natural gas appliances to electric ones. New development, whether built in accordance with the growth distribution of the adopted housing element or proposed rezoning program, would be subject to the requirements and thus consistent with the applicable energy and waste components of the Clean Air Plan.

For the public health aspects of the Clean Air Plan, the proposed rezoning program would be similar to the adopted housing element in that it would shift growth toward the western and northern areas of the city, which, in general, have fewer Air Pollution Exposure Zone (APEZ) areas. The growth distributions are different for the adopted housing element and the proposed rezoning; however, because the APEZ areas are more concentrated in the eastern areas of the city, both would generally encourage growth in areas with less overlap with APEZ areas.

The FEIR conclusion that adopted housing element policies would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the air district's 2017 Clean Air Plan is also applicable to the proposed rezoning program because both would support measures to achieve the goals of the Clean Air Plan. Subsequent development for both would generally promote high-density land use patterns and promote non-vehicular modes of transportation, which is a fundamental goal of the Clean Air Plan.

PLAN-LEVEL CRITERIA POLLUTANT INCREASE

The proposed rezoning program would not result in direct physical environmental impacts. Rather, future development proposals consistent with the adopted housing element, including the rezoning proposal, would have the potential to result in physical environmental impacts. Criteria air pollutant impacts are regional or cumulative in nature and addressed at the project-level only. To evaluate the programmatic effect of the adopted housing element's impacts on criteria pollutant increases at the plan level, the FEIR uses the air district's recommended approach for comparing growth in VMT and growth in the service population in the city. The proposed rezoning program would result in approximately 4,000 more housing units than the adopted housing element; however, as previously stated, the housing projected housing growth is likely overestimated due to uncertainties associated with housing production over the long term, and therefore the environmental analysis is a conservative analysis. Given the slight increase in growth, it would result in more gross VMT and more growth in the service population than the adopted housing element. But, given that both the service population and VMT would increase, the overall ratio of VMT growth with respect to the growth of service population in the city may not be affected. While VMT growth could still outpace service population growth, similar to the adopted housing element, the proposed rezoning would similarly result in a significant and unavoidable with mitigation impact. Overall, the proposed rezoning program would result in reduced densities in some areas balanced by increases in other areas, and the overall magnitude of density between the adopted housing element and rezoning would be similar.

As noted in Transportation and Circulation, future residential development consistent with the proposed rezoning program would be more concentrated in the planning districts that have a denser land use pattern (e.g., Downtown, Marina, Mission, Northeast, and Western Addition planning districts) and would not shift as much future residential development to the west side of the city (e.g., Inner Sunset, Outer Sunset, and Richmond planning districts), as under the adopted housing element where the land use pattern is less dense. Therefore, under the proposed rezoning program, more trips would occur by walking or taking taxis/TNC vehicles and fewer trips would occur in private automobiles than under the adopted housing element. However, the overall number of vehicle trips under the proposed rezoning program is likely to be slightly increased to that of the adopted housing element (i.e., fewer trips by private automobiles but more trips by taxis/TNC vehicles). Because the number of vehicle trips would be similar, it is likely that both would result in a similar rate of VMT per service population. In other words, it is unlikely that the proposed rezoning program would result in a greater imbalance between VMT growth and service population growth than the adopted housing element, considering its focus on the planning districts with a denser land use pattern. Furthermore, as noted on FEIR p. 4.6-46, adding growth to San Francisco per the adopted housing element would increase VMT more than the service population; however, the gap between VMT and service population would be even greater if the same amount of growth were added to a suburban area or other areas with higher per capita VMT values. This is also true of the proposed rezoning program in that, despite a significant impact with respect to VMT growth, the impact would be even greater if growth were to occur elsewhere in the

region. The impact of VMT growth, and thus net increases in criteria pollutants at the plan level, would be significant for the proposed rezoning program, which is the same conclusion reached in the FEIR regarding the adopted housing element.

For localized carbon monoxide concentrations, the impact of the proposed rezoning program would be less than significant, the same as the adopted housing element, because peak-hour intersection volumes would not exceed 44,000 vehicles per hour at any intersection. As noted in the FEIR on p. 4.6-47, the maximum intersection volume in 2050 would be 12,900 vehicles per hour. The proposed rezoning program would not appreciably increase that volume, despite the increase in units and differences in growth distribution.

Mitigation measure M-TR-4a, Parking Maximums and Transportation Demand Management, from the FEIR would also apply to this impact, and this measure would be partially implemented in that a reduction in parking maximums in a number of areas citywide would be codified as part of the proposed rezoning program. The codification of parking maximums would reduce VMT associated with new development and reduce the severity of the VMT growth impact. As noted in the FEIR, the department has not identified a more precise method to determine the correlation between what amount of reduction in VMT would result from a specific parking reduction or vice versa; it is not feasible to quantify the reduced VMT that would result from this mitigation measure. The impact would be significant and unavoidable with mitigation.

CRITERIA POLLUTANT INCREASE FROM FUTURE DEVELOPMENT

As noted above, the proposed rezoning program would not result in direct physical environmental impacts; however, future development proposals consistent with the rezoning program would have the potential to result in physical environmental impacts. The proposed rezoning program proposes higher building heights that would be allowed for future development than the adopted housing element. In the FEIR, construction and operational emissions for seven representative building types (providing a range in development intensity and density) were quantified to evaluate the significance of impacts associated with future development with respect to criteria pollutant increases. The proposed rezoning program and subsequent development is expected to result in the same significant criteria air pollutant impacts from construction but not substantially more severe impacts than those disclosed in the EIR. For both the adopted housing element and proposed rezoning program, the type of development would be of a similar character and size, representing the building types evaluated in the FEIR. Although the proposed rezoning program would allow for taller buildings than the tallest representative building type analyzed in the FEIR (i.e., a 590-foot-tall residential mixed-use building with 984 housing units), buildings constructed under both programs would not exceed the maximum floor space or number of units for the tallest representative building type. The square footage numbers associated with the representative building types are included in Table 2 of Appendix I.3 of the FEIR. As shown therein, the 590-foot-tall representative building included 935,745 square feet of residential area, 60,700 square feet of retail area, and 102,000 square feet of structured parking area. Although the proposed rezoning

program would allow for future development generally up to 500 feet, except in two areas where heights would be up to 650 feet, future buildings' square footage would be comparable to the 590-foot-tall representative building evaluated in the FEIR. For example, the 10 South Van Ness project, which included a 55-story tower and, as a project alternative, two 41-story towers, was located on a relatively small parcel.[57] Emissions for the 10 South Van Ness Avenue project or variant (55-story tower or 41-story towers) were considered to be approximately the same, which is notable, because it demonstrates that a project's emissions are primarily governed by its square footage and not height, assuming that the magnitude of excavation is the same. Consequently, construction emissions associated with the 590-foot-tall building, as presented in the FEIR, are representative of the maximum emissions that would occur from future development under both the adopted housing element and the proposed rezoning program.

Criteria pollutant emissions modeled with the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod), which was used to quantify emissions in the FEIR, are dependent on multiple factors; however, many of the model's key emissions assumptions are tied to square footage.[58] For this reason, the analysis of representative buildings in the FEIR is applicable to future development that would be constructed under the proposed rezoning program. FEIR p. 4.6-51 notes that criteria pollutant emissions during future building construction would exceed the air district's thresholds for oxides of nitrogen (NO_X) by 31 pounds per day for the 590-foot building.[59] That result would also apply to the proposed rezoning program, resulting in a significant impact. Mitigation measure M-AQ-3 from the FEIR would also apply to the proposed rezoning program and reduce exhaust-related emissions during construction of future development. The measure would require Tier 4 Final off-road construction equipment and other strategies to reduce exhaust emissions; with the measure, emissions from the 590-foot building would be below the air district's thresholds, resulting in a less-than-significant impact. Similarly, impacts from fugitive dust would be less than significant, like the adopted housing element, because most future development would need to comply with the Construction Dust Control Ordinance, which requires construction projects on larger sites to prepare a dust control plan for approval by the Department of Public Health. No new mitigation would be required.

For the reasons noted regarding construction-related criteria pollutant emissions, operational emissions from future development under the proposed rezoning program would be within the analysis conducted for the FEIR. The same general type of development would be constructed for both the adopted housing element and the proposed rezoning program. The maximum operational emissions are represented by the 590-foot-tall building analyzed in the FEIR, even though, in rare circumstances, some buildings could exceed 590-feet under the proposed rezoning program. FEIR

---

[57] City and County of San Francisco. 2018. 10 South Van Ness Avenue Mixed-Use Project. *https://sfmea.sfplanning.org/2018-10-17_DEIR_10SVN_reduced.pdf*. Accessed August 11, 2025.

[58] Building height is not a variable that can be inputted in CalEEMod for residential and/or commercial buildings. Building sizes in CalEEMod are defined by other variables, such as square footage, number of units, and surface area.

[59] As noted in the FEIR, this result does not imply that all development of buildings of this size under the proposed rezoning program would cause an exceedance of the threshold. Future projects would be required to conduct a project-level criteria pollutant assessment to determine whether thresholds would actually be exceeded.

pp. 4.6-55 and 4.6-56 discuss the types of sources that would generate emissions during operation of future development (e.g., on-road mobile sources, architectural coatings and consumer products, and stationary sources). The conclusion in the FEIR is that total operational emissions for future development would be below the air district's thresholds of significance for all pollutants. That conclusion also applies to the proposed rezoning program. Operational emissions would not exceed any thresholds for any representative building type that would be constructed under the proposed rezoning program, and the impact would be less than significant.

SENSITIVE RECEPTOR POLLUTANT EXPOSURE

The programmatic citywide evaluation of $PM_{2.5}$ and health risks from on-road vehicle traffic conducted for the FEIR was specific to the conditions expected to occur under the adopted housing element. It found that $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations and health risks would increase relative to the baseline in some locations and decrease in other locations. Although the FEIR results are specific to the growth distribution anticipated in the FEIR, similar results can be expected for the proposed rezoning program as both the health risk modeling and the citywide growth modeling were conservative and may overestimate growth and resulting impacts. Furthermore, the proposed rezoning program would result in a net increase of 4,000 units relative to the adopted housing element, but the increase would be distributed across the city and incremental in most neighborhoods. Because sensitive receptor exposure to $PM_{2.5}$ and toxic air contaminants is a localized concern and the net increase in growth and thus vehicle traffic in most neighborhoods would be relatively minor, the FEIR results are anticipated to be reasonably representative of the effects from the proposed rezoning program. Conservatively, the slight increase in growth in neighborhoods may result in a similarly slight increase in localized $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations and cancer risk, but the overall conclusion would remain the same.

Additionally, as noted previously, since adoption of the FEIR the city published updated maps defining the APEZ areas in 2025. Updates to the APEZ areas are undertaken routinely, and the update for 2025 slightly expands the APEZ coverage in the city. The same general areas of the city remain affected by the APEZ between the 2020 and 2025 maps; however, the 2025 update has identified some new APEZ areas in the Sunset District and in the Lakeshore area. **Figure 4** shows the changes in APEZ areas between 2020 and 2025.

As noted above, the proposed rezoning program would result in an incremental increase in overall units and a slightly different growth distribution, where more housing growth would occur in the Downtown, Marina, Mission, Northeast, and Western Addition planning districts compared to the rezoning analysis assumptions in the FEIR, which projected that growth would be heavily concentrated in the Inner Sunset, Outer Sunset, and Richmond planning districts. Thus, the distribution of $PM_{2.5}$ and the cancer risk would be similarly different from both the baseline and the FEIR analysis; however, there would very likely be air quality benefits in some locations, along with concentration and risk increases in other locations, like the adopted housing element. Although the distribution of $PM_{2.5}$ and the cancer risks would be slightly different, the magnitude of the results is



Graphics ... Gy_SF_Planning Rezoning 104844 (8-14-25) tg

Family Zoning Plan - Housing Element Rezoning Program
Case Nos. 2019-016230ENV, 2021-005878CWP, and 2021-005878GPA

Figure 4
2025 Air Pollution Exposure Zone Areas Compared to the 2020 Air Pollution Exposure Zone Areas

expected to be reasonably similar, because the net increase would be distributed across the city. Additionally, because the APEZ areas have expanded since 2020, the proposed rezoning program may result in a small proportion of additional rezoned parcels being in the APEZ, which could increase the number of people exposed to the generally high pollutant concentrations in the APEZ. Although the specific results and locations of a $PM_{2.5}$ and cancer risk analysis cannot be determined at this time, the proposed rezoning program would not substantially worsen a significant impact from the FEIR. It would result in more net housing units than the adopted housing element, but the increase would be distributed across the city, decreasing the likelihood that $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations or cancer risks would meaningfully exceed the maximum values modeled in the FEIR. The additional parcels that may be added in the expanded APEZ areas (see **Figure 4**, p. 96) would also not constitute a substantially worse impact, because the APEZ expansion is the result of changes to background (i.e. non-project-related) sources of emissions. Similarly, although the proposed rezoning program would result in a net increase in housing units in some areas that are more affected by the 2020 APEZ area[60] (i.e. Northeast planning area), relative to the adopted housing element, this change does not constitute a substantially worse impact.

The maximum increases in $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations and cancer risks would not be meaningfully different than those found in the FEIR analysis, and the results would most likely still be above the air district's thresholds and thus significant and unavoidable with mitigation.

For future development, health risks and $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations were modeled for the same representative building types discussed previously. As already noted, the representative buildings analyzed in the FEIR are also representative of those under the proposed rezoning program, even if, in rare cases, buildings taller than 590 feet may be constructed in limited locations. The FEIR determined that construction of future development in combination with the use of emergency generators during project operation would result in both significant $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations and cancer risks in some circumstances. The FEIR cites an example of a 240-foot-tall building with a significant $PM_{2.5}$ and cancer risk impact at receptors located 98 feet from a future development project site. That scenario, a receptor 98 feet from a project site and the $PM_{2.5}$ concentration and cancer risk results being above the air district thresholds, would also apply to the proposed rezoning program. Many additional combinations of building types and receptor distances could also result in significant impacts. The full results from the representative building type analysis for $PM_{2.5}$ and health risks are included in Appendix I.3 of the FEIR and is applicable to the proposed rezoning program as well. To mitigate the significant impact, the FEIR analysis considered Mitigation Measures M-AQ-3, Clean Off-Road Construction Equipment; M-TR-4a, Parking Maximums and Transportation Demand Management; and M-AQ-5, Best Available Control Technology for Diesel Engines. These measures would also apply to the proposed rezoning program. However, even with the measures, the FEIR analysis demonstrated that significant $PM_{2.5}$ and cancer risk impacts would still occur for the representative building types. This impact would be significant and unavoidable with mitigation for the proposed rezoning program.

[60] Although the APEZ was expanded in 2025, the proposed rezoning program may result in a net increase in housing units in the 2020 APEZ area, which is also included within the 2025 APEZ area.

ODOR EMISSIONS

The proposed rezoning program would, like the adopted housing element, result in exhaust-related odors and reactive organic gas (ROG) emissions from the application of architectural coatings as future development is constructed. The distribution of growth and the locations where construction-related odors would be emitted would be different for the proposed rezoning program because it proposes development in some areas that are different from those of the adopted housing element. However, the type and magnitude of the construction-related odors would not vary substantially between the adopted housing element and the proposed rezoning program because the same general type of development would be constructed under both (i.e., residential and commercial buildings). As noted in the FEIR, odors from diesel fumes, asphalt paving, and architectural coatings would be temporary and would disperse rapidly with distance from the source. The proposed rezoning program would not result in the frequent exposure of sensitive receptors to objectionable odor emissions.

With respect to operational odors, both the adopted housing element and proposed rezoning program would result in future development (e.g., residential and commercial/retail uses) that is not typically a generator of substantial odor emissions. Thus, the proposed rezoning program would not involve siting a new facility that would generate substantial odors. Like the adopted housing element, the proposed rezoning program would have a less-than-significant impact with respect to generating objectionable odors that would affect substantial numbers of people.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The FEIR determined that the adopted housing element would result in significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts regarding $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations and health risks because emissions from future development could combine with emissions from other projects to result in even greater impacts than the impacts resulting from the adopted housing element alone. As concluded in the FEIR, the cumulative effect of toxic air contaminants and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions would result in concentrations and cancer risks that would exceed the air district thresholds. It also found that there is an existing cumulative health risk impact in the city, and the adopted housing element's contribution to that impact would be cumulatively considerable. Cumulative impacts related to odors were found to not be significant, however.

As discussed for the project-level effects, the contribution of $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations and toxic air contaminants resulting from the proposed rezoning program would be similar to that of the adopted housing element. Thus, the contribution to the existing cumulative health risk impact would remain cumulatively considerable.

CONCLUSION

In summary, the proposed rezoning program would not result in new significant air quality impacts that were not previously identified in the FEIR, nor would it result in more severe impacts than those previously identified. No new mitigation measures or changes to existing mitigation measures are required.

Wind

FEIR FINDINGS

The potential wind impacts of the adopted housing element are analyzed in Section 4.7, Wind, of the FEIR. The FEIR identified eight key areas for the analysis of impacts from wind (i.e., Key Areas 1 through 8). The areas were selected to show a range of potential wind conditions throughout the city, representing locations where the greatest amount of future development consistent with the adopted housing element would likely occur in comparison to the 2050 environmental baseline. As determined in the FEIR, based on future representative conditions, wind hazard exceedances would likely not occur in Key Areas 1, 4, 5, 7, and 8 under the 2050 baseline or with development consistent with the adopted housing element. However, wind hazard exceedances would be expected in Key Areas 2, 3, and 6.

As detailed in the FEIR, wind hazard exceedances are predicted under both the 2050 environmental baseline and the adopted housing element in Key Area 2. However, in Key Areas 3 and 6, a wind hazard exceedance would not likely occur under the 2050 environmental baseline but would likely occur under the adopted housing element. Therefore, in Key Areas 2, 3, and 6, development consistent with the adopted housing element that exceeds 85 feet in height would likely create wind hazards in publicly accessible areas with substantial pedestrian use, resulting in a significant impact.[61]

Implementation of Mitigation Measures M-WI-1a, Wind Minimization, and M-WI-1b, Maintenance Plan for Landscaping on or off the Project Site and Wind Baffling Measures in the Public Right-of-Way, would be effective in reducing or avoiding the potential for a wind hazard exceedance. However, there are uncertainties regarding the ability of project sponsors to obtain approvals for wind baffling measures that would require modifications off-site, including in public rights-of-way or additions to buildings that project out over the public-right-of way. Therefore, Mitigation Measures M-WI-1a and M-WI-1b may not reduce wind impacts to a less-than-significant level for every project. As such, the FEIR determined that the adopted housing element would result in a significant and unavoidable wind impacts, even with mitigation.

PROPOSED REZONING PROGRAM IMPACTS

The approach to evaluating the proposed rezoning program is described above under “Analysis of Potential Environmental Effects,” p. 32. The changes under the proposed rezoning program that would affect wind are addressed below.

[61] As detailed on p. 4.7-8 of the FEIR, the department, in consultation with qualified technical specialists who evaluate wind impacts, determined that buildings measuring less than 85 feet in height would not have the potential to create wind hazard impacts in San Francisco; thus, the department would not require a quantitative wind hazards impact analysis for buildings that are 85 feet or less in height.

The analysis provided in this section is based on the "Pedestrian-Level Wind Assessment, San Francisco Housing Element April 2025 Updates" prepared by RWDI in support of the proposed rezoning program; it is included in Appendix C of this addendum.[62] The key areas evaluated in the FEIR are representative of conditions in the city where buildings over 85 feet could result in accelerated ground-level wind speeds under the adopted housing element. Under the proposed rezoning program, buildings over 85 feet in height could be built in more areas of the city, and three new representative key areas (Key Areas 9, 10, and 11) were identified by the department for the evaluation of wind impacts to allow a representative data set that would cover multiple combinations of all relevant parameters (e.g., topography, wind directionality, change in building heights, spacing between buildings, etc.) that would affect wind impacts, as listed below and in Appendix C:[63]

- Key Area 9: Van Ness Avenue between Lombard Street and McAllister Street
- Key Area 10: Market Street between Castro Street and Van Ness Avenue
- Key Area 11: Geary Boulevard between Second Street and Divisadero Street

It is anticipated that these key areas could experience height increases resulting in buildings between 50 to 500 feet, with two limited areas up to 650 feet, under the proposed rezoning program.[64] The three new key areas expand the representative areas analyzed in the FEIR.

This impact analysis is consistent with the FEIR methodology, which identifies a significant impact as any net new exceedance(s) of the 26-mile-per-hour equivalent wind speed wind hazard criterion for a single hour in a year.

KEY AREA 9

The FEIR evaluated a section of Van Ness Avenue between Jackson Street and Sutter Street in Key Area 3. The FEIR determined that future development consistent with the adopted housing element would be substantially taller than the surrounding buildings under the 2050 environmental baseline due to the general low height of development west of Area 3 and the open expanse of Lafayette Park, which would increase the exposure of the proposed tall buildings to predominant winds. Under the proposed rezoning program, the allowable building heights within Key Area 3 would increase to approximately 35 stories, or 350 feet, and extend over a longer stretch of Van Ness Avenue (i.e., Key Area 9) and into an area where existing building heights are low and height changes were not specifically proposed under the adopted housing element. Like Key Area 3, the increase in building heights and redistribution of growth allowed under the proposed rezoning program could result in increased ground-level wind speeds in Key Area 9 - along Van Ness Avenue and at cross streets near

---

62 RWDI, Pedestrian-Level Wind Assessment, San Francisco Housing Element, June 2025 Update, August 14, 2025.

63 The FEIR evaluated Key Areas 1 through 8; thus, the new key areas evaluated in this addendum are Key Areas 9 through 11.

64 Under the proposed rezoning program, buildings with heights generally up to 500 feet, except up to 650 feet, would be allowed in very limited areas within the city (i.e., near the intersections of Van Ness Avenue and Geary Boulevard and Van Ness Avenue and Market Street).

tall buildings. Downwashing, corner acceleration and channeling flows are expected around the base of tall buildings that are downwind (or east of) the much lower existing developments. Similar to impacts in Key Area 3, the resulting wind activity would likely result in exceedances of the hazard criterion along all areas with a proposed height increase of up to 35 stories. However, this would not constitute a substantial increase in the severity of the wind impact identified in the FEIR because the wind impacts in this key area are similar to those in the other areas studied in the FEIR's representative analysis (i.e., it is neither a new impact nor a more severe impact) and because Mitigation Measures M-WI-1a and M-WI-1b would continue to apply to all buildings over 85 in height and subject to CEQA, throughout the city if analysis demonstrates a significant wind impact.

KEY AREA 10

The FEIR determined that future development consistent with the adopted housing element would have an allowable height of approximately 85 feet or less along Market Street between Castro Street and Van Ness Avenue, allowing winds to blow over the area without much disruption and negligible building-induced impacts. Under the proposed rezoning program, allowable heights in Key Area 10 would increase to approximately 16 stories, or 160 feet, at street intersections and 14 stories, or 140 feet, in other places along this segment of Market Street. In addition, the proposed rezoning program would extend the higher height limits to a longer stretch of Market Street and into an area where existing heights are currently approximately 85 feet. In adjacent blocks that do not front Market Street directly, the allowable height under the proposed rezoning program would be approximately 50 feet, an increase of 10 feet from 40 feet or no change in height as 50 feet under existing conditions. Downwashing, corner acceleration, and channeling flows would be expected around the base of the tall buildings in Key Area 10. The low building heights on the adjacent blocks coupled with the increased building heights on Market Street within this area would result in wind activity that would be expected to exceed the hazard criterion on Market Street and at cross streets, with greater wind speeds anticipated at the intersections of Market Street at Church Street and at Gough Street, where the allowed heights are approximately 240 to 250 feet, or approximately 100 feet taller than the approximately 140-foot heights allowed in the adjacent blocks. However, this would not constitute a substantial increase in the severity of the wind impact identified in the FEIR because wind impacts in this key area are similar to those in the other areas studied in the FEIR's representative analysis (i.e., it is neither a new impact nor a more severe impact) and because Mitigation Measures M-WI-1a and M-WI-1b would continue to apply to all buildings over 85 in height, throughout the city, if subject to CEQA and if analysis demonstrates a significant wind impact.

KEY AREA 11

The FEIR determined that future development consistent with the adopted housing element would include building heights of up to approximately 85 feet along most of Geary Boulevard, with taller heights up to approximately 240 feet to 300 feet around the intersection at Masonic Avenue. Under the proposed rezoning program, the allowable building heights in the west half of Key Area 11 would decrease to approximately 80 feet in certain blocks and increase to 140 feet in others where

the previously allowed height under the adopted housing element was approximately 85 feet. In the east half of Key Area 11, allowable building heights under the proposed rezoning program would range from approximately 140 to 490 feet compared to the approximately 85 to 300 feet allowed under the adopted housing element. Downwashing, corner acceleration, and channeling flows would be expected around the base of tall buildings on Geary Boulevard. The height difference between the rezoned blocks and the surrounding blocks with low heights would result in wind speeds that would likely exceed the hazard criterion. However, this would not constitute a substantial increase in the severity of the wind impact identified in the FEIR because wind impacts in this key area are similar to those in the other areas studied in the FEIR's representative analysis (i.e., it is neither a new impact nor a more severe impact) and because Mitigation Measures M-WI-1a and M-WI-1b would continue to apply to all buildings over 85 in height throughout the city, if subject to CEQA and if analysis demonstrates a significant wind impact.

As stated above, this analysis assumes a worst-case future scenario under the proposed rezoning program. In Key Area 9, buildings on some blocks along Van Ness Avenue could be built to the maximum height with buildings to the west being less than half of the maximum height. If more tall buildings are constructed on the blocks to the west of those along Van Ness Avenue, Key Area 9 would be more protected from prevailing winds and fewer wind hazard exceedances may occur. In Key Areas 10 and 11 substantial building height differences would result in a larger area of exposure of tall buildings to prevailing winds which could lead to wind hazard exceedances under the proposed rezoning program, particularly around blocks with allowed building heights of approximately 240 to 250 feet in Key Area 10 and 240 to 290 feet in Key Area 11.

Analysis of the additional key areas discloses that there would be wind hazard exceedances due to the higher heights proposed in limited areas of the city added by the proposed rezoning program. Like the adopted housing element, this analysis is programmatic and represents a worst-case future scenario of potential ground-level wind impacts and is significant and unavoidable with mitigation. Mitigation Measures M-WI-1a and M-WI-1b would continue to apply to all buildings over 85 in height and subject to CEQA as determined applicable, throughout the city.

PROPOSED SECTION 148 AMENDMENT AND CHANGE FROM ONE-HOUR TO NINE-HOUR HAZARD STANDARD

The proposed rezoning program includes an amendment to planning code section 148 to consolidate existing wind controls into one section of the code and to modify the one-hour hazard standard to a nine-hour standard. This change was not addressed in the FEIR but would implement Housing Element Implementation Actions 8.4.12 and 8.5.6. Below is the environmental analysis for this change.

Existing Wind Analysis Requirements. Wind impact analysis compares existing ground-level wind conditions with anticipated conditions resulting from a development project. Natural land features and building characteristics—such as height, massing, and orientation to the prevailing winds — are factors affecting how a new development changes ground-level wind speed and direction in its vicinity.

In San Francisco, proposed projects over 85 feet in height require a wind impact analysis under two conditions:

1. The site is within a zoning district with wind controls per the San Francisco Planning Code and/or;
2. The project is subject to environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

Planning code section 148, Reduction of Ground-Level Wind Currents in Downtown Commercial (C-3) Districts, requires buildings in C-3 zoning districts to be shaped so as not to cause ground-level wind currents to exceed defined pedestrian comfort and hazard criteria. The pedestrian comfort and hazard criteria for certain zoning districts elsewhere in the city (e.g., the Downtown Residential Districts, the Folsom and Main Residential/Commercial Special Use District, and the Van Ness Special Use District) are the same as those established for the C-3 zoning districts by section 148 (see sections 243, 249.1, and 825). There are also wind controls for the Central SoMa Special Use District (see section 249.79 (d)(9). The wind controls for Central SoMa include both comfort and hazard criteria, but are slightly more permissive than in C-3 and other zoning districts, as described further, below.

The pedestrian comfort criteria are based on pedestrian-level wind speeds averaged over one minute, the same averaging time as used for the National Weather Service's wind data. The comfort criteria consist of 11 mph for areas of substantial pedestrian use and 7 mph in public seating areas and reflect the winds speeds above which the spaces would be uncomfortable for the intended uses. The hazard criterion is 26 miles per hour (mph) "equivalent wind speed" which is defined in the planning code as "an hourly mean wind speed adjusted to incorporate the effects of gustiness or turbulence on pedestrians" for one hour in a year. The wind hazard criterion of 26 mph is based on wind speeds averaged over one hour. This is equivalent to a one-minute average of 36 mph, as such locations with gusts of 36 mph (or greater) are considered to be wind hazards exceedances.[65]

Projects may receive exceptions from the planning code by the Zoning Administrator, the department or planning commission for comfort exceedances. However, a building subject to planning code wind controls that results in a net new hazard exceedance compared with existing conditions would have a significant wind impact under CEQA, if applicable, and could not be approved, unless the project sponsor amends the project to reduce or eliminate the wind hazard.

To comply with the Code requirements for comfort criteria, a project must go through a wind tunnel test - a quantitative assessment - because comfort criteria cannot be assessed qualitatively. Proposed development within the zoning districts with wind controls must address a wind hazard exceedance through modification of the building design (height, massing, and orientation), with the incorporation of wind baffling measures such as canopies, or the addition of wind-reducing features such as landscaping or wind screens at the ground level.

[65] A.D. Penwarden. Build Sci. Acceptable Wind Speeds in Towns, Vol. 8, pp. 259-267. Pergamon Press 1973.

For the purpose of CEQA, the department conducts wind impact analysis for proposed buildings over 85 feet in height citywide and only with respect to the hazard criterion set forth in Section 148 (i.e., 26 miles per hour for one hour in a year). Proposed buildings must not result in any net new hazard exceedance(s) compared with existing conditions. Unlike for Code compliance, wind impact analysis for CEQA compliance may be qualitative or quantitative. In some instances, there is enough information for a wind consultant to determine that hazardous winds would not result from a proposed development because of factors such as the orientation of the building to prevailing winds, location, topography, and the characterization (primarily height and massing) of existing development surrounding a project site. When a qualitative analysis demonstrating no hazardous winds is adequate, wind tunnel testing is not required for CEQA purposes.

Environmental Impacts. In San Francisco, wind impact analysis for CEQA assesses whether a project would have a significant effect by creating wind hazards in publicly accessible areas of substantial pedestrian use. Exceedances of the comfort criteria are not an impact under CEQA. Therefore, removal of the comfort criteria would not result in a significant environmental impact related to wind hazards or safety and no further analysis of this change is required. The discussion below focuses on the change from the one-hour standard to the nine-hour standard for generation of hazardous wind.

Proposed Wind Analysis Requirements - Amendments to Planning Code Section 148. Subsequent to certification of the FEIR, the department determined that the one-hour hazard criterion is too conservative for purposes of CEQA, as well as for wind analysis for purpose of planning code regulation and should be changed, as currently proposed. The proposed change and the reasons for this change, both from a technical and policy perspective, are described below.

The proposed rezoning program includes amendments to the existing planning code wind controls. The modified wind controls would continue to apply in areas that are currently subject to such controls, but they would be consolidated into an amended Section 148, while sections 243, 249.1, 249.78(d)(9), and 825 would be repealed. In areas where planning code wind controls exist, the comfort criteria would be eliminated – that is, project sponsors would not be required to measure wind comfort conditions that could result from their project and would not be subject to seeking exceptions for any exceedances. In some cases, such as when qualitative analysis can demonstrate there would be no hazardous winds, elimination of comfort criteria would remove the requirement for a wind tunnel test. In addition, the hazard criterion would be modified such that proposed development must not create any net new exceedance of 26 mph equivalent wind speed for nine hours or more in a year, rather than one hour, compared with existing conditions. Similar to current practice, no exceptions would be granted for net new exceedance(s) of the nine-hour hazard standard compared with the existing conditions.

The City proposes to change the hazard criterion from a one-hour standard to a nine-hour standard for the following policy reasons. The San Francisco wind requirements were developed as part of the Downtown Area Plan between 1983 and 1985 to standardize the procedures for determining

which buildings required wind analysis, how the analysis should be conducted, and what criteria should be used to determine if a project met the City's requirements. The department set a limit of one hour of hazardous wind annually during the Downtown Plan process (1985). However, the one-hour standard is very conservative, requiring proposed projects to demonstrate that windspeeds of 26 mph or more may not be exceeded for one hour in a year. To determine if a project complies with the hazard criterion, a project sponsor must hire a wind consultant to conduct extensive, time-consuming, and expensive studies and possible redesigns of their projects. The City has since determined that these studies and redesigns serve as an overly conservative constraint to housing development. Most jurisdictions with wind controls use a more reasonable standard of up to nine hours in a year.[66]

In August 2016, the department hosted a Wind Analysis Roundtable Discussion (2016 roundtable) attended by academic and industry experts. The roundtable was convened because the department had identified inconsistencies in wind tunnel testing and wished to solicit feedback from an expert panel on how to address the inconsistencies. The long-term goal was to standardize wind tunnel testing and eliminate/minimize inconsistencies. The roundtable resulted in suggestions for refinement to wind analysis standards that should be considered as part of an update to the planning code section 148 as well as the protocols for conducting wind studies in San Francisco.

The 2016 roundtable recommended that the City: 1) improve the weather data used as an input for wind tunnel tests; 2) expand the number of wind directions analyzed from four directions to 16 or 32 directions;[67] 3) allow landscape features to be included in wind tunnel tests; and 4) modify the one-hour standard to allow up to 10 hours in a year.

The City addressed recommendations 1 and 2 through services of a consultant that updated the climatology data that has been used for wind tunnel test since 2023.[5] This data allows testing for 36 wind directions, resulting in more accurate results. The City also has included landscaping in wind tunnel testing, consistent with recommendation 3.

To date, the City has implemented recommendations 1, 2, and 3, which were changes that could be made administratively. Recommendation 4, however, requires an amendment to the planning code, and until now it was not deemed a priority for the department to make this change. However, in response to the October 2023 California Department of Housing and Community Development's (HCD) Housing Policy and Practice Review (PPR) Required Action 2.2 and the City's Housing Element Implementation actions 8.4.12 and 8.5.6, the department conducted a thorough review of the department's wind impact analysis requirements for both planning code wind controls and for environmental review. This was the first comprehensive review that had been conducted since the development of wind controls for the Central SoMa Plan in planning code section 249(d)(9).

---

[66] RWDI, Pedestrian-Level Wind Assessment, San Francisco Housing Element, June 2025 Update, August 14, 2025.

[67] The 2016 roundtable experts indicated that four directions were adequate for assessing wind comfort, but that 16 or 32 directions were needed to assess hazardous winds (2016 Roundtable Meeting minutes).

For the response to the HCD PRR, the department concluded that wind is an appropriate topic for environmental review given the wind conditions in San Francisco. However, the department recognized that the procedures in place to conduct wind analysis should be improved. The 2016 roundtable had recommended the change to a nine-hour standard. In addition, the environmental review for the Central SoMa Plan, an area plan of the General Plan adopted in 2019, acknowledged that the nine-hour standard was more reasonable and more broadly accepted as an industry standard.[68] The Central SoMa Special Use District wind controls allow exceptions to the one-hour hazard standard provided that the nine-hour standard is met.[69]

The department now proposes to implement the change from the one-hour standard to the nine-hour standard, a modified version of recommendation 4 from the 2016 roundtable. The threshold of 26 mph is a commonly used wind safety guideline derived from the wind condition that would generate a three-second gust of wind at 20 meters per second. The 2016 roundtable did not recommend changing this threshold.

From a policy perspective, changing the requirement to find a significant hazardous wind impact from net new location(s) of one-hour of winds exceeding 26 mph to a nine-hour standard would remove a constraint for housing development by easing the ability of housing projects to comply more quickly and with less cost.

The City would still require screening-level analysis for projects greater than 85 feet in height for CEQA and planning code review purposes, as applicable. If the screening analysis indicates the potential for hazardous winds (speeds greater than 26 mph), the City would require a wind tunnel test. There would be no significant wind impact identified if the wind tunnel demonstrated no net new locations with hours of exceedance of 9 hours or more. Net new exceedances of the 26 mph equivalent wind speeds for nine or more hours in a year would indicate a potential impact and require application of wind-reducing features as mitigation measures and/or modification of project features.

As a result of the changed wind hazard criterion from one to nine hours, under the proposed rezoning some tall buildings (greater than 85 feet in height) for projects subject to CEQA and/or the proposed wind controls *could* be permitted and no significant impact would identified; there would be no implementation of mitigation measures or project redesign. This may lead to accelerated ground-level winds at or above 26 mph equivalent wind speeds for one to eight hours per year in a location, and incremental increases in wind gusts *may* be experienced by pedestrians in areas surrounding tall buildings for time limited to nine hours in a year at one location and is negligible. The nine-hour standard considers that the strongest wind gusts occur during storm events, and storm events on average last about three hours. Therefore, incidental gusts occurring during two storm events is tolerable; once there is a pattern of gusts during three storm events or more, wind-reducing features are

[68] RWDI, Pedestrian-Level Wind Assessment, San Francisco Housing Element, June 2025 Update, August 14, 2025.

[69] San Francisco Planning Code. Section 249.78. Central SoMa Special Use District. Added by ordinance 296-18. Effective 12/16/2019. *https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/san_francisco/latest/sf_planning/0-0-0-60331*. Accessed August 26, 2025.

warranted.[70] Also people generally avoid walking during storms, if possible, particularly people that are less able-bodied and more likely to be injured by wind gusts. Therefore, this leads to a very low likelihood of wind impacts to pedestrians. However, if hazardous wind levels rise above nine hours in any one location as a result of a development proposal, then wind-reducing features would be required.

Based on these facts, the department has determined that the proposed changes to the planning code wind controls and the CEQA impact threshold would not result in "new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects," under Public Resources Code Section 21166 and Guidelines Section 15162. Therefore, the FEIR adequately disclosed the significant-and-unavoidable-with-mitigation impact of the proposed rezoning program and no supplemental or subsequent EIR is required.

CONCLUSION

The FEIR identified eight key areas in the city where development under the adopted housing element could result in buildings over 85 feet in height; these key areas were selected to represent a variety of wind conditions throughout the city, based on geographic location; exposure to prevailing winds; and characteristics of the existing built environment. In five of these key areas, no wind hazard exceedances occur under 2050 baseline conditions, and none were projected with development under the adopted housing element. Wind hazard exceedances were expected in the other three key representative areas.

However, the FEIR conservatively concluded that all buildings over 85 feet tall have the potential to result in accelerated ground-level wind speeds and could lead to wind hazard exceedances. As such, FEIR Mitigation Measures M-WI-1a and M-WI-1b apply to all buildings over 85 feet, if subject to CEQA and a significant wind impact is identified, citywide.

Similarly, under the proposed rezoning program, construction of buildings over 85 feet in height could occur in more areas of the city, and three new representative key areas were identified. Key areas 9, 10, and 11 were selected because they represent areas with the greatest height increases under the proposed rezoning. When compared to existing height limits and the heights of existing buildings, tall buildings in these locations would be more exposed to prevailing winds because they would not be shielded by tall buildings on the windward side. As a result, these key areas tend to be representative of worst-case conditions in terms of wind hazard exceedances and confirm the finding that all buildings over 85 feet in height could result in accelerated ground-level wind speeds that could result in wind hazard exceedances. As such, mitigation measures M-WI-1a and M-WI-1b would continue to apply to all buildings over 85 in height and subject to CEQA, throughout the city.

Although wind hazard exceedances are expected within Key Areas 9, 10, and 11, the analysis of the additional key areas does not indicate that there would be new significant or more severe significant impacts related to wind. By expanding the number of representative key areas, the analysis confirms that the nature and severity of the wind impacts under the proposed rezoning

[70] Personal communication between department staff and RWDI, November 2024.

program would be similar to the wind impacts disclosed in the FEIR for the adopted housing element. That is, the proposed rezoning program would not result in worsened or more widespread wind impacts just because wind hazard exceedances are expected in more key areas. Rather, the analysis of the additional key areas, which were not evaluated in the FEIR, provides a more comprehensive representative analysis of potential wind impacts in the city.

As discussed above, this impact analysis is consistent with the FEIR methodology which identifies a significant impact as any net new exceedance(s) of the 26-mile-per-hour equivalent wind speed wind hazard criterion for a single hour in a year. In summary, although the proposed rezoning would allow buildings over 85 feet to be developed in additional areas which could lead to accelerated wind speeds at additional locations, the FEIR mitigation measures would apply to projects with significant wind impacts subject to CEQA. Nonetheless, as discussed herein and in the FEIR, application of the mitigation measures may not always eliminate all wind hazard exceedances. Therefore, wind impacts would continue to be significant and unavoidable, even with mitigation. In addition, FEIR Mitigation Measure M-WI-1a: Wind Minimization and Mitigation Measure M-WI-1b: Maintenance Plan for Landscaping on or off the Project Site and Wind Baffling Measures in the Public Right-of-Way have both been revised for clarity and to conform with updated the 9-hour standard for hazardous winds, as follows (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~ and inserted text is shown in double underline):

> ***Mitigation Measure M-WI-1a: Wind Minimization.***
> If the screening-level assessment conducted by the department, or an assessment submitted to the department by a qualified consultant for approval, determines wind tunnel testing is required due to the potential for one or more proposed buildings to create or exacerbate a wind hazard exceedance, such testing shall be conducted by a professionally qualified firm. The proposed buildings tested in the wind tunnel may incorporate wind baffling features or landscaping. Such features must be tested in the wind tunnel and discussed in a wind report in the order of preference discussed below, with the overall intent being to reduce ground-level wind speeds such that the project shall not cause a net new location where equivalent wind speeds ~~to~~ reach or exceed the 26-mph wind hazard criterion for ~~a single~~ nine hours of the year in areas of substantial use by people walking (e.g., sidewalks, plazas, building entries, etc.):
>
> ~~1. ***Building Massing.*** New buildings and additions to existing buildings shall be shaped to minimize ground-level wind speeds. Examples of these shapes include setbacks, stepped façades, and vertical steps in the massing to help disrupt wind flows.~~
>
> 1~~2~~. ***Wind Baffling Measures on the Building or on the Project Site***. Wind baffling measures shall be included on future buildings and/or on the project site to disrupt vertical wind flows along tower façades and through the project site. Examples of these may include setbacks, stepped façades, and vertical steps in the massing, staggered balcony arrangements on main tower façades, screens and canopies attached to the buildings, rounded building corners, covered walkways, colonnades, art, free-standing canopies, or wind screens. Only after incorporating all feasible features to reduce wind impacts via building massing and wind baffling, and documenting any such features deemed infeasible shall the following be considered:

2~~3~~. ***Landscaping on or off the Project Site and/or Wind Baffling Measures in the Public Right-of-Way.*** Landscaping and/or wind baffling measures shall be installed in the public right-of-way to slow winds along sidewalks and protect places where people walking are expected to gather or linger. ~~Landscaping and/or wind baffling measures shall be installed on the windward side (i.e., the direction from which the wind is blowing) of the areas of concern.~~ Examples of wind baffling measures may include street art to provide a sheltered area for people to walk and free-standing canopies and wind screens in areas where people walking are expected to gather or linger. Preferred landscaping includes groups of street trees of moderate maturity. If landscaping on or off the project site or wind baffling measures in the public right-of-way are required as one of the features to mitigate wind impacts, Mitigation Measure M-WI-1b shall also apply.

Mitigation Measure M-WI-1b: Maintenance Plan for Landscaping on or off the Project Site and Wind Baffling Measures in the Public Right-of-Way.
If it is determined infeasible to fully mitigate wind hazards via ~~massing and~~ wind baffling measures on the subject building pursuant to Mitigation Measure M-WI-1a1~~ and M-WI-1a2~~, the project sponsor shall prepare a maintenance plan for review and approval by the department to ensure maintenance of the features required pursuant to Mitigation Measure M-WI-~~1a3~~ 1a2 in perpetuity. The maintenance plan shall also be reviewed and approved by public works for landscaping or wind baffling measures in the public right-of-way.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The FEIR determined that the adopted housing element, in combination with cumulative projects, would not result in a significant cumulative wind impact. The new cumulative projects implemented subsequent to publication of the FEIR, the Great Highway Mobility Improvements Project and the Vision Zero Quick-Build program (see **Table 4**, p. 28), do not substantially alter the cumulative setting due to the location of the cumulative projects compared to the proposed rezoned area and the nature of the cumulative projects (i.e., the creation of new open space and recreation facilities via traffic and roadway modifications and pedestrian and bicycle safety improvements in the right-of-way). The Great Highway Mobility Improvements Project and the Vision Zero Quick-Build projects would not involve the development of buildings or structures that would be more than 85 feet in height; therefore, those projects would not alter the wind environment or create additional wind hazards in publicly accessible areas of substantial pedestrian use. Thus, the inclusion of the new cumulative projects would not alter the findings related to cumulative wind impacts in the FEIR. Because the proposed rezoning program would not generate new wind impacts that were not previously identified in the FEIR, and the new cumulative projects would not alter the FEIR's cumulative analysis, there would be no new significant cumulative wind impact.

CONCLUSION

In summary, the proposed rezoning program would not result in new significant wind impacts that were not previously identified in the FEIR, nor would it result in more severe impacts than those previously identified. In addition, the change in the hazard criterion from one-hour in a year to nine-hours in a year would not result in a new significant impact or a more severe impact than identified in the FEIR. No new mitigation measures are required.

Shadow

FEIR FINDINGS

The potential shadow impacts of the adopted housing element are analyzed in Section 4.8, Shadow, of the FEIR. The FEIR identified 30 representative open spaces throughout the city to show a range of potential shadow conditions throughout the city in representative locations as a result of future development consistent with the adopted housing element.Of the representative open spaces, 23 are under San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department jurisdiction (subject to planning code section 295) and seven are under the jurisdiction of other agencies.

For open space subject to planning code section 295, the FEIR analysis found that there would be no impact related to new shadow on the following seven open spaces: Margaret Hayward Playground, Civic Center Plaza, Mission Playground, Mission Dolores Park, Portrero Hill Recreation Center and Playground, Garfield Square, and Bay View KC Jones Playground. The FEIR also determined that there would less-than-significant impacts on the following 12 open spaces because the overall duration of shading with implementation of the adopted housing element would be similar to the duration under 2050 environmental baseline conditions: Lafayette Park, Helen Wills Park, Portsmouth Square, Union Square, South Park, Victoria Manolo Draves Park, Grattan Playground, Oceanview Park, Balboa Park, McCoppin Square, Fulton Playground, and Aptos Playground. The FEIR determined that there would be significant shadow impacts on three open spaces: Duboce Park, Larsen Playground, and Laurel Hill Playground. These three open spaces would experience noticeable increases in shadow durations (30 to 120 minutes longer at Duboce Park during winter, 15 to 30 minutes longer year-round at Larsen Playground, and longer morning shadows in winter at Laurel Hill Playground) as a result of implementation of the adopted housing element. For open spaces that are not subject to section 295, the FEIR determined that most impacts would be less than significant, except for those related to the outdoor recreation space at Roosevelt Middle School, which would experience significant impacts due to the up to 45 minutes of additional daily winter shadow as a result of implementation of the adopted housing element.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-SH-1, Shadow Minimization, would reduce or avoid the potential for significant shadow impacts by requiring a redesign to reduce or avoid the creation of new shadow that would substantially or adversely affect the use and enjoyment of publicly accessible open spaces, to the extent feasible. However, the specific massing and design of individual future projects consistent with the adopted housing element is currently unknown and would be subject to future project-level CEQA review. In addition, there are uncertainties regarding the feasibility of redesigning projects to reduce or avoid significant shadow impacts. Therefore, the ability of Mitigation Measure M-SH-1 to reduce potential

impacts of future development to a less-than-significant level is uncertain and evaluation on a project-by-project basis would be required. As such, the FEIR determined that the adopted housing element would result in a significant and unavoidable impact with mitigation related to shadow.

PROPOSED REZONING PROGRAM IMPACTS

The approach to evaluating the proposed rezoning program is described above under "Analysis of Potential Environmental Effects," p. 32. The changes under the proposed rezoning program that would affect shadow are addressed below.

Based on the proposed increase in building heights and growth distribution under the proposed rezoning program, the department re-evaluated the same 30 open spaces that were identified in the FEIR as well as five additional representative parks located near areas where height changes have been proposed to evaluate anticipated shadow impacts associated with the proposed rezoning program. The five additional open spaces are Francisco Park, Golden Gate Park, Joe DiMaggio Playground, Noe Valley Town Square, and Rachele Sullivan Park. To evaluate the net change in shadow effects between the FEIR and the proposed rezoning program, the department evaluated the net change in heights and projected growth distribution in areas surrounding the selected open spaces in order to determine the likelihood of any changes in shadow effects on these open spaces. **Table 7** presents a summary of the anticipated shadow effects on open spaces as a result of the proposed rezoning program compared to the adopted housing element.

EFFECTS ON OPEN SPACES SUBJECT TO SECTION 295

Consistent with the FEIR, there would be no change or increase in the severity of shadow impacts to 14 of the previously evaluated open spaces subject to section 295 as a result of the proposed rezoning program compared to the adopted housing element. Specifically, there would be no impact on the following five open spaces: Margaret Hayward Playground, Civic Center Plaza, Potrero Hill Recreation Center and Playground, Garfield Square, and Bay View Park KC Jones Playground. The proposed rezoning program would also result in less than significant impacts on the following eight open spaces: Portsmouth Square, Union Square, South Park, Victoria Manolo Draves Park, Grattan Playground, Mission Playground, Oceanview Playground, and Aptos Playground. Shadow impacts on Larsen Playground would continue to be significant and unavoidable under the proposed rezoning program; however, there would most likely be no increase or change in the levels of new shadow cast on these open spaces compared to what was evaluated in the FEIR.

As detailed in **Table 7**, regarding the five additional open spaces that were not evaluated in the FEIR (i.e., Francisco Park, Golden Gate Park, Joe DiMaggio Playground, Noe Valley Town Square, Rachele Sullivan Park), there would be a less than significant impacts on the following four open spaces: Francisco Park, Golden Gate Park, Joe DiMaggio Playground, and Rachele Sullivan Park. Shadow impacts on Noe Valley Town Square would be significant and unavoidable under the proposed rezoning program due to height increases to immediately adjacent parcels identified in the FEIR analysis as likely to be redeveloped thereby increasing the likelihood of increased shadow effects on this open space.

Table 7: Summary of Projected Shadows on Open Spaces from Future Development Consistent with the Proposed Rezoning Program Compared to the Adopted Housing Element

Open Space (Jurisdiction)	Active Uses	Projected Shadow Under the Adopted Housing Element	Adopted Housing Element Impact Conclusion	Proposed Rezoning Program Criteria for Shadow Impact Evaluation	Projected Shadow under the Proposed Rezoning Program	Proposed Rezoning Program Impact Conclusion
Open Spaces Subject to Section 295						
Lafayette Park (SFRPD)	Children's play area, tennis courts, a dog play area, and meadow, picnic tables, and seating areas. Paths and walkways.	A. Similar areas of the park would be affected by periodic shading, year-round. B. Locations of longest shadow durations would be similar. C. Seasonal variation in shadow durations would be similar. D. Annual range in shadow durations would be similar. E. Duration of shading on the majority of the park would be similar.	LTS	**Building Heights**: Rezoned heights up to approximately 350 feet along the nearby Van Ness Avenue and California Street corridor would represent an increase over what was evaluated in the FEIR, as would increases in height from 40 to 65 feet for some lots surrounding the park. However, these height increases would be offset by the reductions in building heights up to approximately 200 feet in the intervening areas between Gough Street and Van Ness Avenue along Washington, Clay, and Sacramento Streets. **Growth Distribution**: Approximately 1,000 additional units are anticipated within the area east of the park, while areas in the immediate vicinity and west of the park would have a reduction of approximately 500 units.	Based on the criteria, while the specific patterns of morning shadow may change under the proposed rezoning program due to the building height increases to the east of the park, overall, the park would not be likely to receive additional shadow from the proposed rezoning program above what was evaluated in the FEIR.	LTS

Open Space (Jurisdiction)	Active Uses	Projected Shadow Under the Adopted Housing Element	Adopted Housing Element Impact Conclusion	Proposed Rezoning Program Criteria for Shadow Impact Evaluation	Projected Shadow under the Proposed Rezoning Program	Proposed Rezoning Program Impact Conclusion
Helen Wills Park (SFRPD)	Children's play area, tennis court, basketball court, a clubhouse, and a volleyball court/half basketball court.	A. Similar areas of the park would be affected by periodic shading, from fall through spring, with a slightly larger area affected over summer. B. Locations of longest shadow durations would be similar. C. Seasonal variation in shadow durations would be similar. D. Annual range in shadow durations would be similar. E. Duration of shading on the majority of the park would be similar.	LTS	**Building Heights:** Lots immediately to the south and west of the park along Pacific Avenue and Larkin Street would be rezoned from approximately 40 feet to approximately 65 to 85 feet, and other lots within 2 blocks to the west of the park along the Van Ness Avenue corridor would be rezoned from approximately 240 feet to 350 feet. In addition, lots along Polk Street, closer to the park, would be downzoned from approximately 140 feet to approximately 85 feet. **Growth Distribution**: Approximately 900 additional units are anticipated in the areas surrounding and south of the park, while areas in the immediate vicinity and west of the park would have a reduction of approximately 500 units.	Based on the criteria, the park would be more likely to receive additional new shadow due to the rezoning program than what was evaluated under the adopted housing element; particularly during afternoon and evening hours year-round, and throughout the day during winter months.	SUM

Open Space (Jurisdiction)	Active Uses	Projected Shadow Under the Adopted Housing Element	Adopted Housing Element Impact Conclusion	Proposed Rezoning Program Criteria for Shadow Impact Evaluation	Projected Shadow under the Proposed Rezoning Program	Proposed Rezoning Program Impact Conclusion
Duboce Park (SFRPD)	Grassy areas, dog play area, basketball court, 2 children's play areas, and an arts center.	A. Similar areas of the park would be affected by periodic shading during summer, with larger areas in the central portion of the park affected by afternoon shadow during spring and fall, and longer midday shadow durations over winter. B. Areas of longest shadow durations would be similar, from spring through fall, and larger during winter along the southern edge of the park (including both children's play areas and the basketball courts). C. Seasonal variation in shadow durations would be similar. D. Annual range in shadow durations would be similar. E. Duration of shading on the majority of the park would be similar from spring through fall, and longer (30 to 120 minutes) throughout the day over winter, especially during midday hours.	SUM	**Building Heights**: Lots immediately to the south of the park along Duboce Avenue would be rezoned from approximately 40 feet to approximately 85 feet, and lots along the north side of Duboce Park east of the park have also been rezoned from approximately 40 feet to between approximately 65 to 85 feet. Other lots within 2 blocks of the park to the southeast along Market Street would also be rezoned, including some lots from approximately 85 feet to approximately 240 feet. Lots immediately north of, and to the west of, the park would be downzoned from approximately 65 or 85 feet to approximately 40 feet. **Growth Distribution:** Approximately 550 additional units are anticipated within the areas to the south and east of the park, while areas in the immediate vicinity and west of the park would have a reduction of approximately 120 units.	Based on the criteria, while some spring and fall shading would be reduced due to the downzoning to the west of the park, overall the park would be more likely to receive additional new shadow due to the proposed rezoning program than what was evaluated in the FEIR; particularly from late fall through early spring, and throughout the day during winter months.	SUM

Open Space (Jurisdiction)	Active Uses	Projected Shadow Under the Adopted Housing Element	Adopted Housing Element Impact Conclusion	Proposed Rezoning Program Criteria for Shadow Impact Evaluation	Projected Shadow under the Proposed Rezoning Program	Proposed Rezoning Program Impact Conclusion
Mission Dolores Park (SFRPD)	Tennis courts, dog play areas, picnic tables, a multi-sport court, basketball court, large grassy areas, and Helen Diller Playground.	A. Approximately half the park area would be shaded at various times daily during summer, approximately two thirds would be shaded during fall and spring, and all park areas would be periodically shaded over winter. B. Longest shadow durations occur near the east and west edges of the park from spring through fall and along the southern edge over winter. C. Longer shadow durations occur over winter with shorter durations from spring through fall. D. Range in shadow durations between zero to 45 minutes from spring through fall, and less than 15 to over 180 minutes over winter. E. Majority of the park shaded daily between 0 to 15 minutes from spring through fall, and under 30 minutes over winter.	NI	**Building Heights**: Lots surrounding the park on the south and west sides would be rezoned from approximately 40 feet to approximately 50 or 65 feet. **Growth Distribution:** Approximately 75 additional units are anticipated in areas to the south and west of the park.	Based on the criteria, the park would potentially receive some slight incremental shadow as a result of the proposed rezoning program above what was evaluated in the FEIR. However, due to the modest increase in height and growth distribution, the increase in shadow would not be significant.	LTS

Open Space (Jurisdiction)	Active Uses	Projected Shadow Under the Adopted Housing Element	Adopted Housing Element Impact Conclusion	Proposed Rezoning Program Criteria for Shadow Impact Evaluation	Projected Shadow under the Proposed Rezoning Program	Proposed Rezoning Program Impact Conclusion
Balboa Park (SFRPD)	Baseball/softball fields, large multi-purpose grass areas, skate park, children's play area, dog play area, tennis courts, soccer stadium, and pool.	A. Similar areas of the park would be affected by periodic shading, year-round. B. Locations of longest shadow durations would be similar. C. Seasonal variation in shadow durations would be similar. D. Annual range in shadow durations would be similar. E. Duration of shading on the majority of the park would be similar.	LTS	**Building Heights:** Lots near the southeast corner of the park would be rezoned from approximately 45 feet to approximately 85 or 120 feet. **Growth Distribution:** Approximately 300 additional units are anticipated to the east and south of the park.	Based on the criteria, the park would potentially receive some slight incremental shadow on the southern portion of the park as a result of the proposed rezoning above what was evaluated in the FEIR. However, due to the modest increase in height and growth distribution, the increase in shadow would not be significant.	LTS
McCoppin Square (SFRPD)	Baseball/softball field with bleachers, tennis court, half-court basketball court, children's play area, and a large grassy area.	A. Larger areas of the park, specifically wooded area near the southwest corner of the park would be affected by periodic shading during winter, and the same areas would be affected from spring through fall. B. Locations of longest shadow durations would be similar. C. Seasonal variation in shadow durations would be similar. D. Annual range in shadow durations would be similar. E. Duration of shading on the majority of the park would be similar.	LTS	**Building Heights:** Lots along the eastern and western sides of the square would be downzoned from approximately 55 feet to approximately 40 feet, while the lots along the southern edge of the square on Taraval Street would be rezoned from approximately 65 feet to approximately 85 feet. **Growth Distribution:** No substantial changes in the vicinity of the square.	Based on the criteria, the square would potentially receive less morning and afternoon shadow due to the downzoning on the eastern and western sides of the square, and potentially more midday winter shadow from the rezoned lots to the south of the square. However, altogether, the square would likely not receive additional new shadow as a result of the proposed rezoning program compared to what was evaluated in the FEIR.	LTS

Open Space (Jurisdiction)	Active Uses	Projected Shadow Under the Adopted Housing Element	Adopted Housing Element Impact Conclusion	Proposed Rezoning Program Criteria for Shadow Impact Evaluation	Projected Shadow under the Proposed Rezoning Program	Proposed Rezoning Program Impact Conclusion
Fulton Playground (SFRPD)	Tennis court, 2 children's play areas, half-court basketball court, full basketball court, seating areas located next to the play areas, and clubhouse.	A. Larger areas of the park would be affected by periodic shading from spring through fall, and similar areas would be affected over winter. B. Locations of longest shadow durations would be similar. C. Seasonal variation in shadow durations would be similar. D. Annual range in shadow durations would be similar. E. Duration of shading on the majority of the park would be longer from spring through fall (between less than 15 to 30 minutes), and similar over winter.	LTS	**Building Heights:** Lots half a block south of the playground along Fulton Street would be rezoned from approximately 45 feet to approximately 85 feet. **Growth Distribution:** Fewer units would be anticipated in the areas surrounding the playground.	Based on the criteria, the playground would receive some additional shadow during late fall and early winter as a result of the proposed rezoning program. However, this increase would be considered less than significant, consistent with what was evaluated in the FEIR.	LTS
Francisco Park (SFRPD)	Picnic area, playground, and dog play area	The possible effects of shadow on Francisco Park were not evaluated in the FEIR; however, this park is located near an area where changes in height are proposed under the proposed rezoning program.	--	**Building Heights:** Several lots to the east, west and south of the park would be upzoned from 40 to 65 feet while other lots further removed to the north, east and south would be upzoned from 40 to 50 feet up to 65 feet. However, many of the upzoned lots surrounding the park already contain developments taller than 65 feet, so shadow would not increase on these lots. **Growth Distribution:** No substantial changes in the vicinity of the park.	Based on the criteria, this open space would potentially receive an incremental amount of additional new shadow from the proposed rezoning program above what would occur under the adopted housing element, but the amount of possible new shadow would be considered less than significant.	LTS

Open Space (Jurisdiction)	Active Uses	Projected Shadow Under the Adopted Housing Element	Adopted Housing Element Impact Conclusion	Proposed Rezoning Program Criteria for Shadow Impact Evaluation	Projected Shadow under the Proposed Rezoning Program	Proposed Rezoning Program Impact Conclusion
Golden Gate Park (SFRPD)	Archery field, basketball courts, athletic fields, baseball fields, disc golf course, golf course, handball/raquet-ball courts, stadium, polo field, roller skating paved area, trails, tennis center, volleyball courts, and skate park.	The possible effects of shadow on Golden Gate Park were not evaluated in the FEIR; however, this park is located near an area where changes in height are proposed under the proposed rezoning program.	--	**Building Heights:** Majority of lots along Lincoln Way to the south of Golden Gate Park and many along Stanyan Street to the east would be upzoned from 40 to 55 feet up to 65 feet. A few clusters of lots along Fulton Street north of the park have also been upzoned from between 55 to 80 feet up to 85 feet. **Growth Distribution:** No substantial changes in the vicinity of the park.	Based on the criteria, this open space could receive some incremental additional new shadow from the proposed rezoning program above what would occur under the adopted housing element. However given the large size of Golden Gate Park and dense tree cover along the boundary of Lincoln Way, any shadows cast by taller developments would not affect the vast majority of park areas.	LTS
Joe DiMaggio Playground (SFRPD)	Basketball courts, tennis courts, bocce courts, pool and clubhouse, picnic area, and sports courts.	The possible effects of shadow on Joe DiMaggio Playground were not evaluated in the FEIR; however, this park is located near an area where changes in height are proposed under the proposed rezoning program.	--	**Building Heights:** Lots surrounding the playground would be upzoned from 40 to 50 or 65 feet. **Growth Distribution:** No substantial changes in the vicinity of the playground.	Based on the criteria, some incremental additional net new shadow from the proposed rezoning program might occur above what would occur under the adopted housing element. However, this increase would be considered less than significant.	LTS

Open Space (Jurisdiction)	Active Uses	Projected Shadow Under the Adopted Housing Element	Adopted Housing Element Impact Conclusion	Proposed Rezoning Program Criteria for Shadow Impact Evaluation	Projected Shadow under the Proposed Rezoning Program	Proposed Rezoning Program Impact Conclusion
Noe Valley Town Square (RPD)	Café seating, exercise classes, and music events.	The possible effects of shadow on Noe Valley Town Square were not evaluated in the FEIR; however, this park is located near an area where changes in height are proposed under the proposed rezoning program.	--	**Building Heights:** All lots in the vicinity of the square would be upzoned from 40 to 65 feet. **Growth Distribution:** No substantial changes in the vicinity of the square.	Based on the criteria, this open space could receive additional new shadow from the proposed rezoning program above what would occur under the adopted housing element if sites within a very close proximity to the square on the east, west, or south sides of the park were to be developed. Development on sites farther from the square would not result in net new shadow due to the presence of existing adjacent 2 to 3 story buildings that cast shadow on the square under current conditions.	SUM

Open Space (Jurisdiction)	Active Uses	Projected Shadow Under the Adopted Housing Element	Adopted Housing Element Impact Conclusion	Proposed Rezoning Program Criteria for Shadow Impact Evaluation	Projected Shadow under the Proposed Rezoning Program	Proposed Rezoning Program Impact Conclusion
Rachele Sullivan Park (11th & Natoma site) (SFRPD)	Basketball court, fitness area, children's play area, and tables and seating.	The possible effects of shadow on Rachele Sullivan Park were not evaluated in the FEIR; however, this park is located near an area where changes in height are proposed under the proposed rezoning program.	--	**Rezoned heights in the vicinity:** Lots just west of the park across 11th Street would be upzoned from 55 to 85 feet while two lots a block west of the park on Van Ness Avenue would be upzoned from 400 to 650 feet and 120 to 250 feet, respectively. Additional sites farther to the west have also been upzoned from 85 to 140 feet. **Growth Distribution:** Approximately 425 fewer units anticipated in the block west of the park.	Based on the criteria, this open space would potentially receive additional incremental new shadow from the rezoning program above what would occur under the housing element update due to taller buildings across the street from the park. The two lots with more substantial height increases would not likely change the shadow conditions substantially given shadow from these sites would frequently be cast on and beyond the park even under the adopted housing element heights. Therefore, additional height would not often increase the amount of shadow. Shadow from sites farther west would likely have little effect given heights of intervening buildings. Overall, while some increase in shadow might occur under the proposed rezoning program, it would be considered less than significant.	LTS

Open Space (Jurisdiction)	Active Uses	Projected Shadow Under the Adopted Housing Element	Adopted Housing Element Impact Conclusion	Proposed Rezoning Program Criteria for Shadow Impact Evaluation	Projected Shadow under the Proposed Rezoning Program	Proposed Rezoning Program Impact Conclusion
Open Spaces Not Subject to Section 295						
Sutro Heights Park (GGNRA)	Walking trails, vista points, pathways, and open grassy area.	A. Larger areas of the park would be affected by periodic shading, year-round. B. Locations of longest shadow durations would be similar. C. Seasonal variation in shadow durations would be similar. D. Annual range in shadow durations would be similar. E. Duration of shading on the majority of the park would slightly increase across all seasons.	LTS	**Building Heights**: Most of the lots adjacent to the park along 48th Avenue would be downzoned from approximately 55 or 65 feet to approximately 40 feet, or approximately 85 feet to approximately 65 feet. Lots on Balboa Street near the southeast corner of the park would be rezoned from approximately 40 feet to approximately 65 feet. **Growth Distribution**: Fewer units would be anticipated in the areas surrounding the park.	Based on the criteria, the park would potentially receive additional shadow near the southeastern corner of the park, but less shadow along the eastern edge. However, altogether, the park would not receive additional new shadow as a result of the proposed rezoning program compared to what was evaluated in the FEIR.	LTS

Open Space (Jurisdiction)	Active Uses	Projected Shadow Under the Adopted Housing Element	Adopted Housing Element Impact Conclusion	Proposed Rezoning Program Criteria for Shadow Impact Evaluation	Projected Shadow under the Proposed Rezoning Program	Proposed Rezoning Program Impact Conclusion
Roosevelt Middle School (SFUSD)	Schoolyard is paved and contains full and half-court basketball courts, and a multi-use court.	A. Same areas of the schoolyard would be affected by periodic shading. B. Locations of longest shadow durations would be similar. C. Seasonal variation in shadow durations would be similar. D. Annual range in shadow durations would be similar. E. Duration of shading on the majority of the schoolyard similar from spring through fall, but with longer winter durations throughout the day of 90 to 165 minutes concentrated in the southern half of the schoolyard, with midday hours receiving the most additional new shadow.	SUM	**Building Heights**: Nearly all lots on the east, west, and north sides of the school would be downzoned from approximately 85 feet to approximately 40 feet, with a few lots to the south of the school rezoned from approximately 85 feet to approximately 140 feet. **Growth Distribution:** Approximately 200 more units would be anticipated in areas surrounding the school.	Based on the criteria, the school would likely receive less additional new shadow during morning hours, year-round, but some additional midday winter shadow as a result of the proposed rezoning program. However, this increase would be consistent with what was evaluated in the FEIR.	SUM

Source: Prevision, 2025.
Notes: SFRPD = San Francisco Recreation and Park Department; GGNRA = Golden Gate National Recreation Area; SFUSD = San Francisco Unified School District; NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; SUM = significant and unavoidable with mitigation; -- indicates not applicable

As detailed in **Table 7**, p. 112, the proposed rezoning program would result in a change in shadow impacts on seven open spaces compared to the FEIR. Under the proposed rezoning program, Mission Dolores Park, Lafayette Park, Balboa Park, McCoppin Square, and Fulton Playground would experience slightly different patterns of shadow on the open spaces due to changes in building height and growth distribution proposed under the rezoning program when compared to the FEIR. However, these open spaces would either receive no additional new shadow or minimal additional shadow beyond what was evaluated in the FEIR as a result of the proposed rezoning program. Impacts would therefore remain less than significant for these open spaces. Furthermore, while Duboce Park would likely have less shading during the spring and fall under the proposed rezoning program, overall, the park would likely receive additional new shadow compared to the FEIR, particularly from late fall through early spring, and throughout the day during winter months. Nonetheless, shadow impacts on Duboce Park would continue to be significant, consistent with the FEIR, and no new mitigation measures are required.

Due to changes in building heights and growth distribution proposed under the rezoning program, Helen Wills Park would be more likely to receive additional new shadow compared to what was evaluated under the FEIR. Specifically, under the proposed rezoning program, Helen Wills Park would receive additional shadow during the afternoon and evening hours year-round, and throughout the day during the winter months. Impacts would be significant at this representative park, and greater than the less-than-significant impact that would occur under the adopted housing element. However, Mitigation Measure M-SH-1, Shadow Minimization, would reduce or avoid the potential for significant shadow impacts and future development would be required to implement this mitigation measure. No new mitigation measures are required.

EFFECTS ON OPEN SPACES NOT SUBJECT TO SECTION 295

Consistent with the FEIR, there would be no change or increase in the severity of shadow impacts to six of the eight previously evaluated open spaces not subject to section 295 as a result of the proposed rezoning program compared to the housing element. Specifically, there would be no impact related to new shadow on Daniel Webster Elementary School, and Francis Scott Key Elementary School. The proposed rezoning program would also result in less than significant impacts on the following four open spaces: Rincon Park, Salesforce Park, Sunset Boulevard, and Yerba Buena Gardens.

As detailed in **Table 7**, p. 112, the proposed rezoning program would result in a change in shadow impacts on two parks compared to the FEIR. Sutro Heights Park would experience changes in the patterns of shadow on the open spaces due to changes in building heights and growth distribution proposed under the rezoning program when compared to the FEIR; however, Sutro Heights Parks would not receive a net increase in shadow beyond what was evaluated in the FEIR as a result of the proposed rezoning program and impacts would remain less than significant. In addition, while Roosevelt Middle School would likely have less shading during morning hours, year-round, it would have some additional midday winter shading as a result of the proposed rezoning program.

However, overall, the change in shading on Roosevelt Middle Schools under the proposed rezoning program would be consistent with what was evaluated in the FEIR. Impacts to Roosevelt Middle School would continue to be significant, consistent with the FEIR.

CONCLUSION

Consistent with the FEIR, future development consistent with the proposed rezoning program would be subject to future project-level CEQA review, as applicable. If subject to CEQA and the department determines that future development consistent with the proposed rezoning program would have a significant shadow impact, Mitigation Measure M-SH-1, applicable from the FEIR, would be required. However, consistent with the FEIR, the specific massing, location, orientation, and design of individual future projects consistent with the proposed rezoning program is currently unknown, and there would continue to be uncertainties regarding the feasibility of redesigning projects to reduce or avoid significant shadow impacts. Therefore, the ability of Mitigation Measure M-SH-1 to reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level would continue to be uncertain and would be required to be evaluated on a project-by-project basis.

The analysis of the additional parks does not indicate that there would be new significant or more severe significant impacts related to shadow. By expanding the number of representative open spaces, the analysis confirms that the nature and severity of the shadow impacts under the proposed rezoning program would be similar to the shadow impacts disclosed in the FEIR for the adopted housing element. That is, the proposed rezoning program would not result in new impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of shadow impacts. Rather, the analysis of additional parks not evaluated in the FEIR, combined with a reevaluation of previously analyzed parks, provides a more comprehensive representative analysis of potential shadow impacts in the city.

The proposed rezoning program would continue to result in a significant and unavoidable with mitigation impact related to shadow, consistent with the FEIR. While impacts may be different at different locations and at different times of day than what was disclosed in the FEIR, citywide there would be no appreciable increase in severity of the significant and unavoidable impact.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The FEIR determined that the adopted housing element, in combination with cumulative projects, would not result in a significant cumulative shadow impact. The new cumulative projects implemented subsequent to publication of the FEIR, the Great Highway Mobility Improvements Project and the Vision Zero Quick-Build program (see **Table 4**, p. 28), do not substantially alter the cumulative setting due to the location of the cumulative projects compared to the proposed rezoned area and the nature of the cumulative projects (i.e., the creation of new open space and recreation facilities via traffic and roadway modifications and pedestrian and bicycle safety improvements in the right-of-way). Consistent with the FEIR, impacts associated with shadow are generally site specific; in general, shadow impacts from cumulative projects would result from new buildings or structures constructed in a project area or adjacent to a project's boundaries. Thus, the inclusion of the new

cumulative projects would not alter the findings related to cumulative shadow impacts in the FEIR. Because the proposed rezoning program would not generate new shadow impacts that were not previously identified in the FEIR, and the new cumulative projects would not alter the FEIR's cumulative analysis, there would be no new significant cumulative shadow impact.

CONCLUSION

In summary, the proposed rezoning program would not result in new significant shadow impacts that were not previously identified in the FEIR, nor would it result in more severe impacts than those previously identified. No new mitigation measures or changes to existing mitigation measures are required.

Utilities and Service Systems

FEIR FINDINGS

WATER

The potential utilities and service system impacts of the adopted housing element are analyzed in Section 4.9, Utilities and Service Systems, of the FEIR. The FEIR concluded that future development associated with implementation of the adopted housing element would increase water demand, and if the Bay-Delta Plan Amendment is implemented, significant levels of rationing would be required in dry years and the SFPUC may need to expand existing or develop new water supply facilities to address projected water supply shortfalls. The scope of construction of water supply facilities is unknown at this time. While construction-related mitigation measures could reduce potential impacts resulting from the construction of water supply facilities, the extent of impacts resulting from construction and rationing is unknown at this time and therefore, the FEIR determined that future development would have significant and unavoidable impacts related to water supply rationing and construction of new or expanded water supply facilities.

WASTEWATER AND STORMWATER

The FEIR determined that there would be less-than-significant impacts related to the relocation or construction of wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage facilities within the bayside drainage basin and that existing facilities within the bayside drainage basin would have adequate capacity to accommodate the increased wastewater and stormwater flows generated as a result of implementation of the adopted housing element. However, future development associated with implementation of the adopted housing element would very likely require construction and operation of new or expanded wastewater treatment infrastructure at the Oceanside Water Pollution Control Plant within the westside drainage basin. Expansion of the plant would be subject to future project-level CEQA review at the time it is proposed. However, based on an environmental review for a project completed in 2021 that installed a recycled water treatment plant at the Oceanside Water Pollution Control Plant, with improvements similar to those needed for wastewater treatment expansion, it is possible that the significant impacts of the improvements could be mitigated to less-than-significant levels. Nonetheless, because the specific impacts of the expansion cannot be determined at this time, the impact would be significant and unavoidable with mitigation.

ELECTRICITY AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS

The FEIR concluded that future development associated with the adopted housing element could require construction of new or expanded electric power or telecommunication facilities or relocation of such facilities. If future development should require new or expanded facilities, any such project would be subject to project-level CEQA review at the time it is proposed. Although specific impacts of such projects could not be determined at the time the FEIR was prepared, the FEIR determined that the impacts would most likely be similar to the impacts identified in the FEIR resulting from the construction and operation of future development projects consistent with the adopted housing element and subject to the same or similar regulatory requirements and mitigation measures. Such mitigation measures could include those identified in the FEIR related to construction. Implementation of the construction-related mitigation measures would likely reduce impacts from the construction of new or expanded electric and telecommunication facilities to a less-than-significant level.

SOLID WASTE

With respect to solid waste, the adopted housing element determined that future projects consistent with the adopted housing element would comply with the San Francisco Mandatory Recycling and Composting Ordinance, as well as the city's 2018 waste reduction commitment, and would not generate solid waste in excess of local infrastructure capacity. Therefore, overall solid waste impacts as a result of future development consistent with the adopted housing element would be less than significant.

PROPOSED REZONING PROGRAM IMPACTS

The approach to evaluating the proposed rezoning program is described above under "Analysis of Potential Environmental Effects," p. 32. The changes under the proposed rezoning program that would affect utilities and service systems are addressed below.

WATER

The water supply analysis provided in this section is consistent with the approach and analysis provided in the FEIR but based on the more recent data provided in the 2023 Interim Water Demand Projects for the City and County of San Francisco prepared by the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC), and the Family Zoning Plan (Housing Element Rezoning Program): Infrastructure Memo prepared by the department.[71, 72] Analysis included in the memo is considered below.

As described in the FEIR, there is considerable uncertainty as to whether the Bay-Delta Plan Amendment will be implemented. Therefore, water supply scenarios with and without implementation of the Bay-Delta Amendment were used to evaluate the availability of long-term water supplies for the city and future development. Based on updated 2023 SFPUC projections, without the Bay-Delta Plan Amendment, the SFPUC would have adequate supplies to meet projected water

---

[71] San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, 2023 Interim Water Demand Projections for the City and County of San Francisco, September 2023.

[72] San Francisco Planning Department. Family Zoning Plan (Housing Element Rezoning Program): Infrastructure Memo, July 17, 2025, Record No.: 2021-005878CWP. *https://citypln-m-extnl.sfgov.org/Commissions/CPC/7_17_2025/Commission%20Packet/2021-005878CWP.pdf*. Accessed August 18, 2025.

demands in normal hydrologic years, single dry years, and multiple dry years in 2025, 2030, 2035, 2040, and 2045.[73] In comparison, the adopted housing element determined that the SFPUC would have adequate supplies during normal hydrologic years and in single dry years but would experience shortfalls in multiple dry years, which would require customers to reduce water use through voluntary rationing (i.e., up to 5.3 percent). Based on the 2023 SFPUC projections, if the Bay-Delta Plan Amendment is implemented, water supplies would be available to meet projected demands in normal years with no shortfalls. However, there would be significant shortfalls in single dry years and multiple dry years through 2045.[74] Consistent with the FEIR, the shortfalls would result exclusively from supply reductions from implementation of the Bay-Delta Plan Amendment. The city would not have adequate water supplies available to serve the additional growth associated with the proposed rezoning program during dry and multiple dry years if the Bay-Delta Plan Amendment is implemented.

Consistent with the FEIR, if the Bay-Delta Plan Amendment is implemented, the SFPUC would need to impose higher levels of rationing (i.e., higher than its regional water system level-of-service goal of no more than 20 percent rationing). However, the proposed rezoning program would also encourage infill housing, which promotes water efficiency by default. Specifically, higher-density multi-family housing typically uses less water per capita than lower density development, especially single-family homes. In addition, the new infill housing constructed under the proposed rezoning program would generally be more water-efficient compared to existing housing due to code requirements, building practices, and required installation of water-conserving features.[75] In addition, future development consistent with the proposed rezoning program would be required to adhere to San Francisco's water conservation program and the Non-potable Water Ordinance, as applicable. Furthermore, the SFPUC would continue to implement its water conservation program, invest and replace aging infrastructure, and seek new, expanded, diversified, or alternative water supply facilities, such as local groundwater, recycled water, and purified water projects.[76] Nonetheless, consistent with the FEIR, given the long lead times associated with developing additional water supplies, the SFPUC's expected near-term response to implementation of the Bay-Delta Plan Amendment would be to ration in accordance with the procedures in its Water Shortage Contingency Plan. Both direct and indirect environmental impacts could result from high levels of rationing. The proposed rezoning program would continue to result in significant and unavoidable impacts related to water supplies, consistent with the FEIR.

WASTEWATER AND STORMWATER

Consistent with the FEIR, future development consistent with the proposed rezoning program would be served by San Francisco's combined sewer system, which has two primary drainage basins (bayside drainage basin and westside drainage basin). The bayside drainage basin is served by the Southeast

---

[73] Ibid.

[74] Ibid.

[75] San Francisco Planning Department. Family Zoning Plan (Housing Element Rezoning Program): Infrastructure Memo, July 17, 2025, Record No.: 2021-005878CWP. *https://citypln-m-extnl.sfgov.org/Commissions/CPC/7_17_2025/Commission%20Packet/2021-005878CWP.pdf*. Accessed August 18, 2025.

[76] Ibid.

Water Pollution Control Plant, and the westside drainage basin is served by the Oceanside Water Pollution Control Plant. As such, impacts under the proposed rezoning program would be similar to those provided in the FEIR.

As determined in the FEIR, the Southeast Water Pollution Control Plant would have adequate capacity to serve future development consistent with the proposed rezoning program in combination with existing wastewater flows. It is likely that the Oceanside Water Pollution Control Plant would experience reduced pollutant loads under the proposed rezoning program compared to the adopted housing element because housing growth distribution under the proposed rezoning program would be more evenly distributed in the western and northern parts of the city and along transit corridors, instead of heavily concentrated in the Inner Sunset, Outer Sunset, and Richmond planning districts as assumed under the adopted housing element; thus pollutant load generation, would be more evenly distributed throughout the city rather than concentrated in the western portion of the city. Nonetheless, the Oceanside Water Pollution Control Plant would still require expanded facilities to serve the growth anticipated under the proposed rezoning program as determined in the FEIR. Expansion of the wastewater treatment facilities would be subject to project-level CEQA review at the time it is proposed, which would identify any potentially significant impacts that would result from construction and operation of the facilities and applicable mitigation measures. The impacts would most likely be similar to those identified in the FEIR and would be subject to the same regulatory requirements and mitigation measures, as applicable. The proposed rezoning program would be required to implement the following mitigation measures from the FEIR, as applicable: Mitigation Measures M-CR-2a, Archeological Resources Requirements for Projects Involving Soil Disturbance; M-CR-2b, Archeological Monitoring Program; M-CR-2c, Archeological Testing Program; M-CR-2d, Treatment of Submerged and Deeply Buried Resources; M-TCR-1, Tribal Notification and Consultation; M-NO-1, Construction Noise Control; M-NO-3a, Protection of Adjacent Buildings/Structures and Vibration Monitoring during Construction; M-NO-3b, Prevent Damage to Vibration-Sensitive Equipment; and M-AQ-3, Construction Air Quality.

Implementation of the applicable mitigation measures from the FEIR would very likely reduce potential impacts from the construction and operation of expanded wastewater treatment facilities to a less-than-significant level. However, because the specific impacts and mitigation measures associated with expansion of the Oceanside Water Pollution Control Plant cannot be determined at this time, the proposed rezoning program would continue to result in significant and unavoidable impacts with mitigation related to wastewater facilities, consistent with the FEIR.

ELECTRIC POWER AND TELECOMMUNICATION FACILITIES

Future development consistent with the proposed rezoning program would result in up to approximately 54,000 additional housing units compared to the approximately 50,000 housing units assumed under the adopted housing element. Consistent with the FEIR, future development under the proposed rezoning program would be infill development in areas already served by existing electric and telecommunication facilities. If new future development were to require the construction or expansion of such facilities, any such projects would be subject to project-level CEQA review at the time it is proposed and would identify any potentially significant impacts and applicable mitigation measures that would result from

construction and operation of these facilities. These impacts would most likely be similar to those identified in the FEIR and subject to the same regulatory requirements and mitigation measures, as applicable. The proposed rezoning program would be required to implement the following mitigation measures from the FEIR, as applicable: Mitigation Measures M-CR-2a, Archeological Resources Requirements for Projects Involving Soil Disturbance; M-CR-2b, Archeological Monitoring Program; M-CR-2c, Archeological Testing Program; M-CR-2d, Treatment of Submerged and Deeply Buried Resources; M-TCR-1, Tribal Notification and Consultation; M-NO-1, Construction Noise Control; M-NO-3a, Protection of Adjacent Buildings/Structures and Vibration Monitoring during Construction; M-NO-3b, Prevent Damage to Vibration-Sensitive Equipment; and M-AQ-3, Construction Air Quality. Implementation of the applicable mitigation measures from the FEIR would very likely reduce potential impacts from construction and operation of expanded electric and telecommunication facilities to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the proposed rezoning program would continue to result in less-than-significant impacts with mitigation related to electric power and telecommunication facilities, consistent with the FEIR.

SOLID WASTE

All projects are required to comply with San Francisco's Mandatory Recycling and Compositing Ordinance as well as the city's 2018 waste reduction commitment. As with the adopted housing element, compliance with the requirements would reduce the amount of solid waste generated by construction and operation of future development consistent with the proposed rezoning program. In addition, the city's building ordinance would require all future development consistent with the proposed rezoning program to provide adequate areas for recycling, composting, and storing trash, along with in-building collection systems that provide equal convenience for all users with respect to separating the three material streams.

The proposed rezoning program would result in approximately 54,000 more housing units being constructed compared to the approximately 50,000 housing units assumed under the adopted housing element. Consistent with the FEIR, based on the national average for solid waste production (i.e., 4.9 pounds per day per capita) and an average household size of 2.36 persons, new housing units under the proposed rezoning program would generate approximately 283 tons of solid waste per day. In comparison, the FEIR assumed that approximately 279 tons of solid waste would be generated. The proposed rezoning program's waste generation equals 5.7 percent of the San Francisco Solid Waste Transfer and Recycling Center's permitted maximum disposal capacity of 5,000 tons per day. Therefore, given that future development under the proposed rezoning program would be required to comply with the city's diversion and waste reduction requirements and future long-term capacity would be available at the San Francisco Solid Waste Transfer and Recycling Center and other area landfills the serve San Francisco, consistent with the FEIR, the proposed rezoning program would be served by a landfill with adequate permitted capacity to accommodate solid waste disposal needs. The proposed rezoning program would comply with applicable statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Impacts would be less than significant, consistent with the adopted housing element, and no mitigation measures are required.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The FEIR determined that the adopted housing element, in combination with cumulative projects, would not result in a significant cumulative impact on utilities and service systems. The new cumulative projects implemented subsequent to publication of the FEIR, the Great Highway Mobility Improvements Project and the Vision Zero Quick-Build program (see **Table 4**, p. 28), do not substantially alter the cumulative setting due to the location of the cumulative projects compared to the proposed rezoned area and the nature of the cumulative projects (i.e., the creation of new open space and recreation facilities via traffic and roadway modifications and pedestrian and bicycle safety improvements in the right-of-way). The Great Highway Mobility Improvements Project and the Vision Zero Quick-Build program would most likely require the use of electricity and the generation of solid waste during construction. However, the projects would have no effect on the long-term demand for electricity or the generation of solid waste due to the nature of the projects. Thus, the inclusion of the new cumulative projects would not alter the findings related to cumulative impacts on utilities and service systems in the FEIR. Because the proposed rezoning program would not generate new impacts on utilities and service systems that were not previously identified in the FEIR, and the new cumulative projects would not alter the FEIR's cumulative analysis, there would be no new significant cumulative impact on utilities and service systems.

CONCLUSION

In summary, the proposed rezoning program would not result in new significant utilities and service systems impacts that were not previously identified in the FEIR, nor would it result in more severe impacts than those previously identified. No new mitigation measures or changes to existing mitigation measures are required.

Paleontological Resources

FEIR FINDINGS

The potential paleontological resources impacts of the adopted housing element are analyzed in Section 4.10, Paleontological Resources, of the FEIR. As detailed in the FEIR, sedimentary deposits of Middle Holocene age or older, bay clay and beach deposits, the Colma Formation, and the Merced Formation, all of which are found within the city, have the potential to yield unique fossils. Currently, no geologic units with high or very high sensitivity for paleontological resources have been identified within San Francisco. Nonetheless, anticipated future development associated with the adopted housing element would result in increased construction activities, such as excavation, which could affect unique paleontological resources. Destruction of a unique paleontological resource would be a significant impact.

If a future project-specific evaluation finds that project construction activities would affect geologic units with moderate sensitivity for paleontological resources, including moderately sensitive units that exist at depth below unknown sensitive units, the FEIR determined that Mitigation Measure M-GE-5, Inadvertent Discovery of Paleontological Resources during Construction, would be required. This measure would require construction worker awareness training conducted by a qualified paleontologist and procedures

to be followed should a fossil find occur during construction. In the event a fossil find is determined to be unique, development of a paleontology monitoring plan by a qualified paleontologist would be required to monitor construction activities that could affect moderately sensitive geologic units. The FEIR determined that implementation of the adopted housing element would result in less-than-significant impacts with mitigation for paleontological resources.

PROPOSED REZONING PROGRAM IMPACTS

The approach to evaluating the proposed rezoning program is described above under "Analysis of Potential Environmental Effects," p. 32. The changes under the proposed rezoning program that would affect paleontological resources are addressed below.

As described above, the FEIR determined that sedimentary deposits of Middle Holocene age or older, bay clay and beach deposits, the Colma Formation, and the Merced Formation are found within the city (refer to Figures 4.10-1a through 4.10-1d, Paleontological Potential, of the FEIR). Sedimentary deposits of middle Holocene age or older have the potential to contain unique fossils; bay clay and beach deposits, the Colma Formation, and the Merced Formation have moderate paleontological potential to yield unique fossils. No geologic units with high or very high sensitivity for paleontological resources have been identified within the city.

As described in the FEIR, the department conducts preliminary paleontological resource impact evaluations to determine the potential for projects to affect a unique paleontological resource and would continue to do so under future projects consistent with the proposed rezoning program. In addition to identifying specific geologic units that could be disturbed, the evaluations also consider the amount and depth of excavation, the type of ground-disturbing activities, and the paleontological potential of the geologic units that the activities could disturb.

Anticipated future development consistent with the proposed rezoning program would have the potential to destroy unique paleontological resources in locations where excavations would extend as deep as moderately sensitive geologic units. The proposed rezoning program would allow increased building heights compared to the adopted housing element. Under the adopted housing element, building heights would range from 55 to 300 feet; under the proposed rezoning program, building heights would range from 40 to 500 feet, with two limited areas to 650 feet. In areas where taller structures would be constructed, excavation would very likely be deeper and therefore disturb older sediments, which are more likely to have moderate paleontological potential. Accordingly, future development consistent with the proposed rezoning project could have significant impacts on paleontological resources.

If the project-specific preliminary paleontological resource impact evaluation finds that project construction activities would affect geologic units with moderate sensitivity for paleontological resources, including moderately sensitive units that exist at depth below unknown sensitive units, implementation of Mitigation Measure M-GE-5, applicable to the adopted housing element, would also apply to the proposed rezoning program. Consistent with the FEIR, implementation of Mitigation

Measure M-GE-5 would ensure that the proposed rezoning program would not result in the destruction of unique paleontological resources. Therefore, the proposed rezoning program would result in less-than-significant impacts with regard to paleontological resources.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The FEIR determined that the adopted housing element, in combination with cumulative projects, would not result in a significant cumulative impact related to paleontological resources. The new cumulative projects implemented subsequent to publication of the FEIR, the Great Highway Mobility Improvements Project and the Vision Zero Quick-Build program (see **Table 4**, p. 28), do not substantially alter the cumulative setting due to the location of the cumulative projects compared to the proposed rezoned area and the nature of the cumulative projects (i.e., the creation of new open space and recreation facilities via traffic and roadway modifications and pedestrian and bicycle safety improvements in the right-of-way). Consistent with the FEIR, impacts associated with paleontological resources are generally site specific; in general, only cumulative projects occurring on adjacent sites have the potential to combine and result in significant cumulative impacts related to paleontological resources. As such, future development consistent with the proposed rezoning program would be subject to department paleontological resource impact evaluations, as applicable. Impacts on paleontological resources would be fully addressed by department evaluations as well as project-specific mitigation measures similar to Mitigation Measure M-GE-5, described above, if the potential for effects is found to be significant. Thus, the inclusion of the new cumulative projects would not alter the findings related to cumulative paleontological resources impacts in the FEIR. Because the proposed rezoning program would not generate new impacts related to paleontological resources that were not previously identified in the FEIR, and the new cumulative projects would not alter the FEIR's cumulative analysis, there would be no new significant cumulative impact related to paleontological resources.

CONCLUSION

In summary, the proposed rezoning program would not result in new significant paleontological resources impacts that were not previously identified in the FEIR, nor would it result in more severe impacts than those previously identified. No new mitigation measures or changes to existing mitigation measures are required.

Conclusion

Based on the foregoing, it is concluded that the analyses conducted and the conclusions reached in the final EIR certified on November 17, 2022, remain valid and that no supplemental environmental review is required. The proposed rezoning program would not cause new significant impacts not identified in the FEIR, and no new mitigation measures would be necessary to reduce significant impacts. No changes have occurred with respect to circumstances surrounding the adopted housing element that would cause significant environmental impacts to which the housing element update would contribute considerably, and no new information has become available that shows that the housing element update would cause significant environmental impacts. Therefore, no supplemental environmental review is required beyond this addendum pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15162.

I do hereby certify that the above determination has been made pursuant to state and local requirements.

Lisa Gibson

Lisa Gibson
Environmental Review Officer

September 2, 2025
Date of Determination:

cc: San Francisco Planning Commission
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Project Distribution List

Addendum Preparers

REPORT AUTHORS

San Francisco Planning Department Environmental Planning Division
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400
San Francisco, CA 94103

Environmental Review Officer:	Lisa Gibson
Principal Environmental Planner:	Debra Dwyer
Principal Environmental Planner:	Chelsea Fordham
Principal Environmental Planner:	Allison Vanderslice
Senior Environmental Planner:	Ryan Shum
Senior Environmental Planner (transportation):	Elizabeth White
Senior Environmental Planner (wind):	Rachel Schuett
Senior Environmental Planner (air quality):	Josh Pollak

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTANT

ICF
595 Market Street, Suite 950
San Francisco, CA 94105

Project Director:	Heidi Mekkelson
Project Manager:	Jessica Viramontes
Environmental Planner:	Jennifer Ostner
Environmental Planner:	Devan Atteberry
Hazards and Hazardous Materials Specialist:	Mario Barrera
Noise Specialist:	Jason Volk
Air Quality Specialist:	Cory Matsui
Archaeologist:	Lindsley Britton
Architectural Historian:	Allison Lyons-Medina
GIS Specialist:	David Haughton
Editor:	John Mathias

TRANSPORTATION CONSULTANTS

Fehr & Peers
345 California Street, Suite 450
San Francisco, CA 94104

Matt Goyne
Kevin Zamzow-Pollock
Taylor McAdam

LCW Consulting
3990 20th Street
San Francisco, CA 94114 Luba C. Wyznyckyj

SHADOW CONSULTANT

PreVision Design
1806 Belles Street, Suite 6B
San Francisco, CA 94129 Adam Phillips

WIND CONSULTANT

RWDI
600 Southgate Drive
Guelph, Ontario N1G 4P6 Neetha Vasan
Shelby Ness

PROJECT SPONSOR

San Francisco Planning Commission

San Francisco Planning Department
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400
San Francisco, CA 94103

Planning Director:	Sarah Dennis Phillips
Director (Citywide Division):	Rachael Tanner
Deputy Director (Citywide Division):	Joshua Switzky
Principal Planner:	Lisa Chen
Senior Planner:	Esmeralda Jardines
Senior Planner:	James Pappas
Senior Planner:	Malena Leon-Farrera
Senior Planner:	Mat Snyder
Senior Planner:	Reanna Tong
Planner:	David Hernandez Garcia
Planner:	Dylan Hamilton
Planner:	Sarah Richardson
GIS Specialist:	Diana La
GIS Specialist:	Scott Edmondson
Communications Specialist:	Annie Yalon
Senior Community Development Specialist:	Carla de Mesa

APPENDIX A: AMENDED MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

APPENDIX A

San Francisco Planning

AGREEMENT TO IMPLEMENT MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Record No.:	2019-016230ENV, 2021-005878CWP, and 2021-005878GPA	*Block/Lot:*	Multiple
		Lot Size:	Not Applicable
Project Title:	~~San Francisco Housing Element 2022 Update~~ Family Zoning Plan – Housing Element Rezoning Program	*Project Sponsor:*	San Francisco Planning Commission, Lisa Chen, (628) 652-7422
BPA Nos:	Not Applicable	*Lead Agency:*	San Francisco Planning Department
Zoning:	Multiple Use Districts Multiple Height and Bulk Districts	*Staff Contact:*	Ryan Shum, (628) 652-7542 Elizabeth White – 628.652.7557

The table below indicates when compliance with each mitigation measure must occur. Some mitigation measures span multiple phases. Substantive descriptions of each mitigation measure's requirements are provided on the following pages in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program. Amendments to Mitigation Measures M-W-1a and 1b for clarity and conformance with Planning Code amendments are included, with deletions shown in ~~strikethrough~~ and additions shown in double underline.

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Period of Compliance			Compliance with Mitigation Measure Completed?
	Prior to the Start of Construction*	During Construction**	Post-construction or Operational	
Mitigation Measure M-CR-1a: Avoid or Minimize Effects on Identified Built Environment Resources	X			
Mitigation Measure M-CR-1b: Best Practices and Construction Monitoring Program for Historic Resources	X	X		
Mitigation Measure M-CR-1c: Relocation Plan	X	X		
Mitigation Measure M-CR-1d: Documentation	X			
Mitigation Measure M-CR-1e: Oral History	X	X		
Mitigation Measure M-CR-1f: Salvage Plan	X	X		
Mitigation Measure M-CR-1g: Interpretation	X	X		
Mitigation Measure M-CR-1h: Historic Context	X	X		
Mitigation Measure M-CR-1i: Walking or Building Tour	X	X		
Mitigation Measure M-CR-1j: Educational Program	X	X		
Mitigation Measure M-CR-1k: Community Memorial Event	X			

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Period of Compliance			Compliance with Mitigation Measure Completed?
	Prior to the Start of Construction*	During Construction**	Post-construction or Operational	
Mitigation Measure M-CR-1l: Revise Historic District Documentation	X	X		
Mitigation Measure M-CR-2a: Procedures for Discovery of Archeological Resources for Projects Involving Soil Disturbance	X	X		
Mitigation Measure M-CR-2b: Archeological Monitoring Program	X	X		
Mitigation Measure M-CR-2c: Archeological Testing Program	X	X		
Mitigation Measure M-CR-2d. Treatment of Submerged and Deeply Buried Resources	X	X		
Mitigation Measure M-TCR-1: Tribal Notification and Consultation	X			Yes – Family Rezoning Plan
Mitigation Measure M-TR-4a: Parking Maximums and Transportation Demand Management	X			
Mitigation Measure M-TR-4b: Driveway and Loading Operations Plan and Curb Cut Restrictions	X			
Mitigation Measure M-TR-4c: Implement Transit Travel Times Measures to Reduce Transit Delay	X	X	X	
Mitigation Measure M-TR-6: Curb Management Plans	X	X		
Mitigation Measure M-NO-1: Construction Noise Control	X			
Mitigation Measure M-NO-2: Noise Analysis and Attenuation	X			
Mitigation Measure M-NO-3a: Protection of Adjacent Buildings/Structures and Vibration Monitoring During Construction	X	X		
Mitigation Measure M-NO-3b: Prevent Interference with Vibration-Sensitive Equipment	X	X		
Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3: Clean Construction Equipment	X			
Mitigation Measure M-AQ-5: Best Available Control Technology for Diesel Engines	X	X	X	
Mitigation Measure M-WI-1a: Wind Minimization	X			
Mitigation Measure M-WI-1b: Maintenance Plan for Landscaping on or off the Project Site and Wind Baffling Measures in the Public Right-of-Way	X			
Mitigation Measure M-SH-1: Shadow Minimization	X			
Mitigation Measure M-GE-5: Inadvertent Discovery of Paleontological Resources during Construction	X	X		

NOTES:

* Prior to any ground disturbing activities at the project site.

** Construction is broadly defined to include any physical activities associated with construction of a development project including, but not limited to: site preparation, clearing, demolition, excavation, shoring, foundation installation, and building construction.

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
MITIGATION MEASURES AGREED TO BY PROJECT SPONSOR					
CULTURAL RESOURCES					
Mitigation Measure M-CR-1a: Avoid or Minimize Effects on Identified Built Environment Resources. The project sponsor of a future development project consistent with the housing element update that would result in material impairment to a built-environment historic resource, either an individual resource or a historic district, shall consult with the department's preservation and design staff on feasible means for avoiding or reducing significant adverse effects on built-environment resources per applicable department guidelines, such as residential design guidelines and policies in the urban design element. The project sponsor, in consultation with preservation and design staff, shall provide at minimum drawings and rendering of a proposed project that avoids material impairment of the historic resource in order for the environmental review officer (ERO) to determine if such a project is feasible. Additional studies and reports, such as an economic feasibility analysis, may be required as directed by the ERO. If the project is determined infeasible based on the above criteria, the project sponsor shall consult with the department's preservation and design staff to determine an approach to reduce the significant impact on built-environment resources. This could include, but is not limited to, retaining a portion of the existing building or retaining specific character-defining features and incorporating them into the project. The project sponsor shall demonstrate the feasibility, as defined in CEQA Guidelines section 15364 and as determined by the ERO, of retention of character-defining features or a portion of the existing building to the department's preservation and design staff by providing drawings and renderings along with other requested studies and reports.	Required for future development consistent with the housing element update that would not comply with the secretary's standards, would demolish historic resources, or would substantially alter important characteristics of a resource's historic setting	Project sponsor	Prior to approval of the future development project	Planning Department (preservation and design staff)	Considered complete upon review and approval of a proposed project

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
Mitigation Measure M-CR-1b: Best Practices and Construction Monitoring Program for Historic Resources. Prior to the issuance of demolition, building, or site permits, the project sponsor of a future development project consistent with the housing element update using heavy-duty construction equipment on a project site that contains a historic resources or on a project site that is adjacent to a historic resource shall incorporate into contract specifications a requirement that the contractor(s) use all feasible means to protect and avoid damage to onsite and adjacent historic resources as identified by the department, including, but not necessarily limited to, staging of equipment and materials so as to avoid direct damage, maintaining a buffer zone when possible between heavy equipment and historic resources, or covering the roof of adjacent structures to avoid damage from falling objects. Specifications shall also stipulate that any damage incurred to historic resources as a result of construction activities shall be reported to the environmental review officer within three days. Prior to the issuance of demolition, building, or site permits, the project sponsor shall submit to the department preservation staff for review and approval, a list of measures to be included in contract specifications to avoid damage to historic resources. If damage to a historic resource occurs during construction, the project sponsor shall hire a qualified professional who meets the standards for history, architectural history, or architecture (as appropriate), as set forth by the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards (36 Code of Federal Regulations, part 61). Damage incurred to the historic resource shall be repaired per the secretary's standards in consultation with the qualified professional and department preservation staff. If directed by department preservation staff, the project sponsor shall engage a qualified preservation professional to undertake a monitoring program to ensure that best practices are being followed. If monitoring is required, the qualified preservation professional shall prepare a monitoring plan to direct the monitoring program that shall be reviewed and approved by department preservation staff.	Required for future development consistent with the housing element update that would use heavy-duty construction equipment on a project site that contains a historic resource or on a project site that is adjacent to a historic resource	Project sponsor, qualified historic professional	Prior to the issuance of demolition, building, or site permits for the list of measures to be included in contract specifications; during construction if damage to a historic resource occurs.	Planning Department (preservation and design staff)	Considered complete when Planning Department preservation staff approve a list of measures to be included in contract specifications to avoid damage to historic resources. If damage occurs, considered complete upon approval of repair to historic resource and/or monitoring plan by Planning Department preservation staff.
Mitigation Measure M-CR-1c: Relocation Plan. If the department determines relocation of a historic resource is a feasible means of reducing impacts to the resource, the project sponsor shall retain a qualified historical architect who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards (36 Code of Federal Regulations, part 61) and structural engineer with experience in moving historic resources to prepare a relocation plan.	Required for future development consistent with the housing element update	Project sponsor, qualified historical architect,	Prior to the approval of any permits for the relocation plan; implementation of the relocation	Planning Department (preservation and design staff)	Considered complete upon implementation of a Planning Department-

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
The relocation plan will be reviewed and approved by the department to ensure that character-defining features of the buildings will be retained. The department's review and approval of the relocation plan shall occur prior to the approval of any permits for the proposed project. The relocation plan shall include required qualifications for the building relocation company to ensure that relocation is undertaken by a company that is experienced in moving historic buildings of a similar size and/or structural system as the historic resource. The relocation plan shall ensure that the historic resource will be moved without irreparable damage to the character-defining historic fabric of the resource. The project sponsor will incorporate into construction specifications for the proposed project a requirement that the construction contractor(s) use all feasible means to avoid damage to the subject property during its relocation, including, but not limited to, relocation methods and relocation activity routes, closures, and timing.	if relocation of a historic resource is a feasible means of reducing impacts to the resource	structural engineer	plan prior to the issuance of occupancy permit		approved relocation plan
Mitigation Measure M-CR-1d: Documentation. Prior to the issuance of demolition, building, or site permits, the project sponsor shall submit to the department for review photographic and narrative documentation of the subject building, structure, object, material, and landscaping. Documentation may apply to individually significant resources as well as district contributors and shall focus on the elements of the property that the project proposes to demolish or alter. The documentation shall be funded by the project sponsor and undertaken by a qualified professional who meets the standards for history, architectural history, or architecture (as deemed appropriate by the department's preservation staff), as set forth by the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards (36 Code of Federal Regulations, part 61). The department's preservation staff will determine the specific scope of the documentation depending upon the individual property's character-defining features and reasons for significance. The documentation scope shall be reviewed and approved by the department prior to any work on the documentation. A documentation package shall consist of the required forms of documentation and shall include a summary of the historic resource and an overview of the documentation provided. The types and level of documentation will be determined by department staff and may include any of the following formats: • *HABS/HALS-Like Measured Drawings* –A set of Historic American Building/Historic American Landscape Survey-like (HABS/HALS-like) measured drawings that depict the existing size, scale, and dimension of the subject property. The	Required for future development consistent with the housing element update that proposes to demolish or substantially alter a built-environment historic resource with distinctive physical qualities that contribute to the value of the physical environment and/or the public's	Project sponsor, qualified historic consultant	Prior to the issuance of demolition, building, or site permits	Planning Department preservation staff	Considered complete upon distribution by the project sponsor of completed documentation approved by Planning Department preservation staff

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
department's preservation staff will accept the original architectural drawings or an as-built set of architectural drawings (plan, section, elevation, etc.). The department's preservation staff will assist the consultant in determining the appropriate level of measured drawings. A cover sheet may be required that describes the historic significance of the property. • *HABS/HALS-Like Photographs* – Digital photographs of the interior and the exterior of the subject property. Large-format negatives are not required. The scope of the digital photographs shall be reviewed by the department's preservation staff for concurrence, and all digital photography shall be conducted according to current National Park Service standards. The photography shall be undertaken by a qualified professional with demonstrated experience in HABS photography. • *HABS/HALS-Like Historical Report* – If the department determines that existing survey information or historic resource evaluations of a property do not sufficiently document the historic resources' significant associations, a written historical narrative and report shall be provided in accordance with the HABS/HALS Historical Report Guidelines. The written history shall follow an outline format that begins with a statement of significance supported by the development of the architectural and historical context in which the structure was built and subsequently evolved. The report shall also include architectural description and bibliographic information. • *Print-on-Demand Book* – The Print-on-Demand book shall be made available to the public for distribution by the project sponsor. The project sponsor shall make the content from the historical report, historical photographs, HABS photography, measured drawings, and field notes available to the public through a preexisting print-on-demand book service. This service will print and mail softcover books containing the aforementioned materials to members of the public who have paid a nominal fee. The project sponsor shall not be required to pay ongoing printing fees once the book has been made available through the service. • *Digital Recordation* – In coordination with the department's preservation staff, the project sponsor may be required to prepare some other form of digital recordation of the historic resource. The most commonly requested digital	understanding of San Francisco history				

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
recordation is video documentation but other forms of digital recordation, include 3D laser scan models or 3D virtual tours, Gigapan/Matterpoint or other high-resolution immersive panoramic photography, time-lapse photography, photogrammetry, audio/olfactory recording, or other ephemeral documentation of the historic resource may be required. The purpose of these digital records is to supplement other recordation measures and enhance the collection of reference materials that would be available to the public and inform future research. This digital recordation could also be incorporated into the public interpretation program. Digital recordation shall be conducted by individuals with demonstrated experience in the requested type of digital recordation. If video documentation is required, it shall be conducted by a professional videographer with experience recording architectural resources. The professional videographer shall provide a storyboard of the proposed video recordation for review and approval by the department's preservation staff. • The project sponsor, in consultation with the department, shall conduct outreach to determine which repositories may be interested in receiving copies of the documentation. Potential repositories include but are not limited to, the San Francisco Public Library, the Environmental Design Library at the University of California, Berkeley, the Northwest Information Center, San Francisco Architectural Heritage, the California Historical Society, and Archive.org. The final approved documentation shall be provided in electronic form to the department and the interested repositories. The department will make electronic versions of the documentation available to the public for their use at no charge. • The professional(s) shall submit the completed documentation for review and approval by the department's preservation staff. All documentation must be reviewed and approved by the department prior to the issuance of any demolition, building or site permit is approved for a proposed project.					
Mitigation Measure M-CR-1e: Oral History. The project sponsor shall retain the services of a qualified historian with experience in oral history to undertake an oral history about the historic resource. This oral history project shall consist of interviews and recollections of individuals with a connection to the historic resource that may include owners, occupants, or other related community members. The success of this effort will depend primarily on the	Required for future development consistent with the housing element update when a future	Project sponsor, qualified historian	Prior to the issuance of occupancy permits	Planning Department preservation staff	Considered complete when Planning Department staff approves the oral history

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
ability of the project sponsor to locate such persons, and on their willingness/ability to participate. Therefore, the project sponsor shall make a good faith effort to publicize the oral history project, conduct public outreach, and identify a wide range of potential interviewees. To accomplish this, the sponsor shall employ a range of measures that may include hosting events that allow participants to record their recollections, and hosting a website that allows interviewees to contribute remotely. Prior to undertaking this effort, the scope and methodology of the oral history project shall be reviewed and approved by the department's preservation staff. In addition to potentially use for the on-site interpretive program or documentation, the project sponsor shall have the recordings of the oral history project transcribed and indexed, and the department shall host the transcribed and indexed recordings, which will made available to the public at no charge. The department will also ensure that any information provided in the oral histories are integrated with SF Survey and Citywide historic context statement summarized above. Transcribed and indexed recordings will also be made available to other archives and repositories in order to allow for remote, off-site historical interpretation of the historic resources.	project proposes to demolish or substantially alter an individual resource or historic district whose significance is closely associated with the lifeways or cultural heritage of an individual or group				
Mitigation Measure M-CR-1f: Salvage Plan. Prior to the issuance of demolition, building, or site permits that would remove character-defining features of a built environment historic resource that would have a significant impact, the project sponsor shall consult with the department's preservation staff as to whether any such features may be salvaged, in whole or in part, during demolition or alteration. The project sponsor shall make a good faith effort to salvage and protect materials of historical interest to be used as part of the interpretative program (if required), incorporated into the architecture of the new building that will be constructed on the site, or offered to non-profit or cultural affiliated groups. If this proves infeasible, the sponsor shall attempt to donate significant character-defining features or features of interpretative or historical interest to a historical organization or other educational or artistic group. The project sponsor shall prepare a salvage plan for review and approval by the department's preservation staff prior to issuance of any site demolition permit.	Required for future development consistent with the housing element update that would result in material impairment to a built-environment historic resource or would involve the removal of physical elements of a historic resource	Project sponsor, qualified historic consultant	Prior to the issuance of demolition, building, or site permits; prior to issuance of an occupancy permit for completed implementation of the salvage plan.	Planning Department preservation staff	Considered complete when Planning Department preservation staff approve the salvage plan and confirms project sponsor has completed all actions identified in the salvage plan

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
	that have discrete and identifiable significance				
Mitigation Measure M-CR-1g: Interpretation. The project sponsor shall facilitate the development of a public interpretive program focused on the history of the project site, its identified historic resources, and its significant historic context. The interpretive program should be developed and implemented by a qualified design professional with demonstrated experience in displaying information and graphics to the public in a visually interesting manner, as well as a professionally qualified historian or architectural historian, or community group approved by the department. Through consultation with department preservation staff, coordination with local artists should occur. The primary goal of the program is to educate visitors and future residents about the property's historical themes, associations, and lost contributing features within broader historical, social, and physical landscape contexts. The interpretive program shall be initially outlined in an interpretive plan subject to review and approval by the department's preservation staff prior to approval of demolition, building, or site permits for the project. The plan shall include the general parameters of the interpretive program including the substance, media, and other elements of the interpretative program. The interpretive program shall include within publicly accessible areas of the project site permanent display(s) of interpretive materials concerning the history and design features of the affected historic resource, including both the site as a whole and the individual contributing buildings and features. The display shall be placed in a prominent, public setting within, on the exterior of, or in the vicinity of newly constructed buildings or other features within the project site. The interpretive material(s) shall be made of durable all-weather materials and may also include digital media in addition to a permanent display. The interpretive material(s) shall be of high quality and installed to allow for high public visibility. Content developed for other mitigation measures, as applicable, including the oral history and documentation programs, may be used to inform and provide content for the interpretive program. For properties that do not have a completed Historic Resource Evaluation, the professionally qualified consultant shall undertake research to sufficiently place the historic resource within its larger historic	Required for future development consistent with the housing element update that would demolish or substantially alter an individual built-environment historic resource or historic district associated with significant social, cultural, architectural, or historical themes or narratives	Project sponsor, qualified design professional, qualified historian or architectural historian, or community group	Prior to approval of demolition, building, or site permits for interpretation plan; prior to issuance of an occupancy permit for installation and maintenance of interpretation program	Planning Department preservation staff	Considered complete when Planning Department preservation staff approve the installation of interpretation program; maintenance of interpretation program ongoing

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
context (geographic and thematic). The interpretive program may also incorporate video documentation completed under M-CR-1f, Documentation, as applicable to provide a narrated video that describes the materials, construction methods, current condition, historical use, historic context and cultural significance of the historic resource. The detailed content, media, and other characteristics of such an interpretive program shall be coordinated and approved by the department's preservation staff. The final components of the public interpretation program shall be constructed and an agreed upon schedule for their installation and a plan for their maintenance shall be finalized prior to issuance of a Temporary Certificate of Occupancy. The interpretive program shall be developed in coordination with the other interpretative programs as relevant, such as interpretation required under archeological resource mitigation measures and tribal cultural resource mitigation measures, Native American land acknowledgments, or other public interpretation programs. The department will also ensure that any information gathered through the interpretative program development is integrated with SF Survey and Citywide historic context statement summarized above.					
Mitigation Measure M-CR-1h: Historic Context. To assist in the collection of information that will inform and direct the historical interpretation, the sponsor shall fund a historic context study prepared by a professionally qualified historian or architectural historian, or community group approved by the department to identify significant trends and events associated with a relevant topic to the identified historic resource, as well as identify other associated buildings and sites throughout San Francisco. The objective of this study is to provide background information that will enrich the historical contexts that have already been established for the subject building and to place the subject building within the wider relevant context, for the benefit of the general public interpretation program. The department will also ensure that the historic context is integrated with SF Survey and Citywide historic context statement summarized above.	Required for future planning code amendments to implement the housing element update or required for future development consistent with the housing element update that would demolish or substantially	Planning department or project sponsor, professionally qualified historian or architectural historian, or community group	Prior to implementation of future planning code amendments or for future development projects, prior to approval of demolition, building, or site permits for study scope; prior to issuance of occupancy permit for	Planning Department preservation staff	Considered complete upon approval of historic context study by Planning Department preservation staff. Planning department preservation staff will include historic context statement into the SF Survey and Citywide

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
	alter an individual built-environment historic resource or historic district associated with significant social, cultural, architectural, or historical themes or narratives		completion of the approved historic context		historic context statement.
Mitigation Measure M-CR-1i: Walking or Building Tour. The project sponsor shall engage with SF City Guides, or another tour guide group or association as approved by the department's preservation staff, to develop content for a walking or building tour relevant to the historic resource. The project sponsor shall reach out to the list of tour guide groups provided by preservation staff and provide copies of communication with those groups. Once a tour guide group has been identified, the project sponsor shall engage a qualified architectural historian meeting the qualifications set forth in the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards to work with the sponsor and selected tour guide group to develop content for the tour. Tour content shall use information found in the Historic Resources Evaluation and the Historic Resources Evaluation Response prepared for the project, other available background information on the resource, and the content from other mitigation measures. Other existing information, including photographs, news articles, oral histories, memorabilia and video, may be used to develop information for the walking tour as necessary. The qualified architectural historian and scope of work must be reviewed by preservation staff prior to the issuance of demolition, building, or site permits. Preservation staff must review and approve final content of the walking tour and must receive proof of receipt by the approved tour group or association prior to issuance of temporary certificate of occupancy.	Required for future development consistent with the housing element update that would demolish or substantially alter an individual built-environment historic resource or historic district associated with significant social, cultural, architectural, or historical themes or narratives	Project sponsor, qualified architectural historian, community or tour group	Prior to the issuance of demolition, building, or site permits project sponsor will obtain a qualified architectural historian and Planning Department approval of a scope of work; prior to issuance of occupancy permit Planning Department will review and approve walking or building tour content	Planning Department preservation staff	Considered complete when proof of receipt from approved tour group or association received by Planning Department preservation staff

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
Mitigation Measure M-CR-1j: Educational Program. The project sponsor shall fund the preparation of an educational program that describes the history and significant associations of the historic resource. The scope of the program shall be determined in consultation with the department and shall be prepared by a professionally qualified historian, architectural historian, or historical architecture (as appropriate), as set forth by the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards (36 Code of Federal Regulations, part 61), or community or educational group approved by the department. The purpose of the educational program is to package the relevant history and significant associations into an educational format that engages the public in the significance of the resource, which could serve as a teaching curriculum or presentation the public could easily understand. Other mitigation measures may provide materials that aid in the preparation of the educational program.	Required for future development consistent with the housing element update that would demolish or substantially alter an individual built-environment historic resource or historic district associated with significant social, cultural, architectural, or historical themes or narratives	Project sponsor, professionally qualified historian, architectural historian, or historical architecture, or community or educational group	Prior to the issuance of demolition, building, or site permits Planning Department will approve scope of work; prior to issuance of occupancy permit Planning Department will approve educational program	Planning Department preservation staff	Considered complete upon distribution of educational program approved by Planning Department preservation staff
Mitigation Measure M-CR-1k: Community Memorial Event. For the public benefit in commemorating a publicly accessible historic resource that is significant for association with a community, social group, or neighborhood, the project sponsor shall organize and fund a commemorative event recognizing the historic resource's significance in the form of a public gathering. The project sponsor shall reach out to relevant community groups associated with the historic resource that may be interested in co-sponsoring the organization of the commemorative event. The purpose of the event would be to commemorate the site's history and provide a public space to gather information, stories, or other histories relevant to the historic resource that may inform other mitigation measures including documentation, oral histories, and interpretation. The form of the event shall be determined in coordination with department staff and may take on a variety of forms. This could include a publicly led tour or open house that takes place at the site of the historic resource, or an event held nearby the historic resource.	Required for future development consistent with the housing element update that would demolish or substantially alter an individual built-environment historic resource or historic district associated with	Project sponsor	Prior to the issuance of demolition, building, or site permits	Planning Department preservation staff	Considered complete after community memorial event; community event form and content approved by Planning Department preservation staff

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
	significant social, cultural, architectural, or historical themes or narratives				
Mitigation Measure M-CR-1l: Revise Historic District Documentation. The project sponsor shall coordinate with preservation planning staff to determine the project's contribution towards any impairment of a historic district, review the historic district documentation, and determine if the district boundaries should be revised to retain a portion of the district that still expresses some aspects of its historical significance. Based on the extent of contribution, preservation planning staff may require the project sponsor to engage a professionally qualified architectural historian, as set forth by the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards (36 Code of Federal Regulations, part 61) to prepare documentation of the revised district boundary and justification of its retained integrity. The revised documentation shall be submitted to the appropriate reviewing agency, depending upon its previous level of evaluation or designation. Such documentation may include a historic district assessment report for review by the department's preservation staff, or a National Register of Historic Places designation form for review by the State Historic Preservation Office.	Required for future planning code amendments to implement the housing element update or future development consistent with the housing element update that would result in material impairment to a historic district listed in or eligible for listing in local, state, or national registers	Planning Department or project sponsor, professionally qualified architectural historian	Prior to implementation of future planning code amendments or for future development projects, prior to the issuance of occupancy permit	Planning Department preservation staff	Considered complete upon approval of revised documentation by Planning Department preservation staff
Mitigation Measure M-CR-2a: Procedures for Discovery of Archeological Resources for Projects Involving Soil Disturbance. The following mitigation measure shall be implemented for any project for which the preliminary archeological review conducted by department staff identifies the potential for significant archeological impacts. This measure applies to discoveries made in the absence of an archeologist and to discoveries during archeological monitoring or testing.	Required for future development consistent with the housing element update if the site has	Project sponsor	Prior to and during soils-disturbing activities	Planning Department cultural resources staff	Considered complete when Environmental Review Officer receives the signed affidavit

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
ALERT sheet. The project sponsor shall distribute the planning department archeological resource "ALERT" sheet to the project prime contractor; to any project subcontractor (including demolition, excavation, grading, foundation, pile driving, etc. firms); or utilities firm involved in soils-disturbing activities within the project site. Prior to any soils-disturbing activities being undertaken, each contractor is responsible for ensuring that the "ALERT" sheet is circulated to all field personnel, including machine operators, field crew, pile drivers, supervisory personnel, etc. The project sponsor shall provide the environmental review officer (ERO) with a signed affidavit from the responsible parties (prime contractor, subcontractor(s), and utilities firm) confirming that all field personnel involved in soil-disturbing activities have received copies of the "ALERT" sheet. ***Procedures Upon Discovery of a Suspected Archeological Resource.*** The following measures shall be implemented in the event of a suspected archeological discovery during project soil-disturbing activities: ***Discovery Stop Work and Environmental Review Officer Notification.*** Should any indication of an archeological resource be encountered during any soils-disturbing activity of the project, the project sponsor shall immediately notify the ERO and shall immediately suspend any soils-disturbing activities in the vicinity of the discovery and protect the find in place until the significance of the find has been evaluated and the ERO has determined whether and what additional measures are warranted, and these measures have been implemented, as detailed below.	moderate archeological sensitivity, anticipated archeological site types that would be identifiable by construction crews, and construction methods that allow for archeological site identification (such as shallow excavation) or based on the outcome of preliminary archeological review conducted by department staff				
Archeological Consultant Identification. If the preliminary archeological review did not require archeological monitoring or testing, and an archeological discovery during construction occurs prior to the identification of a project archeologist, and the ERO determines that the discovery may represent a significant archeological resource, the project sponsor shall retain the services of an archeological consultant (hereinafter "project archeologist") from a firm listed on the Qualified Archeological Consultant list maintained by the department to identify, document, and evaluate the resource, under the direction of the ERO. The project sponsor shall ensure that the project archeologist or designee is empowered, for the remainder of soil-disturbing project activity, to halt soil disturbing activity in the vicinity of potential archeological finds, and that work remains halted until the discovery has been assessed and a treatment determination made, as detailed below.		Project sponsor, archeological consultant/ project archeologist, Environmental Review Officer	During soils-disturbing activities if archeological resources are encountered	Planning Department cultural resources staff	Considered complete when archeological consultant completes additional measures as directed by the Environmental Review Officer as warranted

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
Resource Evaluation and Treatment Determination. If an archeological find is encountered during construction or archeological monitoring or testing, the project archeologist shall redirect soil-disturbing and heavy equipment activity in the vicinity away from the find. If in the case of pile driving activity (e.g., foundation, shoring, etc.), the project archeologist has cause to believe that the pile driving activity may affect an archeological resource, the project sponsor shall ensure that pile driving is halted until an appropriate evaluation of the resource has been made. The ERO may also require that the project sponsor immediately implement a site security program if the archeological resource is at risk from vandalism, looting, or other damaging actions. Initial documentation and assessment. The project archeologist shall document the find and make a reasonable effort to assess its identity, integrity, and significance of the encountered archeological deposit through sampling or testing, as needed. The project sponsor shall make provisions to ensure that the project archeologist can safely enter the excavation, if feasible. The project sponsor shall ensure that the find is protected until the ERO has been consulted and has determined appropriate subsequent treatment in consultation with the project archeologist, and the treatment has been implemented, as detailed below. The project archeologist shall make a preliminary assessment of the significant and physical integrity of the archeological resource and shall present the findings to the ERO. If, based on this information, the ERO determines that construction would result in impacts to a significant resource, the ERO shall consult with the project sponsor and other parties regarding the feasibility and effectiveness of preservation-in-place of the resource, as detailed below. Native American Archeological Deposits and Tribal Notification. All Native American archeological deposits shall be assumed to be significant unless determined otherwise in consultation with the ERO. If a Native American archeological deposit is encountered, soil disturbing work shall be halted as detailed above. In addition, the ERO shall notify any tribal representatives who, in response to the project tribal cultural resource notification, requested to be notified of discovery of Native American archeological resources in order to coordinate on the treatment of archeological and tribal cultural resources. Further the project archeologist shall offer a Native American representative the opportunity to monitor any subsequent soil disturbing activity that could affect the find.					

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
Submerged Paleosols. Should a submerged paleosol be identified, the project archeologist shall extract and process samples for dating, paleobotanical analysis, and other applicable special analyses pertinent to identification of possible cultural soils and for environmental reconstruction. Archeological Site Records. After assessment of any discovered resources, the project archeologist shall prepare an archeological site record or primary record (DPR 523 series) for each documented resource. In addition, a primary record shall be prepared for any prehistoric isolate. Each such record shall be accompanied by a map and GIS location file. Records shall be submitted to the planning department for review as attachments to the archeological resources report (see below) and once approved by the ERO, to the Northwest Information Center. Plans and Reports. All archeological plans and reports identified herein and in the subsequent measures, shall be submitted by the project archeologist directly to the ERO for review and comment and shall be considered draft reports subject to revision until final approval by the ERO. The project archeologist may submit draft reports to the project sponsor simultaneously with submittal to ERO. Limit on Construction Delays for Archeological Treatment. Archeological testing and as applicable data recovery programs required to address archeological discoveries, pursuant to this measure, could suspend construction of the project for up to a maximum of four weeks. At the direction of the ERO, the suspension of construction can be extended beyond four weeks only if such a suspension is the only feasible means to reduce to a less than significant level potential effects on a significant archeological resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines. Preservation-in-Place Consideration. Should an archeological resource that meets California register significance criteria be discovered during construction, archeological testing, or monitoring, preservation-in-place (i.e., permanently protect the resource from further disturbance and take actions, as needed, to preserve depositional and physical integrity) of the entire deposit or feature is the preferred treatment option. The ERO shall consult with the project sponsor and, for Native American archeological resources, with tribal representatives, if requested, to consider 1) the feasibility of permanently preserving the resource in place, feasible and effective, the project archeologist, in consultation with the ERO, shall prepare a Cultural Resources Preservation Plan. For Native American archeological resources, the project archeologist shall also consult with the tribal representatives, and the Cultural Resources Preservation Plan shall take into					

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
consideration the cultural significance of the tribal cultural resource to the tribes. Preservation options may include measures such as design of the project layout to place open space over the resource location; foundation design to avoid the use of pilings or deep excavations in the sensitive area; a plan to expose and conserve the resource and include it in an on-site interpretive exhibit; tribal representatives for review and for ERO approval. The project sponsor shall ensure that the approved plan is implemented and shall coordinate with the department to ensure that disturbance of the resource will not occur in future, such as establishing a preservation easement. If, based on this consultation, the ERO determines that preservation-in-place is infeasible or would be ineffective in preserving the significance of the resource, archeological data recovery and public interpretation of the resource shall be carried out, as detailed below. The ERO in consultation with the project archeologist shall also determine whether and what additional treatment is warranted, which may include additional testing, construction monitoring, and public interpretation of the resource, as detailed below. Coordination with Descendant Communities. On discovery of an archeological site associated with descendant Native Americans, Chinese, or other identified descendant cultural group, the project archeologist shall contact an appropriate representative of the descendant group and the ERO. The representative of the descendant group shall be offered the opportunity to monitor archeological field investigations of the site and to offer recommendations to the ERO regarding appropriate archeological treatment of the site and data recovered from the site, and, if applicable, any interpretative treatment of the site. The project archeologist shall provide a copy of the Archeological Resources Report (ARR) to the representative of the descendant group. Compensation. Following on the initial tribal consultation, the ERO, project sponsor and project archeologist, as appropriate, shall work with the tribal representative or other descendant or descendant community representatives to identify the scope of work for a representative to fulfill the requirements of this mitigation measure, which may include participation in archeological monitoring, preparation and review of deliverables (e.g., plans, interpretive materials, art work). Tribal representatives or other descendant community representatives for archeological resources or tribal cultural resources, who complete tasks in the agreed upon scope of work project, shall be compensated for their work as identified in the agreed upon scope of work.					

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
Archeological Data Recovery Program. The project archeologist shall prepare an archeological data recovery plan if all three of the following apply: (1) a potentially significant resource is discovered, (2) preservation-in-place is not feasible, as determined by the ERO after implementation of the Preservation-in-Place Consideration procedures, and (3) the ERO determines that archeological data recovery is warranted. When the ERO makes such a determination, the project archeologist, project sponsor, ERO and, for tribal cultural archeological resources, the tribal representative, if requested by a tribe, shall consult on the scope of the data recovery program. The project archeologist shall prepare a draft archeological data recovery plan and submit it to the ERO for review and approval. If the time needed for preparation and review of a comprehensive archeological data recovery plan would result in a significant construction delay, the scope of data recovery may instead by agreed upon in consultation between the project archeologist and the ERO and documented by the project archeologist in a memo to the ERO. The archeological data recovery plan/memo shall identify how the proposed data recovery program will preserve the significant information the archeological resource is expected to contain. That is, the archeological data recovery plan/memo will identify what scientific/historical research questions are applicable to the expected resource, what data classes the resource is expected to possess, and how the expected data classes would address the applicable research questions. Data recovery, in general, should be limited to the portions of the property that could be adversely affected by the proposed project. Destructive data recovery methods shall not be applied to portions of the archeological resource that would not otherwise by disturbed by construction if nondestructive methods are practical. The archeological data recovery plan shall include the following elements: • Field Methods and Procedures: Descriptions of proposed field strategies, procedures, and operations • Cataloguing and Laboratory Analysis: Description of selected cataloguing system and artifact analysis procedures • Discard Policy: Description of and rationale for field and post-field discard and deaccession policies • Security Measures: Recommended security measures to protect the archeological resource from vandalism, looting, and non-intentionally damaging activities		Project sponsor, project archeologist, Environmental Review Officer, tribal representative (if requested)	After determination by the Environmental Review Officer that an archeological data recovery program is required	Planning Department cultural resources staff	Considered complete upon approval of archeological data recovery program by Environmental Review Officer

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
• Report of Data Recovery Results: Description of proposed report format and distribution of results • Public Interpretation: Description of potential types of interpretive products and locations of interpretive exhibits based on consultation with project sponsor • Curation: Description of the procedures and recommendations for the curation of any recovered data having potential research value, identification of appropriate curation facilities, and a summary of the accession policies of the curation facilities The project archeologist shall implement the archeological data recovery program upon approval of the archeological data recovery plan/memo by the ERO. ***Coordination of Archeological Data Recovery Investigations.*** In cases in which the same resource has been or is being affected by another project for which data recovery has been conducted, is in progress, or is planned, the following measures shall be implemented to maximize the scientific and interpretive value of the data recovered from both archeological investigations: • In cases where an investigation has not yet begun, project archeologists for each project impacting the same resource and the ERO, as applicable, shall consult on coordinating and collaborating on archeological research design, data recovery methods, analytical methods, reporting, curation and interpretation to ensure consistent data recovery and treatment of the resource. • In cases where archeological data recovery investigation is under way or has been completed for a project, the project archeologist for the subsequent project shall consult with the prior project archeologist, if available; review prior treatment plans, findings and reporting; and inspect and assess existing archeological collections/inventories from the site prior to preparation of the archeological treatment plan for the subsequent discovery, and shall incorporate prior findings in the final report for the subsequent investigation. The objectives of this coordination and review of prior methods and findings shall be to identify refined research questions; determine appropriate data recovery methods and analyses; assess new findings relative to prior research findings; and integrate prior findings into subsequent reporting and interpretation.					

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
Treatment of Human Remains and Funerary Objects. If human remains or suspected human remains are encountered during construction, the contractor and project sponsor shall ensure that ground-disturbing work within 50 feet of the remains is halted immediately and shall arrange for the protection in place of the remains until appropriate treatment and disposition have been agreed upon and implemented in accordance with this measure. The treatment of any human remains and funerary objects discovered during any soil- disturbing activity shall comply with applicable state laws, including Health and Safety Code section 7050.5 and Public Resources Code section 5097.98. Upon determining that the remains are human, the project archeologist shall immediately notify the Medical Examiner of the City and County of San Francisco, the ERO, and the project sponsor of the find. If the remains cannot be permanently preserved in place, the landowner or designee shall consult with the most likely descendant and may consult with the project archeologist, project sponsor and the ERO on recovery of the remains and any scientific treatment alternatives. The landowner shall then make all reasonable efforts to develop a burial agreement (agreement) with the most likely descendant, as expeditiously as possible, for the treatment and disposition, with appropriate dignity, of human remains and funerary objects (as detailed in CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5(d)). Per Public Resources Code section 5097.98(c)(1), the agreement shall address, as applicable and to the degree consistent with the wishes of the most likely descendant, the appropriate excavation, removal, recordation, scientific analysis, custodianship prior to reinternment or curation, and final disposition of the human remains and funerary objects. If the most likely descendant agrees to scientific analyses of the remains and/or funerary objects, the project archeologist shall retain possession of the remains and funerary objects until completion of any such analyses, after which the remains and funerary objects shall be reinterred or curated as specified in the agreement. If the landowner or designee and the most likely descendant are unable to reach an agreement on scientific treatment of the remains and/or funerary objects, the ERO, in consultation with the project sponsor shall ensure that the remains and/or funerary objects are stored securely and respectfully until they can be reinterred on the project site, with appropriate dignity, in a location not subject to further or future subsurface disturbance, in accordance with the provisions of state law.		Project sponsor, archeological consultant in consultation with the San Francisco Medical Examiner, Environmental Review Officer, and Native American Heritage Commission and most likely descendant as warranted.	Discovery of human remains	Planning Department cultural resources staff, Medical Examiner, and Native American Heritage Commission and most likely descendant as warranted.	Considered complete on finding by the Environmental Review Officer that all state laws regarding human remains/burial objects have been adhered to, consultation with the most likely descendant is completed as warranted, and disposition of human remains has occurred as specified in agreement

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
Treatment of historic-period human remains and/or funerary objects discovered during any soil-disturbing activity shall be in accordance with protocols laid out in the research design in the project archeological monitoring plan, archeological testing plan, archeological data recovery plan, and other relevant agreements established between the project sponsor, medical examiner, and the ERO. The project archeologist shall retain custody of the remains and associated materials while any scientific study scoped in the treatment document is conducted and the remains shall then be curated or respectfully reinterred by arrangement on a case-by case-basis.					
Cultural Resources Public Interpretation Plan and Land Acknowledgement. If a significant archeological resource (i.e., a historical resource or unique archeological resources as defined by CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5) is identified and the ERO determines in consultation with Native American representatives for Native American archeological resources, that the public interpretation is warranted, the project archeologist shall prepare a Cultural Resources Public Interpretation Plan. The Cultural Resources Public Interpretation Plan shall describe the interpretive products, locations or distribution of interpretive materials or displays, the proposed content and materials, the producers or artists of the displays or installation, and a long-term maintenance program. If the resource to be interpreted is a tribal cultural resource, the department shall notify Native American tribal representatives that public interpretation is being planned. If requested by tribal representatives, the Cultural Resources Public Interpretation Plan shall be prepared in consultation with and developed with the participation of Native American tribal representatives. For public projects or projects that include dedicated public spaces, the interpretive materials may include an acknowledgement that the project is located upon traditional Ohlone lands. For interpretation of a tribal cultural resource, the interpretive program may include a combination of artwork, preferably by local Native American artists, educational panels or other informational displays, a plaque, or other interpretative elements including digital products that address Native American experience and the layers of history. As feasible, and where landscaping is proposed, the interpretive effort may include the use and the interpretation of native and traditional plants incorporated into the proposed landscaping.		Archeological consultant at the direction of the Environmental Review Officer will prepare Cultural Resources Public Interpretation Plan. Measures laid out in Cultural Resources Public Interpretation Plan are implemented by project sponsor	Following completion of treatment and analysis of significant archeological resource by archeological consultant	Planning Department cultural resources staff	Cultural Resources Public Interpretation Plan is complete on review and approval of Environmental Review Officer. Interpretive program is complete on notification to Environmental Review Officer from the project sponsor that program has been implemented

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
The project archeologist shall submit the cultural resources public interpretation plan and drafts of any interpretive materials that are subsequently prepared to the ERO for review and approval. The project sponsor shall ensure that the cultural resources public interpretation plan is implemented prior to occupancy of the project.					
Archeological Resources Report. If significant archeological resources, as defined by CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5, are encountered, the project archeologist shall submit a confidential draft Archeological Resources Report to the ERO. This report shall evaluate the significance of any discovered archeological resource, describe the archeological and historical research methods employed in the archeological programs undertaken, the results and interpretation of analyses, and discuss curation arrangements. Once approved by the ERO, the project archeologist shall distribute the approved Archeological Resources Report as follows: copies that meet current information center requirements at the time the report is completed to the California Archeological Site Survey Northwest Information Center, and a copy of the transmittal of the approved Archeological Resources Report to the Northwest Information Center to the ERO; one bound hardcopy of the Archeological Resources Report, along with digital files that include an unlocked, searchable PDF version of the Archeological Resources Report, GIS shapefiles of the site and feature locations, any formal site recordation forms (CA DPR 523 series), and/or documentation for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places/California Register of Historical Resources, via USB or other stable storage device, to the environmental planning division of the planning department; and, if a descendant group was consulted, a digital or hard copy of the Archeological Resources Report to the descendant group, depending on their preference.		Archeological consultant at the direction of the Environmental Review Officer	Following completion of treatment by archeological consultant as determined by the Environmental Review Officer	Planning Department cultural resources staff	Complete on certification to Environmental Review Officer that copies of the approved Archeological Resources Report have been distributed
Curation. If archeological data recovery is undertaken, the project archeologist and the project sponsor shall ensure that any significant archeological collections and paleoenvironmental samples of future research value shall be permanently curated at an established curatorial facility. The facility shall be selected in consultation with the ERO. Upon submittal of the collection for curation the project sponsor or archeologist shall provide a copy of the signed curatorial agreement to the ERO.		Project archeologist prepares collection for curation and project sponsor pays for curation costs	In the event a significant archeological resource is discovered and upon acceptance by the	Planning Department cultural resources staff	Considered complete upon acceptance of the collection by the curatorial facility

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
			Environmental Review Officer of the Archeological Resources Report		
Mitigation Measure M-CR-2b: Archeological Monitoring Program. If required based on the outcome of preliminary archeological review conducted by department staff, to avoid and mitigate impacts from the proposed action on significant archeological resources found during construction, the project archeologist shall develop and implement an archeological monitoring program as specified herein, and shall conduct an archeological testing and/or data recovery program if required to address archeological discoveries or the assessed potential for archeological discoveries, pursuant to this measure and Mitigation Measure M-CR-2a. ***Qualified Archeologist Identification.*** After the first project approval action or as directed by the environmental review officer (ERO), the project sponsor shall contact the department archeologist to obtain the names and contact information for three qualified archeological consultants on the department's list of qualified archeological consultants, and shall retain one of those archeological consultants ("project archeologist") to develop and implement an archeological monitoring program under the direction of the ERO.	Required for future development consistent with the housing element update based on the outcome of preliminary archeological review conducted by department staff	Project sponsor/ archeological consultant at the direction of the Environmental Review Officer	After the first project approval action or as directed by the Environmental Review Officer, prior to issuance of construction permits and throughout the construction period	Planning Department cultural resources staff	Complete when project sponsor retains qualified archeological consultant
Construction Crew Archeological Awareness. Prior to any soil-disturbing activity, the project archeologist shall conduct a brief on-site archeological awareness training that describes the types of resources that might be encountered and how they might be recognized, and requirements and procedures for work stoppage, resource protection and notification in the event of a potential archeological discovery. The project archeologist also shall distribute an "Alert" wallet card (based on the department's "ALERT" sheet) to all field personnel (e.g., machine operators, field crew, pile drivers, supervisory personnel) involved in soil disturbing activities, which summarizes stop work requirements and provides information on how to contact the project archeologist and ERO. The project archeologist shall repeat the training at intervals during construction, as determined necessary by the ERO, including when new construction personnel start work and prior to periods of soil disturbing work when the project archeologist will not be on site.		Project archeologist for awareness training, Native American representative for Native American cultural resources sensitivity	Prior to any soil-disturbing activity	Planning Department cultural resources staff	Considered complete when all trainings conducted

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
Tribal Cultural Resources Sensitivity Training. In addition to the archeological awareness training, for sites at which the ERO has determined that there is the potential for the discovery of Native American archeological resources or if requested by a tribe pursuant to the department's tribal cultural resources notification process, the project sponsor shall ensure that a Native American representative is afforded the opportunity to provide a Native American cultural resources sensitivity training to all construction personnel.		training (if requested)			
Archeological Monitoring Program. Based on the results of information provided in the preliminary archeological review and additional historical research as needed, the project archeologist shall consult with the ERO prior to the commencement of any project-related soils disturbing activities to determine the appropriate scope of archeological monitoring, allowing for required document preparation and review time. The archeological monitoring program shall be set forth in an Archeological Monitoring Plan, as detailed below. The project archeologist shall be present on the project site according to a schedule agreed upon by the project archeologist and the ERO until the ERO has, in consultation with the project archeologist, determined that project construction activities could have no effects on significant archeological deposits. The project archeologist shall prepare a daily monitoring log documenting activities and locations monitored, soil disturbance depth, stratigraphy, and findings. The project archeologist has the authority to temporarily stop soil disturbing construction activity in the vicinity of a suspected find to document the resource, collect samples as needed, and assess its significance. The project sponsor shall ensure that the find is protected in place in accordance with the archeologist's direction, and that it remains protected until the archeologist, after consultation with the ERO, notifies the project sponsor that assessment and any subsequent mitigation are complete. The project sponsor shall also ensure that the construction foreperson or other on-site delegee, is aware of the stop work and protection requirements. In the event of a discovery of a potentially significant archeological resources during monitoring or construction, the project archeologist shall conduct preliminary testing of the discovery, including the collection of soil samples and artifactual/ ecofactual material, as needed to assess potential significance and integrity. Once this initial assessment has been made, the project archeologist shall consult with the ERO on the results of the assessment. If the resource is assessed as potentially		Project archeologist at the direction of the Environmental Review Officer	Prior to issuance of construction permits and throughout the construction period	Planning Department cultural resources staff	After implementation of Archeological Monitoring Plan approved by the Environmental Review Officer

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
significant, the project sponsor shall ensure that soil disturbance remains halted at the discovery location until appropriate treatment has been determined in consultation with the ERO and implemented, as detailed below. ***Archeological Monitoring Plan.*** The archeological monitoring plan shall include the following provisions: • Project Description: Description of all anticipated soil disturbing activities (e.g., foundation and utility demolition, hazardous soils remediation, site grading, shoring excavations, piles or soil improvements, and foundation, elevator, car stacker, utility, and landscaping excavations), with project plans and profiles, as needed, to illustrate the anticipated soil disturbance. • Site Specific Environmental and Cultural Context: Pre-contact and historic environmental and cultural setting of the project site as pertains to potential Native American use and historic period development; any available information pertaining to subsequent soil disturbance, current knowledge of soil stratigraphy. As appropriate based on the scale and scope of the project, the Archeological Monitoring Plan should include historic maps, as a basis for predicting resource types that might be encountered and their potential locations. An overlay of the project site on the city's prehistoric sensitivity model mapping should be included, as should the locations of all known archeological sites within 0.25 mile of the project site. • Anticipated Resources or Resource Types: Likely resources that might be encountered and at what locations and depths, based on known resources in the vicinity, the site's predevelopment setting and development history, and the anticipated depth and extent of project soil disturbances. • Proposed Scope of Archeological Monitoring: Include soil-disturbing activities/ disturbance depths to be monitored. • Synopsis of Required Procedures: For the assessment and treatment of discoveries, ERO and Native American consultation requirements; burial treatment procedures; and reporting and curation requirements, consistent with the specifications of Mitigation Measure M-CR-2a.					

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
Resource Evaluation and Treatment Determination. Upon discovery of a suspected archeological resource during construction or archeological monitoring, Mitigation Measure M-CR-2a's Resource Evaluation and Treatment Determination stipulations shall be implemented as specified in that measure. ***Additional Applicable Measures.*** If a significant archeological resource is identified, and data recovery is required under Mitigation Measure M-CR-2a's Resource Evaluation and Treatment Determination stipulations, the following additional measures identified in the Mitigation Measure M-CR-2a shall be implemented as specified in that measure: • Archeological Data Recovery Program • Treatment of Human Remains and Funerary Objects (as applicable) • Coordination of Archeological Data Recovery Investigations • Cultural Resources Public Interpretation Plan and Land Acknowledgement (as applicable) • Archeological Resources Report • Curation		Project archeologist at the direction of the Environmental Review Officer	Upon discovery of suspected archeological resource	Planning Department cultural resources staff	Completed when Environmental Review Officer concurs that the status of the additional measures identified in Mitigation Measure M-CR-2a are completed
Mitigation Measure M-CR-2c: Archeological Testing Program. If required based on the outcome of preliminary archeological review conducted by department staff, to avoid and mitigate impacts from the proposed action on significant archeological resources found during construction, the project archeologist shall develop and implement an archeological testing program as specified herein, and shall conduct an archeological monitoring and/or data recovery program if required to address archeological discoveries or the assessed potential for archeological discoveries, pursuant to this measure and Mitigation Measure M-CR-2a: Procedures for Discovery of Archeological Resources for Projects Involving Soil Disturbance. ***Qualified Archeologist Identification.*** After the first project approval action or as directed by the ERO, the project sponsor shall contact the department archeologist to obtain the names and contact information for the next three qualified archeological consultants on the department's list and shall retain a qualified archeologist (hereinafter "project archeologist") from this list of three to develop and implement the archeological testing program.	Required for future development consistent with the housing element update based on the outcome of preliminary archeological review conducted by department staff	Project sponsor/ archeological consultant at the direction of the Environmental Review Officer	After the first project approval action or as directed by the Environmental Review Officer and prior to issuance of construction permits and throughout the construction period	Planning Department cultural resources staff	Complete when project sponsor retains qualified archeological consultant

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
Construction Crew Archeological Awareness. Prior to any soils-disturbing activities being undertaken, the project archeologist shall conduct a brief on-site archeological awareness training that describes the types of resources that might be encountered and how they might be recognized, and requirements and procedures for work stoppage, resource protection and notification in the event of a potential archeological discovery. The project archeologist also shall distribute an "Alert" wallet card, based on the department's "ALERT" sheet, that summarizes stop work requirements and provides necessary contact information for the project archeologist, project sponsor and the to all field personnel involved in soil disturbing activities, including machine operators, field crew, pile drivers, supervisory personnel, etc., have received. The project archeologist shall repeat the training at intervals during construction, as determined necessary by the ERO, including when new construction personnel start work and prior to periods of soil disturbing work when the project archeologist will not be on site. ***Tribal Cultural Resources Sensitivity Training.*** In addition to and concurrently with the archeological awareness training, for sites at which the ERO has determined that there is the potential for the discovery of Native American archeological resources or if requested by a tribe pursuant to the department's tribal cultural resources notification process, the project sponsor shall ensure that a Native American representative is afforded the opportunity to provide a Native American cultural resources sensitivity training to all construction personnel.		Project archeologist for awareness training, Native American representative for Native American cultural resources sensitivity training (if requested)	Prior to any soil-disturbing activity	Planning Department cultural resources staff	Considered complete when all trainings conducted
Archeological Testing Program. The project archeologist shall develop and undertake an archeological testing program as specified herein to determine to the extent possible the presence or absence of archeological resources in areas of project soil disturbance and to identify and to evaluate whether any archeological resource encountered on the site constitutes an historical resource under CEQA. In addition, the consultant shall be available to conduct an archeological monitoring and/or data recovery program if required to address archeological discoveries or the assessed potential for archeological discoveries, pursuant to this measure. ***Archeological Testing Plan.*** The project archeologist shall consult with the ERO reasonably prior to the commencement of any project-related soils disturbing activities to determine the appropriate scope of archeological testing. The archeological testing program shall be conducted in accordance with an approved Archeological Testing Plan, prepared by the project archeologist consistent with the		Project archeologist at the direction of the Environmental Review Officer	Prior to issuance of construction permits and throughout the construction period	Planning Department cultural resources staff	After consultation with and approval by the Environmental Review Officer of Archeological Testing Plan and review and approval of archeological testing results memo by

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
approved scope of work. The Archeological Testing Plan shall be submitted first and directly to the ERO for review and comment and shall be considered a draft subject to revision until final approval by the ERO. Project-related soils disturbing activities shall not commence until the testing plan has been approved and any testing scope to occur in advance of construction has been completed. The project archeologist shall implement the testing as specified in the approved Archeological Testing Plan prior to and/or during construction. The Archeological Testing Plan shall include the following: • Project Description: Description of all anticipated soil disturbing activities, with locations and depths of disturbance, including foundation and utility demolition, hazardous soils remediation, site grading, shoring excavations, piles or soil improvements, and foundation, elevator, car stacker, utility and landscaping excavations, with project plans and profiles, as needed, to illustrate the locations of anticipated soil disturbance. • Site Specific Environmental and Cultural Context: Pre-contact and historic environmental and cultural setting of the project site as pertinent to potential Native American use and historic period development, any available information pertaining to past soil disturbance; soils information, such as stratigraphic and water table data from prior geotechnical testing. As appropriate based on the scale and scope of the project, the Archeological Testing Plan should include historic maps as a basis for predicting resource types that might be encountered and their potential locations. An overlay of the project site on the city's prehistoric sensitivity model mapping should be included, as should the locations of all known archeological sites within 0.25 mile of the project site. • Brief Research Design: Scientific/historical research questions applicable to the expected resource(s), what data classes potential resources may be expected to possess, and how the expected data classes would address the applicable research questions. • Anticipated Resources or Resource Types: Likely resources that might be encountered and at what locations and depths, based on known resources in the vicinity, the site's predevelopment setting and development history, and the anticipated depth and extent of project soil disturbances.					Environmental Review Officer.

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
• Proposed Scope of Archeological Testing and Rationale: Testing methods to be used (e.g., coring, mechanical trenching, manual excavation, or combination of methods); locations and depths of testing in relation to anticipated project soil disturbance; strata to be investigated; any uncertainties on stratigraphy that would affect locations or depths of tests and might require archeological monitoring of construction excavations subsequent to testing. • Resource Documentation and Significance Assessment Procedures: ERO and Native American consultation requirements upon making a discovery; pre-data recovery assessment process, burial treatment procedures, and reporting and curation requirements, consistent with the specifications of Mitigation Measure M-CR-2a. ***Archeological Testing Results Memo.*** Irrespective of whether archeological resources are discovered, the project archeologist shall submit a written summary of the findings to the ERO at the completion of the archeological testing program. The findings report/memo shall describe each resource, provide an initial assessment of the integrity and significance of encountered archeological deposits encountered during testing, and provide recommendations for subsequent treatment of any resources encountered.					
Resource Evaluation and Treatment Determination. Upon discovery of a suspected archeological resource during construction or archeological testing, Mitigation Measure M-CR-2a's Resource Evaluation and Treatment Determination stipulations shall be implemented as specified in that measure. ***Additional Applicable Measures.*** If a significant archeological resource is identified, and data recovery is required under Mitigation Measure M-CR-2a's Resource Evaluation and Treatment Determination stipulations, the following additional measures identified in the Mitigation Measure M-CR-2a shall be implemented as specified in that measure: • Archeological Data Recovery Program • Treatment of Human Remains and Funerary Objects (as applicable) • Coordination of Archeological Data Recovery Investigations		Project archeologist at the direction of the Environmental Review Officer	Upon discovery of suspected archeological resource	Planning Department cultural resources staff	Completed when Environmental Review Officer concurs that the status of the additional measures identified in Mitigation Measure M-CR-2a are completed

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
• Cultural Resources Public Interpretation Plan and Land Acknowledgement (as applicable) • Archeological Resources Report • Curation					
Mitigation Measure M-CR-2d. Treatment of Submerged and Deeply Buried Resources. This measure applies to projects that would include subgrade excavation to depths that would penetrate to native soil or below Young Bay Mud, or entail the use of piles, soil improvements or other deep foundations in landfill areas within former creeks, ponds, bay marshes or waters of the bay that may be sensitive for submerged or buried historical or Native American archeological resources; and shall be implemented in the event of the discovery of a submerged or deeply buried resource during archeological testing, archeological monitoring, or soil-disturbing construction activities that occur when an archeologist is not present. In addition to the measures detailed below, for any project during which a significant archeological resource is identified, a preservation or treatment determination shall be made consistent with the provisions of Mitigation Measure M-CR-2a: Procedures for Discovery of Archeological Resources for Projects Involving Soil Disturbance. If data recovery is required, the following additional measures identified in measure M-CR-2a shall be implemented, as specified in that measure: • Archeological Data Recovery Program • Treatment of Human Remains and Funerary Objects (as applicable) • Coordination of Archeological Data Recovery Investigations • Cultural Resources Public Interpretation Plan and Land Acknowledgement (as applicable) • Archeological Resources Report • Curation The following additional measures shall be undertaken upon discovery of a potentially significant deeply buried or submerged resource to minimize significant effects from deep project excavations, soil improvements, pile construction, or	Required for future development consistent with the housing element update based on the outcome of preliminary archeological review conducted by department staff	Project sponsor, archeological consultant, the Environmental Review Officer, and tribal representative (for Native American archeological resources)	In the event of the discovery of a submerged or deeply buried archeological resource	Planning Department cultural resources staff	After completed implementation of treatment program by project sponsor identified in approved treatment program memo

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
construction of other deep foundation systems, in cases where the environmental review officer (ERO) has determined through consultation with the project sponsor, and with tribal representatives as applicable, that preservation –in place—the preferred mitigation— is not a feasible or effective option. ***Submerged or Buried Resource Treatment Determination.*** If the resource cannot feasibly or adequately be preserved in place, documentation and/or archeological data recovery shall be conducted, as described in Mitigation Measure M-CR-2a. However, by definition, submerged or deeply buried resources sometimes are located deeper than the maximum anticipated depth of project excavations, such that the resource would not be exposed for investigation, and/or under water or may otherwise pose substantial access, safety or other logistical constraints for data recovery; or the cost of providing archeological access to the resource may demonstrably be prohibitive. In circumstances where the constraints identified above limit physical access for documentation and data recovery, the ERO, project sponsor, project archeologist, and tribal representative (for Native American archeological resources), shall consult to explore alternative documentation and treatment options to be implemented in concert with any feasible archeological data recovery. The appropriate treatment elements, which would be expected to vary with the type of resource and the circumstances of discovery, shall be identified by the ERO based on the results of consultation from among the treatment measures listed below. Additional treatment options may be developed and agreed upon through consultation if it can be demonstrated that they would be equally or more effective in recovering or amplifying the value of the data recovered from physical investigation of the affected resources by addressing applicable archeological research questions and in disseminating data and meaningfully interpreting the resource to the public. Each treatment option below, or a combination of the treatment measures, in concert with any feasible standard data recovery methods applied as described above, would be effective in mitigating significant impacts to submerged and buried resources. The ERO, in consultation with the project archeologist and project sponsor, shall identify which of these measures that, individually or in combination, will be applicable and effective in recovering sufficient data, enhancing the research value of the data recovery, meaningfully interpreting the resource to the public, or otherwise effectively mitigating the loss of data or associations that will result from					

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
project construction. Multiple treatment measures shall be adopted in combination, as needed to adequately mitigate data loss and, as applicable, impacts to tribal cultural values, as determined in consultation with the ERO and, as applicable, tribal representatives. The project archeologist shall document the results of the treatment program consultation with respect to the agreed upon scope of treatment in a treatment program memo, for ERO review and approval. Upon approval by the ERO, the project sponsor shall ensure that treatment program is implemented prior to and during construction, as applicable. Reporting, interpretive, curation and review requirements are the same as delineated under the other cultural resources mitigation measures that are applicable to the project, as noted above. The project sponsor shall be responsible for ensuring the implementation of all applicable mitigation measures, as identified in the treatment program memo. ***Treatment Options*** • Remote Archeological Documentation. Where a historic feature cannot be recovered or adequately accessed in place by the archeologist due to size, bulk or inaccessibility, the archeologist shall conduct all feasible remote documentation methods, such as 3-D photography using a remote access device, remote sensing (e.g., ground penetrating radar with a low range (150 or 200 MHz) antenna), or other appropriate technologies and methods, to document the resource and its context. The project sponsor and contractor shall support remote archeological documentation as needed, by assisting with equipment access (e.g., drone, lights and camera or laser scanner mounted on backhoe); providing personnel qualified to enter the excavation to facilitate remote documentation; and accommodating training of construction personnel by the project archeologist so that they can assist in measuring or photographing the resource from inside the excavation in cases when the archeologist cannot enter. • Modification of Contractor's Excavation Methods. At the request of the ERO, the project sponsor shall consult with the project archeologist and the ERO to identify potential modifications to the contractor's excavation and shoring methods to facilitate data recovery to prevent damage to the resource before it has been documented, to assist in exposure and facilitate observation and documentation, and to assist in data recovery. Examples include improved dewatering during excavation, use of a smaller excavator bucket or toothless					

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
bucket, providing a location where spoils can be spread out and examined by the archeologist prior to being offhauled, and phasing or benching of deep excavations to facilitate observation and/or deeper archeological trenching. • Data Recovery through Open Excavation. If a project will include mass excavation to the depth of the buried/submerged deposit, archeological data recovery shall include manual (preferred) or controlled mechanical sampling of the deposit. If project construction would not include mass excavation to the depth of the deposit but would impact the deposit through deep foundation systems or soil improvements, the ERO and the project sponsor shall consult to consider whether there are feasible means of providing direct archeological access to the deposit (e.g., excavation of portion of the site that overlies the deposit to the subject depth so that a sample can be recovered). The feasibility consideration shall include an estimate of the project cost of excavating to the necessary depth and of providing shoring and dewatering sufficient to allow archeological access to the deposit for manual or mechanical recovery. • Mechanical Recovery. If site circumstances limit access by archeologists to the find, the ERO, project archeologist, and project sponsor shall consult on the feasibility of mechanically removing the feature/ deposit or portion of it intact for off-site documentation and analysis, preservation, and interpretive use. The consultation above shall include consideration as to whether such recovery is logistically feasible and can be accomplished without major data loss. The specific means and methods and the type and size of the sample shall be identified, and the recovery shall be implemented as determined feasible by the ERO. The project sponsor shall assist with mechanical recovery and transport and curation of recovered materials and shall provide for an appropriate and secure off-site location for archeological documentation and storage as needed. • Salvage of Historic Materials. Samples or sections of historical features that cannot be preserved in place (e.g., structural members of piers or wharves, sections of wooden sea wall, rail alignments, or historic utility or paving features of particular data value or interpretive interest) shall be tested for contamination and, if not contaminated, shall be salvaged for interpretive use or other reuse, such as display of a reconstructed resource; use of timbers or planks for site furniture and signage structures; installation in publicly accessible open spaces; or other uses of public interest. Historic wood and other salvageable historic					

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
structural material not used for interpretation shall be recovered for reuse, consistent with the San Francisco Ordinance No. 27-06, which requires recycling or reuse of all construction and demolition debris material removed from a project. If the project has the potential to encounter such features, the project sponsor shall plan in advance for reuse of salvaged historic materials to the greatest extent feasible, including identification of a location for interim storage and identification of potential users and reuses. • Data Recovery Using Geoarcheological Cores. If it is deemed infeasible to expose a significant deposit resource for archeological data recovery, geoarcheological coring of the identified deposit shall be conducted at horizontal grid intervals of no greater than 15 feet within areas that will be impacted by project construction. The maximum feasible core diameter shall be used for data recovery coring. The objective of coring is to obtain a minimum of a five percent sample of the estimated total volume of the resource within areas that will impacted by project construction. However, due to the small size of each core, this method alone generally cannot recover a 5 percent sample volume or a sufficient quantity of data to adequately characterize the range of activities that took place at the site. For this reason, if the coring sample constitutes less than five percent of the estimated total volume of the archeological deposit that will be directly impacted by project construction, the project sponsor may elect implementation of one or more of the following additional compensatory measures to amplify the value of the recovered data. • Compensatory Treatment Measures: – *Scientific Analysis of Data from Comparable Archeological Sites/ "Orphaned Collections."* The ERO and the project archeologist shall consult to identify a known archeological site or historical feature, or curated collections or samples recovered during prior investigation of similar sites or features are available for further analysis; and for which site-specific or comparative analyses would be expected to provide data relevant to the interpretation or context reconstruction for the affected site. Examples would include reanalysis or comparative analysis of artifacts or archival records; faunal or paleobotanical analyses; dating; isotopes studies; or such other relevant studies based on the research design developed for the affected site and on data sets available from the impacted resource and comparative collections.					

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
The scope of analyses shall be determined by the ERO based on consultation with the project archeologist, the project sponsor and, for sites of Native American origin Native American representatives. *Additional Off-Site Data Collection and/or Analysis for Historical and Paleoenvironmental Reconstruction.* The ERO and project archeologist shall identify existing geoarcheological data and geotechnical coring records on file with the city; and/or cores extracted and preserved during prior geotechnical or geoarcheological investigations that could contribute to reconstruction of the environmental setting in the vicinity of the identified resource, to enhance the historical and scientific value of recovered data by providing additional data about Native American archeological environmental setting and stratigraphic sensitivity; and/or provide information pertinent to the public interpretation of the significant resource. Relevant data may also be obtained through geoarcheological coring at accessible sites identified by the ERO through consultation with San Francisco public agencies and private project sponsors.					
TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES					
Mitigation Measure M-TCR-1: Tribal Notification and Consultation. ***Applicability*:** This measure applies to both archeological tribal cultural resources and non-archeological tribal cultural resources. This measure shall be implemented for the following types of future development consistent with the proposed action: • For each project for which preliminary archeological review, conducted by department archeologists, identifies the potential for impacts on a Native American archeological resource, which is presumed to be a tribal cultural resource, and • At the initiation of planning for public interpretation of a significant Native American archeological resource, and • For projects with one or more of the following characteristics where the project is located in an area identified as a potential tribal cultural resource: – Development footprint greater than or equal to 10,000 square feet and any soil disturbance greater than or equal to 10 feet deep – Use of piles or other deep foundation or deep soil improvements	Required for future planning code amendments to implement the housing element update or required for future development consistent with the housing element update that meet one or more of the following criteria:	Planning Department cultural resources staff, Planning Department or project sponsor, Native American tribal representative	Prior to implementation of future planning code amendments; or for future development projects, during environmental review for notification and consultation; prior to issuance of demolition permit for identified measures	Planning Department cultural resources staff	Considered complete if no tribal cultural resource is identified, or tribal cultural resource is identified and implementation of identified tribal cultural resource measures.

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
– Total soil excavation volume in excess of 1,500 cubic yards – Development for which the city requires the inclusion of public open space, public art, or other public interpretative programs – Development that includes habitat restoration, creek daylighting, or channelization that could affect native plants – Development for which the department requires a streetscape plan under the Better Streets Plan (planning code section 138.1) ***Notification.*** The department shall distribute a notification for projects that meet any of the characteristics above to parties on its local Native American tribal distribution list, including the Association of Ramaytush Ohlone and other interested Ohlone parties list. The notification shall include the project description; project location; anticipated depth and extent of soil disturbance necessary for construction; information on changes to public access, removal or addition of native plantings or habitat, and any proposed public interpretation, as relevant; the conclusions of the preliminary archeological review regarding potential impacts on Native American archeological tribal cultural resources; anticipated next steps, including proposed archeological identification and/or treatment for archeological tribal cultural resources; an invitation to consult on the project; and a timeline for requesting consultation, which is within 30 days after receipt of a notification. ***Consultation.*** The department and project sponsor shall ensure that Native American tribal representatives who respond to the notification shall be provided the opportunity to consult on the proposed project. Consultation shall follow requirements identified in CEQA section 21080.3.2; if the Native American tribal representatives request consultation regarding alternatives to the project, recommended mitigation measures, or significant effects, the consultation shall include those topics. Consultation meetings shall occur primarily between department staff members and Native American representatives, with department staff members coordinating with the project sponsor. Project sponsors may join in consultation meetings if requested and agreed to by the Native American representative. Native American representatives shall be provided with project plans and details to review and given an opportunity to provide input with respect to whether the project as designed would affect a tribal cultural resource and, if so, how such an impact might be avoided or mitigated. For archeological tribal cultural resources, the department shall ensure that Native American representatives are	• Preliminary archeological review identifies potential impacts on a Native American archeological resource • Initiation of planning for public interpretation of a significant Native American archeological resource • Projects located in an area identified as a potential tribal cultural resource and have one of the following: – Development footprint greater than or equal to 10,000 square feet and any soil				

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
informed of the sensitivity of the project site, as assessed by the department, and the presence of any known or discovered resources so that they can provide input on the archeological steps to be implemented, per Mitigation Measures M-CR-2a: Archeological Resources Requirements for Projects Involving Soil Disturbance and, as applicable, Mitigation Measure M-CR-2b: Archeological Monitoring Program; Mitigation Measure M-CR-2c: Archeological Testing Program; and Mitigation Measure M-CR-2d: Treatment of Submerged and Deeply Buried Resources, if requested by those tribal representatives. Additional measures on the treatment of tribal cultural resources may be developed through consultation. Consultation shall be concluded as defined in CEQA section 21080.3.2(b). Site-specific measures identified through consultation to reduce or eliminate impacts would be implemented by the project sponsor in coordination with department staff members. Site-specific measures could include, but would not be limited to: • Sampling and paleoenvironmental analysis of soils that would be affected by project piles or excavation for reconstruction of the Native American environmental setting • Native planting and vegetation treatments in publicly accessible open spaces and community gathering areas that emphasize native and/or environmentally sustainable shoreline plants, such as those traditionally used by the Ohlone • Public interpretive exhibits that educate the public and/or reflect tribal cultural heritage and values and address local Native American experience and history • Ohlone land acknowledgements • Public art by local Native American artists • For projects that include public open spaces or onsite public access spaces within the project site (such as a community room), make the spaces available for events organized by the local Native American community, by arrangement with event space organizers • Other educational tools and applications identified by tribal representatives through consultation with the tribe and determined by the environmental review officer (ERO) and the project sponsor to be feasible for inclusion in the project. Different or additional project-specific mitigation measures may be identified through Native American consultation if, in consultation with the tribal	disturbance greater than or equal to 10 feet deep – Use of piles or other deep foundation or deep soil improvements – Soil excavation in excess of 1,500 cubic yards – Requires public open space, public art, or other public interpretative programs – Habitat restoration, creek daylighting, or channelizatio n that could affect native plants – Streetscape plan under the Better Streets Plan				

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
representative, the project sponsor, and the ERO, they are determined to be equally effective as or more effective than the measures identified above in mitigating the specific impacts of development on tribal cultural resources. Project-specific mitigation measures applicable to the specific proposal shall be agreed upon by the tribal consultants and the department in coordination with the project sponsor and implemented by the project sponsor, if determined feasible by the ERO. If no tribal group requests consultation but the ERO determines that a proposed project may have a potential significant adverse effect on a tribal cultural resource, based on prior consultation, then the site-specific measures and treatments listed above, as applicable, may be required at the discretion of the ERO. ***Compensation.*** Following on the initial tribal consultation, the ERO, project sponsor, and project archeologist, as appropriate, shall work with the tribal representative to identify the scope of work to fulfill the requirements of this mitigation measure, which may include participation in archeological monitoring, preparation and review of deliverables (e.g., plans, interpretive materials, art work). Tribal representatives shall be compensated for their work as identified in the agreed upon scope of work.					
TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION					
Mitigation Measure M-TR-4a: Parking Maximums and Transportation Demand Management. The city shall reduce vehicle trips from future planning code amendments (e.g., future rezonings or housing sustainability district designations) to implement the proposed action or future development projects that contribute considerably to or result in a significant transit delay impact, as defined in the Housing Element 2022 Update EIR's transit analysis for future development. This mitigation measure shall not apply to future planning code amendments, or future development projects implementing the proposed action, that do not contribute considerably to or result in a significant transit delay impact. The city may achieve this vehicle trip reduction through one of the following measures A, B, or C:	Required for future planning code amendments to implement the housing element update or future development consistent with the housing element update until such planning code amendments are made	City (e.g., SFMTA, Planning Department) or project sponsors of future development projects	Prior to implementation of future planning code amendments or prior to the commencement of any project-related soils disturbing activities	Planning Department	Considered complete when planning code sections 151 and 151.1 or section 169 is amended or issuance of an applicable future development project's entitlement

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
• Measure A: Amend planning code parking maximums for residential uses (sections 151 and 151.1) by a 50 percent or more reduction than such maximums as of April 2022; OR • Measure B: Amend planning code transportation demand management requirements (section 169) for residential uses or its associated program standards for residential uses by an equivalent amount to achieve the vehicle trip reduction estimated by implementation of a 50 percent reduction in planning code parking maximums, compared to parking maximums as of April 2022; OR • Measure C: The department shall apply vehicle trip reduction measures A or B on future development projects consistent with the housing element on project-by-project basis until the city amends the planning code consistent with measures A or B.					
Mitigation Measure M-TR-4b: Driveway and Loading Operations Plan and Curb Cut Restrictions. The city shall reduce potential conflicts between driveway and loading operations, including passenger and freight loading activities, and people walking, bicycling, riding transit, and driving, from future planning code amendments to implement the proposed action (e.g., future rezonings or housing sustainability district designations) or future development projects that would contribute considerably to or result in a significant transit delay or significant loading impacts, as defined in the Housing Element 2022 Update EIR's transit and loading analysis for future development. This mitigation measure shall not apply to future planning code amendments, or future development projects implementing the proposed action, that do not contribute considerably to or result in a significant transit delay or significant loading impacts. The city may achieve this through one of the following measures A or B: • Measure A.1: Amend planning code section 155(r) to not permit curb cuts for garage entries, driveways, or other vehicular access to off-street parking or loading along the street(s) of the significant transit delay and significant loading impacts (may not apply to streets with protected center-running transit-only lanes); AND • Measure A.2: Amend the geographic applicability of planning code section 155(u) for projects to prepare and implement a Driveway and Loading Operations Plan (DLOP). Applicable projects shall prepare and submit a draft DLOP to the	Required for future planning code amendments to implement the housing element update or future development consistent with the housing element update with significant transit delay or loading impacts as described in the EIR	City (e.g., SFMTA, Planning Department) or project sponsors of applicable future development projects	Prior to implementation of future planning code amendments or prior to the commencement of any project-related soils disturbing activities	Planning Department	Considered complete when planning code section 155 is amended or issuance of an applicable future development project's DLOP in accordance with any guidelines issued by the Planning Department

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
department for their review and approval, in consultation with the SFMTA. The DLOP shall be written in accordance with any guidelines issued by the department and shall respond to any applicable SFMTA curb management plans (e.g., see Mitigation Measure M-TR-6: Curb Management Plans); OR • Measure B: The department shall apply measures A.1 and A.2 on a development project by development project basis until the city amends the planning code consistent with measures A.1 and A.2.					
Mitigation Measure M-TR-4c: Implement Transit Travel Times Measures to Reduce Transit Delay. The city (e.g., SFMTA, department) shall implement measures to reduce transit delay on the Geary and 19th Avenue corridors. This measure shall also apply to other transit corridors where future planning code amendments (e.g., future rezonings or housing sustainability district designations) to implement the proposed action would contribute considerably to or result a significant transit delay impact (thresholds of significance), as defined in the Housing Element 2022 Update EIR. The city will consider the improvements in the below table. The table presents the three levels (i.e., tiers) or transit improvements in terms of infrastructure changes that would be applicable to the different street network types and transit operating characteristics, depending on the nature of transit delay. The Tier 1 and 2 improvements include traffic engineering measures that are consistent with San Francisco's Muni Forward (such measures may include transit stop changes, traffic lane modifications, parking and turn restrictions, traffic signal and stop sign changes, and pedestrian improvements) and are organized to distinguish between measures that do not restrict private vehicle movements (Tier 1) and those that do restrict private vehicle movements (Tier 2). The Tier 3 improvements are consistent with those major capital projects (e.g., subways) various government agencies are considering as a part of San Francisco's ConnectSF and Bay Area Rapid Transit and Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Authority Link21.	Required for future planning code amendments to implement the housing element update with significant transit delay impacts as described in the EIR	City (e.g., SFMTA, Planning Department)	Within two years of the final approval of any future planning code amendments (e.g., future rezonings or housing sustainability district designations) to implement the proposed action	Planning Department	Considered complete when the city implements identified measures

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
Table: Improvements to Reduce Transit Delay Based on Street Network and Transit Operating Characteristics					

Street Network/Transit Operating Characteristics	Tier 1 Improvements	Tier 2 Improvements	Tier 3 Improvements
	Transit bulbs, boarding islands, prepaid boarding, stop consolidation, transit signal priority, traffic signals	Side-running transit-only or HOV lanes, or protected center-running transit-only lanes	Grade separation of transit service (subway)
Bus routes that operate primarily in mixed-traffic lanes	X	X	X
Bus routes or light rail lines that operate in a mix of transit-only lanes and mixed-traffic lanes	X	X	X
Bus routes or light rail lines that operate primarily in transit-only lanes		X	X

Note: The city's selection of which specific transit network improvements to implement as a part of this measure would depend on the future transit network and roadway conditions within the rezoning area. If transit is not already protected, the city would start with tier 1 improvements and move toward tier 2 and then tier 3 when these features are already in place.

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
The city shall implement measures consistent with Muni Forward and ConnectSF plans, studies, and toolkits to reduce transit delay associated with traffic congestion and passenger boarding. The city may develop transit network improvement plans for routes that would be affected by future planning code amendments to implement the proposed action, which could include identifying the specific measures and implementation timing of the measures. Potential measures could include, but are not limited to, those shown in the table above. The city shall identify the specific measures within two years of the final approval of any future planning code amendments (e.g., future rezonings or housing sustainability district designations) to implement the proposed action that will exceed the thresholds of significance. Additionally, the city shall make every effort to seek and obtain new funding sources to fund transit delay improvements identified in the above table. This may include increasing the existing transportation sustainability fee or assessing a new transit impact fees to future development projects consistent with the proposed action as part of future planning code amendments. This may also include seeking applicable state or federal funding sources.					
Mitigation Measure M-TR-6: Curb Management Plans. The SFMTA shall develop a curb management plan(s) for the geographic area(s) under future planning code amendments (e.g., future rezonings or housing sustainability district designations) to implement the proposed action that result in significant loading impacts as defined in the Housing Element 2022 Update EIR's loading analysis for future development. The SFMTA shall develop the plan to be consistent with the recommendations in the SFMTA's adopted Curb Management Strategy. Such a plan may include, but would not be limited to, components such as identifying the necessary curb regulations based on curb function priorities and parking and loading needs, and issues related to transit, accessibility, and safety. The SFMTA shall develop the plan within two years after the department has received project applications under future planning code amendments to implement the proposed action that cumulatively total greater than 200,000 gross square feet in the plan's geographic area. The SFMTA shall implement applicable components of the plan prior to the city's issuance of certificate of occupancy for the project applications. Project sponsors for project applications for individual development projects may also implement applicable components of the plan, including if	Required for future planning code amendments to implement the housing element update	San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency	Within two years after the Planning Department has received project applications under future planning code amendments to implement the proposed action that cumulatively total greater than 200,000 gross square feet in the plan's	Planning Department	Considered complete when the curb management plan(s) are implemented

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
identified with any driveway and loading operations guidelines issued by the department. The SFMTA shall monitor conditions in the geographic area and update the plan, as needed.			geographic area; and prior to the city's issuance of certificate of occupancy for the project applications		
NOISE AND VIBRATION					
Mitigation Measure M-NO-1: Construction Noise Control. The project sponsor shall submit a project-specific construction noise control plan to the environmental review officer (ERO) for approval prior to issuance of any demolition or building permit. The construction noise control plan shall be prepared by a qualified acoustical engineer, with input from the construction contractor, and include all feasible measures to reduce construction noise. The construction noise control plan shall identify noise control measures to ensure that construction noise levels shall not exceed 90 dBA 1-hour L_{eq}, 10 dBA above the ambient noise level, nor an interior level of 45 dBA during nighttime hours at noise sensitive receptors (residences, hospitals, convalescent homes, schools, churches, hotels, and motels). The project sponsor shall ensure that requirements of the construction noise control plan are included in contract specifications. If nighttime construction is required, the plan shall include specific measures to reduce nighttime construction noise. The plan shall also include measures for notifying the public of construction activities, complaint procedures, and a plan for monitoring construction noise levels in the event complaints are received. The construction noise control plan shall include the following measures to the degree feasible, or other effective measures, to reduce construction noise levels: • Use construction equipment that is in good working order, and inspect mufflers for proper functionality; • Select "quiet" construction methods and equipment (e.g., improved mufflers, use of intake silencers, engine enclosures); • Use construction equipment with lower noise emission ratings whenever possible, particularly for air compressors;	Required for future development consistent with the housing element update if project-level analysis finds that the frequency, duration, and intensity of construction noise would result in a significant construction noise impact or a considerable contribution to a significant cumulative construction noise impact	Project sponsor, project sponsor's qualified acoustical consultant	Prior to issuance of demolition or building permit	Planning Department	Considered complete upon implementation of Planning Department approved project-specific construction noise control plan and following completion of all construction activities

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
• Prohibit the idling of inactive construction equipment for more than five minutes; • Locate stationary noise sources (such as compressors) as far from nearby noise sensitive receptors as possible, muffle such noise sources, and construct barriers around such sources and/or the construction site. • Avoid placing stationary noise-generating equipment (e.g., generators, compressors) within noise-sensitive buffer areas (as determined by the acoustical engineer) immediately adjacent to neighbors. • Enclose or shield stationary noise sources from neighboring noise-sensitive properties with noise barriers to the extent feasible. To further reduce noise, locate stationary equipment in pit areas or excavated areas, if feasible; and • Install temporary barriers, barrier-backed sound curtains and/or acoustical panels around working powered impact equipment and, if necessary, around the project site perimeter. When temporary barrier units are joined together, the mating surfaces shall be flush with each other. Gaps between barrier units, and between the bottom edge of the barrier panels and the ground, shall be closed with material that completely closes the gaps, and dense enough to attenuate noise. The construction noise control plan shall include the following measures for notifying the public of construction activities, complaint procedures and monitoring of construction noise levels: • Designation of an on-site construction noise manager for the project; • Notification of neighboring noise sensitive receptors within 300 feet of the project construction area at least 30 days in advance of high-intensity noise-generating activities (e.g., pier drilling, pile driving, and other activities that may generate noise levels greater than 90 dBA at noise sensitive receptors) about the estimated duration of the activity; • A sign posted on-site describing noise complaint procedures and a complaint hotline number that shall always be answered during construction; • A procedure for notifying the planning department of any noise complaints within one week of receiving a complaint;					

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
• A list of measures for responding to and tracking complaints pertaining to construction noise. Such measures may include the evaluation and implementation of additional noise controls at sensitive receptors; and • Conduct noise monitoring (measurements) at the beginning of major construction phases (e.g., demolition, grading, excavation) and during high-intensity construction activities to determine the effectiveness of noise attenuation measures and, if necessary, implement additional noise control measures. The construction noise control plan shall include the following additional measures during pile-driving activities: • When pile driving is to occur within 600 feet of a noise-sensitive receptor, implement "quiet" pile-driving technology (such as pre-drilling of piles, sonic pile drivers, auger cast-in-place, or drilled-displacement, or the use of more than one pile driver to shorten the total pile-driving duration [only if such measure is preferable to reduce impacts to sensitive receptors]) where feasible, in consideration of geotechnical and structural requirements and conditions; • Where the use of driven impact piles cannot be avoided, properly fit impact pile driving equipment with an intake and exhaust muffler and a sound-attenuating shroud, as specified by the manufacturer; and • Conduct noise monitoring (measurements) before, during, and after the pile driving activity.					
Mitigation Measure M-NO-2: Noise Analysis and Attenuation. The project sponsor shall undertake a detailed noise analysis of noise-generating activities or equipment (e.g., heating, ventilation, and air-conditioning equipment; outdoor gathering areas; places of entertainment). This analysis shall be conducted prior to the first project approval action. This analysis shall include a site survey to identify potential noise-sensitive uses (residences, hospitals, convalescent homes, schools, churches, hotels and motels) and include at least one 24-hour noise measurement to determine ambient noise levels throughout the day and nighttime hours. The analysis shall be prepared by persons qualified in acoustical analysis and/or engineering and shall demonstrate with reasonable certainty that the proposed use would not adversely affect nearby noise-sensitive uses, would not substantially	Required for future development consistent with the housing element update, as applicable	Project sponsor's qualified acoustical or engineering consultant	Prior to the commencement of any project-related soils disturbing activities	Planning Department	Considered complete upon completion of noise analysis and installation of noise attenuation features into future building design and operations.

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
increase ambient noise levels, and would not result in a noise level in excess of any applicable standards, such as those in section 2909 of the noise ordinance. All recommendations from the acoustical analysis necessary to ensure that noise sources would meet applicable requirements of the noise ordinance and/or not result in substantial increases in ambient noise levels shall be incorporated into the building design and operations. Should concerns remain regarding potential excessive noise, completion of a detailed noise control analysis (by a person qualified in acoustical analysis and/or engineering), and incorporation of noise reduction measures (including quieter equipment, construction of barriers or enclosures, etc.) into the building design and operations prior to the first project approval action shall be required. Acoustical treatments may include, but are not limited to: • Enclosing noise-generating mechanical equipment • Installing relatively quiet models of air handlers, exhaust fans, and other mechanical equipment • Using mufflers or silencers on equipment exhaust fans • Orienting or shielding equipment to protect noise sensitive receptors to the greatest extent feasible • Increasing the distance between noise-generating equipment and noise-sensitive receptors • Placing barriers around the equipment to facilitate the attenuation of noise					
Mitigation Measure M-NO-3a: Protection of Adjacent Buildings/Structures and Vibration Monitoring During Construction. Prior to issuance of any demolition or building permit, the project sponsor shall submit a project-specific Pre-construction Survey and Vibration Management and Monitoring Plan to the ERO or the ERO's designee for approval. The plan shall identify all feasible means to avoid damage to potentially affected buildings. The project sponsor shall ensure that the following requirements of the Pre-Construction Survey and Vibration Management and Monitoring Plan are included in contract specifications, as necessary. ***Pre-construction Survey.*** Prior to the start of any ground-disturbing activity, the project sponsor shall engage a consultant to undertake a pre-construction survey of potentially affected buildings. If potentially affected buildings and/or structures are	Required for future development consistent with the housing element update, as applicable	Project sponsor, qualified historic preservation professional (for effects on historic buildings and/or structures) and/or	Prior to issuance of any demolition, building, or site permit and monitoring and reporting throughout construction, as necessary	Planning Department	Considered complete when the final Vibration Monitoring Results Report is approved by the Environmental Review Officer and following completion of all construction

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
not potentially historic, a structural engineer or other professional with similar qualifications shall document and photograph the existing conditions of the potentially affected buildings and/or structures. The project sponsor shall submit the survey to the ERO or the officer's designee for review and approval prior to the start of vibration-generating construction activity. If nearby affected buildings are potentially historic, the project sponsor shall engage a qualified historic preservation professional and a structural engineer or other professional with similar qualifications to undertake a pre-construction survey of potentially affected historic buildings. The pre-construction survey shall include descriptions and photograph of all identified historic buildings including all façades, roofs, and details of the character-defining features that could be damaged during construction, and shall document existing damage, such as cracks and loose or damaged features (as allowed by property owners). The report shall also include pre-construction drawings that record the pre-construction condition of the buildings and identify cracks and other features to be monitored during construction. The qualified historic preservation professional shall be the lead author of the pre-construction survey if historic buildings and/or structures could be affected by the project. The pre-construction survey shall be submitted to the ERO for review and approval prior to the start of vibration-generating construction activity. ***Vibration Management and Monitoring Plan.*** The project sponsor shall undertake a monitoring plan to avoid or reduce project-related construction vibration damage to adjacent buildings and/or structures and to ensure that any such damage is documented and repaired. Prior to issuance of any demolition or building permit, the project sponsor shall submit the Plan to the ERO for review and approval. The Vibration Management and Monitoring Plan shall include, at a minimum, the following components, as applicable: • Maximum Vibration Level. Based on the anticipated construction and condition of the affected buildings and/or structures on adjacent properties, a qualified acoustical/vibration consultant in coordination with a structural engineer (or professional with similar qualifications) and, in the case of potentially affected historic buildings/structures, a qualified historic preservation professional, shall establish a maximum vibration level that shall not be exceeded at each building/structure on adjacent properties, based on existing conditions, character-defining features, soil conditions, and anticipated construction		structural engineer (for effects on historic and non-historic buildings and/or structures)			activities (including repairs of adjacent buildings damaged during construction)

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
practices (common standards are a peak particle velocity [PPV] of 0.25 inch per second for historic and some old buildings, a PPV of 0.3 inch per second for older residential structures, and a PPV of 0.5 inch per second for new residential structures and modern industrial/commercial buildings). • Vibration-generating Equipment. The plan shall identify all vibration-generating equipment to be used during construction (including, but not limited to: site preparation, clearing, demolition, excavation, shoring, foundation installation, and building construction). • Alternative Construction Equipment and Techniques. The plan shall identify potential alternative equipment and techniques that could be implemented if construction vibration levels are observed in excess of the established standard (e.g., drilled shafts [caissons] could be substituted for driven piles, if feasible, based on soil conditions, or smaller, lighter equipment could be used in some cases). • Pile Driving Requirements. For projects that would require pile driving, the project sponsor shall incorporate into construction specifications for the project a requirement that the construction contractor(s) use all feasible means to avoid or reduce damage to potentially affected buildings. Such methods may include one or more of the following: – Incorporate "quiet" pile-driving technologies into project construction (such as drilled shafts, using sonic pile drivers, auger cast-in-place, or drilled-displacement), as feasible; and/or – Ensure appropriate excavation shoring methods to prevent the movement of adjacent structures. • Buffer Distances. The plan shall identify buffer distances to be maintained based on vibration levels and site constraints between the operation of vibration-generating construction equipment and the potentially affected building and/or structure to avoid damage to the extent possible. • Vibration Monitoring. The plan shall identify the method and equipment for vibration monitoring to ensure that construction vibration levels do not exceed the established standards identified in the plan.					

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
– Should construction vibration levels be observed in excess of the standards established in the plan, the contractor(s) shall halt construction and put alternative construction techniques identified in the plan into practice, to the extent feasible. – The qualified historic preservation professional (for effects on historic buildings and/or structures) and/or structural engineer (for effects on historic and non-historic buildings and/or structures) shall inspect each affected building and/or structure (as allowed by property owners) in the event the construction activities exceed the vibration levels identified in the plan. – The structural engineer and/or historic preservation professional shall submit monthly reports to the ERO during vibration-inducing activity periods that identify and summarize any vibration level exceedances and describe the actions taken to reduce vibration. – If vibration has damaged nearby buildings and/or structures that are not historic, the structural engineer shall immediately notify the ERO and prepare a damage report documenting the features of the building and/or structure that has been damaged. – If vibration has damaged nearby buildings and/or structures that are historic, the historic preservation consultant shall immediately notify the ERO and prepare a damage report documenting the features of the building and/or structure that has been damaged. – Following incorporation of the alternative construction techniques and/or planning department review of the damage report, vibration monitoring shall recommence to ensure that vibration levels at each affected building and/or structure on adjacent properties are not exceeded. • Periodic Inspections. The plan shall identify the intervals and parties responsible for periodic inspections. The qualified historic preservation professional (for effects on historic buildings and/or structures) and/or structural engineer (for effects on historic and non-historic buildings and/or structures) shall conduct regular periodic inspections of each affected building and/or structure on adjacent properties (as allowed by property owners) during vibration-generating construction activity on the project site. The plan will specify how often inspections shall occur.					

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
• Repair Damage. The plan shall also identify provisions to be followed should damage to any building and/or structure occur due to construction-related vibration. The building(s) and/or structure(s) shall be remediated to their pre-construction condition (as allowed by property owners) at the conclusion of vibration-generating activity on the site. For historic resources, should damage occur to any building and/or structure, the building and/or structure shall be restored to its pre-construction condition in consultation with the qualified historic preservation professional and planning department preservation staff. ***Vibration Monitoring Results Report.*** After construction is complete the project sponsor shall submit to the ERO a final report from the qualified historic preservation professional (for effects on historic buildings and/or structures) and/or structural engineer (for effects on historic and non-historic buildings and/or structures). The report shall include, at a minimum, collected monitoring records, building and/or structure condition summaries, descriptions of all instances of vibration level exceedance, identification of damage incurred due to vibration, and corrective actions taken to restore damaged buildings and structures. The ERO shall review and approve the Vibration Monitoring Results Report.					
Mitigation Measure M-NO-3b: Prevent Interference with Vibration-Sensitive Equipment. Prior to construction, the project sponsor and its contractors shall designate and make available a community liaison to respond to vibration complaints from occupants at the building containing vibration-sensitive equipment. Through the community liaison, the project sponsor's team shall provide notification to property owners and occupants of the building at least 10 days prior to construction activities involving equipment that can generate vibration capable of interfering with vibration-sensitive equipment, informing them of the estimated start date and duration of vibration-generating construction activities. If feasible, the project sponsor team shall identify potential alternative equipment and techniques that could reduce construction vibration levels. For example, alternative equipment and techniques may include, but are not limited to: • Pre-drilled piles • Caisson drilling	Required for future development consistent with the housing element update, as applicable	Project sponsor	Prior to issuance of any demolition, building, or site permit project sponsor will identify community liaison: notification at least 10 days prior to construction activities involving equipment that can generate	Planning Department	Considered complete after construction activities involving equipment that can generate vibration capable of interfering with vibration-sensitive equipment is completed

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
• Oscillating or rotating pile installation • Jetting piles into place using a water injection at the tip of the pile could be substituted for driven piles, if feasible, based on soil conditions • Static rollers could be substituted for vibratory rollers in some cases If concerns are raised prior to construction or complaints received during construction related to equipment interference, the community liaison shall work with the project sponsor's team and the affected building occupants to resolve the concerns. Vibration control measures shall meet the performance target (i.e., threshold of 65 VdB for vibration-sensitive equipment) set forth by the Federal Transit Administration. To resolve concerns raised by building occupants, the community liaison shall convey the details of the complaints to the project sponsor team, planning department, and the complainant. The liaison shall convey the details of the measures being implemented to ensure that the vibration level is not exceeded. These measures may include evaluation by a qualified noise and vibration consultant; scheduling certain construction activities outside the hours of operation for vibration-sensitive equipment or when specific vibration-sensitive equipment is in use, if feasible; and/or conducting groundborne vibration monitoring to document that an individual project can meet the performance target of 65 VdB at specific distances or locations. Groundborne vibration monitoring, if appropriate to resolve concerns, shall be conducted by a qualified noise and vibration consultant.			vibration capable of interfering with vibration-sensitive equipment		
AIR QUALITY					
Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3: Clean Construction Equipment. The project sponsor shall comply with the following: A. Engine Requirements: 1. All off-road equipment greater than 25 horsepower and operating for more than 20 total hours over the entire duration of construction activities shall have engines that meet or exceed either U.S. EPA or air resources board Tier 4 Final off-road emission standards. 2. Where access to alternative sources of power are available, portable diesel engines shall be prohibited.	Required for future development consistent with the housing element update, as applicable	Project sponsor	Prior to issuance of demolition, building, or site permits project sponsor to submit: 1. Construction emissions minimization	Planning Department	Considered complete upon Environmental Review Officer review and acceptance of construction emissions minimization plan, implementation

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
3. Diesel engines, whether for off-road or on-road equipment, shall not be left idling for more than two minutes at any location, except as provided in exceptions to the applicable state regulations regarding idling for off-road and on-road equipment (e.g., traffic conditions, safe operating conditions). The project sponsor shall post legible and visible signs in English, Spanish, and Chinese in designated queuing areas and at the construction site to remind operators of the two-minute idling limit. If the majority of the project sponsor's construction staff speak a language other than these, then the signs shall be posted in that language as well. 4. The project sponsor shall instruct construction workers and equipment operators on the maintenance and tuning of construction equipment and require that such workers and operators properly maintain and tune equipment in accordance with manufacturers' specifications. 5. Any other best available technology in the future may be included, provided that the project sponsor submits documentation to the department demonstrating that (1) the technology would result in emissions reductions and (2) it would not increase other pollutant emissions or result in other additional impacts, such as noise. This may include new alternative fuels or engine technology for off-road or other construction equipment (such as electric or hydrogen fuel cell equipment) that is not available as of 2022. B. Waivers: The environmental review officer (ERO) may waive the requirement of subsection (A)(2) regarding an alternative source of power if an alternative source is limited or infeasible at the project site. If the ERO grants the waiver, the project sponsor must submit documentation that the equipment used for onsite power generation meets the engine requirements of subsection (A)(1). The ERO may waive the equipment requirements of subsection (A)(1) if a particular piece of Tier 4 Final off-road equipment is technically not feasible, the equipment would not produce the desired emissions reduction because of expected operating modes, or a compelling emergency requires the use off-road equipment that is not Tier 4 compliant. In seeking an exception, the project sponsor shall demonstrate that the project shall use the cleanest piece of construction equipment available and feasible and submit documentation that average daily construction emissions of ROG, NOx, PM2.5 would not exceed 54 pounds per day, and PM10 emissions would not exceed 82 pounds per day.			plan for review and approval, and 2. Signed certification statement		of the plan, and submittal of final report summarizing use of construction equipment pursuant to the plan

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
C. Construction Emissions Minimization Plan: Before starting onsite construction activities, the project sponsor shall submit a Construction Emissions Minimization Plan (Plan) to the ERO for review and approval. The Plan shall state, in reasonable detail, how the project sponsor will meet the engine requirements of Section A. • The Plan shall include estimates of the construction timeline by phase, with a description of each piece of off-road equipment required for every construction phase. The description may include, but is not limited to, equipment type, equipment manufacturer, equipment identification number, engine model year, engine certification (tier rating), horsepower, engine serial number, and expected fuel use and hours of operation. For off-road equipment using alternative fuels, the description shall also specify the type of alternative fuel being used. • The project sponsor shall ensure that all applicable requirements of the Plan have been incorporated into the project sponsor's contract specifications. The Plan shall include a certification statement that the project sponsor agrees to comply fully with the Plan. • The project sponsor shall make the Plan available to the public for review onsite during working hours. The project sponsor shall post at the construction site a legible and visible sign summarizing the Plan. The sign shall also state that the public may ask to inspect the Plan for the project at any time during working hours and shall explain how to request to inspect the Plan. The project sponsor shall post at least one copy of the sign in a visible location on each side of the construction site facing a public right-of-way. D. Monitoring: • After start of construction activities, the project sponsor shall submit reports every six months to the ERO documenting compliance with the Plan. After completion of construction activities and prior to receiving a final certificate of occupancy, the project sponsor shall submit to the ERO a final report summarizing construction activities, including the start and end dates, duration of each construction phase, and the specific information required in the Plan.					

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
Mitigation Measure M-AQ-5: Best Available Control Technology for Diesel Engines. All diesel engines used for building operations shall have engines that meet U.S. EPA (1) Tier 4 Final emissions standards, (2) Tier 4 interim emissions standards, or (3) Tier 2 or Tier 3 emission standards and are equipped with an air resources board Level 3 verified diesel emissions control strategy. For each new diesel engine submitted for future projects subject to this mitigation measure, including any associated generator pads, engine and filter specifications shall be submitted to the ERO for review and approval prior to issuance of a permit for the engine from the building department. Once operational, all diesel generators shall be maintained in good working order in perpetuity, and any future replacement for the diesel engines shall be required to be consistent with emissions specifications. The operator of the facility shall maintain records of the testing schedule for each diesel engine for the life of that engine and provide the information for review to the ERO within three months of requesting such information.	Required for future development consistent with the housing element update if a project-level analysis finds that a future development project would result in a significant health risk impact or make a considerable contribution to a health risk impact.	Project sponsor	Prior to issuance of building permit. Maintenance, ongoing	Planning Department	Equipment specifications portion considered complete when equipment specifications approved by the Environmental Review Officer. Maintenance is ongoing and records are subject to Planning Department review upon request.
WIND					
Mitigation Measure M-WI-1a: Wind Minimization. If the screening-level assessment conducted by the department, or an assessment submitted to the department by a qualified consultant for approval, determines wind tunnel testing is required due to the potential for one or more proposed buildings to create or exacerbate a wind hazard exceedance, such testing shall be conducted by a professionally qualified firm. The proposed buildings tested in the wind tunnel may incorporate wind baffling features or landscaping. Such features must be tested in the wind tunnel and discussed in a wind report in the order of preference discussed below, with the overall intent being to reduce ground-level wind speeds such that the project shall not cause a net new location where equivalent wind speeds ~~to~~ reach or exceed the 26-mph wind hazard criterion for a ~~single~~ nine hours of the year in areas of substantial use by people walking (e.g., sidewalks, plazas, building entries, etc.):	Required for future development consistent with the housing element update if wind screening-level assessment determines a wind tunnel test is required, and the wind-tunnel testing	Project sponsor, professionally qualified wind consultant	During permit review of future development project consistent with the housing element update	In coordination with San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency and San Francisco Public Works, the Planning Department to review and approve wind testing	Considered complete upon approval of final demolition, building, or site permit

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
~~1. ***Building Massing.*** New buildings and additions to existing buildings shall be shaped to minimize ground-level wind speeds. Examples of these shapes include setbacks, stepped façades, and vertical steps in the massing to help disrupt wind flows.~~ 1~~2~~. ***Wind Baffling Measures on the Building or on the Project Site***. Wind baffling measures shall be included on future buildings and/or on the project site to disrupt vertical wind flows along tower façades and through the project site. Examples of these may include setbacks, stepped façades, and vertical steps in the massing, staggered balcony arrangements on main tower façades, screens and canopies attached to the buildings, rounded building corners, covered walkways, colonnades, art, free-standing canopies, or wind screens. Only after incorporating all feasible features to reduce wind impacts via building massing and wind baffling, and documenting any such features deemed infeasible shall the following be considered: 2~~3~~. ***Landscaping on or off the Project Site and/or Wind Baffling Measures in the Public Right-of-Way.*** Landscaping and/or wind baffling measures shall be installed in the public right-of-way to slow winds along sidewalks and protect places where people walking are expected to gather or linger. ~~Landscaping and/or wind baffling measures shall be installed on the windward side (i.e., the direction from which the wind is blowing) of the areas of concern.~~ Examples of wind baffling measures may include street art to provide a sheltered area for people to walk and free-standing canopies and wind screens in areas where people walking are expected to gather or linger. Preferred landscaping includes groups of street trees of moderate maturity. If landscaping on or off the project site or wind baffling measures in the public right-of-way are required as one of the features to mitigate wind impacts, Mitigation Measure M-WI-1b shall also apply.	determines the project has the potential for a new or worsened wind hazard exceedance				
Mitigation Measure M-WI-1b: Maintenance Plan for Landscaping on or off the Project Site and Wind Baffling Measures in the Public Right-of-Way. If it is determined infeasible to fully mitigate wind hazards via massing and wind baffling measures on the subject building pursuant to Mitigation Measure M-WI-1a1 ~~and M-WI-1a2~~, the project sponsor shall prepare a maintenance plan for review and approval by the department to ensure maintenance of the features required pursuant to Mitigation Measure M-WI-~~1a3~~ 1a2 in perpetuity. The maintenance plan shall also be reviewed and approved by public works for landscaping or wind baffling measures in the public right-of-way.	Required for future development consistent with the housing element update if it is determined infeasible to fully mitigate	Project sponsor with a roof height greater than 85 feet	During the permit review of a future development project consistent with the housing element update	In coordination with San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency and San Francisco Public Works, Planning Department to	Ongoing and in perpetuity for the lifetime of the building

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
	wind hazards via massing and wind baffling measures on the subject building pursuant to Mitigation Measure M-WI-1a1 and M-WI-1a2			review and approve	
SHADOW					
Mitigation Measure M-SH-1: Shadow Minimization. If it is determined that a future project consistent with the housing element update would create new shadow that would substantially and adversely affect the use and enjoyment of publicly accessible open space, the project sponsor shall redesign the proposed project to reduce or avoid significant shadow impacts to the extent feasible, as determined by the environmental review officer (ERO). Redesign could include changes to building height, massing, and/or orientation.	Required for future development consistent with the housing element update if it is determined that a future project would create new shadow that would substantially and adversely affect the use and enjoyment of publicly accessible open space	Project sponsor	During the permit review of a future development project consistent with the housing element update	Planning Department	Considered complete upon Environmental Review Officer's approval of revised design or concurrency that redesign is not feasible

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES					
Mitigation Measure M-GE-5: Inadvertent Discovery of Paleontological Resources during Construction. **Worker Awareness Training** – Prior to commencing construction, and ongoing throughout ground-disturbing activities (e.g., excavation, utility installation), the project sponsor and/or their designee shall engage a qualified paleontologist meeting the standards specified by the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology (Society of Vertebrate Paleontology 2010) to train all project construction workers regarding how to recognize paleontological resources and on the contents of the paleontological resources alert sheet, as provided by the department. The paleontological resources alert sheet shall be prominently displayed at the construction site during ground-disturbing activities for reference regarding potential paleontological resources. In addition, the paleontologist shall inform the project sponsor, contractor, and construction personnel of the immediate stop work procedures and other procedures to be followed if bones or other potential fossils are unearthed at the project site. Should new workers that will be involved in ground-disturbing construction activities begin employment after the initial training has occurred, the construction supervisor shall ensure that they receive the worker awareness training as described above. The paleontologist shall complete the standard form/affidavit confirming the timing of the worker awareness training and submit it to the environmental review officer (ERO). The affidavit shall confirm the project's location, the date of training, the location of the informational handout display, and the number of participants. The affidavit shall be transmitted to the ERO within five business days of conducting the training. **Paleontological Resource Discoveries** - In the event of the discovery of an unanticipated paleontological resource during project construction, ground-disturbing activities shall temporarily be halted within 25 feet of the find until the discovery is examined by a qualified paleontologist as recommended by the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology standards (Society of Vertebrate Paleontology 2010) and best practices in mitigation paleontology (Murphey et al. 2019). The paleontologist shall consult the ERO. Work within the sensitive area shall resume only when deemed appropriate by the qualified paleontologist in consultation with the ERO. The qualified paleontologist shall determine 1) if the discovery is scientifically significant; 2) the necessity for involving other responsible or resource agencies and	Required for future development consistent with the housing element update if the project-specific evaluation finds that the scope of project construction activities are greater than screening thresholds and would adversely affect geologic units with moderate sensitivity for paleontological resources	Project sponsor, qualified paleontologist	Prior to the start of construction, and ongoing throughout ground-disturbing activities	Planning Department	Ongoing during construction. Considered complete once ground disturbing activities are complete or once the Environmental Review Officer approves the Paleontological Resources Report, if required.

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
stakeholders, if required or determined applicable; and 3) methods for resource recovery. If a paleontological resource assessment results in a determination that the resource is not scientifically important, this conclusion shall be documented in a paleontological evaluation letter to demonstrate compliance with applicable statutory requirements (e.g., Federal Antiquities Act of 1906, CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5, Public Resources Code Chapter 17, section 5097.5, Paleontological Resources Preservation Act 2009). The paleontological evaluation letter shall be submitted to the ERO for review within 30 calendar days of the discovery. If in consultation with the ERO the qualified paleontologist determines that a paleontological resource is of scientific importance, the qualified paleontologist shall make a recommendation as to what action, if any, is warranted and prepare a paleontological mitigation program. The mitigation program shall include measures to fully document the resource of scientific importance. The qualified paleontologist shall submit the mitigation program to the ERO for review and approval within ten business days of the discovery. Upon approval by the ERO, ground-disturbing activities in the project area shall resume and be monitored as determined by the qualified paleontologist for the duration of such activities. The mitigation program shall include: 1) procedures for construction monitoring at the project site; 2) fossil preparation and identification procedures; 3) curation of paleontological resources of scientific importance into an appropriate repository; and 4) preparation of a Paleontological Resources Report (report or paleontology report) at the conclusion of ground-disturbing activities. The report shall include dates of field work, results of monitoring, fossil identifications to the lowest possible taxonomic level, analysis of the fossil collection, a discussion of the scientific significance of the fossil collection, conclusions, locality forms, an itemized list of specimens, and a repository receipt from the curation facility. The project sponsor shall be responsible for the preparation and implementation of the mitigation program, in addition to any costs necessary to prepare and identify collected fossils, and for any curation fees charged by the paleontological repository. The paleontology report shall be submitted to the ERO for review within 30 business days from conclusion of ground-disturbing activities, or as negotiated following consultation with the ERO.					

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria

NOTES:

[a] Definitions of MMRP Column Headings:

- *Adopted Mitigation and Improvements Measures:* Full text of the mitigation measure(s) copied verbatim from the final CEQA document.
- *Implementation Responsibility:* Entity who is responsible for implementing the mitigation measure. Project sponsor for a future development project consistent with the housing element update may also include the project's sponsor's contractor/consultant.
- *Mitigation Schedule:* Identifies milestones for when the actions in the mitigation measure need to be implemented. Occupancy permit may refer to a temporary certificate and/or a final permit.
- *Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility:* Identifies who is responsible for monitoring compliance with the mitigation measure and any reporting responsibilities. In most cases it is the planning department that is responsible for monitoring compliance with the mitigation measure. If a department or agency other than the planning department is identified as responsible for monitoring, there should be an expressed agreement between the planning department and that other department/agency. In most cases the project sponsor of the future development project consistent with the housing element update, their contractor, or their consultant is responsible for any reporting requirements.
- *Monitoring Actions/Completion Criteria:* Identifies the milestone at which the mitigation measure is considered complete. This may also identify requirements for verifying compliance.

PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK

APPENDIX B: TRANSIT DELAY SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Proposed Rezoning Program Addendum
Travel Demand Summary for Housing Units in TAZ 402

Number of Residential Units	Number of Bedrooms [2)	PM Peak Hour Trip Generation (1)			
		Person trips (3)	Vehicle trips		
			inbound	outbound	total
1,900	2,850	1,140	245	54	299
2,438	3,657	1,463	314	70	384

Notes:
(1) SF Planning Department Travel Demand Spreadsheet, Residential, Place Type 3, District 8, Sunset
(2) Assumes 50 percent one-bedroom and 50 percent two-bedroom units.
(3) Person trips by all ways of travel

INSTRUCTIONS:FILL IN INPUTS IN GREEN CELLS UNDER *STEP 1* ONLY

50 percent 1 bedrooms + 50 percent 2+bedrooms applied to 1,900 housing units

STEP 1: USER INPUTS

Land Use	Res
Number of Bedrooms	2850
1000s of Square Feet	1900
Distribute By	District
Place Type	3
District Number	8
District Name	Sunset

STEP 2: PERSON TRIP GEN (UPDATED 2018) - PLACETYPE

Daily Person Trip Rate	4.5
Total Daily Person Trips	12825
PM Person Trip Rate	0.4
Total PM Person Trips	1140

STEP 3: PM MODE SPLIT (UPDATED 2018) - PLACETYPE

Auto Split	39%	443
Taxi TNC Split	4%	40
Public Transit	19%	217
Walk	34%	391
Bike	4%	44
	100%	

INSTRUCTIONS:FILL INPUTS (GREEN TABS) FOR YOUR PROJECT'S APPLICABLE LAND USE TYPE(S). THIS PROJECT SUMMARY TAB PRESENTS TOTAL PROJECT PERSON/VEHICLE TRIPS ACROSS LAND USE TYPES BASED ON YOUR INPUTS.

Person Trips by Mode

	Residential	Office	Retail	Restaurant (Quality Sit Down)	Restaurant (Composite)	Superm arket	Hotel	Total
Auto Split	443	-	-	-	-	-	-	443
Taxi TNC Split	40	-	-	-	-	-	-	40
Public Transit	217	-	-	-	-	-	-	217
Walk	391	-	-	-	-	-	-	391
Bike	44	-	-	-	-	-	-	44

OD PERSON TRIPS BY TRIP PURPOSE AND DIRECTION - DISTRICT

Outbound

		1 Downtown/ NorthBeach	2 SoMa	3 Marina/Wes ternMarket	4 Mission/Pot rero	5 OuterMissio n/Hills	6 Bayshore	7 Richmond	8 Sunset	9 Islands	10 South Bay	11 East Bay	12 North Bay	Total
Auto Person Trips	**PM Work Trips**	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	-	-	9
	PM Non-Work Trips	4	-	14	-	14	-	18	15	-	3	4	-	72
Taxi / TNC Person Trips	**PM Work Trips**	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1
	PM Non-Work Trips	0	-	1	-	1	-	2	1	-	0	0	-	6
Transit Person Trips	**PM Work Trips**	-	-	7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7
	PM Non-Work Trips	-	-	23	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	23
Auto VehicleTrips*	**PM Work Trips**	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	5
	PM Non-Work Trips	3	-	9	-	8	-	11	9	-	2	2	-	45
Taxi / TNC Vehicle Trips*	**PM Work Trips**	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	0
	PM Non-Work Trips	0	-	1	-	1	-	1	1	-	0	0	-	4
														54

Inbound

		1 Downtown/ NorthBeach	2 SoMa	3 Marina/Wes ternMarket	4 Mission/Pot rero	5 OuterMissio n/Hills	6 Bayshore	7 Richmond	8 Sunset	9 Islands	10 South Bay	11 East Bay	12 North Bay	Total
Auto Person Trips	**PM Work Trips**	7	6	-	3	2	28	-	8	-	23	9	9	94
	PM Non-Work Trips	9	-	24	-	14	-	9	199	-	3	-	11	269
Taxi / TNC Person Trips	**PM Work Trips**	1	1	-	0	0	3	-	1	-	2	1	1	8
	PM Non-Work Trips	1	-	2	-	1	-	1	18	-	0	-	1	24
Transit Person Trips	**PM Work Trips**	9	69	1	5	-	-	4	4	-	-	62	-	154
	PM Non-Work Trips	-	4	4	-	1	-	3	21	-	-	-	-	33
Auto VehicleTrips*	**PM Work Trips**	4	4	-	2	1	17	-	5	-	14	5	6	58
	PM Non-Work Trips	6	-	15	-	8	-	6	123	-	2	-	7	166
Taxi / TNC Vehicle Trips*	**PM Work Trips**	0	0	-	0	0	2	-	0	-	1	0	1	5
	PM Non-Work Trips	1	-	1	-	1	-	1	11	-	0	-	1	15
														245
														299

*Auto vehicle trips based on rolling up of shared ride 2, shared ride 3, and drive alone person trips divided by an AVO of 2,3.5, and 1, respectively

Loading Demand

	Residential	Office	Retail	Restaurant (Quality Sit Down)	Restaurant (Composite)	upermark	Hotel	Total
Pax Loading Demand								
Peak Hour Spaces of Demand	1.311	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.311
Peak 15-minutes Spaces of Demand	2.622	0	0	0	0	0	0	2.622
Freight Loading Demand								
Peak Hour Spaces of Demand	3.29861111	0	0	0	0	0	0	3.2986

INSTRUCTIONS:FILL IN INPUTS IN GREEN CELLS UNDER *STEP 1* ONLY

50 percent 1 bedrooms + 50 percent 2+bedrooms applied to 2,438 housing units

STEP 1: USER INPUTS

Land Use	Res
Number of Bedrooms	3657
1000s of Square Feet	2438
Distribute By	District
Place Type	3
District Number	8
District Name	Sunset

STEP 2: PERSON TRIP GEN (UPDATED 2018) - PLACETYPE

Daily Person Trip Rate	4.5
Total Daily Person Trips	16457
PM Person Trip Rate	0.4
Total PM Person Trips	1462.8

STEP 3: PM MODE SPLIT (UPDATED 2018) - PLACETYPE

Auto Split	39%	569
Taxi TNC Split	4%	51
Public Transit	19%	278
Walk	34%	502
Bike	4%	57
	100%	

INSTRUCTIONS:FILL INPUTS (GREEN TABS) FOR YOUR PROJECT'S APPLICABLE LAND USE TYPE(S). THIS PROJECT SUMMARY TAB PRESENTS TOTAL PROJECT PERSON/VEHICLE TRIPS ACROSS LAND USE TYPES BASED ON YOUR INPUTS.

Person Trips by Mode

	Residential	Office	Retail	Restaurant (Quality Sit Down)	Restaurant (Composite)	Superm arket	Hotel	Total
Auto Split	569	-	-	-	-	-	-	569
Taxi TNC Split	51	-	-	-	-	-	-	51
Public Transit	278	-	-	-	-	-	-	278
Walk	502	-	-	-	-	-	-	502
Bike	57	-	-	-	-	-	-	57

OD PERSON TRIPS BY TRIP PURPOSE AND DIRECTION - DISTRICT

Outbound

		1 Downtown/ NorthBeach	2 SoMa	3 Marina/Wes ternMarket	4 Mission/Pot rero	5 OuterMissio n/Hills	6 Bayshore	7 Richmond	8 Sunset	9 Islands	10 South Bay	11 East Bay	12 North Bay	Total
Auto Person Trips	**PM Work Trips**	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11	-	-	11
	PM Non-Work Trips	5	-	19	-	18	-	23	20	-	4	5	-	92
Taxi / TNC Person Trips	**PM Work Trips**	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1
	PM Non-Work Trips	0	-	2	-	2	-	2	2	-	0	0	-	8
Transit Person Trips	**PM Work Trips**	-	-	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9
	PM Non-Work Trips	-	-	29	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	29
Auto VehicleTrips*	**PM Work Trips**	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	-	-	7
	PM Non-Work Trips	3	-	12	-	11	-	14	12	-	3	3	-	57
Taxi / TNC Vehicle Trips*	**PM Work Trips**	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1
	PM Non-Work Trips	0	-	1	-	1	-	1	1	-	0	0	-	5
														70

Inbound

		1 Downtown/ NorthBeach	2 SoMa	3 Marina/Wes ternMarket	4 Mission/Pot rero	5 OuterMissio n/Hills	6 Bayshore	7 Richmond	8 Sunset	9 Islands	10 South Bay	11 East Bay	12 North Bay	Total
Auto Person Trips	**PM Work Trips**	8	8	-	4	2	36	-	10	-	29	11	12	120
	PM Non-Work Trips	12	-	30	-	18	-	12	256	-	4	-	14	345
Taxi / TNC Person Trips	**PM Work Trips**	1	1	-	0	0	3	-	1	-	3	1	1	11
	PM Non-Work Trips	1	-	3	-	2	-	1	23	-	0	-	1	31
Transit Person Trips	**PM Work Trips**	12	88	1	6	-	-	5	6	-	-	79	-	198
	PM Non-Work Trips	-	5	5	-	1	-	3	28	-	-	-	-	42
Auto VehicleTrips*	**PM Work Trips**	5	5	-	3	1	22	-	6	-	18	7	7	75
	PM Non-Work Trips	7	-	19	-	11	-	7	158	-	3	-	8	214
Taxi / TNC Vehicle Trips*	**PM Work Trips**	0	0	-	0	0	2	-	1	-	2	1	1	7
	PM Non-Work Trips	1	-	2	-	1	-	1	14	-	0	-	1	19
														314
														384

*Auto vehicle trips based on rolling up of shared ride 2, shared ride 3, and drive alone person trips divided by an AVO of 2,3.5, and 1, respectively

Loading Demand

	Residential	Office	Retail	Restaurant (Quality Sit Down)	Restaurant (Composite)	upermark	Hotel	Total
Pax Loading Demand								
Peak Hour Spaces of Demand	1.68222	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.6822
Peak 15-minutes Spaces of Demand	3.36444	0	0	0	0	0	0	3.3644
Freight Loading Demand								
Peak Hour Spaces of Demand	4.23263889	0	0	0	0	0	0	4.2326

Housing Element Rezoning Program
Peak Hour Traffic Volumes and v/c Ratios on Brotherhood Way

Brotherhood Way Street Segment	Traffic capacity per direction (veh/hour) [d]	AM PEAK HOUR				PM PEAK HOUR			
		Eastbound		Westbound		Eastbound		Westbound	
		Vehicles	v/c [e]	Vehicles	v/c [e]	Vehicles	v/c [e]	Vehicles	v/c [e]
West of Chumasero Way [a]	1,600	1,138	71%	1,084	68%	1,254	78%	1,220	76%
Proposed Rezoning Program Test [c]		1,438	90%	1,384	87%	1,554	97%	1,520	95%
Alemany Blvd to Arch St [b]	1,600	1,122	70%	971	61%	1,185	74%	890	56%
Proposed Rezoning Program Test [c]		1,422	89%	1,271	79%	1,485	93%	1,190	74%

Notes:

[a] StreetLight Data was used to provide estimates of weekday traffic volumes on Brotherhood Way west of Chumasero Drive. Average peak hour traffic volumes for all Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Thursdays between February 1, 2023 and April 30, 2023.

[b] Quality Counts count data of weekday hourly traffic volumes on Brotherhood Way between Alemany Boulevard and Arch Street. Counts conducted on October 10th through October 13, 2023. See attached. Average peak hour traffic volumes for Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday (October 10-12, 2023).

[c] Proposed Rezoning Program projected housing unit increase from 2050 environmental baseline conditions in TAZ 402 of 2,438 units would generate about 384 vehicle trips during the p.m. peak hour (inbound and outbound). Because not all vehicles generated by the projected housing units would travel on count segment, test conducted by adding 300 vehicles per hour in both eastbound and westbound directions.

[d] Traffic lane capacity based on two travel lanes each way using capacity from Exhibit 10-7 Examples Service Volumes for Urban Streets, Highway Capacity Manual, Transportation Research Board, Washington DC, June 2006

[e] v/c = volume to capacity ratio (i.e., traffic volume divided by total capacity)

Brotherhood Way between Alemany Boulevard and Arch Street, San Francisco
Hourly Traffic Volumes

	Eastbound				Westbound			
Start Time	**Tuesday 10/10/23**	**Wednesday 10/11/23**	**Thursday 10/12/23**	**Average Weekday**	**Tuesday 10/10/23**	**Wednesday 10/11/23**	**Thursday 10/12/23**	**Average Weekday**
12:00 AM	127	124	133	128	126	132	131	130
1:00 AM	70	63	77	70	64	58	79	67
2:00 AM	49	44	49	47	52	51	65	56
3:00 AM	60	52	52	55	69	58	75	67
4:00 AM	84	92	91	89	103	99	111	104
5:00 AM	236	232	220	229	248	264	250	254
6:00 AM	520	519	489	509	400	409	373	394
7:00 AM	894	887	886	889	771	768	791	777
8:00 AM	**1,117**	**1,134**	**1,116**	**1,122**	**957**	**993**	**962**	**971**
9:00 AM	1,020	1,083	943	1,015	945	932	864	914
10:00 AM	759	817	833	803	752	760	669	727
11:00 AM	768	800	805	791	664	686	707	686
12:00 PM	856	929	890	892	669	676	694	680
1:00 PM	795	937	859	864	689	728	683	700
2:00 PM	1,072	1,102	979	1,051	747	894	767	803
3:00 PM	1,043	1,075	1,028	1,049	857	863	847	856
4:00 PM	1,107	1,183	1,028	1,106	**883**	**915**	873	**890**
5:00 PM	**1,125**	**1,240**	**1,189**	**1,185**	879	894	**880**	884
6:00 PM	1,123	1,152	1,139	1,138	844	883	837	855
7:00 PM	860	901	1,012	924	616	696	628	647
8:00 PM	648	734	701	694	477	557	530	521
9:00 PM	582	614	600	599	407	464	403	425
10:00 PM	383	421	452	419	278	333	361	324
11:00 PM	204	237	229	223	198	241	213	217
Day Total	15,502	16,372	15,800	15,891	12695	13354	12793	12,947

Source: Quality Counts, October 2023. See Attached.

Type of report: Tube Count - Volume Data

LOCATION: Brotherhood Way btwn Arch St and Alemany Blvd — **QC JOB #:** 16353031

SPECIFIC LOCATION: — **DIRECTION:** EB

CITY/STATE: San Francisco, CA — **DATE:** Oct 10 2023 - Oct 16 2023

Start Time	Mon	Tue 10 Oct 23	Wed 11 Oct 23	Thu 12 Oct 23	Fri 13 Oct 23	Average Weekday Hourly Traffic	Sat 14 Oct 23	Sun 15 Oct 23	Average Week Hourly Traffic	Average Week Profile
12:00 AM		127	124	133	170	139	228	258	173	
01:00 AM		70	63	77	80	73	145	162	100	
02:00 AM		49	44	49	64	52	99	112	70	
03:00 AM		60	52	52	61	56	91	76	65	
04:00 AM		84	92	91	115	96	66	56	84	
05:00 AM		236	232	220	223	228	143	108	194	
06:00 AM		520	519	489	461	497	250	197	406	
07:00 AM		894	887	886	850	879	435	262	702	
08:00 AM		**1117**	**1134**	**1116**	**1084**	**1113**	668	409	**921**	
09:00 AM		1020	1083	943	1015	1015	791	636	915	
10:00 AM		759	817	833	839	812	831	748	805	
11:00 AM		768	800	805	856	807	**983**	**801**	836	
12:00 PM		856	929	890	936	903	**1071**	847	922	
01:00 PM		795	937	859	833	856	1018	865	885	
02:00 PM		1072	1102	979	951	1026	1054	957	1019	
03:00 PM		1043	1075	1028	999	1036	1033	**976**	1026	
04:00 PM		1107	1183	1028	**1130**	1112	973	969	**1065**	
05:00 PM		**1125**	**1240**	**1189**	853	1102	988	958	1059	
06:00 PM		1123	1152	1139	1083	**1124**	863	852	1035	
07:00 PM		860	901	1012	887	915	754	733	858	
08:00 PM		648	734	701	753	709	693	553	680	
09:00 PM		582	614	600	675	618	633	539	607	
10:00 PM		383	421	452	554	453	518	356	447	
11:00 PM		204	237	229	340	253	390	215	269	
Day Total		15502	16372	15800	15812	15874	14718	12645	15143	
% Weekday Average		97.7%	103.1%	99.5%	99.6%					
% Week Average		102.4%	108.1%	104.3%	104.4%	104.8%	97.2%	83.5%		
AM Peak Volume		8:00 AM 1117	8:00 AM 1134	8:00 AM 1116	8:00 AM 1084	8:00 AM 1113	11:00 AM 983	11:00 AM 801	8:00 AM 921	
PM Peak Volume		5:00 PM 1125	5:00 PM 1240	5:00 PM 1189	4:00 PM 1130	6:00 PM 1124	12:00 PM 1071	3:00 PM 976	4:00 PM 1065	

Comments:

Report generated on 6/12/2024 12:03 PM

SOURCE: Quality Counts, LLC (http://www.qualitycounts.net)

Type of report: Tube Count - Volume Data

LOCATION: Brotherhood Way btwn Arch St and Alemany Blvd
QC JOB #: 16353031
SPECIFIC LOCATION:
DIRECTION: EB
CITY/STATE: San Francisco, CA
DATE: Oct 10 2023 - Oct 16 2023

Start Time	Mon 16 Oct 23	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Average Weekday Hourly Traffic	Sat	Sun	Average Week Hourly Traffic	Average Week Profile
12:00 AM	144					144			144	
01:00 AM	61					61			61	
02:00 AM	61					61			61	
03:00 AM	53					53			53	
04:00 AM	93					93			93	
05:00 AM	209					209			209	
06:00 AM	508					508			508	
07:00 AM	855					855			855	
08:00 AM	**1122**					**1122**			**1122**	
09:00 AM	984					984			984	
10:00 AM	811					811			811	
11:00 AM	781					781			781	
12:00 PM	857					857			857	
01:00 PM	842					842			842	
02:00 PM	980					980			980	
03:00 PM	1083					1083			1083	
04:00 PM	1094					1094			1094	
05:00 PM	**1190**					**1190**			**1190**	
06:00 PM	1135					1135			1135	
07:00 PM	932					932			932	
08:00 PM	688					688			688	
09:00 PM	522					522			522	
10:00 PM	354					354			354	
11:00 PM	185					185			185	
Day Total	15544					15544			15544	
% Weekday Average	100%									
% Week Average	100%					100%				
AM Peak Volume	8:00 AM 1122					8:00 AM 1122			8:00 AM 1122	
PM Peak Volume	5:00 PM 1190					5:00 PM 1190			5:00 PM 1190	

Comments:

Report generated on 6/12/2024 12:03 PM

SOURCE: Quality Counts, LLC (http://www.qualitycounts.net)

Type of report: Tube Count - Volume Data

LOCATION: Brotherhood Way btwn Arch St and Alemany Blvd
QC JOB #: 16353031
SPECIFIC LOCATION:
DIRECTION: WB
CITY/STATE: San Francisco, CA
DATE: Oct 10 2023 - Oct 16 2023

Start Time	Mon	Tue 10 Oct 23	Wed 11 Oct 23	Thu 12 Oct 23	Fri 13 Oct 23	Average Weekday Hourly Traffic	Sat 14 Oct 23	Sun 15 Oct 23	Average Week Hourly Traffic	Average Week Profile
12:00 AM		126	132	131	168	139	248	234	173	
01:00 AM		64	58	79	97	75	152	158	101	
02:00 AM		52	51	65	60	57	117	123	78	
03:00 AM		69	58	75	70	68	71	88	72	
04:00 AM		103	99	111	109	106	79	69	95	
05:00 AM		248	264	250	244	252	128	86	203	
06:00 AM		400	409	373	383	391	209	144	320	
07:00 AM		771	768	791	736	767	428	268	627	
08:00 AM		**957**	**993**	**962**	**956**	**967**	760	435	**844**	
09:00 AM		945	932	864	873	904	646	631	815	
10:00 AM		752	760	669	663	711	**792**	671	718	
11:00 AM		664	686	707	680	684	749	**675**	694	
12:00 PM		669	676	694	670	677	**778**	694	697	
01:00 PM		689	728	683	691	698	770	667	705	
02:00 PM		747	894	767	732	785	739	710	765	
03:00 PM		857	863	847	**907**	869	711	**711**	**816**	
04:00 PM		**883**	**915**	873	834	**876**	694	653	809	
05:00 PM		879	894	**880**	805	865	661	615	789	
06:00 PM		844	883	837	756	830	610	581	752	
07:00 PM		616	696	628	650	648	526	474	598	
08:00 PM		477	557	530	528	523	454	482	505	
09:00 PM		407	464	403	389	416	457	431	425	
10:00 PM		278	333	361	391	341	380	362	351	
11:00 PM		198	241	213	329	245	342	256	263	
Day Total		12695	13354	12793	12721	12894	11501	10218	12215	
% Weekday Average		98.5%	103.6%	99.2%	98.7%					
% Week Average		103.9%	109.3%	104.7%	104.1%	105.6%	94.2%	83.7%		
AM Peak Volume		8:00 AM 957	8:00 AM 993	8:00 AM 962	8:00 AM 956	8:00 AM 967	10:00 AM 792	11:00 AM 675	8:00 AM 844	
PM Peak Volume		4:00 PM 883	4:00 PM 915	5:00 PM 880	3:00 PM 907	4:00 PM 876	12:00 PM 778	3:00 PM 711	3:00 PM 816	

Comments:

Report generated on 6/12/2024 12:03 PM

SOURCE: Quality Counts, LLC (http://www.qualitycounts.net)

Type of report: Tube Count - Volume Data

LOCATION: Brotherhood Way btwn Arch St and Alemany Blvd
QC JOB #: 16353031
SPECIFIC LOCATION:
DIRECTION: WB
CITY/STATE: San Francisco, CA
DATE: Oct 10 2023 - Oct 16 2023

Start Time	Mon 16 Oct 23	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Average Weekday Hourly Traffic	Sat	Sun	Average Week Hourly Traffic	Average Week Profile
12:00 AM	144					144			144	
01:00 AM	76					76			76	
02:00 AM	57					57			57	
03:00 AM	64					64			64	
04:00 AM	102					102			102	
05:00 AM	247					247			247	
06:00 AM	387					387			387	
07:00 AM	778					778			778	
08:00 AM	**937**					**937**			**937**	
09:00 AM	896					896			896	
10:00 AM	737					737			737	
11:00 AM	661					661			661	
12:00 PM	705					705			705	
01:00 PM	703					703			703	
02:00 PM	777					777			777	
03:00 PM	**869**					**869**			**869**	
04:00 PM	862					862			862	
05:00 PM	842					842			842	
06:00 PM	822					822			822	
07:00 PM	563					563			563	
08:00 PM	441					441			441	
09:00 PM	365					365			365	
10:00 PM	290					290			290	
11:00 PM	191					191			191	
Day Total	12516					12516			12516	
% Weekday Average	100%									
% Week Average	100%					100%				
AM Peak Volume	8:00 AM 937					8:00 AM 937			8:00 AM 937	
PM Peak Volume	3:00 PM 869					3:00 PM 869			3:00 PM 869	

Comments:

Report generated on 6/12/2024 12:03 PM

SOURCE: Quality Counts, LLC (http://www.qualitycounts.net)

APPENDIX C: PEDESTRIAN-LEVEL WIND ASSESSMENT

PEDESTRIAN LEVEL WIND ASSESSMENT

SAN FRANCISCO HOUSING ELEMENT JUNE 2025 UPDATE

SAN FRANCISCO, CA

PROJECT #: 2401677
AUGUST 14, 2025

SUBMITTED TO

Jessica Viramontes
Senior Environmental Planner
jessica.viramontes@icf.com

ICF
201 Mission Street, Suite 1500
San Francisco, CA 94105
T: 415.205.2268

SUBMITTED BY

Neetha Vasan, M.A.Sc., LEED AP
Senior Specialist | Associate
Neetha.Vasan@rwdi.com

Shelby Ness, CPHC® PMP
Senior Project Manager | Associate
Shelby.Ness@rwdi.com

RWDI
601 SW 2nd Ave, Suite 1140
Portland, OR 97204
T: 503.457.4710

This document is intended for the sole use of the party to whom it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged and/or confidential. If you have received this in error, please notify us immediately. ® RWDI name and logo are registered trademarks in Canada and the United States of America.

INTRODUCTION & PROJECT INFORMATION

RWDI USA LLC (RWDI) was retained by ICF to assess the pedestrian wind conditions for the proposed updates to the San Francisco Housing Element Program under the Proposed Rezoning Program June 2025.

RWDI previously completed a qualitative assessment of the program in March 2022 to support the San Francisco Housing Element Program 2022 EIR. The 2022 EIR was certified in January 2023. The proposed action (height and density distribution scenario) evaluated in the certified EIR is hereafter referred to as the **"adopted housing element"**.

We understand that updates have been proposed to the program under the Proposed Rezoning Program, that include changes to the heights, densities and distribution thereof, primarily in the west and north sides of the city. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the impacts on the pedestrian level wind environment that could result from adoption and implementation of the Proposed Rezoning Program June 2025 (hereby referred to as the "**proposed rezoning**") which is an update to the San Francisco Housing Element Program 2022.

RWDI completed this assessment in three phases:

- Kick off Meeting and Review of Information
- Wind Analysis
- Summary Text to be incorporated by ICF into final Addendum

This report provides the Summary Text and a description of our initial review and wind analysis comparing the Proposed Rezoning to the 2022 EIR. The assessment was based on the following:

- A review of regional long-term meteorological data for San Francisco;
- ArcGIS models received from Environmental Planning (EP) San Francisco in June and July 2025;
- A review of wind-tunnel studies and desktop assessments undertaken by RWDI for projects in San Francisco;
- our engineering judgement and knowledge of wind flows around buildings[1-3]; and,
- The use of 3D software developed by RWDI (*WindEstimator*[2]) for estimating the potential wind conditions around generalized building forms.

This approach provides a screening-level estimation of potential wind conditions. Scale model wind tunnel testing was not carried out for this assessment.

---

1. H. Wu and F. Kriksic (2012). "Designing for Pedestrian Comfort in Response to Local Climate", *Journal of Wind Engineering and Industrial Aerodynamics*, vol.104-106, pp.397-407.
2. H. Wu, C.J. Williams, H.A. Baker and W.F. Waechter (2004), "Knowledge-based Desk-Top Analysis of Pedestrian Wind Conditions", *ASCE Structure Congress 2004,* Nashville, Tennessee.
3. C.J. Williams, H. Wu, W.F. Waechter and H.A. Baker (1999), "Experience with Remedial Solutions to Control Pedestrian Wind Problems", *10th International Conference on Wind Engineering*, Copenhagen, Denmark.

FEIR FINDINGS

KEY AREAS



Image Source: Figure 4.7-1 - *San Francisco Planning Department, San Francisco Housing Element 2022 Update Final Environmental Impact Report, Planning Department Case No. 2019-016230ENV, State Clearinghouse No. 2021060358, certified January 31, 2023.*

LIST OF KEY AREAS

1. Downtown Area Surrounding the Transbay Center Bound by Market Street to the North, Main Street to the East, Folsom Street to the South and 3rd Street to the West
2. Central SoMA Area Bound by Harrison Street to the North, 3rd Street to the East, Townsend Street to the South and 5th Street to the West
3. Area near Lafayette Park Bound by Jackson Street to the North, Polk Street to the East, Sutter Street to the South and Laguna Street to the West
4. Area Bound by Lake Street to the North, Arguello Boulevard to the East, Anza Street to the South And Funston Avenue to the West
5. Geary Boulevard between 16th Avenue and 28th Avenue
6. Irving Street between 19th Avenue to the east and 27th Avenue to the west
7. 19th Avenue between Ortega Street and Santiago Street
8. Taraval Street between 40th Avenue and 48th Avenue

IMAGES ARE NOT TO SCALE

SUMMARY

SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

KEY AREAS	2050 ENV. BASELINE	HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE	PLAN BAY AREA 2050	EASTSIDE ALTERNATIVE
AREA 1	NO	NO	NO	NO
AREA 2	YES	YES	YES	YES
AREA 3	NO	YES	YES	YES
AREA 4	NO	NO	NO	NO
AREA 5	NO	NO	NO	NO
AREA 6	YES	YES	YES	NO
AREA 7	NO	NO	NO	NO
AREA 8	NO	NO	NO	NO

The darker the shade of orange, the greater the average wind speeds expected as evaluated under the San Francisco Hazard Criterion. The higher the speeds, the more difficult it is typically to manage or mitigate the significant wind impact. However, a comprehensive evaluation would also involve weighing the contributions from not only building height and exposure, but also the grouping of tall buildings of similar height, the positions of each massing relative to the shape and massing in other scenarios etc. Details to this effect will be elaborated in the EIR through RWDI's collaboration with ICF.

PRELIMINARY INPUT

KICK-OFF AND INFORMATION REVIEW

PRELIMINARY INPUT

RWDI provided ICF and EP San Francisco the following preliminary inputs on June 11, 2025, based on our understanding of the project scope and GIS information provided by the City of San Francisco communicated to RWDI up to that date, including the Proposed Rezoning Plan April 2025:

- Within the limited scope of this project/assessment, RWDI prioritized the preliminary inputs around the potential for the proposed rezoning plan to create more severe significant impacts compared to the adopted housing element program (FEIR Housing Element Update 2022), over areas where a reduction of significant impacts may occur.
- A reduction in heights by itself is unlikely to result in more significant impacts.
- An increase in height (delta between allowable heights in the adopted housing element and proposed rezoning) of over 50 ft may have some notable impacts on pedestrian level wind conditions. The impact may be more substantial with higher deltas and in areas that are primarily surrounded by shorter buildings.
- In addition to the absolute height deltas, it is important to evaluate the delta in relation to the original height of the development areas in the adopted housing element plan in further detail.

In this preliminary stage, based on the absolute height deltas (i.e. increase in height compared to the adopted housing element plan), the potential for new significant impacts are expected in the following new key areas (see image on following page) numbered in sequence following the 8 key areas in the FEIR:

9. Van Ness Ave between Lombard St and McAllister St
10. Market Street between Castro St and Van Ness Ave
11. Geary Blvd between 2nd St and Divisadero St

These areas noted a height increase of 51 to 520 feet in the April 2025 update that the preliminary findings were based on. In the June 2025 update of the Rezoning Plan, these areas note a greater height increase of 50 to 650 ft, therefore the three areas continue to be relevant for this assessment.

The three new key areas were not previously assessed for the FEIR. Conclusions made from a detailed evaluation of the above three key areas should provide representative information that would be applicable to other areas with similar height increases as well.

PRELIMINARY INPUT

New Key Areas Selected for Assessment



IMAGES ARE NOT TO SCALE

KEY AREA SELECTION AND REPRESENTATION

KEY AREA SELECTION AND REPRESENTATION

The adopted housing element and proposed rezoning would introduce varying levels of changes to the height and built density in several parts of the city. In order to assess the impact of the changes in an effective and efficient manner, and to provide meaningful findings to support the updates, RWDI selected a limited number of 'key areas' from across the city to evaluate in detail – eight key areas in the FEIR and three additional key areas in relation to the proposed rezoning discussed in the Addendum appendix.

Wind impacts due to building and city development can be attributed to several factors like topography, wind directionality, upwind terrain in a region, change in built density, change in building heights, spacing between buildings, etc. Some of these factors (like spacing and specific design aspects of individual buildings) in the adopted housing element update and proposed rezoning cannot be known at this time, so, the conservative approach would be to assume a worst-case scenario that buildings will be built to the maximum allowable height. With regards to the other factors listed above, wind impacts are not only dependent on the individual contributions of those factors, but different permutations and combinations of these factors can also create varying levels of wind impacts.

Through consultation with the City, the key areas were selected to allow a representative data set that would cover multiple combinations of all relevant parameters that would affect wind impacts in a meaningful way as determined through RWDI's extensive expertise and experience in the assessment of pedestrian level wind impacts on for projects in the city of San Francisco and globally. The tables that follow provide an overview of the representative selection parameters.

Conclusions made from a detailed evaluation of the selected eleven key areas in the FEIR and the Addendum should provide representative information that would be applicable to other areas with similar properties as well.

KEY AREA SELECTION AND REPRESENTATION

#	Key Area	Current Height	Other Considerations	Current Wind Impact and Hazard Exceedances	Expected Updates in the Adopted Housing Element and/or Proposed Rezoning Increase in:		Expected Wind Impact in the Adopted Housing Element and/or Proposed Rezoning
					Height	Built density	
1	Downtown Area Surrounding the Transbay Center Bound by Market Street to the North, Main Street to the East, Folsom Street to the South and 3rd Street to the West	High-rise	Downtown core	Low	No	Yes	Low
2	Central SoMA Area Bound by Harrison Street to the North, 3rd Street to the East, Townsend Street to the South and 5th Street to the West	Low-rise	Low and Mid-rise buildings and under development with many tall building proposals	Moderate	Yes	Yes	High
3	Area near Lafayette Park Bound by Jackson Street to the North, Polk Street to the East, Sutter Street to the South and Laguna Street to the West	Mid-rise	Upwind Topography (hill and park)	Low	Yes	Yes	High
4	Area Bound by Lake Street to the North, Arguello Boulevard to the East, Anza Street to the South And Funston Avenue to the West	Low-rise	Large blocks of varying height and density increases	Low	Yes	Yes	Low

KEY AREA SELECTION AND REPRESENTATION

#	Key Area	Current Height	Other Considerations	Current Wind Impact and Hazard Exceedances	Expected Updates in the Adopted Housing Element and/or Proposed Rezoning Increase in:		Expected Wind Impact in the Adopted Housing Element and/or Proposed Rezoning
					Height	Built density	
5	Geary Boulevard between 16th Avenue and 28th Avenue	Low-rise	Requested by CPC, Key transit-corridor, Irregular topography	Low	No	No	Low
6	Irving Street between 19th Avenue to the east and 27th Avenue to the west	Low-rise	Requested by CPC	Low	No	Yes	Moderate
7	19th Avenue between Ortega Street and Santiago Street	Low-rise	Requested by CPC	Low	Yes	Yes	Low
8	Taraval Street between 40th Avenue and 48th Avenue	Low-rise	Requested by CPC	Low	Yes	No	Low
9	Van Ness Ave between Lombard St and McAllister St	Mid-rise	Extension of Area 3	Moderate	Yes	Yes	High
10	Market Street between Castro St and Van Ness Ave	Low-rise	Area curently under development with many taller building proposals.	Low	Yes	Yes	High
11	Geary Blvd between 2nd St and Divisadero St	Low-rise	Irregular topography, addition of high-rise buildings	Low	Yes	Yes	Moderate

WIND DATA AND CRITERIA

WIND DATA

Long-term wind data generated using a Weather Research and Forecasting (WRF) model for the entire City of San Francisco[4] is referenced for this assessment; this is the standard meteorological data currently used for all projects in the City. The Image below presents the WRF-generated wind data for the downtown area that is in reasonable proximity to the three key areas being assessed. The wind rose represents calculated wind speeds from 07:00 to 18:00 between 2000 and 2019, scaled to 33 ft above an open terrain.

Average wind speeds in San Francisco are the highest in the summer and lowest in winter. However, the strongest peak winds occur in winter. Winds approach predominantly from the west and west-southwest as indicated by the wind rose in Image 4; peak wind speeds (although relatively less frequent) also occur from the south and north. Winds from these directions are most important for the current project, but winds from other directions are also considered in our analysis.

This data set differs from the wind data that was used in the wind assessment conducted for the FEIR in wind directionality and speed distribution. The differences would be relevant for a quantitative study that would use the data to calculate specific speeds at project sites. For the high-level qualitative nature of the current assessment, reasonable considerations have been given to account for the updates to the data and still form a fair comparison to the EIR assessment.



Map of Wind Zones in San Francisco



Annual Distribution of Winds (07:00 to 18:00, 2000 to 2019)

4. Rowan Williams Davies & Irwin Inc. (2021). "San Francisco Wind Climatology Study", Climate Analysis, RWDI #1700178, February 9, 2021.

WIND CRITERIA

San Francisco Planning Code Section 148, Reduction of Ground-level Wind Currents in C-3 Districts, requires buildings to be shaped so as not to cause ground-level wind currents to exceed defined comfort and hazard criteria. The hazard criterion requires that buildings not cause equivalent wind speeds to reach or exceed the hazard level of 26 mph as averaged from a single full hour for the year. For the purposes of environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the wind hazard criterion is used to determine if a proposed project would have significant wind impacts.

The hazard criterion is based on winds that are measured for one hour and averaged. The corresponding one-minute hazard criterion speed is 36 mph. The Planning Code defines these wind speeds in terms of equivalent wind speeds, which are average wind speed (mean velocity), adjusted to include the level of gustiness and turbulence. The text in the report simply refers to the data as wind speeds.

Planning Code Amendments:

RWDI understands that the proposed rezoning program includes amendments to base zoning which includes an update to Section 148 of the Planning Code. The amendment would consolidate all existing wind controls in the planning code into a single section, eliminate the wind comfort criteria, and modify the wind hazard criterion. Wind controls would continue to apply to areas with existing wind controls.

The updated wind hazard criteria will be relevant to determining substantial wind impacts. The proposed update would redefine 'significant impacts' as equivalent speeds exceeding the hazard level (26 mph as averaged from a single full hour for the year) for 9 or more hours in a year (compared to zero hours in the current by-law). This redefinition in essence represents a greater tolerance for wind gusts, accounting for the natural occurrence of gusts statistically in a year and result in a reduced number of significant impacts in the City. The findings of the current wind assessment using the existing 1-hour criterion will be conservative compared to the anticipated findings following the implementation of the legislative amendment that will shift to the 9-hour hazard criterion.

Validity of the 9-hour hazard criterion: A comparison to Standards in Other North American Municipalities

The assessment of pedestrian wind comfort is common practice in many municipalities in the US and Canada and other parts of the world. Some of these municipalities have published standards and guidelines that are adhered to for all building projects, similar to the practice in San Francisco. The criteria for evaluating hazard or pedestrian safety are associated with a wind speed threshold (often gusts as opposed to a mean speed) and an occurrence frequency, that go hand-in-hand with each other. The thresholds have, through research, been related to observed conditions in nature and effect of wind force on people.

Commonly used criteria are based on the works of T.V. Lawson, A.G. Davenport, W.H. Melbourne, A.D. Penwarden, Admiral Beaufort and C.J. Williams, et.al.(RWDI). In the criteria adopted by many municipalities, the allowed hours of occurrence of threshold gusts range between 1 hour (ex. Based on the work by T.V. Lawson, in the City of London, England) to 90 hours (based on the work by Melbourne in the City of Boston, USA) and are associated with varying gust speeds. RWDI and several North American municipalities use a threshold of 9 hours that falls within the aforementioned extreme limits. Hence, the proposed Planning Code amendment and update to a 9-hour criterion in San Francisco, aligns with a broadly adopted industry standard.

5. Lawson, T.V. (1973). "Wind Environment of Buildings: A Logical Approach to the Establishment of Criteria", Report No. TVL 7321, Department of Aeronautic Engineering, University of Bristol, Bristol, England.
6. Davenport, A.G. (1972). “Approach to the Human Comfort Criteria for Environmental Wind Conditions”, Colloquium on Building Climatology, Stockholm (1972)
7. Melbourne, W.H. (1978). “Criteria for environmental wind conditions”, Journal of Wind Engineering and Industrial Aerodynamics, Vol.3, pp.241-249.
8. Penwarden, A.D. (1973). “Acceptable wind speeds in towns”, Building Science, Vol.8, pp.259-267.
9. Williams, C.J., Hunter, M.A. and Waechter, W.F. (1990). "Criteria for Assessing the Pedestrian Wind Environment," Journal of Wind Engineering and Industrial Aerodynamics, Vol.36, pp.811-815.
10. Williams, C.J., Soligo M.J. and Cote, J. (1992). "A Discussion of the Components for a Comprehensive Pedestrian Level Comfort Criteria," Journal of Wind Engineering and Industrial Aerodynamics, Vol.41-44, pp.2389-2390.
11. City of Boston. Redevelopment Authority Code. Section 49A-4. Municode Library. Accessed August 14, 2025. URL:https://library.municode.com/ma/boston/codes/redevelopment_authority?nodeId=ART49AGROVDI_S49A-4LAPRREGEDEENST
12. City of London Corporation (2019). “Wind Microclimate Guidelines for Developments in the City of London”, Accessed August 14, 2025. https://www.cityoflondon.gov.uk/assets/Services-Environment/wind-microclimate-guidelines.pdf
13. City of Toronto Urban Design, City Planning. (2022). “Pedestrian Level Wind Study Terms of Reference Guide”, Accessed August 14, 2025. https://www.toronto.ca/city-government/planning-development/application-forms-fees/building-toronto-together-a-development-guide/application-support-material-terms-of-reference/
14. City of Edmonton. (2021). “Wind Impact Assessments Terms of Reference”. Accessed August 14, 2025. https://www.edmonton.ca/sites/default/files/public-files/assets/Wind_Impact_Assessments_TermsofReference.pdf.

WIND FLOW MECHANISMS AROUND BUILDINGS

Predicting wind speeds and occurrence frequencies is complicated. It involves the combined assessment of building geometry, orientation, position and height of surrounding buildings, upstream terrain and the local wind climate. Over the years, RWDI has conducted thousands of wind-tunnel model studies on pedestrian wind conditions around buildings, yielding a broad knowledge base. This knowledge has been incorporated into RWDI's proprietary software that allows, in many situations, for a qualitative, screening-level numerical estimation of pedestrian wind conditions without wind tunnel testing.

In our discussion of anticipated wind conditions, reference is made to the generalized wind flows illustrated and defined on the right side. Buildings taller than their immediate surrounds tend to intercept the naturally stronger winds at higher elevations and redirect them down to pedestrian level. Such a downwashing flow is often the main cause for wind accelerations around tall buildings. These winds can be relatively strong and turbulent, especially around exposed building corners and in relatively narrow passageways between buildings.

If these building and wind combinations occur for prevailing directions, there is a greater potential for increased wind activity and wind hazard concerns.



Downwashing

Tall buildings tend to intercept the stronger winds at higher elevations and redirect them to the ground level. This is often the main cause for wind accelerations around large buildings at the pedestrian level.



Corner Acceleration

Winds approach at an oblique angle to a tall façade and are deflected down causing a localized increase in the wind activity or corner acceleration around the exposed building corner(s) at pedestrian level.



Channeling

When two buildings are situated side by side or an underpass is created, wind flow tends to accelerate through the space due to channeling effect caused by the narrow gap.

PROPOSED REZONING PROGRAM IMPACTS

AREA 9

Van Ness Ave between Lombard St and McAllister St





EIR Scenario

DAG224

- 55' Height Allowed
- 65' Height Allowed
- 85' Height Allowed
- 140' Height Allowed
- 240' Height Allowed
- 300' Height Allowed
- No height change, density decontrol
- Increased density up to four units (six units on corner lots)

June 2025 - For Public Map- Local Heights

Rezoning Change

- 40' Height Allowed and density decontrol under Local Program
- 50' Height Allowed and density decontrol under Local Program (40' Base Height)
- 65' Height Allowed
- 80' Height Allowed
- 105' Height Allowed
- 120' Height Allowed
- 130' Height Allowed
- 140' Height Allowed
- 160' Height Allowed
- 180' Height Allowed
- 240' Height Allowed
- 250' Height Allowed
- 300' Height Allowed
- 350' Height Allowed
- 490' Height Allowed
- 500' Height Allowed
- 650' Height Allowed

IMAGES ARE NOT TO SCALE

Project #: 2401677
August 14, 2025

AREA 9

Van Ness Ave between Lombard St and McAllister St

KEY POINTS

The assessment completed for the FEIR reviewed a section of Van Ness Avenue between Jackson Street and Sutter Street under Key Area 3. Future development consistent with the adopted housing element included buildings of the order of 15 to 24 that would be substantially taller than the surrounding buildings in the 2019 and 2050 Existing development. The general low height of the 2019 and 2050 existing development to the west of Area 3 and the open Lafayette Park would increase the exposure of these tall buildings to the predominant winds.

In the proposed rezoning program, the allowed heights in this section has increased to about 35 stories (350'). The program also extends this allowable height to a longer stretch of Van Ness Avenue (Area 9), where existing heights are low and no height changes were proposed in the adopted housing element. The increased height, and density of development resulting from this update would lead to increased wind hazard exceedances along Van Ness Avenue and it's cross-streets near the tall buildings.

Downwashing, corner acceleration and channeling flows are expected around the base of all buildings that are downwind (or east of) the much lower developments. The resulting wind activity is expected to exceed the hazard criterion along all areas proposing a height increase up to 35 stories/350'.

New wind hazard exceedances are expected because of the proposed rezoning. Average wind speeds in the proposed rezoning are expected to be higher than in the 2050 environmental baseline as well as the adopted housing element.

Impact of growth distribution:
It should be noted that this conclusion assumes a worst-case future condition in the proposed rezoning where buildings in some blocks along Van Ness will be built to the maximum height with buildings to the west being less than half the maximum height – i.e. a low to moderate density of tall buildings. If/when the density of tall buildings in the blocks to the west of those along Van Ness increases, Area 9 would be more protected from the prevailing wind and wind hazard exceedances may be reduced.

Impact of Planning Code Amendment:
The Planning Code amendment would replace the 1-hour hazard criterion with a 9-hour hazard criterion, which would result in fewer projects exceeding the 9-hour criterion.

AREA 10

Market Street between Castro St and Van Ness Ave

June 2025 - For Public Map- Local Heights

EIR Scenario

DAG224

- 55' Height Allowed
- 65' Height Allowed
- 85' Height Allowed
- 140' Height Allowed
- 240' Height Allowed
- 300' Height Allowed
- No height change, density decontrol
- Increased density up to four units (six units on corner lots)

Rezoning Change

- 40' Height Allowed and density decontrol under Local Program
- 50' Height Allowed and density decontrol under Local Program (40' Base Height)
- 65' Height Allowed
- 80' Height Allowed
- 105' Height Allowed
- 120' Height Allowed
- 130' Height Allowed
- 140' Height Allowed
- 160' Height Allowed
- 180' Height Allowed
- 240' Height Allowed
- 250' Height Allowed
- 300' Height Allowed
- 350' Height Allowed
- 490' Height Allowed
- 500' Height Allowed
- 650' Height Allowed



IMAGES ARE NOT TO SCALE

Project #: 2401677
August 14, 2025

AREA 10

Market Street between Castro St and Van Ness Ave

KEY POINTS

Future development consistent with the adopted housing element presented an allowed height of 85 ft or lower along most of Market Street. Buildings of these heights typically, do not create significant impacts in San Francisco, particularly in the Market Street section. The general low height of the 2019 and 2050 existing development in and to the west of Area 10 would allow wind to blow over the area without much disruption and negligible building-induced wind effects.

The proposed rezoning program increases the allowed heights in Area 10 to approximately 16 stories (160') at street intersections and 14 stories (140') elsewhere along Market Street. The program also extends these allowable heights to a longer stretch of Market Street where existing heights are currently low (less than 85') and no height changes were proposed in the adopted housing element. In adjacent blocks that are not directly fronting Market Street, the allowed height in the proposed rezoning program is 50'. The substantially low surroundings relative to the allowed heights on Market Street would result in the tall buildings being exposed to the prevailing winds. Downwashing, corner acceleration and channeling flows are expected around the base of the tall buildings in Area 10. The resulting wind activity is expected to exceed the hazard criterion on Market Street and its cross streets. Wind hazard exceedances are likely to be higher around the blocks at the intersections of Market Street at Church Street and Gough Street where the allowed heights are 240'-250' which is 100' taller than the 140' allowed heights in the adjacent blocks.

New wind hazard exceedances are expected because of the proposed rezoning. Average wind speeds in the proposed rezoning are expected to be higher than in the 2050 environmental baseline as well as the adopted housing element.

Impact of growth distribution:
The proposed rezoning extends the allowed height of over 140' to a longer stretch of Market Street, while retaining much of the surrounding blocks at an allowed height of 50'. The substantial height difference and the extension of the tall-building zone to a larger area would result in a larger area of wind hazard exceedances compared to the adopted housing element.

Impact of Planning Code Amendment:
The Planning Code amendment would replace the 1-hour hazard criterion with a 9-hour hazard criterion, which would result in fewer projects exceeding the 9-hour criterion. However, it is likely that 9-hour wind hazard exceedances will be seen around the blocks with allowed heights of 240'-250'.

AREA 11

Geary Blvd between 2nd St and Divisadero St

EIR Scenario

DAG224

- 55' Height Allowed
- 65' Height Allowed
- 85' Height Allowed
- 140' Height Allowed
- 240' Height Allowed
- 300' Height Allowed
- No height change, density decontrol
- Increased density up to four units (six units on corner lots)

June 2025 - For Public Map- Local Heights

Rezoning Change

- 40' Height Allowed and density decontrol under Local Program
- 50' Height Allowed and density decontrol under Local Program (40' Base Height)
- 65' Height Allowed
- 80' Height Allowed
- 105' Height Allowed
- 120' Height Allowed
- 130' Height Allowed
- 140' Height Allowed
- 160' Height Allowed
- 180' Height Allowed
- 240' Height Allowed
- 250' Height Allowed
- 300' Height Allowed
- 350' Height Allowed
- 490' Height Allowed
- 500' Height Allowed
- 650' Height Allowed



IMAGES ARE NOT TO SCALE

AREA 11

Geary Blvd between 2nd St and Divisadero St

KEY POINTS

Future development consistent with the adopted housing element included buildings of heights up to 85' along most of Geary Boulevard in Area 11, with taller heights of 240'-300' at around the intersection at Masonic Avenue. The taller blocks would result in wind hazard exceedances around that intersection.

In the proposed rezoning program, the allowed heights in the west half of Area 11 has decreased to 80' in some blocks and increased to 140' in others (where allowed height was 85' in the adopted housing element). The decreased height to 80' is not expected to have an impact on wind effects. However, the increased height of 140' is considered substantial considering the neighbouring blocks that are not directly on Geary Boulevard are zoned at 40' which is less than half the taller allowed height on Geary Boulevard. The massing of the taller buildings extending above the general surroundings will redirect wind and increase wind speeds at ground level relative to the 2050 environmental baseline, as well as the adopted housing element.

In the east half of Area 11, allowed height in the proposed rezoning program range from 140' to 490' (compared to the 85'-300' range in the adopted housing element). These blocks will be surrounded by blocks where height increases are not proposed (retained at an allowed height of 40'-50').

Downwashing, corner acceleration and channeling flows are expected around the base of all tall buildings on Geary Boulevard. The wind impacts resulting from the height difference between the rezoned blocks and surrounding low blocks would result in wind speeds exceeding the hazard criterion by a larger margin and across a longer stretch of Geary Boulevard compared to the adopted housing element.

New wind hazard exceedances are expected because of the proposed rezoning. Average wind speeds in the proposed rezoning are expected to be higher than in the 2050 environmental baseline as well as the adopted housing element.

Impact of growth distribution:
The proposed rezoning extends the allowed height of over 140' to a longer stretch of Market Street, while retaining much of the surrounding blocks at an allowed height of 40'. The substantial height difference and the extension of the tall-building zone to a larger area would result in a larger area of wind hazard exceedances compared to the adopted housing element.

Impact of Planning Code Amendment:
The Planning Code amendment would replace the 1-hour hazard criterion with a 9-hour hazard criterion, which would result in fewer projects exceeding the 9-hour criterion. However, it is likely that 9-hour wind hazard exceedances will be seen around the blocks with allowed heights of 240'-490'

IMAGES ARE NOT TO SCALE

PROPOSED REZONING IMPACTS ON KEY AREAS 2, 3 AND 6

PROPOSED REZONING IMPACTS ON KEY AREAS 2, 3 AND 6

Wind hazard exceedances were predicted in Key areas 2, 3 and 6 in the FEIR assessment of the adopted housing element. In the proposed rezoning program, we find the following general observations:,

Area 2: No height change is proposed in the proposed rezoning relative to the adopted housing element. Therefore, conclusions in the FEIR continue to be applicable.

Area 3: The proposed rezoning introduces a height increase of 100' on Van Ness Avenue and a height decrease of 100 ft on Franklin Street which is west of Van Ness Avenue. Thus, the taller buildings on Van Ness would be more exposed to the prevailing winds and increased wind hazard exceedances relative to the adopted housing element are likely.

Area 6: The proposed rezoning introduces a height increase from 85' to 140' at the intersection of Geary Boulevard and 19th Avenue, which can result in increased wind hazard exceedances relative to the adopted housing element at the intersection. The program introduced a reduction in height in many parts of Area 6; however, these areas were not predicted to show wind hazard exceedances in the adopted housing element and are not expected under the proposed rezoning.

CONCLUSIONS

CONCLUSIONS

KEY POINTS

In the proposed rezoning program, the allowed heights in many blocks within the selected key areas increased by over 100', some up to 190'.

The increased height of 140' is considered substantial considering the neighbouring blocks in many of these areas are zoned at 40'-50' which is less than half the taller allowed height in the rezoned blocks. The proposed rezoning also extends the allowed taller heights to a longer stretch of the selected areas. The massing of the taller buildings extending above the general surroundings will redirect wind and increase wind speeds at ground level relative to the 2050 environmental baseline, as well as the adopted housing element.

Downwashing, corner acceleration and channeling flows are expected around the base of all tall buildings in the selected key areas. The wind impacts resulting from the height difference between the rezoned blocks and surrounding low blocks would result in wind speeds exceeding the hazard criterion by a larger margin and across a larger area compared to the adopted housing element.

New or exacerbated wind hazard exceedances are expected because of the proposed rezoning. Average wind speeds in the proposed rezoning are expected to be higher than in the 2050 environmental baseline as well as the adopted housing element.

Impact of growth distribution:

The proposed rezoning extends the blocks zoned for substantially increased allowed height to a larger area within the selected key areas while retaining much of the surrounding blocks at an allowed height of 40'-50'. The substantial height difference and the extension of the tall-building zone to a larger area would result in a larger area of wind hazard exceedances compared to the adopted housing element.

Impact of Planning Code Amendment:
The Planning Code amendment would replace the 1-hour hazard criterion with a 9-hour hazard criterion, which would result in fewer projects exceeding the 9-hour criterion. However, it is likely that 9-hour wind hazard exceedances will be seen around the blocks with allowed heights of over 240' surrounded by shorter blocks of allowed heights of 85' or lower.

Impact on Key Areas 2, 3 and 6

Overall, new or exacerbated wind hazard exceedances are likely in Areas 3 and 6 due to the proposed rezoning, while no changes are expected in Area 2. Average wind speeds are expected to be higher than in the development under the adopted housing element in Areas 3 and 6.

STATEMENT OF LIMITATIONS

7. STATEMENT OF LIMITATIONS

Design Assumptions

The findings/recommendations in this report are based on the information communicated to RWDI up to July 11, 2025. Should the details of the proposed design and/or geometry of the building change significantly, results may vary.

Limitations

This report was prepared by RWDI USA LLC for ICF ("Client"). The findings and conclusions presented in this report have been prepared for the Client and are specific to the project described herein and authorized scope. The conclusions and recommendations contained in this report are based on the information available to RWDI when this report was prepared. Because the contents of this report may not reflect the final design of the Project or subsequent changes made after the date of this report, RWDI recommends that it be retained by Client to verify that the results and recommendations provided in this report have been correctly interpreted in the final design of the Project.

The conclusions and recommendations contained in this report have also been made for the specific purpose(s) set out herein. Should the Client or any other third party utilize the report and/or implement the conclusions and recommendations contained therein for any other purpose or project without the involvement of RWDI, the Client or such third party assumes any and all risk of any and all consequences arising from such use and RWDI accepts no responsibility for any liability, loss, or damage of any kind suffered by Client or any other third party arising therefrom.

Finally, it is imperative that the Client and/or any party relying on the conclusions and recommendations in this report carefully review the stated assumptions contained herein and to understand the different factors which may impact the conclusions and recommendations provided.

APPENDIX D: MEMORANDUM REGARDING POTENTIAL ZONING MAP CHANGES IN SUPERVISOR DISTRICT 3

San Francisco Planning

49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400
San Francisco, CA 94103
628.652.7600
www.sfplanning.org

APPENDIX D
MEMORANDUM REGARDING POTENTIAL ZONING MAP CHANGES IN SUPERVISOR DISTRICT 3

Background

The San Francisco Planning Department (department) is considering potential changes to the current proposed rezoning program described in Addendum No. 1 to the certified the San Francisco Housing Element 2022 Update Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) (San Francisco Planning Department Case No. 2019-016230ENV). The potential changes include: adding two small areas to the proposed rezoned area along Polk Street and Sansome Street in Supervisor District 3 in the City and County of San Francisco (city) and decreasing heights on blocks near Fisherman's Wharf and the Embarcadero. No decision has yet been made regarding the inclusion of these potential changes in the proposed rezoning program; thus, these changes are not included in the analysis in the addendum. These potential changes are minor relative to the proposed rezoning program as a whole. Consequently, this memorandum provides the analysis for these potential changes to determine whether the changes, if implemented, would alter the impact determinations in the addendum. These potential changes are described in further detail below and are considered potential future rezoning areas. The analysis of the potential future rezoning areas contained herein and incorporates by reference analysis in the addendum and meets the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in accordance with CEQA Statute section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines sections 15162–15164.

Description of Potential Future Rezoning Areas

The changes described below would be incorporated as a whole – that is, changes would not be made to one area of the city without the changes in the other two areas. In aggregate, the potential future rezoning of these three areas of the city would result in a net increase of approximately 39 housing units within Supervisor District 3, which is in the Northeast Planning District.

Polk Street Area Revisions

The area proposed along Polk Street is centered around the intersection of Polk Street and Sacramento Street and bounded by Clay Street to the north, Larkin Street to the east, California Street to the south, and Van Ness Avenue to the west, as shown in Figure 1 below. All figures referenced in this appendix are attached at the end of this memorandum. The following parcels are included (block/lots):

- 0621/ -014, -015, -022, and -023
- 0622/ -001, -002, -003, -004, -005, -006, and -017
- 0643/ -001, -001A, -002, -004, -007, and -019
- 0644/ -010, -011, -012, -013, -014, -015, -016, and -017

The potential future rezoning would increase the Housing Choice – San Francisco Program (referred to hereinafter as "local program") height on these parcels from 85 feet to 120 feet, while the base height would remain at 65 feet. As a result of the potential height increases, these parcels would accommodate approximately 161 more housing units compared to the current proposed rezoning program.

Sansome Street Area Revisions

The area proposed along Sansome Street is centered along Sansome Street and bounded by Greenwich Street to the north, Battery Street to the east, Vallejo Street to the south, and Montgomery Street to the west, as shown in Figure 2 below. The following parcels are included (block/lots):

- 0085/ -005 and -048
- 0106/ -001, -002, -003, -004, and -042
- 0112/ -008 and -009
- 0113/ -006, -041, -040, and -063
- 0134/ -001
- 0135/ -007, -008, and -009

The potential future rezoning would add these parcels into the local program but no height changes would be proposed. However, form-based density measures from the local program would apply, which would increase housing capacity on these sites by approximately 66 more housing units compared to the current proposed rezoning program.

Revisions near Fisherman's Wharf and the Embarcadero

In addition to the two areas described above, the potential future rezoning would include height decreases on three blocks near Fisherman's Wharf and the Embarcadero, as shown in Figure 3 below:

- 0017/ -002
- 0018/ -001, -004, and -005
- 0035/ -001

The existing height limit for these blocks is 40 feet. The potential future rezoning would change from 85 feet in the proposed rezoning program to 65 feet.[1] This change would decrease growth capacity anticipated with the current proposed rezoning program on those sites by 188 units but would still increase capacity from existing conditions.

[1] For clarification, the height decreases would be a reduction compared to the proposed building heights under the current proposed rezoning program, not compared to existing heights as of August 2025.

Analysis of Environmental Effects

Approach to Analysis

As discussed in the "Approach to Analysis of Potential Environmental Effects" section of the addendum, the current proposed rezoning program is evaluated in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Statute section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines sections 15162–15163. Accordingly, the potential future rezoning areas described above are evaluated in the same manner. As shown in the analysis below, if the potential future rezoning areas are added to the current proposed rezoning program, the conclusion of the addendum would not change. That is, it would remain true that the proposed rezoning program would not result in new environmental impacts, substantially increase the severity of previously identified environmental impacts, or require new mitigation measures beyond what was evaluated in the FEIR. In addition, it would remain true that no new information has emerged that would materially change the analyses or conclusions set forth in the FEIR. Therefore, as discussed in more detail below, the proposed rezoning program, inclusive of the potential future rezoning areas described above (if added) would not change the analysis or conclusions reached in the FEIR, and no subsequent or supplemental EIR is required.

Overview of Analysis

In the context of the current proposed rezoning program, the potential future rezoning areas around Polk Street, Sansome Street, and Fisherman's Wharf and the Embarcadero would marginally increase overall growth by 39 units. This represents a small fraction of the total anticipated growth under the current proposed rezoning program (i.e., approximately 54,000 additional housing units). The potential future rezoning changes (i.e., height, form-based density measures, and inclusion into the local program) are similar in nature to other rezoning changes throughout the city and do not consist of peculiar features or unusual circumstances that would distinguish these areas from other areas of the rezoning that have been analyzed. Thus, the potential future rezoning changes would result in a minor increase in housing units and there would be similar impacts related to the following topics, as described in the FEIR and addendum:

- Aesthetics
- Agriculture and Forestry Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Energy
- Geology and Soils
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Paleontological Resources
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Tribal Cultural Resources
- Utilities and Service Systems
- Wildfire

Transportation

The potential future rezoning areas would result in a net increase of 39 units within the Northeast Planning District compared with the current proposed rezoning program. With these modifications, a portion of anticipated growth along the Embarcadero would shift to the Polk Street and Sansome Street rezoning areas. The Embarcadero blocks are approximately 1.5 miles away from the Polk Street changes and approximately 0.5 mile from the Sansome Street changes, and the transportation analysis would be similar to what was disclosed in addendum, as the trips would still occur in the same general vicinity and are all within the northeastern part of the city. The northeastern area of the city is classified as urban high density place type and has some of the lowest vehicle miles traveled per capita in the city.

Accordingly, because the potential future rezonings would only result in a marginal increase in housing growth, the number of vehicle trips would be similar and would result in similar transportation impacts. The potential increase of 161 units closer to the 19 Polk Muni route would add approximately 724 daily person trips (180 automobile, 47 TNC/taxi, 203 transit, 21 bike, and 273 walking trips) and approximately 13 peak hour vehicle trips. [2] These 13 peak hour vehicle trips would not significantly contribute to transit delay on the 19 Polk. For these reasons, the proposed rezoning program, inclusive of the potential future rezoning changes described above (if added), would not result in new significant transportation impacts that were not previously identified in the FEIR, nor would it result in more severe impacts than those previously identified.

Shadow

The potential Sansome Street changes would not increase building heights compared to what is analyzed in the addendum. Therefore, no additional shadow analysis is required for this area.

The potential Polk Street changes would increase maximum building heights under the local program by 35 feet from 85 feet to 120 feet. To evaluate the potential for shadow impacts resulting from potential future development on these parcels, the department prepared representative shadow fans in the proposed area, as shown in Figure 4 below. As shown in Figure 4, development on these parcels up to 120 feet tall would not cast new shadow on any existing or planned San Francisco Recreation and Park Department properties. For these reasons, the proposed rezoning program, inclusive of the potential future rezoning changes described above (if added), would not result in new significant shadow impacts that were not previously identified in the FEIR, nor would it result in more severe impacts than those previously identified.

[2] San Francisco County Transportation Authority. *Travel Demand Tool*. August 26, 2025. Available at: https://sftraveldemand.sfcta.org/

Wind

The potential Sansome Street changes would not increase building heights compared to existing conditions and heights are below 85 feet in height. Therefore, no additional wind analysis is required for this area.

The potential Polk Street changes would increase maximum building heights under the local program by 35 feet from 85 feet to 120 feet. The existing heights for these parcels is 65 feet. Buildings over 85 feet in height could result in accelerated wind speeds at ground level and wind hazard impacts.

The FEIR evaluated eight representative key areas throughout the city and the addendum evaluated three additional representative key areas to further assess potential wind impacts of future development consistent with the proposed rezoning program. The wind impact analysis addresses proposed height increases of generally up to 500 feet, with two limited areas up to 650 feet. The wind impact analysis in the FEIR and addendum disclosed that the nature and severity of the wind impacts under the proposed rezoning program would be similar to the wind impacts for the adopted housing element. That is, the proposed rezoning program would not result in new or substantially more severe wind impacts than identified in the FEIR. Furthermore, wind hazard exceedances could occur in some areas in the city as a result of future development under the proposed rezoning program, and FEIR Mitigation Measures M-WI-1a and M-WI-1b would apply to all buildings over 85 feet, if subject to CEQA and if a significant wind impact is identified, citywide. As previously discussed, the future potential rezoning is similar in nature to the proposed rezoning program changes throughout the city, and subsequent development characteristics would be substantially similar. For these reasons, the proposed rezoning program, inclusive of the potential future rezoning changes described above (if added), would not result in new significant wind impacts that were not previously identified in the FEIR, nor would it result in more severe impacts than those previously identified.

Conclusion

Based on the foregoing, it is concluded that the analyses conducted and the conclusions reached in the FEIR certified on November 17, 2022, remain valid and that no supplemental environmental review is required. The potential future rezoning changes, inclusive of the potential future rezoning changes described above (if added), would not cause new significant impacts not identified in the FEIR, and no new mitigation measures would be necessary to reduce significant impacts. No changes have occurred with respect to circumstances surrounding the adopted housing element that would cause significant environmental impacts to which the housing element update would contribute considerably, and no new information has become available that shows that the housing element update would cause significant environmental impacts. Therefore, no supplemental environmental review is required.



Figure 1 – *Polk Street area revisions*

Figure 2 – *Sansome Street area revisions*

Figure 3 - *Revisions near Fisherman's Wharf and the Embarcadero*

Figure 4 – *Representative Shadow Fans at 120 Feet*



26 August, 2025

San Francisco Planning

San Francisco Planning

49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400
San Francisco, CA 94103
628.652.7600
www.sfplanning.org

PLANNING COMMISSION RESOLUTION NO. 21810

HEARING DATE: September 11, 2025

Project Name: Family Zoning Plan (Housing Element Rezoning Program)
Case Number: 2021-005878GPA MAP PCA
Initiated by: Mayor Lurie, Supervisor Sauter, Supervisor Mahmood, and Supervisor Dorsey
BOS File No: 250701
Staff Contacts: Lisa Chen, Principal Planner
lisa.chen@sfgov.org, 628-652-7422
Reviewed by: Rachael Tanner, Director of Citywide Planning
Rachael.tanner@sfgov.org, 628-652-7471

RESOLUTION ADOPTING AND RECOMMENDING THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVE AMENDMENTS WITH MODIFICATIONS TO THE SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING CODE AND ADMINISTRATIVE CODE TO GIVE EFFECT TO THE FAMILY ZONING PLAN, AND AMENDMENTS TO THE IMPLEMENTATION PLAN OF THE CITY'S CERTIFIED LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM, DELEGATING AUTHORITY FOR REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF HOUSING CHOICE-SF PROJECTS TO THE PLANNING DIRECTOR, AND MAKING FINDINGS OF PUBLIC NECESSITY, CONVENIENCE, AND WELFARE PURSUANT TO PLANNING CODE SECTION 302, FINDINGS OF CONSISTENCY WITH THE GENERAL PLAN AND PLANNING CODE SECTION 101.1, AND FINDINGS UNDER THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT.

WHEREAS, on June 24, 2025, Mayor Lurie introduced an ordinance for Planning Code Amendments (Board File 250701) as a part of the San Francisco Family Zoning Plan ("Family Zoning Plan" or "Plan"), and

WHEREAS, on June 24, 2025, Mayor Lurie, Supervisor Sauter, Supervisor Mahmood, and Supervisor Dorsey introduced a companion ordinance (Board File 250700) for Zoning Map Amendments to implement the Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Commission, at a duly noticed public hearing on July 17, 2025 and in accordance with Planning Code Section 340(c), initiated the General Plan Amendments for the Urban Design Element, the Transportation Element, the Commerce and Industry Element, the Balboa Park Station Area Plan, the Market & Octavia Area Plan, the Glen Park Community Plan, the Northeastern Waterfront Plan, the Van Ness Avenue Area Plan, the Western Shoreline Area Plan, the Western SoMa Area Plan, the Downtown Area Plan, and the Land Use Index by Planning Commission Resolution No. 21784; and

WHEREAS, on July 29, 2025, Mayor Lurie introduced a substitute ordinance for the same Planning Code Amendments; and

WHEREAS, the subject Family Zoning Plan Planning Code Amendments along with the related Zoning Map and General Plan Amendments ("the 2025 Actions") is a rezoning that implements the schedule of actions contained in the Housing Element, as it was updated in 2022 (the Housing Element 2022 Update); and

WHEREAS, the Housing Element 2022 Update was prepared pursuant to Government Code 65583, which, in part, requires that the Housing Element provide: (a) an assessment of housing needs and an inventory of resources and constraints relevant to meeting these needs; (b) a statement of community's goals, quantified objectives, and policies relative to affirmatively furthering fair housing and to the maintenance, preservation, improvement, and development of housing; and (c) a program setting forth a schedule of actions during the planning period to achieve the goals and objectives of the housing element, including the need to revise certain General Plan objectives and policies and rezone portions of the City to increase development capacity to meet the City's housing needs; and

WHEREAS, the Housing Element 2022 Update was certified as compliant with state housing element law by the California Department of Housing and Community Development on February 1, 2023; and

WHEREAS, as required by the Housing Element 2022 Update, the Planning Department has embarked on a multi-year community-based planning effort to revise land use policies, the Planning Code and Zoning Maps to assure sufficient and equitable development capacity to create a variety of housing types in areas of the City that are particularly well suited to accommodate additional housing; the rezoning effort is commonly referred to as the Family Zoning Plan. As called for in the Housing Element 2022 Update, the rezoning focuses on the well-resourced neighborhoods of the western and northern portions of San Francisco (also referred to as Housing Opportunity Areas); and

WHEREAS, throughout this process, the Family Zoning Plan has been developed based on robust public input, including, but not limited to, four public open houses; 11 presentations at the Planning Commission; seven focus groups targeting populations facing greater housing insecurity; 62 housing education workshops in District 1 and District 4; five field walks; multiple presentations at City Commissions and Board of Supervisors committee hearings; two webinars open to a general audience; four online surveys; over 90 meetings with individual neighborhood organizations and advocacy groups; a robust interactive web page presence; a mailed notice to all residents, business owners, and property owners within the rezoning area and within 300 feet of its boundary; and thousands of individual meetings, phone calls, and emails with stakeholders; and

WHEREAS, the Family Zoning Plan aims to expand housing affordability and diversity, including housing suitable for families, seniors, people with disabilities, essential workers, and low- and moderate-income households; to create a more predictable process to approve and build housing; to ensure inspiring urban design and architecture; to support small businesses and neighborhood vitality, and to plan for infrastructure and services to serve growth; and

WHEREAS, a draft ordinance, substantially in the form attached hereto as Exhibit 3.b., and approved as to form by the City Attorney's office would amend the Planning Code in furtherance of the Family Zoning Plan. The Planning Code Amendments would: 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; and

WHEREAS, the draft ordinance includes a provision in proposed Planning Code Section 334, ("Housing Choice-SF Program Project Authorization"), that establishes that the Commission will not hold hearings for discretionary review for Housing Choice-SF projects if the Commission delegates its authority to review applications to the Planning Department; and

WHEREAS, collectively, the General Plan Amendments, the Zoning Map Amendments, and the Planning Code Amendments will affect approximately 92,000 of the approximately 150,000 parcels in the City where residential development is permitted; the Family Zoning Plan will allow increased density on all of those 92,000 parcels (approximately 60% of those 150,000 parcels), and increase the permitted heights on approximately 17% of parcels citywide; and

WHEREAS, the draft ordinance also proposes amendments to the Implementation Plan of the City's certified Local Coastal Program ("LCP"). On August 1, 2025 the Department issued a Notice of Availability of an LCP Amendment ("NOA") in accordance with California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Section 13515 requirements for public participation and agency coordination. The Department mailed the NOA to all neighborhood organizations that requested notice of hearings and applications in the Coastal Zone; individuals who have made a specific written request to be notified of hearings and applications pertaining to the Coastal Zone; local governments contiguous with the area that is the subject of the LCP Amendment; regional, state, and federal agencies that may have an interest in or may be affected by the proposed LCP Amendment; and the local library. The Department has completed a Consistency Analysis of the proposed LCP Amendment, attached hereto as Exhibit 7, in accordance with California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Sections 13511 and 13552; and

WHEREAS, the Commission certified the Housing Element 2022 Update EIR on November 17, 2022 in motion 21206, and adopted CEQA findings, a Statement of Overriding Considerations, and a Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting program (MMRP) for the Housing Element 2022 Update on December 15, 2022 in resolution 21220. The Planning Department has prepared an addendum to the Housing Element 2022 Update FEIR, which was published on September 3, 2025 and found that the proposed Family Zoning Plan, including the General Plan, Planning Code and Zoning Map amendments, would not create any new or substantially more severe significant impacts than those described in the FEIR; and

WHEREAS, on September 11, 2025, the Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting on the Planning Code Amendments; and

WHEREAS, Planning Department staff recommends adoption of this Resolution adopting and recommending that the Board of Supervisors approve the Planning Code Amendments with modifications; and

WHEREAS, the Commission has heard and considered the testimony presented to it at the public hearing and has further considered written materials and oral testimony presented on behalf of Department staff and other interested parties; and

WHEREAS, all pertinent documents may be found in the files of the Department, as the Custodian of Records, at 49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco; and

WHEREAS, the Commission has reviewed the proposed ordinance; and

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, pursuant to Planning Section 302, that the Commission finds from the facts presented that the public necessity, convenience, and general welfare require the proposed Planning Code Amendments:

Findings

Having reviewed the materials identified in the preamble above, and having heard all testimony and arguments, this Commission finds, concludes, and determines as follows:

1. The Planning Code Amendments along with the Family Housing Zoning Plan will create development capacity for more than 36,200 additional housing units by 2030 by increasing realistic zoned capacity for housing and removing current constraints on new housing in the City's well-resourced neighborhoods, in satisfaction of Housing Element Action 7.1.1.

2. The Planning Code Amendments will increase the supply of housing units, helping to alleviate the City's housing shortage and affordability crisis. Allowing for greater density and heights encourages the construction of a wide range of housing typologies, thereby providing greater accessibility to housing for residents of all incomes, household types, and needs throughout the city. The increased capacity will also generate more subsidized, permanently-affordable units through the City's inclusionary housing program and by increasing the geographic availability of sites zoned for the scale and type of buildings feasible for 100% affordable housing development.

3. The Planning Code Amendments will advance the production of housing in state-designated Housing Opportunity Areas, where, over the past two decades, only about 10% of new housing units were built, even though they comprise more than 50% of the City's land. Building more residential units in these areas – which have higher incomes, good access to jobs, well-performing public schools, and low levels of environmental pollution – will create housing and economic opportunities for low- and moderate-income households.

4. The Planning Code Amendments will enable increased housing production, which will generate more tax revenue and other public revenue to support public services and facilities. This increased revenue will ensure that vital infrastructure and services such as transit, schools, parks, and fire stations support healthy and complete communities, and that these facilities can increase in capacity as our population grows, in addition to supporting reinvestment in existing facilities.

5. The Planning Code Amendments will include increasing housing capacity in mixed-use and commercial areas and corridors, which will benefit local businesses by generating more customers and demand for their goods and services.

6. The Planning Code Amendments will include increasing housing capacity along major transit corridors and near job, schools and services, which will reduce reliance on automobile trips and reduce greenhouse gas emissions, while providing additional ridership to support higher levels of transit service to benefit both existing and future residents, workers and visitors.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the Planning Commission hereby find that the subject Planning Code Amendments are consistent with the General Plan and Planning Code Section 101.1 as provided in Planning Commission Resolution No. 21808 concerning the proposed General Plan Amendments related to the Family Zoning Plan; and,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Commission finds that the Planning Code Amendments do not impose any new governmental constraints on the development of housing, as set forth in Policies 7.1.1 and 8.1.6 of the 2022 Housing Element, nor do they lessen the intensity of land use within the meaning of Government Code Section 66300(h)(1). The Commission further finds that collectively, the General Plan Amendments, the Zoning Map Amendments, and the Planning Code Amendments, provide capacity for more than 36,200 units over the City's current zoning, which would more than offset any constraint or reduction in intensity on specific parcels, if any; and,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Commission finds the amendments to the Implementation Plan of the City's certified LCP conform 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 LCP Land Use Plan—the Western Shoreline Area Plan—for the reasons set forth in the Consistency Analysis, attached hereto as Exhibit 7. The Commission further finds that the amendments will be implemented in full conformance with the Coastal Act's provisions; and,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Commission has reviewed and considered the FEIR and CEQA Findings as modified by Addendum No. 1, and related findings previously adopted by the Commission for the Project, including the statement of overriding considerations and mitigation monitoring and

reporting program, the findings as set forth in Addendum No. 1, and the findings related to amendments to adopted mitigation measures set out in Exhibit 8 to this Resolution. The Commission adopts the findings made in Addendum No. 1 and adopts the amendments to mitigation measures as proposed by Addendum No. 1 and identified in Exhibit 8; and,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Commission finds and determines that the 2025 Actions is within the scope of the 2022 Housing Element Update analyzed in the FEIR as modified by the subsequent Addendum No. 1, and require no further environmental review pursuant to CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines Section 15180, 15162, and 15163 for the following reasons: (1) implementation of the 2025 Actions does not require major revisions in said FEIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; and, (2) no substantial changes have occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the actions analyzed in said FEIR will be undertaken that would require major revisions to the FEIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects, or a substantial increase in the severity of effects identified in the FEIR; and, (3) no new information of substantial importance to the actions analyzed in said FEIR has become available which would indicate that (A) the Project as modified by the 2025 Actions will have significant effects not discussed in the FEIR; (B) significant environmental effects will be substantially more severe; (C) mitigation measures or alternatives found not feasible, which would reduce one or more significant effects, have become feasible; or (D) mitigation measures or alternatives, which are considerably different from those in the FEIR, will substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment; and,

NOW THEREFORE BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Commission hereby APPROVES WITH MODIFICATIONS the proposed Ordinance as described in this Resolution. The Commission's proposed recommended modifications are listed in the attachment Exhibit 3.a.1.; and,

THEREFORE BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Planning Commission hereby delegates its authority to review and approve applications for Housing Choice-SF projects to the Planning Director.

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was adopted by the Commission at its meeting on September 11, 2025.

Jonas P. Ionin
Commission Secretary

AYES: Campbell, McGarry, Braun, So

NOES: Williams, Imperial, Moore

ABSENT: None

ADOPTED: September 11, 2025

San Francisco Planning

49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400
San Francisco, CA 94103
628.652.7600
www.sfplanning.org

Exhibit 3.a.1. to Draft Resolution

RECOMMENDED MODIFICATIONS TO PLANNING, BUSINESS, AND TAX REGULATIONS CODE AMENDMENTS

HEARING DATE: SEPTEMBER 11, 2025

The Planning Commission recommends the following modifications to the proposed Ordinance amending the Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Code

#	Code Section	Change
1	135	Reduce the usable open space requirement for Senior Housing (e.g. to 36 sq ft) and allow indoor community spaces to meet the requirement.
2	155.1	Eliminate or reduce (e.g., cut by 50%) the bike parking requirements for Senior Housing.
3	202.2(f)(1)(C)	Change the definition of Senior Housing so that there is no minimum number of units to qualify.
4	202.17	Expand the waiver of the Conditional Use Authorization (for use authorization) and impact fees waivers from just Legacy Businesses to all displaced businesses.
5	206.10(d)(1)	Waive ground floor height requirement (Section 145.1) for projects using the Local Program to allow a building of 9 stories in 85' height districts.
6	206.10(d)(1)(B)	Amend the unit mix requirement applicable to projects using the Local Program as follows: • 4-unit building: min one 2+BR • 5-9 units: min 25% 2+BR, including at least one 3+BR unit • 10+ units: min 25% 2+BR, including at least 5% 3+BR
7	206.1(d)(1)(E) and (K); various	Square Footage Bonus for additional multi-bedroom units in the Local Program: Projects of 3+ units can receive additional square footage added to their building envelope for providing: • 3BR units: 250 sq ft for each unit provided , including any the required unit(s) • 4+BR units: 400 sq ft for each unit provided including any required unit(s) In the R-districts, bonus square footage can be added horizontally through any combination of the following:

#	Code Section	Change
		• Reducing the required rear yard (from 30% down to 25% rear yard or 20 feet, whichever is greater). • Reducing the rear yard on the ground floor to 18% or 15 ft, whichever is greater. • Building into the required side yard, where applicable. • Reducing the required upper-story setback for additions to historic properties, from 15 feet down to 10 feet. (Preservation Design Standard P.5.1.1). In other districts, bonus square footage can be added horizontally as above, or vertically through the addition of additional height, generally not to exceed 1 additional story of height.
8	206.1(d)(1)(E) and (K); 414A; various	Square Footage Bonus for family-friendly amenities in the Local Program: In R-districts, projects can get a square footage bonus for providing certain communal amenities, calculated as follows: • 2.0 sq ft bonus for each square foot provided of shared community rooms, shared kitchen, reservable room for overnight guests, extra storage for large objects, space for in-home childcare. Bonus square footage can be added horizontally through any combination of the following: • Reducing the required rear yard (from 30% down to 25% rear yard or 20 feet, whichever is greater). • Reducing the rear yard on the ground floor to 18% or 15 ft, whichever is greater. • Building into the required side yard, where applicable. • Reducing the required upper-story setback for additions to historic properties, from 15 feet down to 10 feet. (Preservation Design Standard P.5.1.1). In addition, projects that are providing an in-home childcare space may receive a waiver of their childcare fee obligation (Section 414A).
9	206.10(d)(1)(F)	Remove usable open space requirement for projects using the Local Program. Projects are still subject to applicable rear yard requirements.
10	206.10(d)(1)(G)	Remove Planning Code exposure requirements for projects using the Local Program.
11	206.10(d)(1)(K)	Add an additional Height Bonus available for projects in the Local Program, comprised of additional square footage for providing tenant improvements (e.g., a "warm shell").
12	206.10(d)(1)(K)	Square Footage Bonus and Code Flexibility for Preservation of historic structures. Add a bonus and code flexibility for adaptive reuse on sites with historic structures (which could include Category A buildings, designated Article 10/11 landmarks, and listed resources in the State or National historic registers) in districts other than R districts and in the RTO-C district that do not demolish the resource and comply with the Preservation Design Standards in ways that preserve the resource and reduce the volume of the project within the otherwise permitted building envelope not accounting for the historic structure. The bonus square footage shall be equivalent to 1.5 times the square footage foregone through setback or unused volume above the footprint of the historic structure. This volume can be used to expand the allowed volume of a building horizontally or vertically, not to exceed a certain additional number of stories (to be

#	Code Section	Change
		determined) or reduce the required rear yard above the ground floor to less than 15 feet where abutting the rear yard of parcels containing residential uses.
13	206.10(d)(1)	State that future revisions to the Housing Choice SF program must satisfy two conditions: 1) Any proposed new or increased government constraints in the Housing Choice SF program must be offset by decreasing constraints; and, 2) Substantive changes to the applicability and/or development standards in the Local Program must be analyzed for consistency with Housing Element statute in Government Code 65583(a)(3).
14	209.4	Edit the Use Size Control for the RTO-C district and delete the first clause ("P: up to 4,999 gross square feet per lot") so that it reads as follows: "P: Non-Residential use of any size that is part of a project where at least 2/3 of the floor area contains Residential uses. C: Non-residential use in new development, changes of use, or addition of more than 20% to an existing structure, in which the non-residential uses constitute more than 1/3 of the gross square footage of the proposed new, converted, or enlarged structure(s)."
15	311	Codify early notification for commercial tenants. Upon receipt of a development application on a commercial corridor, the Planning Department will send mailed notice to the address (to notify any commercial tenants) and notify the Office of Small Business.
16	317(c)(12)	Edit the proposed language to read: *(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 units on the property.*
17	Various	Clean up Planning Code Section 151 references and supersede those with 151.1 references. PC 151.1 is the only remaining off-street parking section.

[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 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.

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. 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. 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 Legacy 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 the rezoning deadline in 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.*

(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 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) 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.

(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 five or more net new dwelling units shall include at least 25% of units as two bedrooms or more; provided that 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:*** *Open space requirements under Section 135 may be modified as follows:*

(i) Usable Open Space may be reduced to a minimum of 36 square feet per Dwelling Unit.

(ii) Open space may be private or common space, or publicly accessible on-site or off-site open space.

(iii) Any space provided as common usable open space shall have a minimum horizontal dimension of 10 feet and a minimum area of 100 square feet.

(iv) Individual private residential usable space shall have a minimum horizontal dimension of 3 feet and a minimum area of 27 square feet.

(v) ***On-Site Publicly Accessible Usable Open Space.*** *The usable open space requirement may be met with on-site publicly accessible usable open space including open space otherwise required by Section 270.3. When on-site publicly accessible usable open space is provided, the maintenance, information plaque, and liability provisions of Sections 270.3(e) shall apply.*

(G) ***Dwelling Unit Exposure.*** *The Dwelling Unit exposure requirements of Section 140 shall apply. However, up to 30% of the units may instead face onto either a Yard or a Court as defined below.*

(i) ***Yards.*** *For the purposes of this subsection (d)(1)(G), a Yard is an open space, other than a court as defined in subsection (d)(1)(F)(ii), unobstructed from the ground to the sky, on the lot on which a building is situated. Yards shall be not less than three feet in depth extending the full lot length or depth, for buildings two stories or less above grade plane. For buildings more than two stories above grade plane, the minimum depth extending the full lot length or depth of the Yard shall be increased at the rate of one foot for each additional story. For buildings exceeding 14 stories above grade plane, the required depth extending the full lot length or depth of the Yard shall be computed on the basis of 14 stories above grade plane.*

(ii) ***Courts.*** *For the purposes of this subsection (d)(1)(G), a Court is an open, uncovered space, unobstructed to the sky, bounded on three or more sides by exterior building walls or other enclosing structures. Courts shall not be less than three feet in depth. Courts having windows opening on opposite sides shall not be less than six feet in depth. Courts shall not be less than 10 feet in length unless bounded on one end by a public right-of-way or yard as defined in subsection (d)(1)(F)(i). For buildings more than two stories above grade plane, the Court shall be increased one foot in depth and two feet in length for each additional story. For buildings exceed 14 stories above grade plane, the required dimensions shall be computed on the basis of 14 stories above grade plane.*

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

(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) ***Height Bonus for Micro-Retail and/or Community Benefit Uses.*** *For projects that include, at or above grade, (1) 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 (2) 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 shall include: Child Care Facility, Community Facility, Job Training, Public Facilities, Social Service or Philanthropic Facility, Laundromat, Trade School, retail Grocery (General or Specialty), a Legacy Business as defined in Administrative Code Section 2A.242 that meets the requirements of Section 202.17, and/or any Displaced Business as defined in subsection (d)(1)(K)(iii). 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):*

(i) For every square foot of Community Benefit Use(s), or every 1.5 square feet of Micro-Retail, the Project is allowed:

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

b. up to a maximum of 10 feet total above the permitted height limit to accommodate the additional square footage;

(ii) On-site Community Benefits Use(s), and Micro-Retail space must be included in the project for a minimum of 30 years, 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).

(iii) For purposes of this subsection (d)(1)(K), a Displaced Business means a commercial tenant whose lease expired and was not renewed, or was otherwise terminated by the property owner and that was located on a site for which a Development Application has received a Final Approval within three years prior to or subsequent to the expiration or termination of the lease.

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

(M) ***Reduction of Quantitative Objective Standards.*** *Except for standards set forth in subsection (d)(1)(A) through (d)(1)(L) inclusive, standards ineligible for Major Modifications under Section 334(d)(3), and maximum average floor plate requirements in Section 270(i), any quantitative Objective Standard may be modified by up to 15% of the standard.*

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

(A) ***Definitions.*** *A 100% Affordable HC Housing Project shall be an eligible HC-SF Project where the principal use is housing comprised solely of housing that is restricted for a minimum of 55 years or the Life of the Project, whichever is longer and consistent with any applicable tax credit regulatory requirements, as affordable for "persons and families of low or moderate income," as defined in California Health & Safety Code Section 50093.*

(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 Bonus.*** *Up to 20 feet of additional height is permitted above the HC-SF height limit set forth in Section 263.19(b), and in subsection (d)(1)(C).*

(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.*

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 modification under this Section 334 shall be completed within 90 days*

of submittal of a complete Development Application if the project contains 150 or fewer Residential Units, or within 180 days of submittal of a complete Development Application if the project contains more than 150 Residential Units. 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.*

(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). 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 under Sections 260, 263.19 or 260.10; maximum permitted accessory off-street parking amounts under Section 151.1; wind controls under Section 148; minimum density under Section 207.10; Floor Area Ratio requirements; 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; 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.*

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 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.

(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~~subsection (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~~subsection (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)*(2~~*b*~~). 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 also Height and Bulk District Maps.	No portion of a Dwelling may be taller than 35 feet. Structures with uses 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	~~*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 slope of the lot.	Varies, but generally 40 feet. Height sculpting on Alleys per § 261.1.

		based on the slope of the lot.	
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 feet if common.	At least 300 square feet if private, and 400 square feet if common.	At least 300 square feet for the first unit and 100 for the minor second unit if private, and 400 square feet for the first unit and 133 square feet for the second unit if common.	At least 125 square feet if private, and 166 square feet if common.	At least 100 square feet if private, and 133 square 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	P up to two units per lot, if the secon d unit is 600 sq. ft. or less, or up	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.

			lot area.	to one unit per 3,000 square feet of lot area, with 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 415 square feet of lot area.	P, up to one bedroom for every 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, 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				
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, 142, 156	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP
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, 132	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.		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 Building Frontage	§ 144.1	Stepping of the front of the buildings required when 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 common.	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.	
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.*~~ Total maximum permitted density is one unit per 800 square feet of lot area. ~~*(11)*~~	~~*P if 3 units per lot or at least one unit per 800 square feet of lot area, whichever is greater.*~~ Total maximum permitted density is one unit per 600 square feet of lot area. ~~*(11)*~~	~~*P if 3 units per lot or at least one unit per 533 square feet of lot area, whichever is greater.*~~ Total maximum permitted density is one unit per 400 square feet of lot area ~~*(11)*~~	~~*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 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,*~~ Group Housing *Density*	§208	P (6), Up to one bedroom for every 275 square feet of lot area.	P (6), Up to one bedroom for every 210 square feet of lot area.	P (6), Up to one bedroom for every 140 square feet of lot area.	P (6), Up 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 occupied by a garage or storage space located in the Basement or First Story.	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 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 Limits	§§ 102, 105, 106, 250-252, 260-, 261.1-, *263.19*, 270, *270.3*, 271	Varies~~,~~. See Height and Bulk Maps. Height sculpting on Alleys per § 261.1.	
* * * *			
~~*Residential*~~Design Guidelines *and Standards*	§ 311	Subject to the Residential Design Guidelines *and Citywide Design Standards and any*~~. *O*~~other 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 (§ 263.19). Outside the R-4 Height and Bulk District,* P up to one bedroom for every 140 square feet of lot area. (9)	*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 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, 3 and 6 of the Planning Code are hereby amended by revising Sections 121.2, 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. 121.2. NON-RESIDENTIAL USE SIZE LIMITS IN NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL, ~~*AND*~~ NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL TRANSIT DISTRICTS, *AND THE RTO-C DISTRICT*.

(a) In order to protect and maintain a scale of development appropriate to each district, Non-Residential Uses of the same size or larger than the square footage stated in the table below may be permitted only as Conditional Uses. The use area shall be measured as the Gross Floor Area for each individual Non-Residential Use.

District	**Use Size Limits**
* * * *	* * * *
Taraval Street	4,000 sq. ft.
Residential Transit Oriented, Community Districts (RTO-C)	*5,000 sq. ft., unless such use is part of a project in which at least 2/3 of the floor area is for Residential Uses.*
* * * *	* * * *

* * * *

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~~Residential ~~u~~Uses. *However, projects proposing new construction of a Dwelling Unit that would exceed the maximum dwelling unit size described in Section 207.10 may require a 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.

*** * * ***

(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.

* * * *

(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 Authorization. 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 Standards*	§ 311	Subject to the Residential Design Guidelines, *Citywide Design Standards, and* *any* ~~O~~other design guidelines that have been approved by the Planning Commission~~ *may also apply*~~.	
Street Frontage and Public Realm			
Front Setback Landscaping and	§ 132	*Generally* ~~R~~required. At least 50% of Front Setback shall be permeable so as to increase storm water infiltration and 20% of Front Setback shall be	

Permeability Requirements		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, Demolition, or Merger *of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*	§ 317	C ~~*for Removal of one or more Residential Units or Unauthorized Units.*~~		
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 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.*	*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(10)	P(10)	*P(10)*
Single Room Occupancy	§ 102	P	P	*P*
Student Housing	§ 102	P	P	*P*
Residential Uses				
~~*Residential Density*~~, Dwelling Unit~~s~~ *Density, General* (7)	§ 207	~~*P if at least one unit per 800 square feet of lot area (8).*~~ Maximum density as of right is one unit	~~*No density limit. Density is regulated by the permitted height and bulk, and required setbacks,*~~	*Form-Based Density.*

		per 600 square feet of lot area. C above, per criteria of § 207(a). ~~(11)~~*(8)*	~~*exposure, and open space of each parcel, along with Residential Design Guidelines.*~~ *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), *207.9*	*Form-Based Density applies within the R-4 Height and Bulk District (§ 263.19). Outside the R-4*	~~*No density limit. Density is regulated by the permitted height and bulk, and required setbacks,*~~	*Form-Based Density.*

		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 height, bulk, setbacks, open space, exposure, unit mix, and relevant design guidelines.*~~	~~*exposure, and open space of each parcel, along with Residential Design Guidelines.*~~*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 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*	*P: up to 4,999 gross square feet per lot. P: Non-Residential use of any size that is part of a project where at least 2/3 of the floor area contains*

				Residential uses. C: 5,000 gross square feet and above per lot, except as provided above.
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) *[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. 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 *S*ection *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, 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	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*.

Excelsior Outer Mission Street Neighborhood Commercial District	
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 stations.***	*0.5 parking spaces for each Dwelling Unit.*	*1.6 parking spaces per 1,000 square feet of Occupied Floor Area.*
*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. 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.

(~~e~~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*istricts, 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.

(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. 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.*

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

(1) ***Applicability.*** *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.*

(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.*

(3) ***Exception for Projects with Non-Code Complying Minimum Densities.*** *Projects that fail to comply with the minimum Dwelling Unit densities in this Section 207.9 shall be considered non-code-compliant. The Planning Commission may grant an exception to this objective standard upon approval of a Conditional Use Authorization pursuant to Section 303.*

(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 of Embarcadero, Montgomery, Powell, or Civic Center BART stations; and Salesforce Transbay Transit Center.**	*100 units per acre*	*Floor Area Ratio 4:1*
*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	*50 units per acre*	*Floor Area Ratio 1:1*

*of all ferry terminals, including the Ferry Building, 16th Street/Mission Bay, and Treasure Island; and all other locations subject to the 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 any project to construct Dwelling Units for which a Development Application is filed after January 31, 2026, for one or more 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.*** *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.*

(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.

Section 11. Legacy 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 TO ALLOW LEGACY BUSINESS RELOCATION.

(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 long-standing local 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 registered Legacy 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. *The site or location where a Legacy Business seeks to be permitted.*

Prior Location. *The place of operation where a Legacy Business operated for at least five years prior to relocating to the New Location.*

Relocating Legacy Business. *A Legacy Business, as defined under Administrative Code Section 2A.242, that ceases to operate at a Prior Location in order to begin operating at 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 Legacy Business is either principally or conditionally permitted in the zoning district of the New Location, the use and use size of the Legacy Business shall be considered 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 a Conditional Use Authorization.*

(2) ***No Development Impact Fees.*** *A Relocating Legacy Business shall not be subject to fees pursuant to Article 4.*

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, 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.*

* * * *

Legacy Business. *A Use Characteristic that applies to Non-Residential uses listed on the Legacy Business Registry pursuant to Administrative Code 2A.242.*

Length (of a Building or Structure). See Plan Dimensions.

* * * *

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. 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. 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 Demolition, Conversion, or Merger of Residential Flats shall not require a Conditional Use Authorization if the project would increase the number of 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, 295	~~*Generally 40-X*~~*Varies*. Additional Height Limits of § 261 apply. See Height and Bulk District Maps.
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 *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* (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 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 §

		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,	Varies. See also Height and Bulk District Maps.				

	263.19, 261, 270, *270.3*, 271					
* * * *						
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,*	§ 317	C ~~*for Removal of one or more Residential Units or Unauthorized 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* (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	§ 317	C ~~*for Removal of one or more Residential Units or Unauthorized Units; in C-3, only for Removal above the ground floor.*~~.			

Merger *of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats*		
* * * *		

* * * *

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,	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.

	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 Grade level and at each succeeding 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*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*

Units, including Residential Flats				
		~~*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, 204.5	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.		
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, 261.1, *263.19*, 270, *270.3*, 271. See also Height and	Varies~~*, but generally 40-X*~~. See Height and Bulk Map Sheets HT10-13 for more information. Height sculpting required on Alleys per § 261.1.

	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, 602-604, 607, 607.1, 608, 609	As permitted by § 607.1

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 Service Uses	§ 102	NP	NP	NP
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~~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 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*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		

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. 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~~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.*
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.*
* * * *		
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.*
Loss of Dwelling Units*: Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*

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*	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	~~*40-X.*~~ *Varies.* See Height and Bulk Map Sheet HT03 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 600 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~*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.*		
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.*		
* * * *				
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.*		
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 Bulk District Maps	~~*40 X.*~~ *Varies.* See Height and Bulk Map Sheet HT03 and HT04 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	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design*

	Industry Element	*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.*		
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.*		

* * * *				
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.*		
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~~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.*		
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.*		
* * * *				
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.*		
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, 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 Sheets 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.*
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*
* * * *		
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.*
Loss of Dwelling Units*: Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*

Units, including Residential Flats				
		~~*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 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. 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	Subject to the Urban Design Guidelines*, Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable design*

	and Industry Element	*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*~~*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 ~~*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~~*1*) 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 Maps	*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.
* * * *		
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~~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	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.*		
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.*		
* * * *				

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.*		
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* ~~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~~	§§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.*
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.*
* * * *		
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.*
Loss of Dwelling Units*: Conversion, Demolition,*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*

or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats				
		~~*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 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 600 square foot lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest R District, whichever is greater.*~~*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.*
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.*
* * * *		
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.*
Loss of Dwelling Units*: Conversion, Demolition,*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*

or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats				
		~~*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.	*Varies.* ~~*40-X.*~~ See Height and Bulk Map Sheets HT01 and HT02 for more information. Height sculpting required on Alleys per § 261.1.

	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 and the Polk/Pacific Special Area	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*.

	Design Guidelines			
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	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.*		
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.*		
* * * *				
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.*		
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*~~	~~*§ 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 Maps	Varies~~*, but generally 26-X*~~. See Height and Bulk Map Sheet HT12 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		
* * * *		
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.*
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.*
* * * *		
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.*
Loss of Dwelling Units*: Conversion, Demolition,*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*

or Merger of Dwelling Units, including Residential Flats				
		~~*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. 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.	Varies~~*, but generally 40-X*~~. See Height and Bulk Map Sheet HT07 for more information. Height sculpting required on Alleys per § 261.1.

	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	§ 207.7	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.*		
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.*		
* * * *				
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.*		
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	~~*NP*~~*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.*
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.*
* * * *		
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.*
Loss of Dwelling Units*: Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*

Units, including Residential Flats				
		~~*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.*		

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.*		
* * * *				
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.*		
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 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.*		
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.*		
* * * *				
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.*		

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, 106, 250–252, 260, *263.19,* 261.1, 270, *270.3,* 271. See also Height and	Varies. See Height and Bulk Map Sheet HT05 for more information. Height sculpting required on Alleys per § 261.1.

	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.*		
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.*		
* * * *				
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.*		
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	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.*		
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.*		
* * * *				
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.*		
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.*		
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.*		
* * * *				
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.*		
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. 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.	Varies~~*, but generally 40-X*~~. See Height and Bulk Map Sheet HT03 for more information. Height sculpting required on Alleys per § 261.1.

	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				
* * * *				
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.*		
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.*		
* * * *				
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.*		
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. 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.	Varies~~*, but generally 40-X*~~. See Height and Bulk Map Sheet HT04 for more information. Height sculpting required on Alleys per § 261.1.

	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				
* * * *				
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.*		
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.*		
* * * *				
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.*		
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 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.		
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 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.*		

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.*		
* * * *				
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.*		
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~~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 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~~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. 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, 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 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		
* * * *		
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.*
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.*
* * * *		
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.*
Loss of Dwelling Units*: Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*

Units, including Residential Flats				
		~~*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~~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.*
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.*
* * * *		
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.*
Loss of Dwelling Units*: Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*

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. 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*~~*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 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 Height and Bulk District Maps.	Varies~~*, but generally 40-X*~~. See Height and Bulk Map Sheet~~s~~ 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 ~~*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.*
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.*
* * * *		
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.*
Loss of Dwelling Units*: Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*

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. 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*~~*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. 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~~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*(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 Maps	Varies. See Height and Bulk Map Sheets HT08, 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~~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*	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~~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*	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~~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(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.*		
* * * *				

* 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 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. 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, *270.3*,271. See also Height and Bulk District Maps.	Varies~~*, but generally 45-X*~~. See Height and Bulk Map Sheet HT12 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		
* * * *		
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*:*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		

Conversion, Demolition, or Merger of Dwelling Units, including 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.*		
* * * *				

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 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*, minimum percentages of two bedroom and three bedroom Dwelling Units* ~~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. 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*~~*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*	§ 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	§~~s~~ 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
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 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 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 Maps	~~*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.

* * * *		
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~~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*~~	~~*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~~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*~~	~~*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* ~~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 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~~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	§~~s~~ 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*	*§ 317*	~~*Controls by Story*~~*C*		

Units, including Residential Flats				
		~~*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.*		
* * * *				

* * * *

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 ~~*Facility*~~*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~~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*	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 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*	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, Demolition or Merger*~~	~~*§ 317*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~	~~*C*~~
* * * *				
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 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. 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	Subject to the Citywide Urban Design Guidelines, *Citywide Design Standards, and any other applicable*

	and Industry Element; Central SoMa Plan	*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 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	§§ 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, 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, 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 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*, 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 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		
* * * *		

* * * *

(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 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		
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 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.*~~
~~*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. Local Coastal Program. 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 121.2, 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, 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) Add Planning Code Section 202.17, as set forth above in Section 11 of this ordinance [“Legacy Businesses”];

(i) Modify Planning Code Sections 102, 311, and 317, as set forth above in Section 12 of this ordinance [“Miscellaneous Amendments”]; and

(j) 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 16. 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 17. 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.

Section 18. Transmittal of Ordinance. 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 19. 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 20. 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\01857833.docx

San Francisco Planning

49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400
San Francisco, CA 94103
628.652.7600
www.sfplanning.org

EXHIBIT 7

FAMILY ZONING PLAN – LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM AMENDMENTS CONSISTENCY ANALYSIS

Purpose

This document provides an analysis of the consistency of amendments to the City's Local Coastal Program (LCP), proposed as part of the Family Zoning Plan, with relevant provisions of the California Coastal Act (Public Resources Code Division 20) and the certified LCP in accordance with California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Sections 13511 and 13552.

LCP Land Use Plan (LUP) Amendments

Summary of Proposed LUP Amendments

The proposed LUP amendments pertain to residential and commercial development in the Coastal Zone portions of residential neighborhoods in the Richmond and Sunset districts. The amendments revise Objective 11 of the LUP, which currently calls for preservation of the scale of development in those districts, to call for advancing housing and community development goals in a place-sensitive manner. Policy 1 under Objective 11, which currently calls for regulating the density and appearance of development in order to preserve the scale and character of residential neighborhoods, would be revised to call for regulation of the form, design, and use of development in a manner that takes into consideration both the Coast and the larger City context. The proposed amendments are necessary for the City to accommodate its Regional Housing Needs Allocation shortfall of 36,200 units under Housing Element law.

Standard of Review

Pursuant to Coastal Act Section 30512.2 (Chapter 6 Article 2), the standard of review for LUP amendments is that they must conform with the requirements of Chapter 3 policies of the Coastal Act to the extent necessary to achieve the basic state goals specified in Section 30001.5.

Relevant Coastal Act Requirements

The proposed LUP amendments concern high-level policy regarding regulation of residential and commercial development in existing developed areas located inland from the first public road. Relevant

Coastal Act requirements are therefore concentrated in Articles 6 (Development) and 2 (Public Access) of Chapter 3 (Coastal Resources Planning and Management):

Article 6: Development

Section 30250: Location; existing developed area

(a) New residential, commercial, or industrial development, except as otherwise provided in this division, shall be located within, contiguous with, or in close proximity to, existing developed areas able to accommodate it or, where such areas are not able to accommodate it, in other areas with adequate public services and where it will not have significant adverse effects, either individually or cumulatively, on coastal resources. In addition, land divisions, other than leases for agricultural uses, outside existing developed areas shall be permitted only where 50 percent of the usable parcels in the area have been developed and the created parcels would be no smaller than the average size of surrounding parcels.

(b) Where feasible, new hazardous industrial development shall be located away from existing developed areas.

(c) Visitor-serving facilities that cannot feasibly be located in existing developed areas shall be located in existing isolated developments or at selected points of attraction for visitors.

Section 30251: Scenic and visual qualities

The scenic and visual qualities of coastal areas shall be considered and protected as a resource of public importance. Permitted development shall be sited and designed to protect views to and along the ocean and scenic coastal areas, to minimize the alteration of natural land forms, to be visually compatible with the character of surrounding areas, and, where feasible, to restore and enhance visual quality in visually degraded areas. New development in highly scenic areas such as those designated in the California Coastline Preservation and Recreation Plan prepared by the Department of Parks and Recreation and by local government shall be subordinate to the character of its setting.

Section 30252: Maintenance and enhancement of public access

The location and amount of new development should maintain and enhance public access to the coast by (1) facilitating the provision or extension of transit service, (2) providing commercial facilities within or adjoining residential development or in other areas that will minimize the use of coastal access roads, (3) providing nonautomobile circulation within the development, (4) providing adequate parking facilities or providing substitute means of serving the development with public transportation, (5) assuring the potential for public transit for high intensity uses such as high-rise office buildings, and by (6) assuring that the recreational needs of new residents will not overload nearby coastal recreation areas by correlating the amount of development with local park acquisition and development plans with the provision of onsite recreational facilities to serve the new development.

Article 2: Public Access

Section 30211: Development not to interfere with access

Development shall not interfere with the public's right of access to the sea where acquired through use or legislative authorization, including, but not limited to, the use of dry sand and rocky coastal beaches to the first line of terrestrial vegetation.

Section 30212: New development projects

(a) Public access from the nearest public roadway to the shoreline and along the coast shall be provided in new development projects except where: (1) it is inconsistent with public safety, military security needs, or the protection of fragile coastal resources, (2) adequate access exists nearby, or (3) agriculture would be adversely affected. Dedicated accessway shall not be required to be opened to public use until a public agency or private association agrees to accept responsibility for maintenance and liability of the accessway. […]

Section 30213: Lower cost visitor and recreational facilities; encouragement and provision; overnight room rentals

Lower cost visitor and recreational facilities shall be protected, encouraged, and, where feasible, provided. Developments providing public recreational opportunities are preferred.

The commission shall not: (1) require that overnight room rentals be fixed at an amount certain for any privately owned and operated hotel, motel, or other similar visitor-serving facility located on either public or private lands; or (2) establish or approve any method for the identification of low or moderate income persons for the purpose of determining eligibility for overnight room rentals in any such facilities.

Consistency Analysis

The proposed LUP amendments would apply to the Coastal Zone portions of residential neighborhoods in the Richmond and Sunset districts, which are existing developed areas extending well inland from the Coastal Zone and identified as well-resourced neighborhoods in the Housing Element of the San Francisco General Plan. As articulated in the Housing Element, it is the City's goal to expand housing choice within well-resourced neighborhoods and promote neighborhoods that are well-connected, healthy, and rich with community culture. The proposed amendment to LUP Objective 11 aims to ensure that development in these neighborhoods advances the City's housing and community development goals as appropriate for the location of each parcel. The proposed amendment to Policy 1 would further clarify that the location of each parcel relative to both the coast and the city context should be considered when establishing standards for development, and that the city context includes major commercial and transit corridors.

Article 6: Development

The proposed LUP amendments identify existing developed areas as locations for advancing the City's housing and community development goals, and are therefore consistent with Section 30250 which encourages infill development by calling for new residential and commercial development to be located within such areas.

The amendments require that both the coast and the city context be considered when establishing standards for development, thus reconciling the need for housing and community development in these neighborhoods with Section 30251's requirement that scenic and visual qualities of coastal areas be considered and protected as a resource of public importance. The established street pattern

in the Sunset and Richmond districts is a rectilinear grid with frequent uninterrupted streets arrayed orthogonally to the coast. All existing developed areas are inland from the first public road, which is generally parallel to the coast, and all land between the coast and first public road is publicly owned open space. These street and land-use patterns ensures that public views to and along the coast, generally available from public streets and open space, are protected from development impacts consistent with Section 30251. Furthermore, by requiring consideration of the city context when establishing development standards, the amendments are compatible with Section 30251's requirement that development be visually compatible with the character of surrounding areas, where these surrounding areas are considered as established City neighborhoods with boundaries that extend well inland of the Coastal Zone.

Section 30252 requires that the location and amount of new development maintain and enhance public access to the coast, including via transit and other non-automotive modes. The Richmond and Sunset districts include several transit corridors with high-quality rail and bus lines that connect the Coastal Zone with the rest of the City and with regional transit. The City's housing and community development goals as articulated in the Housing Element call for expanding housing choices and neighborhood commercial activity along these corridors. Implementing these goals in the Coastal Zone neighborhoods, as called for in the proposed LUP amendments, would help support this transit service, consistent with Section 30252. Furthermore, the established neighborhood street grid is fine grained and highly walkable, thus providing residents and visitors with abundant opportunities for non-vehicular circulation as required by this Section.

Article 2: Public Access

The existing street pattern of the Sunset and Richmond districts, discussed above, ensures that development will not interfere with access to the sea consistent with **Section 30211**. Likewise, since the proposed LUP amendments pertain to existing developed areas that are all inland from the nearest public roadway to the shoreline, the proposed LUP amendments are consistent with **Section 30212**.

The coast adjacent to the Sunset and Richmond districts is publicly owned and includes beaches, parks, and other recreational facilities that are free to all, consistent with **Section 30213** which calls for the provision of lower cost recreational facilities. In addition, the Richmond and Sunset districts include several commercial corridors that extend into the Coastal Zone and include establishments that provide lower cost services useful to visitors, such as grocery stores and take-out food establishments. The proposed LUP amendments would require consideration of these existing commercial corridors when establishing development standards, facilitating the continued presence of such establishments in the Coastal Zone.

LCP Implementation Plan (IP) Amendments

Summary of Proposed IP Amendments

The proposed IP amendments would modify development controls in the westernmost portions of the City's Richmond and Sunset districts. These are existing developed areas, inland of the first public road, and are

largely residential with moderate amounts of neighborhood- and visitor-serving commercial uses. These areas are designated for residential and commercial uses under the current IP, and the proposed amendments would continue this designation while allowing more housing and complete neighborhood amenities as appropriate in both the City and Coastal context. In particular, the amendments would:

- create the Housing Choice – San Francisco (HC-SF) program which includes a local residential bonus program that is similar to the State Density Bonus law in that it allows additional residential development opportunities in certain circumstances. The HC-SF program also includes a Housing Sustainability District to encourage housing production on certain infill sites near public transportation;
- create the R-4 Height and Bulk District, which will provide for form-based density, and increased height limits for projects using the HC-SF Program;
- reclassify certain properties as Residential Transit Oriented, Commercial District (RTO-C), which permits a wide array of neighborhood-serving uses at limited sizes along with housing, subject to form-based density;
- require minimum densities in transit-rich locations and impose maximum size limits on residential units;
- create the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Special Use District (SFMTA SUD), which 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; and
- modify the zoning controls in Neighborhood Commercial (NC-1, NC-2, NC-S) Districts in the Coastal Zone to allow for form-based density and reclassify certain properties as NC-2.

Standard of Review

The standard of review for IP amendments is that they must be consistent with and adequate to carry out LCP Land Use Plan (LUP) provisions. The proposed IP amendments will be paired with LUP amendments that will be adopted locally and submitted for Coastal Commission certification concurrently with the IP amendments. The standard of review for the proposed IP amendments is therefore the LUP as amended by the accompanying LUP amendments.

Relevant LUP Provision

The proposed IP Amendments concern residential and commercial development in the Coastal Zone portions of residential neighborhoods in the Richmond and Sunset districts. The applicable LUP provisions are in the Richmond and Sunset Residential Neighborhoods section (Objective 11 and related policies, as proposed to be amended), with additional provisions in the Transportation section (Objective 1 and related policies) and the Coastal Hazards section (Objective 12 and related policies):

> **RICHMOND AND SUNSET RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOODS**
>
> OBJECTIVE 11: ENSURE DEVELOPMENT IN THE COASTAL ZONE ADVANCES HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GOALS APPROPRIATE FOR THE LOCATION OF EACH PARCEL.

Policy 1: Consider the location of each parcel relative to both the city context, including major commercial and transit corridors, as well as the coast, when establishing standards for the form, design, and use of new development.

Policy 2: Develop the former Playland-at-the-Beach site as a moderate density residential apartment development with neighborhood commercial uses to serve the residential community and, to a limited extent, visitors to the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

Policy 3: Continue the enforcement of citywide housing policies, ordinances and standards regarding the provision of safe and convenient housing to residents of all income levels, especially low- and moderate-income people.

Policy 4: Strive to increase the amount of housing units citywide, especially units for low- and moderate-income people.

Policy 7: Maintain a community business district along Sloat Boulevard within the Coastal Zone to provide goods and services to residents of the outer Sunset and visitors to the Zoo and Ocean Beach.

TRANSPORTATION

OBJECTIVE 1: IMPROVE PUBLIC TRANSIT ACCESS TO THE COAST.

Policy 1: Improve crosstown public transit connections to the coastal area, specifically Ocean Beach, the Zoo and the Cliff House.

Policy 5: Consolidate the Municipal Railway turnaround at the former Playland-at-the-Beach site.

COASTAL HAZARDS

OBJECTIVE 12: PRESERVE, ENHANCE, AND RESTORE THE OCEAN BEACH SHORELINE WHILE PROTECTING PUBLIC ACCESS, SCENIC QUALITY, NATURAL RESOURCES, CRITICAL PUBLIC INFRASTRUCTURE, AND EXISTING DEVELOPMENT FROM COASTAL HAZARDS.

Policy 12.4: Develop the Shoreline in a Responsible Manner.

Consistency Analysis

Richmond and Sunset Residential Neighborhoods section

The proposed IP amendments would establish eligibility for the HC-SF Local Program (Local Program), which qualifies eligible projects for certain height, density, and code flexibility. Eligible projects would generally be required to meet inclusionary housing requirements, thus increasing the amount of housing for residents of all income levels, especially low- and moderate-income people, consistent with Policies 3 and 4 of this section.

Allowable building heights under the current IP are generally 40 feet. The proposed IP amendments include moderate increases in allowable heights along transit and commercial corridors, mostly for projects using the Local Program. Most height limit increases proposed within the Coastal Zone are located at least one block inland from the first public road and are components of larger district-wide patterns that extend beyond the Coastal Zone, consistent with Objective 11 and Policy 1.

Consistent with Policy 2, the proposed IP amendments would facilitate redevelopment of under-developed portions of the former Playland-at-the-Beach site with moderate density residential and neighborhood commercial uses by allowing moderate height increases under the Local Program and for SFMTA Joint Development (see below), and by reclassifying certain properties from the Neighborhood Commercial Shopping Center (NC-S) zoning use district to the Small-Scale Neighborhood Commercial (NC-2) zoning use district.

The amendments would retain the existing NC-2 zoning use district along Sloat Boulevard, consistent with Policy 7. Furthermore, the amendments would reclassify certain properties along other established transit and commercial corridors from various residential zoning use districts to the RTO-C zoning use district, allowing for additional commercial uses to serve the residential community and visitors in addition to the two commercial clusters named in Policies 2 and 7.

Transportation

The proposed IP amendments would allow and encourage denser residential and mixed-use development in existing walkable neighborhoods that are well-served by existing high-quality public transit, particularly along crosstown transit corridors that connect the Coastal Zone to the rest of the city and to regional transit. The amendments are consistent with Objective 1 and related Policies since transit can achieve greater ridership and cost-effectiveness by serving areas with higher densities and other complementary elements such as mixed uses and pedestrian connectivity.

The SFMTA's La Playa/Cabrillo Terminal Loop at 780 La Playa Street is located at the former Playland-at-the-Beach site and supports crosstown public transit connections to the Coastal Zone including the northern portion of Ocean Beach and the Cliff House. The proposed IP amendments would reclassify the Terminal site from the Low Density Mixed Residential (RM-1) zoning use district to the NC-2 zoning use district, and into the Non-Contiguous SFMTA Special Use District in implementation of the SFMTA Joint Development Policy. The proposed zoning reclassification, base height increase to 50', and Local Program height increase to 85' would all facilitate residential mixed-use redevelopment of the site while retaining the ability to maintain and improve transit-related uses, consistent with Objective 1 and related Policies.

Coastal Hazards

Objective 12 and related Policies are mostly concerned with the shoreline, while the proposed IP amendments would only apply to existing developed areas inland from the first public road. Policy 12.4 states that development in the Coastal Zone should be sited to avoid coastal hazard areas when feasible, and requires design and construction mitigations where avoidance is not feasible. As of this time the City has not identified any coastal hazard areas overlapping the areas to which the proposed IP amendments apply, and the amendments are thus not in conflict with Policy 12.4. In accordance with California Senate Bill No. 272 the City is developing a Sea Level Rise Plan (SLR Plan), as part of the City's LCP, including vulnerability assessment, adaptation strategies, and recommended projects. The SLR Plan may identify new coastal hazard areas, in which case it may propose new development controls or other guidance to minimize impacts to public safety and property from relevant hazards.

FAMILY ZONING PLAN

Exhibit 8

Addendum No. 1 to the Housing Element 2022 Update FEIR

San Francisco Planning

49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400
San Francisco, CA 94103
628.652.7600
www.sfplanning.org

ADDENDUM NO. 1 TO ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

Date of Publication of Addendum:	September 3, 2025
Date of EIR Certification:	November 17, 2022
Case Nos.	2019-016230ENV, 2021-005878CWP, and 2021-005878GPA
Project Title:	Family Zoning Plan – Housing Element Rezoning Program
Block/Lot:	Multiple
Project Sponsor:	San Francisco Planning Commission
Project Sponsor Contact:	Lisa Chen, (628) 652-7422, sf.housing.choice@sfgov.org
Lead Agency:	San Francisco Planning Department
Environmental Staff Contact:	Ryan Shum, (628) 652-7542, CPC.FamilyZoningCEQA@sfgov.org

Background

Overview

On November 17, 2022, the San Francisco Planning Commission (planning commission, and project sponsor) certified the San Francisco Housing Element 2022 Update Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) (San Francisco Planning Department Case No. 2019-016230ENV).[1] On December 15, 2022, the planning commission adopted the mitigation monitoring and reporting program (MMRP) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Findings: Findings of Fact, Evaluation of Mitigation Measures and Alternatives, and Statement of Overriding Considerations, and recommended the San Francisco Board of Supervisors' (board of supervisors') adoption of the City and County of San Francisco's (city's) housing element update. The board of supervisors adopted and the mayor signed the San Francisco Housing Element 2022 Update (housing element update) on January 31, 2025. The FEIR evaluated the impacts on the environment that could result from adoption and implementation of the housing element update, described below. Revisions and clarifications to the draft EIR were provided as part of the responses to comments (RTC) document prepared to address comments on the draft EIR. Together, the draft EIR and RTC document comprise the FEIR. Upon certifying the FEIR and approving the housing element update, the planning commission updated the 2014 housing element of the San Francisco General Plan (general plan) and made conforming amendments to the air quality, commerce and industry, environmental protection, and urban design elements of the general plan.

[1] San Francisco Planning Department, San Francisco Housing Element 2022 Update Final Environmental Impact Report, Planning Department Case No. 2019-016230ENV, State Clearinghouse No. 2021060358, certified January 31, 2023. The FEIR is available at: *https://sfplanning.org/environmental-review-documents?title=Housing+Element+2022&field_environmental_review_categ_target_id=All&items_per_page=10*.

As noted in the FEIR, adoption of the housing element update would lead to future actions, such as San Francisco Planning Code (planning code) amendments, designation of housing sustainability districts, and approval of development projects consistent with the goals, policies, and actions of the housing element update. These reasonably foreseeable changes are the subject of the FEIR analysis, which determined that the housing element update would not result in any direct physical changes to the environment but would result in reasonably foreseeable changes from these future actions. The proposed action evaluated in the FEIR is hereafter referred to as the "adopted housing element."

The subject of this addendum to the FEIR is the future actions that the city proposes to take to implement the housing element update. As anticipated in the FEIR, these include a set of planning code amendments and the designation of a housing sustainability district. These current proposals are encompassed within the Family Zoning Plan – Housing Element Rezoning Program, hereafter referred to as the "proposed rezoning program." More information about the proposed rezoning program is available at: *https://sfplanning.org/sf-family-zoning-plan.* These changes, some of which are required by state law and some of which are a required implementation action of the adopted housing element, focus on property in the Downtown, Marina, Mission,[2] Northeast, and Western Addition planning districts of San Francisco—specifically, in and near the areas designated by the state as Housing Opportunity Areas, referred to in the adopted housing element and in the FEIR as well-resourced areas.[3] The purpose of this addendum is to evaluate the environmental impacts of the rezoning program and document the San Francisco Planning Department's (department's) determination that these impacts are adequately addressed in the FEIR.

San Francisco Housing Element 2022 Update

The city (including the planning commission, the board of supervisors, and the mayor) updated the 2014 housing element of the general plan with the adopted housing element. The adopted housing element was prepared as required by housing element law pursuant to California Government Code section 65583. The FEIR was prepared to evaluate impacts on the environment that could result from adoption and implementation of the adopted housing element.

The adopted housing element establishes goals, policies, and actions to address the existing and projected housing needs of San Francisco. The goals, policies, and actions were required to plan for the regional housing targets allocated to San Francisco by regional agencies for the 2023 to 2031 cycle (82,070 units) and meet future housing demand in San Francisco. The adopted housing

---

[2] The projected growth in the Mission Planning District would primarily occur in the Hub and Upper Market area, as shown in Figures 2 and 3. For the purposes of this addendum, these areas are within the Mission Planning District boundary.

[3] *Well-resourced areas* are high- and highest-resource areas, which are neighborhoods identified by the State of California that provide strong economic, health, and educational outcomes for its residents. More information is available at: *https://www.treasurer.ca.gov/ctcac/opportunity.asp. San Francisco Planning Department*. Well-Resourced Neighborhoods: State Department of Housing and Community Development. *https://sfplanning.org/sites/default/files/documents/citywide/housing-choice/housingchoice_well-resourced_neighborhoods_map.pdf*. Accessed August 28, 2025.

element includes policies to improve housing affordability and advance racial and social equity in accordance with directives from the planning commission and historic preservation commission in summer 2020. The adopted housing element includes overarching goals for the future of housing in San Francisco that respond both to state law requirements as well as local community values, as understood from community engagement conducted for the housing element update. The underlying policies and actions guide development patterns and the allocation of resources to San Francisco neighborhoods. In general, the adopted housing element shifts an increased share of the city's future housing growth to transit corridors and low-density residential districts within, but not limited to, well-resourced areas.

FEIR ENVIRONMENTAL BASELINE AND PROJECTED GROWTH

As stated on pp. 4-6 and 4-7 in Chapter 4, Environmental Setting and Impacts, of the FEIR, because the adopted housing element is a long-term plan with no direct impacts, the use of an existing, current conditions, or 2020 baseline would have been misleading to the public and decision makers. Instead, the environmental impact analysis in the FEIR acknowledged some growth would occur regardless of an updated housing element and used a future 2050 baseline to better inform decision makers as to the impacts of adopting the housing element update rather than continuing with the status quo.

In the FEIR, the department projected that approximately 150,000 housing units would be constructed in the city by 2050, compared to 2020 conditions. The department projected approximately 102,000 housing units would be constructed by 2050 under the 2014 housing element. In other words, the department predicted that approximately 50,000 more housing units would be constructed by 2050 if the adopted housing element was implemented compared with the development anticipated under the 2014 housing element.

Review of Implementation Actions and Projects Since the FEIR

When preparing the FEIR, the department assumed that adoption of the housing element update would lead to future actions such as planning code amendments to increase height limits along transit corridors and modify density controls in low-density areas, which are located primarily on the west and north sides of the city; the designation of housing sustainability districts; the removal of other constraints on the maintenance, improvement, or development of housing; and the approval of development projects consistent with the goals, policies, and actions of the adopted housing element. The proposed rezoning program is one such implementation action and includes a suite of proposed changes.

Other implementation actions and projects that are not part of the proposed rezoning program but which have occurred or are in process since the FEIR, include:

- **Tribal Notification and Consultation.** Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-TCR-1: Tribal Notification and Consultation from the FEIR, which requires notification of Native American tribal representatives regarding environmental review of future development under the

adopted housing element. The department sent out a notification concerning the proposed rezoning program to local Native American tribal representatives on February 29, 2024. Three tribal groups responded to the notification and the department is consulting with these tribal groups on implementation of tribal notification and tribal cultural resources measures for future development under the adopted housing element.

- **Development Projects.** Review and approval of residential and mixed-use development projects consistent with the development density established by the adopted housing element; project-level review for such projects is conducted using the streamlined process provided under Public Resources Code (PRC) section 21083.3 and CEQA Guidelines section 15183. The resulting documents issued by the department are known as "general plan evaluations."
- **Downtown Office to Residential Conversion Zoning Program.** The city passed zoning legislation in July 2023 to reduce the regulatory barriers to make it easier to convert underutilized office buildings into housing. The Commercial to Residential Adaptive Reuse Program is contained in planning code section 210.5 and provides for a slew of zoning waivers and modifications for conversion of non-residential buildings in the greater downtown area to housing. To supplement the zoning program and as part of ongoing efforts to improve the feasibility of adaptive reuse projects, San Francisco voters approved Measure C on the March 2024 ballot. The city's transfer tax is now waived on the first transfer of a property after a conversion from commercial to residential use. In March 2025, the city passed legislation which waives the inclusionary housing requirement and impact fees for eligible adaptive reuse projects.
- **Housing Legislation.** Implementation of local housing legislation to facilitate housing development. **Table 1** identifies approved and pending legislative proposals to facilitate housing development that increase development capacity at sites since certification of the FEIR that relied on the FEIR. Housing Element implementation actions to improve the development review process that would not result in environmental impacts are not included; others were proposed by members of the board of supervisors. Some of these proposals have passed and are in effect. Those legislative proposals that are pending are noted as such.

Table 1: Legislative Proposals to Facilitate Housing Development Since the FEIR that Relied on the FEIR

Board File	Planning Case No.	Title	Description [Sponsor of Legislation]	Notes
Approved				
240787 and 250003	2024-006988PCAMAP and 2024-007906GPA	Central SoMa and Transit Center District Commercial Development Requirements	Ordinance Nos. 037-25 and 42-25 were signed on April 3, 2025, to enact zoning changes that would allow additional housing in the Central SoMa Plan and Transit Center District Plan areas by lifting zoning requirements for certain large sites to include a certain amount of non-residential development. As a result, large sites can pursue projects that are 100 percent residential. [Mayor, Dorsey]	Environmental review through Central SoMa and Transit Center District Plan EIRs 01/09/25
231258	2023-003676PCA	Housing Production (Constraints Reduction)	Ordinance 053-24, signed on March 22, 2024, to encourage housing production by exempting specified housing projects from the notice and review procedures of section 311 in areas outside of Priority Equity Geographies; and removing the Conditional Use requirement for several types of housing projects, including housing developments on large lots in areas outside the Priority Equity Geographies Special Use District. [Mayor, Melgar]	Determined within scope of the FEIR 11/13/23
230446	2023-003676PCA	Housing Production (Constraints Reduction)	In certain zoning districts, this ordinance allows construction of more units than currently principally permitted on larger lots in residential (RH-1, RH-2, and RH-3) districts, based on the lot area, removing the current requirement for conditional use authorization. [Engardio, Melgar, Dorsey, and Safai]	Determined within scope of the FEIR 07/14/23
230026	2023-006326PCA	Family Housing Opportunity Special Use District	Creates the Family Housing Opportunity Special Use District (SUD). Qualifying projects receive a density exception of up to four dwelling units per lot, eight units on a lot resulting from a two-lot merger, or 12 units on a lot resulting from a three-lot merger. In addition, corner lots are permitted up 6 units (and commensurately more for lot mergers) and up to 6 stories in height, among other provisions. [Melgar, Engardio]	Determined within scope of the FEIR 05/31/23

Board File	Planning Case No.	Title	Description [Sponsor of Legislation]	Notes
230732	2023-005431PCA	Planning and Building Codes - Commercial to Residential Adaptive Reuse and Downtown Economic Revitalization	Amended the Planning and Building Codes to achieve seven policy outcomes: Facilitate Residential Uses Downtown (planning code amendments), Economically Revitalize Downtown, Streamline Signage Permitting in C-3 Districts and Citywide, Streamline Historic Preservation Review for certain types of work, Provide Alternatives to Onsite Open Space Requirements in Certain C-3 Districts, Facilitate Residential Adaptive Reuse in the Building Code (Building Code Amendments), and Rezone a Portion of the Showplace Square Plan Area to C-2. [Mayor, Peskin, Safai, and Dorsey]	Determined within scope of the FEIR 05/09/23
Pending				
230734	2023-006115PCA	Planning Code - Density Exception on Specified Lots with Numerical Density Limits	Change the density requirements for dwelling units, group housing and senior housing in RC, RTO, NC and certain Named NC District's to form-based density. However, if a lot in an RC, RTO, NC, or certain Named NC District is within the Priority Equity Geographies Special Use District (planning code section 249.97), existing numerical density limits would continue to apply. Although also within the Priority Equity Geographies SUD, form-based density would control in the Excelsior Outer Mission Neighborhood Commercial District, the Polk Street Neighborhood Commercial District, and the Van Ness Special Use District. [Mayor, Melgar]	Determined within scope of the FEIR 03/18/2024

Source: San Francisco Planning Department, 2025.
Notes: FEIR = San Francisco Housing Element 2022 Update Environmental Impact Report

CEQA Review of the Proposed Rezoning Program

At the time the FEIR was prepared, a zoning proposal had not yet been developed. Therefore, the exact locations and physical parameters of the additional 50,000 housing units were unknown. To analyze the indirect impacts of the adopted housing element in the FEIR, it was necessary to develop assumptions for a rezoning program scenario that established the locations and physical parameters of subsequent development projects. As stated in Response PD-1 on pp. 4-10 and 4-11 of the RTC document, the FEIR includes maps (i.e., RTC Figure 4-1, p. 4-12; RTC Figure 4-2, p. 4-13; and RTC Figure 4-3, p. 4-14) that present hypothetical scenarios developed by the department for where future development consistent with the housing element could occur under the adopted housing element. The rezoning program scenarios reflected in the maps show increased height limits along transit corridors and modification of density controls in low-density areas that are primarily located on the west and north sides of the city.

The FEIR also included assumptions regarding the types of buildings that could be developed under the housing element update. The FEIR assumed that future development consistent with the adopted housing element would consist predominately of residential projects, some with ground-floor neighborhood services (e.g., retail or small medical offices), and was anticipated to include buildings with heights ranging from 55 to 300 feet, with the tallest buildings projected for locations along Geary Boulevard and Van Ness Avenue. In the FEIR analysis for transportation, noise, and air quality impacts, the department identified and quantitatively evaluated seven representative building types ranging from accessory dwelling units to a 590-foot-tall residential mixed-use building with 984 housing units that would be consistent with the housing element update.[4] Thus, the programmatic analysis in the FEIR accounted for subsequent development projects that could include a range of building types.

The FEIR stated that future actions that would implement the housing element update, such as future zoning programs, would provide more specificity to the hypothetical scenarios evaluated in the FEIR. The FEIR stated that when a future zoning change is proposed, the department would conduct a CEQA review, as needed. Accordingly, the department prepared this addendum for the proposed rezoning program, which was anticipated as part of the housing element update evaluated in the FEIR, as discussed below under “Proposed Rezoning Program (Proposed Revisions to Project).”

The proposed rezoning program is evaluated in accordance with CEQA Statute section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines sections 15162–15163. When an EIR has been certified for a project, the guidelines state that no new, subsequent, or supplemental EIR shall be required unless one or more of the following events occurs: (1) substantial changes to a project are proposed that will require major revisions to the EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; (2) substantial changes will occur due to the circumstances under which the project is being undertaken, requiring major revisions to the previous EIR due to new significant

[4] The building types in the FEIR included residential or mixed-use residential buildings at the following heights with the number of housing units in parentheses: 590 feet (984 housing units), 240 feet (495 housing units), 120 feet (200 housing units), 85 feet (50 housing units), 65 feet (29 housing units), and 40 feet (30 housing units). Additionally, construction of accessory dwelling units (ADUs) was analyzed. The quantitative evaluation was based on construction phases, durations, and equipment required to construct the range of building types. Appendices G, H, and I of the FEIR provide additional information on the types of buildings that were analyzed.

environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or (3) new information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified, has become available. In addition, San Francisco Administrative Code section 31.19(c)(1) states that a modified project must be reevaluated and that "if, on the basis of such reevaluation, the Environmental Review Officer determines, based on the requirements of CEQA, that no additional environmental review is necessary, this determination and the reasons therefor shall be noted in writing in the case record, and no further evaluation shall be required by this Chapter."

CEQA Guidelines section 15164 provides for the use of an addendum to document the basis for a lead agency's decision not to require a subsequent EIR for a project that is already adequately covered in a previously certified final EIR provided that none of the conditions described in CEQA Guidelines section 15162 that call for preparation of a supplemental or subsequent final EIR have occurred. Accordingly, this addendum documents the department's determination that the environmental impacts of the proposed rezoning program are adequately addressed in the FEIR and that none of the criteria set forth in CEQA Guidelines sections 15162–15163 requiring further environmental review have been met.

Housing Element Rezoning Statutory Exemption

On June 30, 2025, California Senate Bill (SB) 131 was signed into law and immediately took effect. Among other changes, the bill amended CEQA by adding PRC section 21080.085, a provision that statutorily exempts from CEQA "a rezoning that implements the schedule of actions contained in an approved housing element pursuant to subdivision (c) of section 65583 of the Government Code." The exemption does not apply to a rezoning that would allow for construction to occur within the boundaries of any natural and protected lands as defined pursuant to new PRC section 21067.5, among other exclusionary conditions. Further, the rezoning of any parcel or portions of a parcel that is excluded from a rezoning under the exemption "shall be considered a separate project subject" to CEQA.

Following adoption of SB 131, the department considered whether the proposed rezoning program is eligible for a statutory exemption in accordance with new PRC section 21080.085. The department determined that the proposed rezoning program implements an action in the approved housing element and therefore meets that criterion for the statutory exemption. However, approximately 3.4 percent of the parcels included in the rezoning program meet the definition of "natural and protected lands," which means those parcels would not qualify for the exemption. The rezoning of the excluded parcels, which are distributed throughout and adjacent to the boundaries of the well-resourced areas at the time the FEIR was prepared, would be considered a separate project requiring separate environmental review.

Given that the entire proposed rezoning program is eligible for an addendum to the FEIR, as supported by substantial evidence in this document, a rezoning of approximately 3.4 percent of the parcels (i.e., those that would not qualify for the exemption) would also likely qualify for an addendum to the FEIR. The impacts of the rezoning of the parcels ineligible for the exemption would likely be less than, and not different from, those impacts analyzed in the FEIR and discussed below under "Analysis of Potential Environmental Effects," beginning on p. 32.

The department therefore considered a two-pronged approach to environmental review for the proposed rezoning program: a statutory exemption for the rezoning of the parcels qualifying for an exemption under PRC section 21080.085, and an addendum to the FEIR for the rezoning of the parcels ineligible for the exemption. However, by the time SB 131 went into effect, preparation of an addendum for the entirety of the rezoning was almost complete. The department determined that pivoting to a two-pronged approach to the environmental review would be methodologically challenging to prepare because it would require extensive and detailed revisions to the addendum, based primarily on the fact that the parcels that are excluded from the exemption (and which would have required separate environmental review) are not clustered in discrete locations, but rather distributed throughout the boundaries of the proposed rezoning. The department also determined that a two-pronged approach could have been confusing for decision makers and the public and would have required considerable staff time and consultant effort, which could not be accomplished within the required rezoning timeline.

For these reasons, the department concluded that reviewing the entirety of the rezoning program in this addendum remained the best approach to environmental review to meet the requirements of CEQA. Nevertheless, the department finds that the rezoning of the parcels that qualify for an exemption under PRC section 21080.085 is statutorily exempt from environmental review. That is because it would implement the schedule of actions contained in an approved housing element under California Government Code section 65583(c)—in particular, Housing Element Implementing Action 7.1.1. Moreover, any impacts of the rezoning of the non-exempt parcels would be of a lesser magnitude than those documented in this addendum for the entire proposed rezoning program, and would therefore likely not require additional environmental review.

Proposed Rezoning Program (Proposed Revisions to Project)

Overview of the Proposed Rezoning Program

The proposed rezoning program was developed subsequent to certification of the FEIR. As previously discussed, implementation actions and zoning changes were anticipated as part of the proposed action evaluated in the FEIR. Growth that would be anticipated to occur under the proposed rezoning program is generally similar to the hypothetical scenarios as well as land use density and distribution assumptions presented for the adopted housing element in the FEIR, which are described above under “CEQA Review of the Proposed Rezoning Program,” with some changes, as described below.

Similar to the adopted housing element, adoption of the proposed rezoning program would not constitute an approval of any development projects. In accordance with CEQA Guidelines section 15064(d), this addendum identifies the reasonably foreseeable environmental impacts that could occur as a result of future actions that would implement the proposed rezoning program, as well as development projects that would be consistent with it, and determines whether the impacts are within the scope of the FEIR analysis.

The proposed rezoning program[5] would include the following changes:

- Establishment of a specific housing sustainability district;
- Amendments to base zoning,[6] including reclassification of lots across the rezoning area to a new R-4 height and bulk district;
- Establishment of a Residential Transit Oriented-Commercial (RTO-C) zoning district;
- Establishment of a local program;
- Reclassification of certain SFMTA properties into the Non-Contiguous SFMTA Special Use District; and
- Codification of certain FEIR mitigation measures identified as being the city's responsibility.

As previously discussed, in the FEIR, the department anticipated that, in general, the adopted housing element would shift an increased share of San Francisco's projected future housing growth to transit corridors and low-density residential districts within well-resourced areas. The land use density and distribution anticipated under the proposed rezoning program would be generally very similar in geography and basic rezoning concepts (e.g., heights, densities, and distribution thereof) to what was evaluated in the FEIR. However, there would be some differences in the exact location and the degree of the various height limit and density changes, such that there would be some modest shifts in projected growth in a few specific locations. Thus, the housing growth distribution assumptions under the proposed rezoning program include growth evaluated in the FEIR as well as some limited adjacent areas. The changes described below under "Effects of Proposed Rezoning Program on FEIR Housing Growth Assumptions" and "Effects of Proposed Rezoning Program on FEIR Land Use Density, Land Use Distribution, and Building Height Assumptions" are based on the planning code amendments to increase height limits at certain locations and the modifications to density controls in low-density areas in the proposed rezoning program including the Housing Choice – San Francisco Program (referred to hereinafter as "local program").

Table 2 compares the proposed rezoning program and the adopted housing element, highlighting the primary similarities and differences. The proposed rezoning program is described in more detail below.

---

[5] San Francisco Board of Supervisors. July 29, 2025. The proposed ordinances to implement the Family Zoning Plan and related information include amending the Zoning Map, Board of Supervisor's file 250700 available at: *https://sfgov.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=7449404&GUID=0F95C63F-86D3-433A-8B92-069CAB240942&%20Options=ID|Text|&Search=250700*, amending the Planning Code, Board of Supervisor's file 250701 available at: *https://sfgov.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=7449405&GUID=DDD973ED-4B60-44D3-B7E9-3EC31487D470&Options=ID|Text|&Search=250701*, and General Plan amendments in Planning Case file 2021-005878GPA available at: *https://citypln-m-extnl.sfgov.org/Commissions/CPC/7_17_2025/Commission%20Packet/2021-005878GPA.pdf*. All are available online at the links included herein. Accessed August 2, 2025.

[6] The zoning map amendments would reclassify the height limits across the rezoned area, including the establishment of a base height limit and a separate height limit for projects utilizing the local program (a local program to incentivize housing).

Table 2: Comparison of the Adopted Housing Element Assumptions in the FEIR to the Proposed Rezoning Program

Category	Adopted Housing Element Assumptions in the FEIR	Proposed Rezoning Program
Housing Growth	Approximately 50,000 net new housing units	**Incremental Increase:** Approximately 54,000 net new housing units
Growth Distribution	Growth primarily in well-resourced areas, heavily concentrated in the Inner Sunset, Outer Sunset, and Richmond planning districts	**Slightly Different:** More growth in well-resourced areas in the Downtown, Marina, Mission, Northeast, and Western Addition planning districts; overall, growth would be distributed more broadly across the well-resourced areas and in limited areas adjacent to well-resourced areas compared to the rezoning analysis assumptions in the FEIR
Heights	Buildings with heights ranging from 55 to 300 feet high[c]	**Slightly Different:** Buildings with heights ranging from 40 to 500 feet high, with two limited areas up to 650 feet high[a]
Density	Increased land use density and building heights projected along certain transit and commercial corridors, including certain residential areas adjacent to (but not immediately along) transit corridors	**Similar:** Further increase in the allowable land use density and building heights along certain transit and commercial corridors (e.g., Geary Boulevard, Van Ness Avenue, Lombard Street, North Point Street, western portion of Market Street, Ocean Avenue, Irving Street, etc.) Reduction in the allowable land use density and building heights in certain residential areas adjacent to (but not immediately along) transit corridors (e.g., some areas adjacent to Geary Boulevard, Van Ness Avenue, Taraval Street, Judah Street, etc.)
Project-Level Approvals	Did not approve any development projects	**Same:** Does not approve any development projects
Housing Sustainability Districts	Anticipated areas for a possible housing sustainability district within the anticipated rezoned area	**Similar:** Establishes a specific housing sustainability district for an area similar to the area anticipated in the FEIR
Zoning Amendments	Did not include amendments to base zoning[b]	**Different:** Includes amendments to base zoning[b] (e.g., applying form-based density, establishing base-height limit changes, creating new zoning for some parcels, etc.)

Source: San Francisco Planning Department, 2025.
Notes: FEIR = San Francisco Housing Element 2022 Update Environmental Impact Report

a. Under the proposed rezoning program, buildings with heights generally up to 500 feet, except in two areas where up to 650 feet would be allowed in very limited areas within the city (i.e., near the intersections of Van Ness Avenue and Geary Boulevard and Van Ness Avenue and Market Street).

b. *Base zoning* refers to the general zoning requirements for an individual parcel. Modifications allowed pursuant to the Housing Choice – San Francisco Program, the State Density Bonus law, or other program allowing modifications to zoning controls, are modifications from the base zoning.

c. The FEIR analysis utilized seven representative building types for some technical topics, such as air quality. See FEIR Appendix I – Air Quality for more information.

Establishment of a Specific Housing Sustainability District

A housing sustainability district is a designated area in a city created by ordinance and within 0.5 mile of public transit in which at least 20 percent of all housing units would be affordable for very low-, low-, and moderate-income households for at least 55 years. As discussed on p. 2-27 in Chapter 2, Project Description, of the FEIR, a foreseeable future outcome of the housing element update would be the designation of one or more of the areas identified as a housing sustainability district under California Government Code sections 66200 through 66210, which could be used to streamline the environmental review and approval of residential development projects. No specific housing sustainability districts were proposed as part of the housing element update, but the FEIR identified where such districts may be considered in the future.

The proposed rezoning program includes the establishment of a specific housing sustainability district, albeit with slightly different boundaries from the areas considered for possible housing sustainability districts in the FEIR. The establishment of a specific housing sustainability district is a mechanism for creating a ministerial process for some development projects. The housing units that would occur within the housing sustainability district are already included in the assumptions developed for the proposed rezoning program. **Figure 1** compares the areas that would be included in the specific housing sustainability district under the proposed zoning program to those areas anticipated for a possible housing sustainability district in the FEIR. Under the proposed rezoning program, the housing sustainability district would include areas that were not considered for potential housing sustainability districts as part of the adopted housing element, including the area near the intersection of Van Ness Avenue and Market Street, historically known as The Hub; portions of the Fisherman's Wharf area; portions of the Castro/Dolores Heights; portions of the Glen Park neighborhood near the Glen Park BART station north of San José Avenue; and portions of the Balboa Park neighborhood near the Balboa Park BART station.

The supporting ordinance would include zoning and design review standards as well as affordability requirements. Eligible projects seeking entitlement under the proposed housing sustainability district that meet the zoning and design review standards would be approvable through a ministerial process. Pursuant to California Government Code sections 66202 to 66210 and CEQA sections 21155.10 and 21155.11, subsequent projects in the designated housing sustainability district areas that meet the requirements of a housing sustainability district would not require further environmental review but would be required to implement the applicable mitigation measures determined to be necessary to reduce the significant impacts identified in the FEIR.



Family Zoning Plan – Housing Element Rezoning Program

Case Nos. 2019-016230ENV, 2021-005878CWP, and 2021-005878GPA

Figure 1

Housing Sustainability District Under the Proposed Rezoning Program Compared to Areas Considered for Possible Housing Sustainability Districts Under the Adopted Housing Element

Amendments to Base Zoning

The proposed rezoning program includes the following amendments to the base zoning[7] in areas of the city that would be rezoned:

- Applying form-based density (also known as density decontrol)[8] to parcels in neighborhood commercial/mixed-use districts and certain parcels along and adjacent to certain corridors
- Establishing base-height limit changes on some parcels
- Creating new zoning for some parcels, including a newly created RTO-C (Residential Transit-Oriented, Commercial) designation, which would be applied to some parcels along certain transit corridors, and extending certain NC (Neighborhood Commercial) districts; renaming the existing RTO district as RTO-1 and applying it to some additional parcels near certain transit corridors and employment hubs; changing the height limits on certain lots in the R-4 Height and Bulk district; reclassifying a small number of parcels from various R (Residential), NC and P (Public) designations to various NC designations; and reclassifying two parcels at the intersection of Geary Boulevard and Masonic Avenue and one in Fisherman's Wharf to C-2 (Community Business).
- Codifying certain design standards[9]
- Establishing curb-cut restrictions on certain neighborhood commercial and transit frontages
- Creating a special use district for certain sites under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) to enable continued use of the sites for transportation, as needed, and permit joint development (residential uses) in furtherance of the SFMTA's Joint Development Policy.

The proposed rezoning program includes the following amendments to base zoning that would apply citywide:

- Establishing minimum housing densities for residential and office uses within 0.5 mile of certain transit stations, in compliance with Metropolitan Transportation Commission's (MTC's) Transit-Oriented Communities Policy, as well as reused sites or low-income sites in the housing element sites inventory
- Establishing maximum unit sizes for new construction
- Codifying existing residential flats policy

---

[7] *Base zoning* refers to the general zoning requirements for an individual parcel. Modifications allowed pursuant to the local program, the State Density Bonus law, or other program allowing modifications to zoning controls, are modifications from the base zoning.

[8] *Form-based density* refers to where residential density is regulated by the permitted building volume – either the maximum floor area ratio (FAR) or a maximum building volume controlled by height, bulk, and setback controls.

[9] Some objective design standards are being codified as part of the proposed zoning program, such as bulk controls. However, the code amendments also refer to the department's adopted design standards and guidelines, which are available at: *https://sfplanning.org/design-review*, accessed August 26, 2025.

- Reducing maximum accessory parking limits, including within 0.5 mile of certain transit stations in compliance with the MTC's Transit-Oriented Communities Policy
- Consolidating all existing wind controls in the planning code into a single section, deleting the requirement to meet wind comfort criteria, and modifying the wind hazard criterion. Wind controls would continue to apply to areas with existing wind controls.
- Expanding the requirement for large projects to develop and implement a driveway and loading operations plan
- Cleaning up the planning and conforming amendments, including:
  - Removing obsolete code sections related to efficiency dwelling units
  - Eliminating the analyzed state density bonus from the planning code
  - Where relevant, updating tables and other language to note applicability of adopted citywide design standards and other objective standards

The proposed revisions to the planning code and associated amendments to the business and tax codes, as well as amendments to the zoning map, to implement the Family Zoning Plan are available in San Francisco Board of Supervisors files 250700 and 250701.[10]

Establishment of a Residential Transit Oriented-Commercial Zoning District

The proposed rezoning program includes the establishment of an RTO-C zoning district on portions of transit and commercial streets that are currently zoned Residential.

Establishment of a Local Program

STATE DENSITY BONUS PROGRAM

Under Government Code section 65915, the state density bonus law, cities are required to grant density bonuses, waivers, concessions, and incentives[11] when a developer of a housing project with five or more units makes at least 5 percent of those units onsite affordable to very low-, low-, or moderate-income

---

[10] More information regarding Ordinance 250700 is available at: *https://sfgov.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=7449404&GUID=0F95C63F-86D3-433A-8B92-069CAB240942&Options=ID|Text|&Search=250700*, and Ordinance 250701 is available at: *https://sfgov.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=14322322&GUID= B227117C-69AA-4164-85E7-B98814B244FD*.

[11] *Concessions and incentives* mean (1) a reduction in site development standards or a modification of zoning requirements or architectural design requirements that exceeds the minimum building standards approved by the California Building Standards Commission, as provided in part 2.5 (commencing with section 18901) of division 13 of the Health and Safety Code, including, but not limited to, a reduction in setback and square footage requirements and the ratio of vehicular parking spaces that would otherwise be required that results in identifiable, financially sufficient, and actual cost reductions; (2) approval of mixed-use zoning in conjunction with the housing project if commercial, office, industrial, or other land uses will reduce the cost of the housing development and if the commercial, office, industrial, or other land uses are compatible with the housing project and the existing or planned development in the area where the proposed housing project will be located; or (3) other regulatory incentives or concessions proposed by the developer or the city, county, or city and county that result in identifiable, financially sufficient, and actual cost reductions (see Government Code section 65915).

households (i.e., income between 50 and 120 percent of the area median income). The amount of the density bonus and the number of concessions and incentives varies, depending on the percentage of affordable units onsite proposed and the level of affordability, and is based on a sliding scale; generally, however, state law requires cities to grant a density bonus of 5 to 100 percent, and up to four concessions and incentives, if a developer designates a specified number of the units as affordable. In addition, project sponsors can receive waivers from development standards if the standards physically preclude a project with the additional density and/or the requested concessions and incentives.

Local jurisdictions can adopt an ordinance to implement the state density bonus law. The city's State Density Bonus Law is the Individually Requested State Density Bonus Program in planning code section 206.6 and Planning Director's Bulletin Number 6. Projects that implement the state density bonus law would use the base height limits and other aspects of the base zoning described above to establish their "base project" (i.e., the starting point for calculating bonus allowances and layering code waivers or incentives).

LOCAL PROGRAM (HOUSING CHOICE-SAN FRANCISCO PROGRAM)

The proposed rezoning program would establish a local program to incentivize housing, the Housing Choice – San Francisco Program (referred to hereinafter as "local program") in planning code section 206.10 et al. Projects that use the local program must opt out of state bonus programs or other state laws that grant relief from local planning standards and must meet local objective code requirements and design standards. Under the local program, eligible projects would be granted a range of automatic, pre-determined modified development standards. Eligible projects would also have the ability to vary by up to 15 percent from the quantitative development standards not already modified in the specific list and not explicitly prohibited by the program.

Local program projects may still use provisions in state law that provide for process streamlining (i.e., ministerial review), such as those created by Assembly Bill 2011 and Senate Bill 423, provided they meet a program's eligibility criteria.

The local program would be applicable to a project that:

- Consists of new construction, additions, or conversions of existing structures and adds net new housing units or group housing bedrooms;
- Contains two or more housing units or group housing bedrooms, exclusive of accessory dwelling units (ADUs) (though ADUs can be included in the project);
- Is located on a lot in the R-4 Height and Bulk District;
- Does not demolish a historic building that is designated as a landmark or as a contributor to a historic district under Article 10, is listed as a significant or contributory building under Article 11 of the planning code or is listed in the California Register or National Register of Historic Places;
- Does not seek or receive any density or development bonuses or relief from applicable planning code standards in any other State or local law or program under state law;

- Complies with objective standards, except as provided for or allowed through the local program;
- Is at least two-thirds new or converted residential square footage or at least 50 percent residential in cases where some existing non-residential space is converted to residential and the existing non-residential use is not expanded by more than 25 percent; and
- Is not located in a special use district that implements a development agreement.

LOCAL PROGRAM PROVISIONS AND CODE FLEXIBILITY

Projects that are eligible for and seeking entitlement under the local program could choose an unlimited number of benefits from the menu of "local modified development standards" provided below.

- Height: Projects could build up to the local program height limit established for that parcel, which is consistent with the heights for the proposed rezoning program identified in **Figure 3**, p. 22, discussed below under "Effects of Proposed Rezoning Program on FEIR Land Use Density, Land Use Distribution, and Building Height Assumptions." The highest heights under the proposed rezoning program are those that are allowed via opting into the local program. Corner lots and lots larger than 8,000 square feet may allow structures up to 65 feet tall.
- Inclusionary (Affordable) Housing: In addition to standard provisions under section 415 (onsite, fee, offsite), may also satisfy inclusionary requirements through land dedication within the Housing Opportunity Areas, or provide 100% rent control for a rental property (for projects with 24 or fewer units).
- Density: Form-based density for any parcel not already subject to such rules.
- Dwelling Unit Mix: Qualifying projects of five or more net new dwelling units shall include at least 25% of units as two bedrooms or more.
- Rear Yard and Lot Coverage: Reduction to the greater of 18 percent or 15 feet for lots except for lots in certain R districts and certain large lots.
- Street-Facing Legislated and Front Setback: Projects on 19th Avenue may reduce legislated and front setback if a project would expand the sidewalk to at least 15 feet.
- Usable Open Space: Reduction to 36 square feet/dwelling unit.
- Dwelling Unit Exposure: 30 percent of units can use a standard equivalent to the current lower California building code requirement.
- Non-Residential Use Size Limits: No conditional use authorization required for uses on the ground floor.
- Height limits for architectural elements: Additional height allowance for non-habitable decorative elements.
- Large Lot Development: no conditional use authorization required.

- Additional bonus square footage and height (above the local program limits) for provision of Micro-retail and/or certain Community Benefit Uses, including (among others specified) Child Care, Community Facilities, Grocery, etc. or space for Legacy Businesses or other businesses displaced by development, limited to 2 square feet for every square foot of Community Benefit Use and not more than one additional story (i.e., 10 feet).
- Any quantitative Objective Standard not otherwise modified by the local program directly can be varied up to 15 percent from that standard, except as explicitly prohibited by the local program (e.g., height limits, parking maximum limits, and other certain code provisions).
- Additional Major Modifications: a project may pursue additional deviation from any quantitative standard in the planning code or any applicable Objective Standard not otherwise allowed by the local program, pursuant to discretionary approval from the planning commission.

LOCAL PROGRAM PROVISIONS FOR 100 PERCENT AFFORDABLE HOUSING PROJECTS

In addition to the above code flexibility for projects that are eligible for and using the local program, 100 percent affordable housing projects can receive additional flexibility, as follows:

- Minimum ground-floor ceiling height requirements in code section 145.1(c)(4) shall not apply
- Active use requirement shall be reduced by 20 percent
- Micro-retail requirements shall not apply
- Curb-cut restrictions in code section 155(r) shall not apply, but alternative frontages are encouraged
- An additional height bonus of two stories (20 feet) above the local program height limit shall be available

Effects of Proposed Rezoning Program on FEIR Housing Growth Assumptions

Similar to the housing growth assumptions in the FEIR, it is anticipated that the proposed rezoning program would result in the construction of approximately 54,000 more housing units in the city by 2050, albeit distributed slightly differently from what was assumed in the FEIR. **Table 3** compares the change in housing units by planning district under the adopted housing element and the proposed rezoning program. **Figure 2**, p. 20, compares the projected housing growth and distribution under the proposed zoning program to the projected housing growth and distribution for the adopted housing element evaluated in the FEIR. As shown in **Table 3** and **Figure 2**, p. 20, the proposed rezoning program would distribute housing growth more broadly across the well-resourced areas and in limited areas adjacent to well-resourced areas compared to the rezoning analysis assumptions in the FEIR.

Table 3: Comparison of Housing Units between the Adopted Housing Element FEIR and the Proposed Rezoning Program by Planning District

Planning District	Net New Housing Units[a,b]		Net Change between Proposed Rezoning Program and Adopted Housing Element
	Adopted Housing Element in the FEIR[c]	Proposed Rezoning Program	
Bernal Heights	-200	-200	0
Buena Vista	1,600	2,800	1,200
Central	2,900	3,000	100
Downtown	-1,800	500	2,300
Golden Gate Park	0	0	0
Ingleside	6,800	7,900	1,100
Inner Sunset	11,000	7,600	-3,400
Marina	4,200	5,800	1,500
Mission	-1,300	1,500	2,700
Northeast	800	5,900	5,200
Outer Sunset	14,300	7,400	-7,000
Presidio	0	0	0
Richmond	12,400	9,400	-3,100
South Bayshore	-600	-600	0
South Central	-600	-200	400
South of Market	-5,800	-5,800	0
Treasure Island	0	0	0
Western Addition	6,100	8,900	2,800
Total	**50,000**	**54,000**	**4,000**

Source: San Francisco Planning Department, 2021 and 2025.
Notes:

a. Numbers have been rounded and will not sum to the total.

b. The negative numbers in this table indicate that the planning district is anticipated to have fewer new housing units under the adopted housing element or the proposed rezoning program compared to the 2050 environmental baseline. The negative numbers do not indicate that the planning district would lose existing housing units or that any zoning changes would reduce development capacity compared to existing zoning. Rather, these numbers reflect the department's assumptions that because of the proposed rezoning, a certain portion of housing growth would shift away from these districts and to the proposed rezoned area.

c. The net new housing units in the Adopted Housing Element in the FEIR column (i.e., approximately 50,000) are in addition to the housing units that would be constructed under the 2050 environmental baseline. The net new housing units in the Adopted Housing Element in the FEIR column are consistent with the San Francisco County Transportation Authority's San Francisco Chained Activity Modeling Process (SF-CHAMP) travel demand model data used in the FEIR.



Graphics ... Gy_SF_Planning Rezoning 104844 (8-25-25) tg

Family Zoning Plan - Housing Element Rezoning Program

Case Nos. 2019-016230ENV, 2021-005878CWP, and 2021-005878GPA

Figure 2

Projected Housing Growth and Distribution under the Proposed Rezoning Program Compared to the Adopted Housing Element

Regarding housing growth assumptions, the proposed rezoning program would include the following primary differences compared to the hypothetical scenario presented for the adopted housing element in the FEIR:

- Increased growth projections in the Downtown, Marina, Mission, Northeast, and Western Addition planning districts due primarily to the increased housing capacity in Fisherman's Wharf, Russian Hill, and the Van Ness corridor;
- Increased growth projections for the far southwestern part of the city due primarily to the increased housing capacity on the large parcels on Brotherhood Way between Lake Merced Boulevard and Junipero Serra Boulevard in the Ingleside planning district; and
- Reduced growth projections for the Richmond, Inner Sunset, and Outer Sunset planning districts due primarily to the reduced housing capacity in the residential areas off major transit corridors as well as a revised distribution for projected housing citywide.

As discussed on p. 2-30 in Chapter 2, Project Description, of the FEIR, the adopted housing element focuses on housing production and distribution and does not include policies or actions that would substantially change the number or location of jobs in the city relative to the 2050 environmental baseline. The FEIR assumed that the number and distribution of jobs in the city would be essentially the same under both the 2050 environmental baseline and the adopted housing element update. Similarly, the proposed rezoning program would not include policies or actions that would substantially change the number or location of jobs compared to the adopted housing element update.

Similar to the FEIR's analysis of the housing element update, this addendum may represent a conservative environmental analysis because it likely overestimates the growth anticipated under the proposed rezoning program due to uncertainties associated with housing production over the long term. Specifically, the types and amount of future development would depend on, among other things, local economic conditions, market demand, and other financing considerations. However, in no case would growth exceed the maximum growth permitted under the proposed rezoning program.

Effects of Proposed Rezoning Program on FEIR Land Use Density, Land Use Distribution, and Building Height Assumptions

Figure 3 compares the proposed heights under the proposed zoning program to the heights evaluated for the adopted housing element in the FEIR.



Graphics ... Gy_SF_Planning Rezoning 104844 (8-22-25) tg

Family Zoning Plan - Housing Element Rezoning Program

Case Nos. 2019-016230ENV, 2021-005878CWP, and 2021-005878GPA

Figure 3

Proposed Heights under the Proposed Rezoning Program Compared to the Adopted Housing Element

Regarding land use density and distribution, the proposed rezoning program would have the following primary differences compared to the hypothetical scenario presented for the adopted housing element in the FEIR:

- The proposed rezoning program would increase the allowable land use density and building heights along certain transit and commercial corridors (e.g., Geary Boulevard, Van Ness Avenue, Lombard Street, North Point Street, western portion of Market Street, Ocean Avenue, Irving Street, etc.) compared to the assumptions for the adopted housing element, as shown in **Figure 3**, p. 22;
- The proposed rezoning program would reduce the allowable land use density and building heights in certain residential areas adjacent to (but not immediately along) transit corridors (e.g., some areas adjacent to Geary Boulevard, Van Ness Avenue, Taraval Street, Judah Street, etc.) compared to the adopted housing element, as shown in **Figure 3**, p. 22; and
- The proposed rezoning program would result in housing growth within the boundaries of the well-resourced areas at the time the FEIR was prepared, as well as within some limited additional adjacent areas outside of the well-resourced areas. In addition, the anticipated density and housing growth within the boundaries of the well-resourced areas under the proposed rezoning program would be different than what was analyzed in the FEIR. The adjacent areas include the area near the intersection of Van Ness Avenue and Market Street, historically known as The Hub; portions of the Fisherman's Wharf area; portions of the Castro/Dolores Heights; portions of the Glen Park neighborhood near the Glen Park Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) station north of San José Avenue; portions of the Balboa Park neighborhood near the Balboa Park BART station; and portions of the Oceanview neighborhood near the intersection of 19th Avenue and Sargent Street and along Brotherhood Way). **Figure 3**, p. 22, shows the difference between the proposed heights under the proposed rezoning program and the adopted housing element.

Regarding building heights, it is anticipated that the proposed rezoning program would result in buildings with heights ranging from 40 to 500 feet, with two limited areas of up to 650 feet, which would be slightly lower than the lowest assumption in the FEIR and higher than the highest assumption in the FEIR.[12,13] Under the proposed rezoning program, buildings with heights up to 650 feet would be allowed in very limited areas within the city (i.e., near the intersections of Van Ness Avenue and Geary Boulevard and Van Ness Avenue and Market Street).

In addition to the proposed rezoning program, this addendum considers two small areas for potential future rezoning in Supervisor District 3 in the northeastern part of the city. The potential environmental impacts of this potential rezoning are analyzed in Appendix D of this addendum.

---

[12] As discussed above under "CEQA Review of the Proposed Rezoning Program," the programmatic analysis in the FEIR accounted for subsequent development projects that could include a range of building types. The department identified and quantitatively evaluated seven representative building types ranging from accessory dwelling units to a 590-foot-tall residential mixed-use building with 984 housing units to analyze the indirect impacts of the adopted housing element for transportation, noise, and air quality.

[13] More information is available at: *https://sfplanning.org/sf-family-zoning-plan*.

Codification of Certain FEIR Mitigation Measures

The proposed rezoning program includes planning code amendments (i.e., codification) to incorporate the following mitigation measures from the FEIR as planning code requirements:

Mitigation Measure M-TR-4a: Parking Maximums and Transportation Demand Management.

The city shall reduce vehicle trips from future planning code amendments (e.g., future rezonings or housing sustainability district designations) to implement the proposed action or future development projects that contribute considerably to or result in a significant transit delay impact, as defined in the Housing Element 2022 Update EIR's transit analysis for future development. This mitigation measure shall not apply to future planning code amendments, or future development projects implementing the proposed action, that do not contribute considerably to or result in a significant transit delay impact.

The city may achieve this vehicle trip reduction through one of the following measures A, B, or C:

- Measure A: Amend planning code parking maximums for residential uses (sections 151 and 151.1) by a 50 percent or more reduction than such maximums as of April 2022; OR
- Measure B: Amend planning code transportation demand management requirements (section 169) for residential uses or its associated program standards for residential uses by an equivalent amount to achieve the vehicle trip reduction estimated by implementation of a 50 percent reduction in planning code parking maximums, compared to parking maximums as of April 2022; OR
- Measure C: The department shall apply vehicle trip reduction measures A or B on future development projects consistent with the housing element on project-by-project basis until the city amends the planning code consistent with measures A or B.

Mitigation Measure M-TR-4b: Driveway and Loading Operations Plan and Curb-Cut Restrictions.

The city shall reduce potential conflicts between driveway and loading operations, including passenger and freight loading activities, and people walking, bicycling, riding transit, and driving, from future planning code amendments to implement the proposed action (e.g., future rezonings or housing sustainability district designations) or future development projects that would contribute considerably to or result in a significant transit delay or significant loading impacts, as defined in the Housing Element 2022 Update EIR's transit and loading analysis for future development. This mitigation measure shall not apply to future planning code amendments, or future development projects implementing the proposed action, that do not contribute considerably to or result in a significant transit delay or significant loading impacts.

The city may achieve this through one of the following measures A or B:

- Measure A.1: Amend planning code section 155(r) to not permit curb cuts for garage entries, driveways, or other vehicular access to off-street parking or loading along the street(s) of the significant transit delay and significant loading impacts (may not apply to streets with protected center-running transit-only lanes); AND

- Measure A.2: Amend the geographic applicability of planning code section 155(u) for projects to prepare and implement a Driveway and Loading Operations Plan (DLOP). Applicable projects shall prepare and submit a draft DLOP to the department for their review and approval, in consultation with the SFMTA. The DLOP shall be written in accordance with any guidelines issued by the department and shall respond to any applicable SFMTA curb management plans (e.g., see Mitigation Measure M-TR-6: Curb Management Plans); OR
- Measure B: The department shall apply measures A.1 and A.2 on a development project by development project basis until the city amends the planning code consistent with measures A.1 and A.2.

The proposed rezoning program would amend planning code sections 151 and 151.1 to codify Mitigation Measure M-TR-4a, which is discussed on pp. 4.4-114 and 4.4-115 in Section 4.4, Transportation and Circulation, in the FEIR. This measure would reduce the number of vehicle parking spaces permitted for applicable future development projects consistent with the adopted housing element that would contribute considerably to the significant transit delay impact. This would reduce vehicle trips associated with the proposed rezoning and reduce projected increases in congestion and transit travel times (i.e., transit will be faster) at intersections through which Muni routes travel. This measure would reduce the significant transit delay impact of the proposed action. As further explained in the transportation section below, the codification of Mitigation Measure M-TR-4a would partially fulfill the requirements of the mitigation measure.

The proposed rezoning program would amend planning code sections 155(r) and 155(u) to codify Mitigation Measure M-TR-4b, which is discussed on p. 4.4-115 in Section 4.4, Transportation and Circulation, in the FEIR. This measure would expand the geographic applicability to include streets where significant transit delay and significant loading impacts occur and future development projects consistent with the adopted housing element that would contribute considerably to the significant transit delay impact. In addition, on streets where significant transit delay impacts are identified, Mitigation Measure M-TR-4b may not permit curb cuts and driveways to off-street loading facilities for applicable projects. This measure would reduce the potential for conflicts between transit vehicles and passenger or onsite freight loading activities or vehicles turning into or out of driveways, and thus reduce or minimize the severity of the transit delay associated with future development consistent with the proposed action.

The codification of M-TR-4b as part of the proposed rezoning program would fulfill the requirements of the mitigation measure.

The mitigation monitoring and reporting program for the proposed rezoning program is included in Appendix A of this addendum. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15097, the MMRP is designed to ensure implementation of the mitigation measures identified in the FEIR and this addendum and adopted by decision makers.

Proposed Rezoning Program Approvals and Related Amendments

The board of supervisors will consider adopting a set of ordinances to amend the planning code and zoning maps to adopt the proposed rezoning program as well as amend the planning code and business and tax code to adopt the housing sustainability district.[14] In addition, the board of supervisors will consider adopting a set of amendments to the general plan and planning code to modify text and maps that relate to height and density in the relevant area plans that overlap the proposed rezoning program as well as a general plan elements, including the Urban Design Element. Other planning code changes would include a new section 148 consolidating existing wind controls and amending various criteria. Furthermore, some of the general plan amendments and zoning changes constitute amendments to the city's Local Coastal Plan because the proposed rezoning program would apply to parcels in the Coastal Zone.

The planning commission will review and make recommendations on these ordinances, and forward their recommendation to the board of supervisors for their consideration. The planning commission and board of supervisors will also consider adopting amendments to the general plan[15] and the planning code. The California Coastal Commission will consider approving amendments to the city's Local Coastal Plan.

Project Setting

Project Location

The project location is described on p. 2-12 in Chapter 2, Project Description, in the FEIR.

Cumulative Development

CEQA requires an evaluation of a proposed project's potential contributions to cumulative impacts, in addition to proposed project-specific impacts. CEQA Guidelines section 15130(a)(1) states that a "cumulative impact consists of an impact which is created as a result of the combination of the project evaluated in the EIR together with other projects causing related impacts." Other proposed projects include reasonably foreseeable future projects. CEQA Guidelines section 15130(b)(1) states that the approach to the cumulative impact analysis may be based on either a list of past, present, and probable future projects producing related or cumulative impacts or a summary of projections contained in an adopted general plan or related planning document that describes or evaluates conditions that contribute to the cumulative effect.

---

[14] More information regarding Ordinance 250700 is available at: *https://sfgov.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=7449404&GUID=0F95C63F-86D3-433A-8B92-069CAB240942&Options=ID|Text|&Search=250700* and Ordinance 250701 is available at: *https://sfgov.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=14322322&GUID= B227117C-69AA-4164-85E7-B98814B244FD*.

[15] San Francisco Planning Commission. July 17, 2025. The planning commission initiated the general plan amendments and amendments to the Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan on July 17, 2025. The proposed amendments are reflected in Planning Department record 2021-005878GPA available at: *https://citypln-m-extnl.sfgov.org/Commissions/CPC/7_17_2025/Commission%20Packet/2021-005878GPA.pdf*, accessed August 20, 2025.

As discussed in "E. Cumulative Impacts" in Chapter 4, Environmental Setting and Impacts, of the FEIR, because the projections for the housing element update included all anticipated housing and employment growth in the city through 2050, the analysis of the housing element update's environmental impacts is largely a cumulative impact analysis by nature. While the project-level impact analysis identifies the impacts that would result from the construction and operation of approximately 50,000 housing units by 2050 (i.e., the difference between growth anticipated under the 2050 environmental baseline and the additional housing growth projected under the housing element update), the cumulative impact analysis in the FEIR considered the impacts that would result from the addition of approximately 150,000 housing units and 111,000 jobs in the city through 2050 compared to 2020 conditions. Thus, the cumulative impact analysis in the FEIR identified the impacts that would result from the housing and job growth that would occur in the city through 2050 without the housing element update in combination with the additional growth anticipated with the housing element update. The analysis is based primarily on modeled projections, including housing and employment growth projections and transportation (travel demand and mode) projections.

Since completion of the FEIR, the cumulative context has largely remained unchanged, with the Great Highway Mobility Improvements Project (Case No. 2024-010317ENV) and SFMTA's Vision Zero Quick-Build program being the only substantial projects implemented that were not evaluated in the FEIR.[16] **Table 4** describes the Great Highway Mobility Improvements Project and SFMTA's Vision Zero Quick-Build program, which are considered as part of the cumulative analysis for the proposed rezoning program in this addendum, as applicable; in addition, **Table 4** lists the cumulative projects evaluated in the FEIR. The Great Highway Mobility Improvements Project and the Vision Zero Quick-Build program are roadway modification projects and do not substantially alter the cumulative setting.

[16] The FEIR stated that the sites identified for potential development under the Port of San Francisco's (port's) Waterfront Plan Update would be geographically separate from the well-resourced neighborhoods where future housing construction would occur consistent with the adopted housing element. The proposed rezoning program projects more housing units in the Downtown, Marina, Mission, Northeast, and Western Addition planning districts compared to the adopted housing element. The Northeast Planning District is adjacent to the area covered by the Fisherman's Wharf subarea, a portion of the Waterfront Plan Update area. However, the potential impacts of the Waterfront Plan Update, which does not propose residential uses, would not substantially spatially overlap with housing growth anticipated under the proposed rezoning program in the Northeast Planning District. In addition, the proposed rezoning program would not rezone any port-owned land.

Table 4: Cumulative Projects

Project	Description
Cumulative Projects that were not Evaluated in the FEIR	
Great Highway Mobility Improvements Project Case No. 2024-010317ENV	San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) proposed traffic changes in conjunction with improvements proposed by the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department (SFRPD); together, these traffic changes and improvements comprise the Great Highway Mobility Improvements Project. The SFMTA would make the following traffic modifications on Sloat Boulevard from Upper Great Highway to 47th Avenue and on Lincoln Way from Upper Great Highway to Martin Luther King Jr. Drive: • Turn restrictions to prohibit vehicular access to the Upper Great Highway, between Lincoln Way and Sloat Boulevard, excepting emergency and other authorized vehicles • New protected (Class IV) bicycle facilities on Sloat Boulevard and Lincoln Way for connections to the Upper Great Highway • Minor bus stop relocation for the Muni route 18 46th Avenue (on Lincoln Way) SFRPD proposed minor roadway modifications to Upper Great Highway from a point 400 feet north of Lincoln Way to the intersection of Sloat Boulevard and Great Highway to improve wayfinding and ensure the safety of all non-vehicular users of the space and to reduce social trails on the dunes, as follows: • Pedestrian-only signage and stencils on the upper west side of the Upper Great Highway; bicycle-only signage and stencils on the east side of the Upper Great Highway • New protected bikeway for connections from the O'Shaughnessy Ocean Beach Parking Lot to Lincoln Way • Intersection safety barriers (at Lincoln Way and Sloat Boulevard) to reinforce traffic and turn restrictions • Low-profile fencing and signage along the length of the Upper Great Highway's west side to reduce pedestrians walking on the duns and support visitors to stay on non-dune surfaces The project was officially approved on January 3, 2025.
SFMTA's Vision Zero Quick-Build Program	SFMTA's effort to quickly implement pedestrian and bicycle safety improvements on the Vision Zero High Injury Network comprise the Vision Zero Quick-Build program. The Vision Zero Quick Build program includes the following corridors that have been implemented subsequent to publication of the FEIR: • Hyde Street – (Geary to McAllister streets) – transit-only lane, pedestrian safety • Winston Drive – Bicycle and concrete island • 13th Street (Mission to Isis streets) and Duboce Avenue (Otis to Valencia streets)– Bikeway and pedestrian safety

Project	Description
Cumulative Projects that were Evaluated in the FEIR[a]	
Waterfront Plan Update Case No. 2019-023037ENV	The Port of San Francisco's (port's) proposed 2019 Waterfront Plan Update would update and amend the 1997 Waterfront Land Use Plan, which sets long-term goals and policies to guide the use, management, and improvement of 7.5 miles of properties under the port's jurisdiction, from Fisherman's Wharf to India Basin. The 2019 plan provides a long-range policy framework to guide future port improvement projects, programs, and stewardship initiatives. The nine goals and polices proposed by the plan include, but are not limited to, preserving and enhancing the waterfront's function as a maritime port, hosting a diversity of activities and people, enhancing public access and open space along the waterfront, designing quality new development and preserving the waterfront's historic character, strengthening the port's resilience to climate change impacts, and cultivating an environmentally sustainable port to limit the impacts of climate change. The 2019 plan would focus on changes in land use and redevelopment and would not result in a substantial amount of residential development. The EIR for the Waterfront Plan Project was certified on March 16, 2023.
Second Transbay Tube Project (included in Link21)	Link21 is a program of system improvements for Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) and regional rail operations. Link21's program would include a second transbay tube crossing between Oakland and San Francisco that would increase BART's transbay capacity and connect regional rail services across San Francisco Bay. Additional improvements throughout the region would be included in Link21 to address issues that affect system performance and the passenger experience, such as travel time, reliability, and capacity in high-demand corridors. The Second Transbay Tube Project, which is the cumulative project relevant to the analysis and is one part of Link21's program of improvements, is currently being studied.
Downtown Congestion Pricing	The San Francisco County Transportation Authority is studying downtown congestion pricing which would include charging a toll to drive into the congestion pricing zone in northeast San Francisco and investing revenues to increase transit service and improve bicycle, pedestrian, and transit infrastructure. The project is currently being studied and has not undergone environmental review.
Increased Caltrain Service and Pennsylvania Avenue Extension	Under Caltrain's 2040 Service Vision, Caltrain service during peak hours would grow to a minimum of eight trains per direction per hour which is two trains per hour per direction higher than assumed in the 2050 environmental baseline. The vision would also include all-day express service every 15 minutes as well as increased off-peak and weekend services as compared to the 2050 environmental baseline. The Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board adopted the vision on October 3, 2019. The Pennsylvania Avenue extension would put Caltrain (and High-Speed Rail) under Pennsylvania Avenue from the future Fourth and Townsend station to just north of 22nd Street. The extension project is currently being designed and has not undergone environmental review.

Source: San Francisco Planning Department, 2025.

Notes: The list of cumulative projects in the FEIR was prepared at the time of publication of the notice of preparation for the EIR (June 16, 2021). The list of cumulative projects not evaluated in the FEIR was prepared at the time of the publication of this addendum (August 2025).

a. These cumulative projects were already evaluated in the cumulative impact analysis FEIR and the cumulative context has largely remained unchanged; thus, these cumulative projects are not required to be evaluated in the cumulative impact analysis in this addendum.

The cumulative analysis for each topic is included in each topical subsection below under "Analysis of Potential Environmental Impacts," p. 32.

Approach to Analysis of Potential Environmental Effects

Approach

The proposed rezoning program is evaluated in accordance with CEQA Statute section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines sections 15162–15163. When an EIR has been certified for a project, the guidelines state that no new, subsequent, or supplemental EIR shall be required unless one or more of the following events occurs: (1) substantial changes to a project are proposed that will require major revisions to the EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; (2) substantial changes will occur due to the circumstances under which the project is being undertaken, requiring major revisions to the previous EIR due to new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or (3) new information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified, has become available. In addition, San Francisco Administrative Code section 31.19(c)(1) states that a modified project must be reevaluated and that "if, on the basis of such reevaluation, the Environmental Review Officer determines, based on the requirements of CEQA, that no additional environmental review is necessary, this determination and the reasons therefor shall be noted in writing in the case record, and no further evaluation shall be required by this Chapter."

CEQA Guidelines section 15164 provides for the use of an addendum to document the basis for a lead agency's decision not to require a subsequent final EIR for a project that is already adequately covered in a previously certified final EIR. An addendum to a certified final EIR may be prepared if some changes or additions are necessary, but none of the conditions described in section 15162 calling for preparation of a supplemental or subsequent final EIR have occurred. This addendum evaluates whether the environmental impacts of the modified project are addressed in the FEIR that was certified on November 17, 2022. As shown in the analysis below, the proposed rezoning program, which is the subject of this addendum, would not result in new environmental impacts, substantially increase the severity of previously identified environmental impacts, or require new mitigation measures. In addition, no new information has emerged that would materially change the analyses or conclusions set forth in the FEIR. Therefore, as discussed in more detail below, the proposed rezoning program would not change the analysis or conclusions reached in the FEIR, and no subsequent or supplemental EIR is required.

Analysis

The FEIR identified less than significant impacts or no impact/not applicable for the following environmental topic areas:

- Land use and planning
- Aesthetics
- Population and housing

- Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions
- Recreation
- Public services
- Biological resources
- Geology and soils
- Hydrology and water quality
- Hazards and hazardous materials
- Energy
- Agriculture and forestry resources
- Mineral resources
- Wildfire

The FEIR found impacts to be less than significant with mitigation for archeological resources (project and cumulative), human remains (project and cumulative), tribal cultural resources (project and cumulative), groundborne vibration (project), criteria pollutant emissions (project), new or expanded electric or telecommunication facilities (project), and paleontological resources (project). Mitigation measures were incorporated for these topics to reduce the impacts to less than significant.

Impacts were determined to be significant and unavoidable with mitigation for built-environment historical resources (project and cumulative), public transit delay (project and cumulative), loading (project and cumulative), construction noise (project and cumulative), operational noise (project), criteria pollutant emissions for which the project region is in nonattainment status under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (project and cumulative), health effects (project), wind (project), shadow (project), new or expanded wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage facilities (project), and wastewater treatment capacity (project). Mitigation measures were incorporated for these topics, but it was determined that impacts would remain significant and unavoidable with mitigation.

Significant and unavoidable impacts were found for transportation impacts during construction (project and cumulative) and water supply (project). There were no feasible mitigation measures identified in the FEIR for these topics.

This addendum evaluates the proposed rezoning program with respect to the resource topics discussed in the FEIR. This addendum also documents the assessment and determination that the proposed rezoning program is within the scope of the FEIR and confirms that no additional environmental review is required.

Analysis of Potential Environmental Effects

This section evaluates the potential environmental effects in the same order as they appear in the FEIR. Specifically, this section begins with the topics that were found to have no impact or a less-than-significant impact that were addressed in Section 4.1, Effects Found Not to Be Significant, of the FEIR. This section then evaluates the topics that were found to have impacts that are less than significant with mitigation, significant and unavoidable with mitigation, or significant and unavoidable that were addressed in Section 4.2, Cultural Resources, through Section 4.10, Paleontological Resources, in the FEIR.

The primary similarities and differences between the adopted housing element and the proposed rezoning program are summarized above under "Overview of the Proposed Rezoning Program," p. 9. Consistent with the adopted housing element, because the proposed rezoning program would not authorize any new development, the proposed rezoning program itself would have no direct physical environmental impacts. Therefore, this analysis identifies the reasonably foreseeable environmental impacts that could occur as a result of the proposed rezoning program—primarily impacts that are influenced by land use density, growth distribution, and building heights. The analysis also considers impacts related to codification of FEIR mitigation measures related to transportation, as applicable.

As discussed above under "CEQA Review of the Proposed Rezoning Program," p. 7, the department identified and quantitatively evaluated seven representative building types ranging from accessory dwelling units to a 590-foot-tall residential mixed-use building with 984 housing units to analyze the indirect impacts of the adopted housing element for transportation, noise, and air quality. As discussed below under "Transportation and Circulation," "Noise and Vibration," and "Air Quality," the analysis of the indirect impacts of the proposed rezoning program for transportation, noise, and air quality relies on the seven representative building types analysis in the FEIR.

Land Use and Planning

FEIR FINDINGS

The potential land use and planning impacts of the adopted housing element are analyzed under "Land Use and Planning" in Section 4.1, Effects Found Not to Be Significant, of the FEIR. The FEIR determined that implementation of the adopted housing element would result in less-than-significant impacts on land use and planning.

Although the adopted housing element would allow for different types of residential development throughout the city and at higher density, the FEIR found that future development would still occur within established lot boundaries. Thus, the adopted housing element would not create any new physical barriers that would divide established neighborhoods or isolate any areas within the city.

The adopted housing element, as discussed in the FEIR, would not substantially conflict with general plan policies or the planning code. Although the adopted housing element includes housing production levels and development patterns different from those under Plan Bay Area 2050, it would not conflict with implementation of the plan. The adopted housing element would be consistent with other local plans and policies, such as air quality plans. Overall, future residential development, as well as any related work involving street networks or open space, as a result of implementation of the adopted housing element would be required to conform to or comply with specific city, state, and federal plans, policies, and regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. Any secondary impacts that would occur as a result of implementation of the adopted housing element were discussed throughout this FEIR at a programmatic level. Therefore, the FEIR determined that the adopted housing element would not result in substantial impacts on land use and planning.

PROPOSED REZONING PROGRAM IMPACTS

The approach to evaluating the proposed rezoning program is described above under "Analysis of Potential Environmental Effects," p. 32. The changes under the proposed rezoning program that would affect land use are addressed below.

DIVISION OF A COMMUNITY

Actions that would directly or indirectly divide established neighborhoods include the creation of physical barriers, or future roadways (e.g., freeways), that would divide the city or isolate planning areas or individual neighborhoods within it. As with the adopted housing element, all actions under the proposed rezoning program would result in development within established lot boundaries, in most cases at a scale and density somewhat greater than currently permitted. The proposed rezoning program would result in an incremental increase in overall units and a slightly different growth distribution compared to the adopted housing element. Under the proposed rezoning program, more growth would occur in well-resourced areas in the Downtown, Marina, Mission, Northeast, and Western Addition planning districts compared to the rezoning analysis assumptions in the FEIR, which projected that growth would be heavily concentrated in the Inner Sunset, Outer Sunset, and Richmond planning districts, as shown in **Table 3**, p. 19, and **Figure 2**, p. 20. Similarly, changes to building heights under the rezoning program would occur within the well-resourced areas and adjacent areas, which were projected to occur only within the well-resourced areas, as shown in **Figure 3**, p. 22. This change would provide more broadly distributed residential growth in existing areas but would not alter the FEIR's findings related to the division of a community. Similarly, the creation of a housing sustainability district, establishment of a local program, and amendments to base zoning that provide individual property control adjustments would each allow for a diversity of residential development throughout the city. Therefore, the proposed rezoning program would have a less-than-significant impact related to the division of an established community, and no mitigation measures are necessary.

CONFLICT WITH A POLICY

The specific changes under the proposed rezoning program serve to implement the vision of the adopted housing element and comply with state government code requirements. The specific features of the program would alter the zoning code, creating control adjustments that would allow a diversity of residential development throughout the city and ensuring consistency for future development. Plans, policies, and regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect are those that directly address environmental issues and/or contain targets or standards that must be met in order to maintain or improve characteristics of the city's physical environment. As addressed in detail in the FEIR, examples of such plans, policies, and regulations include the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's (air district's) 2010 Clean Air Plan and the San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board's San Francisco Basin Plan. As addressed in other sections of this addendum, the proposed rezoning program would not directly conflict with any plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. Individual development projects proposed under the proposed rezoning program would be evaluated by city decision makers for their consistency with such plans, policies, or regulations; conflicts would need to be addressed prior to the approval of any entitlements. The codification of certain FEIR mitigation measures for parking maximums, requirement for driveway and loading operation plans (as applicable), and curb-cut restrictions, as addressed below under "Transportation and Circulation," would not result in new environmental impacts.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The FEIR determined that the adopted housing element, in combination with cumulative projects, would not result in a significant cumulative land use impact. The new cumulative projects implemented subsequent to publication of the FEIR, the Great Highway Mobility Improvements Project and the Vision Zero Quick-Build program (see **Table 4**, p. 28), do not substantially alter the cumulative setting due to the nature of the cumulative projects (i.e., the creation of new open space and recreation facilities via traffic and roadway modifications and pedestrian and bicycle safety improvements in the right-of-way). Thus, the inclusion of the new cumulative projects would not alter the findings related to cumulative land use impacts in the FEIR. Because the proposed rezoning program would not generate new land use impacts that were not previously identified in the FEIR, and the new cumulative projects would not alter the FEIR's cumulative analysis, there would be no new significant cumulative land use impact.

CONCLUSION

In summary, the proposed rezoning program would not result in new significant land use and planning impacts that were not previously identified in the FEIR, nor would it result in more severe impacts than those previously identified. No new mitigation measures or changes to existing mitigation measures are required.

Aesthetics

FEIR FINDINGS

The potential aesthetic impacts of the adopted housing element are analyzed under "Aesthetics" in Section 4.1, Effects Found Not to Be Significant, of the FEIR. The FEIR determined that implementation of the adopted housing element would result in less-than-significant impacts on aesthetics. The FEIR concluded that the adopted housing element would allow noticeable changes related to increased building height from various scenic vistas but that impacts on scenic vistas would not be substantial. The FEIR also concluded that the adopted housing element would not substantially damage scenic resources, including scenic highways and other natural features within San Francisco, because development would not occur on natural features but in the existing urban context of the city. Future development under the adopted housing element would comply with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality, ensuring no substantial damage to scenic quality. Similar adherence to planning and building codes would ensure that light and glare impacts from future development under the adopted housing element would remain less than significant.

PROPOSED REZONING PROGRAM IMPACTS

The approach to evaluating the proposed rezoning program is described above under "Analysis of Potential Environmental Effects," p. 32. The changes under the proposed rezoning program that would affect aesthetics are addressed below.

The changes to growth distribution under the proposed rezoning program would result in impacts on visual character similar to those addressed under the FEIR, though with development and visual changes located in slightly different locations. The changes to building heights, the new housing sustainability district, the amendments to base zoning, and establishment of the local program provided under the proposed rezoning program would each support the increased density and massing of future development within the city. By allowing qualifying projects to exceed existing height limits in certain locations throughout San Francisco, the proposed rezoning program would result in buildings that could be taller than what is currently permitted under existing regulations, which could indirectly affect the visual character of the areas of development. Future development consistent with the proposed rezoning program would result in increased building heights compared to the 2050 environmental baseline and in more areas than what was considered in the FEIR.[17] Although these changes would be noticeable from various scenic vistas, impacts on scenic vistas would not be substantial and would remain similar to those addressed in the FEIR.

As with the adopted housing element, the changes under the proposed rezoning program would limit development to the existing urban context of the city (and not on natural features). Therefore, consistent with the adopted housing element, future development under the proposed rezoning program would not substantially damage scenic resources.

---

[17] The adjacent areas include the area near the intersection of Van Ness Avenue and Market Street, historically known as The Hub; portions of the Fisherman's Wharf area; portions of the Castro/Dolores Heights; portions of the Glen Park neighborhood near the Glen Park Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) station north of San José Avenue; portions of the Balboa Park neighborhood near the Balboa Park BART station; and portions of the Oceanview neighborhood near the intersection of 19th Avenue and Sargent Street and along Brotherhood Way.

As noted above, the proposed rezoning program would increase the allowable building heights and shift a greater share of anticipated growth to well-resourced and adjacent areas along transit corridors and in low-density areas. Adoption of the proposed rezoning program would authorize changes in zoning as detailed above under "Amendments to Base Zoning," p. 14, but does not approve specific development projects. Physical effects that would result from future actions consistent with the proposed rezoning program are analyzed as reasonably foreseeable effects throughout this addendum. Therefore, the proposed rezoning program would not result in any direct physical changes to scenic quality. Consistent with the findings of the FEIR, future development under the proposed rezoning program would be required to comply with all applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality and new development consistent with the proposed rezoning program would be subject to policies in the general plan, governing area plans, applicable design guidelines, and planning codes. Therefore, the proposed rezoning program would not conflict with applicable zoning or other regulations governing scenic quality.

With respect to light and glare, as well as the brightness of the nighttime sky, the same policies that were applicable to the adopted housing element would be applicable to the proposed rezoning program. Therefore, although development density under the proposed rezoning program would result in more development adjacent to well-resourced areas and transit corridors, the net change in light and glare, as well as the brightness of the nighttime sky, due to future development consistent with the proposed rezoning program compared to the adopted housing element and the 2050 environmental baseline would be minimal.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The FEIR determined that the adopted housing element, in combination with cumulative projects, would not result in a significant cumulative aesthetic impact. The new cumulative projects implemented subsequent to publication of the FEIR, the Great Highway Mobility Improvements Project and the Vision Zero Quick-Build program (see **Table 4**, p. 28), do not substantially alter the cumulative setting due to the nature of the cumulative projects (i.e., the creation of new open space and recreation facilities via traffic and roadway modifications and pedestrian and bicycle safety improvements in the right-of-way). Thus, the inclusion of the new cumulative projects would not alter the findings related to cumulative aesthetics impacts in the FEIR. Because the proposed rezoning program would not generate new aesthetics impacts that were not previously identified in the FEIR, and the new cumulative projects would not alter the FEIR's cumulative analysis, there would be no new significant cumulative aesthetic impact.

CONCLUSION

In summary, the proposed rezoning program would not result in new significant aesthetic impacts that were not previously identified in the FEIR, nor would it result in more severe impacts than those previously identified. No new mitigation measures or changes to existing mitigation measures are required.

Population and Housing

FEIR FINDINGS

The potential population and housing impacts of the adopted housing element are analyzed under "Population and Housing" in Section 4.1, Effects Found Not to Be Significant, of the FEIR. The FEIR determined that implementation of the adopted housing element would result in less-than-significant impacts on population and housing.

According to the FEIR, the adopted housing element would increase housing production and shift a greater share of anticipated growth from the east side of the city to well-resourced areas along transit corridors and in low-density areas, which are located primarily on the west and north sides of the city. Although there may be a small increase in demand for neighborhood services where increased residential growth would be directed, the resulting number of jobs across planning districts would be negligible relative to the total number of jobs under the 2050 environmental baseline and jobs were not analyzed further. The FEIR determined that, regardless of the adopted housing element, the population of San Francisco would continue to grow through 2050. The FEIR estimated that implementation of the adopted housing element would result in an estimated 50,000 additional units to address an existing need for housing and plan for future housing demand in San Francisco. "The increases in population in San Francisco are forecast to continue through 2050, regardless of whether the housing element update is adopted. The city's existing zoning would not preclude the development density required to fully accommodate planned population growth in the city through 2050." As such, the adopted housing element is the city's proposed plan to accommodate anticipated growth; it would not induce unplanned population growth, either directly or indirectly, and the FEIR determined the impact would be less than significant.

With regard to housing displacement, the FEIR noted that new market-rate housing development may contribute to indirect displacement of lower-income communities in San Francisco. However, the adopted housing element includes policies and actions that focus on advancing equitable housing access, promoting racial and social equity, and eliminating displacement with strategies such as tenant protections, preservation of affordability, production of affordable housing, and advancing equitable access to housing resources and affordable units. The FEIR determined that, because of these policies and actions, the adopted housing element would strengthen the city's anti-displacement policies and increase housing production for all income levels to accommodate projected population growth, which would reduce both direct and indirect displacement compared to the environmental baseline. Therefore, the FEIR determined that the adopted housing element would not displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing units, necessitating the construction of replacement housing, and the impact would be less than significant.

PROPOSED REZONING PROGRAM IMPACTS

The approach to evaluating the proposed rezoning program is described above under "Analysis of Potential Environmental Effects," p. 32. The changes under the proposed rezoning program that would affect population and housing are addressed below.

UNPLANNED GROWTH

The proposed rezoning program implements the vision of the adopted housing element. The proposed rezoning program would result in an incremental increase in overall units and a slightly different growth distribution compared to the adopted housing element. Under the proposed rezoning program, more growth would occur in well-resourced areas in the Downtown, Marina, Mission, Northeast, and Western Addition planning districts compared to the rezoning analysis assumptions in the FEIR, which projected that growth would be heavily concentrated in the Inner Sunset, Outer Sunset, and Richmond planning districts. A slight redistribution of growth to other areas in the city would not result in a new or more severe impact to population growth since growth is a citywide impact, not a localized neighborhood impact. Relatedly, changes to building heights under the proposed rezoning program would not directly drive population growth; rather, density would, and as described above the overall population growth across the city would not substantially increase due to the proposed rezoning program.

Ultimately, as with the FEIR, the increases in population in San Francisco are forecast to continue through 2050, regardless of whether the proposed rezoning program is adopted. Implementation of the proposed rezoning program and future development consistent with it would not directly induce substantial unplanned population growth but, rather, would address an existing need for housing and plan for future housing demand in San Francisco. Thus, as with the FEIR, the proposed rezoning program would not induce substantial unplanned population growth, either directly or indirectly, and the impact would be less than significant.

DISPLACEMENT

There could be a connection between market rate housing development and displacement. As discussed in the FEIR, the adopted housing element update is San Francisco's first housing plan centered in racial and social equity; with the majority of the update's policies and actions focus on advancing equitable housing access, racial and social equity, and eliminating displacement. Specifically, Objective 3.c seeks to: "Eliminate community displacement within areas vulnerable to displacement." The proposed rezoning program would establish a local program to provide more diversity of affordable housing (on-site, fee, off-site, land dedication, rent control). In addition, the proposed rezoning program would distribute housing growth more broadly across the well-resourced areas and in limited areas adjacent to well-resourced areas compared to the rezoning analysis assumptions in the FEIR so that a diversity of housing options would be available throughout the entire city. Thus, the proposed rezoning program (similar to the adopted housing element) would strengthen the city's anti-displacement policies and increase housing production for all income levels to accommodate projected population growth, which would reduce both direct and indirect displacement compared to the environmental baseline. The proposed rezoning program would not displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing units, necessitating the construction of replacement housing, and the impact would be less than significant.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The FEIR determined that the adopted housing element, in combination with cumulative projects, would not result in a significant cumulative impact from unplanned growth or displacement. The new cumulative projects implemented subsequent to publication of the FEIR, the Great Highway Mobility Improvements Project, and the Vision Zero Quick-Build Program (see **Table 4**, p. 28) would not substantially alter the cumulative setting due to the nature of the cumulative projects (i.e., the creation of new open space and recreation facilities through traffic and roadway modifications and pedestrian and bicycle safety improvements in the right-of-way). Therefore, the inclusion of the new cumulative projects would not alter the findings related to cumulative unplanned growth or displacement impacts in the FEIR. Because the proposed rezoning program would not generate new impacts related to unplanned growth or displacement that were not previously identified in the FEIR, and because the new cumulative projects would not alter the FEIR's cumulative analysis, there would be no new significant cumulative impact related to unplanned growth or displacement.

CONCLUSION

In summary, the proposed rezoning program would not result in new significant population and housing impacts that were not previously identified in the FEIR, nor would it result in more severe impacts than those previously identified. No new mitigation measures or changes to existing mitigation measures are required.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

FEIR FINDINGS

The potential GHG emissions impacts of the adopted housing element are analyzed under "Greenhouse Gas Emissions" in Section 4.1, Effects Found Not to Be Significant, of the FEIR. The FEIR concluded that the adopted housing element would not generate GHG emissions that would have a significant impact on the environment. The FEIR also evaluated the effect of the adopted housing element on several emissions sectors. The emissions sectors are transportation, building energy, waste, and water and wastewater. For each emissions sector, the FEIR demonstrates how the adopted housing element would comply with regulations and ordinances to minimize emissions.

With respect to GHG plan consistency, the FEIR determined that the adopted housing element would be consistent with city ordinance 81-08 from May 2008; the updated ordinance from July 2021, which established the "0-80-100-Roots" climate action framework; and the 2017 GHG reduction strategy update.[18] Since adoption of the FEIR, the city adopted an updated GHG reduction strategy in October 2023. The updated GHG strategy carries forward the goals of previous

[18] San Francisco Planning Department. 2017 Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy Update. July 2017. *https://sfplanning.s3.amazonaws.com/sfmea/GHG/GHG_Strategy_October2017.pdf*. Accessed October 29, 2021.

efforts to reduce GHG emissions.[19] The FEIR also found that the adopted housing element would be consistent with the air district's Clean Air Plan, along with various statewide executive orders and laws.

PROPOSED REZONING PROGRAM IMPACTS

The approach to evaluating the proposed rezoning program is described above under "Analysis of Potential Environmental Effects," p. 32. The changes under the proposed rezoning program that would affect GHG are addressed below.

Although the adopted housing element and the proposed rezoning program have some differences with respect to the distribution of growth in the city, they are fundamentally similar, particularly in terms of their potential to result in GHG impacts. The proposed rezoning program would, like the adopted housing element, increase the portion of future housing growth in the city near transit corridors relative to the baseline. Thus, the proposed rezoning program would result in a pattern of land use similar to that of the adopted housing element, which would facilitate a similar pattern of daily per capita vehicle miles traveled (VMT) for new residents and employees. The FEIR notes that, for the adopted housing element, daily per capita VMT would be between 47 to 53 percent below the regional average, which is well below the 15 percent threshold recommend by the Governor's Office of Land Use and Climate Innovation. As such, the proposed rezoning program would very likely result in per capita VMT in the range of 47 to 53 percent below the regional average because of its general similarities to the adopted housing element. As such, transportation emissions from the proposed rezoning program would be consistent with the state's long-term climate goals and would not be considered substantial.

With respect to other sources of GHG emissions, such as those associated with building energy, waste, and water and wastewater, compliance with the city's existing ordinances and requirements, which would apply to future development under both the adopted housing element and the proposed rezoning program, regardless of where the growth occurs, would minimize GHG emissions. The all-electric new construction ordinance would prevent emissions from natural gas appliances from occurring. Similarly, the recycling and composting ordinance, construction and demolition debris recovery ordinance, and green building code would minimize waste-related emissions. The green building requirements for reductions in water use would minimize water- and wastewater-related emissions.

Because of the nature of the proposed growth under the proposed rezoning program, GHG emissions from transportation sources would not be considered substantial. Compliance with existing regulations would ensure that emissions from other sources would be minimized. This conclusion is the same as the conclusion in the FEIR.

---

[19] San Francisco Planning Department. 2023 Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy Update. October 2023. *https://citypln-m-extnl.sfgov.org/SharedLinks.aspx?accesskey=02df0ca3679c50c014fea50e2c99f69567b11125c0d60cb1eb53ecaaabe39dab&VaultGUID=A4A7DACD-B0DC-4322-BD29-F6F07103C6E0*. Accessed August 11, 2025.

For GHG plan consistency, the reasoning described previously applies. This is because the adopted housing element and proposed rezoning program would result in a similar type of development, and development under both would be subject to future programs and regulations to reduce GHG emissions, including the city's climate action plan. As noted in the FEIR, the addition of housing units aligns the city's 2017 *GHG Reduction Strategy*, because future development would be required to comply with regulations that have been effective at meeting the city's GHG reduction targets; thus, the proposed rezoning program would also be aligned with that framework, as updated in 2023. In addition, both the adopted housing element and proposed rezoning program seek to increase density in the city, which is consistent with, and advances, the GHG reduction target of the Bay Area's sustainable communities strategy and Plan Bay Area 2050. The proposed rezoning program's consistency with the city's GHG emission reduction strategy means that it would also be consistent with statewide GHG reduction goals, which were considered in development of the GHG emission reduction strategy (e.g., Executive Orders S-3-05, B-30-15, and B-55-18; the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2016; and the Bay Area 2017 Clean Air Plan). As such, the proposed rezoning program would not result in a conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions, which is the same conclusion reached for the adopted housing element in the FEIR.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The analysis of GHG impacts in the FEIR is inherently cumulative because climate change is a global issue, and GHG impacts are, by definition, cumulative. The project-level analysis in the FEIR is inclusive of cumulative impacts. Similarly, the discussion of impacts for the proposed rezoning program is inherently cumulative. The conclusion would be the same as in the FEIR; that is, the impact would not be cumulatively considerable.

CONCLUSION

In summary, the proposed rezoning program would not result in new significant GHG emissions impacts that were not previously identified in the FEIR, nor would it result in more severe impacts than those previously identified. No new mitigation measures or changes to existing mitigation measures are required.

Recreation

FEIR FINDINGS

The potential recreation impacts of the adopted housing element are analyzed under "Recreation" in Section 4.1, Effects Found Not to Be Significant, of the FEIR. The FEIR determined that implementation of the adopted housing element would result in impacts that would be less than significant on existing recreational facilities; impacts on the development of future recreational facilities would be less than significant with mitigation.

The FEIR noted that the adopted housing element would shift housing growth to the western and northern portions of the city, and that existing recreational facilities already experience high demand, which would likely be exacerbated from increased use. However, the San Francisco Recreation & Parks Department's (SFRPD) would continue to maintain, expand existing recreational facilities and/or acquire new open spaces and recreational facilities to accommodate the anticipated increase in demand for recreational facilities generated by future housing development

Any potential new facilities would be subject to project-level environmental review in accordance with CEQA at the time they are proposed. Although it is not currently possible to identify exact project-specific impacts and mitigation measures, projects would have impacts similar to those associated with the FEIR and be subject to the same regulatory requirements and mitigation measures. The mitigation measures would include typical construction-related mitigation measures such as M-CR-2a, Archeological Resources Requirements for Projects Involving Soil Disturbance; M-CR-2b, Archeological Monitoring Program; M-CR-2c, Archeological Testing Program; and M-CR-2d, Treatment of Submerged and Deeply Buried Resources, in Section 4.2, Cultural Resources; M-TCR-1, Tribal Notification and Consultation, in Section 4.3, Tribal Cultural Resources; M-NO-1, Construction Noise Control; M-NO-3a, Protection of Adjacent Buildings/ Structures and Vibration Monitoring during Construction; and M-NO-3b, Prevent Damage to Vibration-Sensitive Equipment, in Section 4.5, Noise and Vibration; and M-AQ-3, Construction Air Quality, in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Therefore, the FEIR concluded this impact would be less than significant with mitigation.

PROPOSED REZONING PROGRAM IMPACTS

The approach to evaluating the proposed rezoning program is described above under "Analysis of Potential Environmental Effects," p. 32. The changes under the proposed rezoning program that would affect recreation are addressed below.

INCREASED DEMAND ON RECREATIONAL FACILITIES

Changes under the proposed rezoning program would generate a similar demand for recreational resources across the city upon buildout in 2050, but the intensity of new development would be more broadly distributed across the well-resourced areas and in limited areas adjacent to those rather than concentrated in the western portion of the city. As shown in **Table 3**, p. 19, the proposed rezoning program would result in an incremental increase in overall units and a slightly different growth distribution compared to the adopted housing element. Under the proposed rezoning program, more growth and the corresponding demand on recreational facilities would occur in well-resourced areas in the Downtown, Marina, Mission, Northeast, and Western Addition planning districts compared to the rezoning analysis assumptions in the FEIR, which projected that growth and demand on recreational facilities would be heavily concentrated in the Inner Sunset, Outer Sunset, and Richmond planning districts. Overall, population growth generated by the proposed rezoning program would be incrementally increased compared to the level considered under the FEIR, and the proposed rezoning program would result in a similar incremental increase in demand for recreational facilities to that considered under the FEIR. Similar to the FEIR findings, the existing SFRPD facilities that already experience high levels of demand would continue to experience exacerbated demand compared to the

2050 environmental baseline, but this would be similar to that found under the FEIR for the adopted housing element. It is expected there would still be exceedances above the existing capacity for recreational facilities overall. As considered in the FEIR, continued adherence to the general plan and the SFRPD Strategic Plan would ensure that the Recreation and Parks Department would acquire new parkland as needed and that existing parks would continue to receive preventative maintenance and renovations. In addition, since publication of the FEIR, the city has constructed or is planning for new parks and recreational facilities that were not previously considered. For example, the first phase of the Great Highway Sunset Dunes is complete and the planning and design for the India Basin Waterfront Park at 900 Innes Avenue is underway. New parks and recreational facilities completed but not previously considered in the FEIR include Gene Friend Extension (at 240 6th Street), Francisco Park Guy Place, Noe Valley Town Square, and Rachel Sullivan Park (at 11th and Natoma streets). These new facilities, similar to those noted in the FEIR, would further offset future demand for recreational facilities in the city. Ultimately, continued adherence to the general plan and the SFRPD Strategic Plan would ensure that the Recreation and Parks Department would be able to acquire new parkland as needed and to perform preventative maintenance and renovations at existing parks and facilities. Because this practice would continue under the proposed rezoning program, the impact would continue to be less than significant impact with mitigation, and no new mitigation is required.

IMPACT OF NEW RECREATIONAL FACILITIES

As noted above, the proposed rezoning program, as with the adopted housing element, does not propose new recreational facilities. Overall, population growth generated by the proposed rezoning program would be incrementally increased compared to the level considered under the FEIR, and the proposed rezoning program would result in a similar increase in demand for recreational facilities to that considered under the FEIR. As with the FIER, when new open spaces and recreational facilities are proposed for development they would be subject to project-level environmental review in accordance with CEQA at the time they are proposed, as applicable. It is anticipated that the analysis would result in findings similar to those under the FEIR for construction-related environmental impacts, thereby requiring mitigation. As described in the FEIR, compliance with mitigation measures would be the responsibility of SFRPD. Therefore, the proposed rezoning would continue to result in a less-than-significant impact with mitigation with respect to construction or expansion of recreational facilities.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The FEIR determined that the adopted housing element, in combination with cumulative projects, would not result in a significant cumulative impact on recreation. The new cumulative projects implemented subsequent to publication of the FEIR, the Great Highway Mobility Improvements Project and the Vision Zero Quick-Build program (see **Table 4**, p. 28), do not substantially alter the cumulative setting due to the nature of the cumulative projects (i.e., the creation of new open space and recreation facilities via traffic and roadway modifications and pedestrian and bicycle safety improvements in the right-of-way). Thus, the inclusion of the new cumulative projects would not alter the findings related to cumulative impacts on recreation in the FEIR. Because the proposed rezoning

program would not generate new impacts on recreation that were not previously identified in the FEIR, and the new cumulative projects would not alter the FEIR's cumulative analysis, there would be no new significant cumulative impact on recreation.

CONCLUSION

In summary, the proposed rezoning program would not result in new significant recreational impacts that were not previously identified in the FEIR, nor would it result in more severe impacts than those previously identified. No new mitigation measures or changes to existing mitigation measures are required.

Public Services

FEIR FINDINGS

The potential public services impacts of the adopted housing element are analyzed under "Public Services" in Section 4.1, Effects Found Not to Be Significant, of the FEIR. The FEIR determined that implementation of the adopted housing element would lead to an increase in demand for public services. As a result, the construction of new or the expansion of existing fire protection, police protection, school, library, or park facilities may be required to accommodate future demand. These facilities would be subject to project-level environmental review in accordance with CEQA, if applicable, at the time that they are proposed and would be constructed by public agencies. The FEIR identified that significant environmental impacts could result from construction and operation of the facilities. Although it is not currently possible to identify exact project-specific impacts and mitigation measures, projects would have impacts similar to those in the FEIR and be subject to the same regulatory requirements and mitigation measures. The mitigation measures would include M-CR-2a, Archeological Resources Requirements for Projects Involving Soil Disturbance; M-CR-2b, Archeological Monitoring Program; M-CR-2c, Archeological Testing Program; and M-CR-2d, Treatment of Submerged and Deeply Buried Resources, in Section 4.2, Cultural Resources; M-TCR-1, Tribal Notification and Consultation, in Section 4.3, Tribal Cultural Resources; M-NO-1, Construction Noise Control; M-NO-3a, Protection of Adjacent Buildings/Structures and Vibration Monitoring during Construction; and M-NO-3b, Prevent Damage to Vibration-Sensitive Equipment, in Section 4.5, Noise and Vibration; and M-AQ-3, Construction Air Quality, in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Therefore, impacts on public services would be less-than-significant with mitigation.

PROPOSED REZONING PROGRAM IMPACTS

The approach to evaluating the proposed rezoning program is described above under "Analysis of Potential Environmental Effects," p. 32. The changes under the proposed rezoning program that would affect public services are addressed below.

On July 17, 2025, the planning commission held an informational hearing regarding key municipal infrastructure systems, including how the city's infrastructure agencies and departments are positioned to accommodate additional housing growth as a result of the proposed rezoning program

and how the City is planning for any upgrades needed in the future. As part of this presentation, the department prepared the Family Zoning Plan (Housing Element Rezoning Program): Infrastructure Memo.[20] Analysis included in the memo is considered below.

FIRE PROTECTION AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL FACILITIES

The proposed rezoning program would result in moderate, distributed population growth—primarily in neighborhoods that already have robust fire station coverage and service levels. According to the citywide nexus study, the level of fire station service in these areas is more than enough to accommodate projected growth. Although the potable water system has adequate future fire protection capacity for day-to-day fires, expansion of the Emergency Firefighting Water System (EFWS), especially in the city's western neighborhoods, would improve citywide emergency resilience in case of large multi-fire events. The Westside EFWS Expansion Project, paired with ongoing seismic upgrades and strategic capital investment, ensures that both existing and future communities would be protected during large-scale emergencies. Through proactive coordination between the San Francisco Fire Department (SFFD), SFPUC, and the department, San Francisco's fire safety infrastructure would continue to evolve to meet population growth, seismic threats, and climate risks, ensuring that resilience and response capacity would remain strong across all neighborhoods. Consistent with the findings of the FEIR, development of the proposed rezoning program would increase demand on SFFD resources gradually, and the department would continuously assess and address the need for additional facilities and services as the population grows.[21]

POLICE PROTECTION

The distribution of growth under the proposed rezoning program generally fall within the jurisdiction of existing district stations that already meet or exceed the citywide staffing and response benchmarks. Although existing stations could serve an increased number of officers, varying levels of investment may be needed for improvements at some existing stations in the future. Changes in policing techniques, priorities, and policies have also heavily influenced decisions on staffing levels. As addressed in the FEIR, the San Francisco Police Department evaluates district workload, response times, and geographic coverage when assessing capital and staffing needs. As with the adopted housing element, new housing enabled by the proposed rezoning program is expected to result in a modest increase in demand, potentially requiring personnel adjustments but not new station construction in the foreseeable future. Coordination with the department and the Office of Resilience and Capital Planning would ensure ongoing monitoring of the service alignment with residential patterns.[22]

---

[20] San Francisco Planning Department. Family Zoning Plan (Housing Element Rezoning Program): Infrastructure Memo, July 17, 2025, Record No.: 2021-005878CWP. *https://citypln-m-extnl.sfgov.org/Commissions/CPC/7_17_2025/Commission%20Packet/2021-005878CWP.pdf*. Accessed August 18, 2025.

[21] Ibid., pp. 13–14 in Attachment A.

[22] Ibid, p. 16 in Attachment A.

SCHOOLS

As with the adopted housing element, the proposed rezoning program is expected to generate modest population growth, including some increase in the number of families with school-aged children. Consistent with the FEIR analysis the San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD) currently has significant excess capacity in its K–12 public school system due to sustained declines in enrollment over the past several years, particularly following the COVID-19 pandemic. New housing in many neighborhoods under the proposed rezoning program may help stabilize or reverse declining student populations in local schools.

While SFUSD is not part of the city's capital planning process because the district operates under an independent governance structure and is not part of the city's financial and budgeting authority, city departments and SFUSD regularly coordinate on development trends, student generation forecasts, and long-range facilities planning to ensure that housing and school planning are aligned. As such, there is significant collaboration between SFUSD and the city in general.[23] The city and SFUSD will continue to share data and planning assumptions to coordinate decision-making. At this time, no new school construction projects or facility expansions are anticipated as a direct result of rezoning, and existing school capacity is expected to accommodate new demand within the current network of schools for the foreseeable future.[24]

LIBRARIES

New housing units introduced through the proposed rezoning program would be expected to incrementally increase the demand on public libraries, particularly in already well-served areas within well-resourced areas. However, the well-resourced areas already meet or exceed the citywide standard for library access (i.e., one large library branch per 25,000 to 50,000 people or one small branch that serves 10,000 to 15,000 people in a low-density area). Overall, existing number and distribution of libraries is well positioned to serve a significant additional population in the proposed rezoned area, with the majority of this area being within 1 mile of two or more libraries. The San Francisco Public Library Branch Library Improvement Program continues to prioritize seismic, Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), and capacity upgrades systemwide. Infill growth would be monitored through planning and building permit data and if significant population increases cluster in specific areas. The San Francisco Public Library may consider programmatic expansions (e.g., extended hours, programming) rather than capital-intensive new branches or branch expansion or reconstruction. According to San Francisco Public Library's service model, facility planning is largely focused on renovations and capacity upgrades rather than new branch construction or significant expansion.[25]

---

[23] Ibid., p. 17 in Attachment A.

[24] Ibid.

[25] Ibid., p. 16 in Attachment A.

SUMMARY

Under the adopted housing element, there would be an increase in housing production, with a shift in growth from the east side of the city to well-resourced areas along transit corridors and in low-density areas that are located primarily on the west side of the city. The proposed rezoning program would maintain a similar distribution but with the density spread more broadly across the well-resourced areas and limited areas adjacent to those, as shown in **Table 2**, p. 11, and **Table 3**, p. 19. That is, the proposed rezoning program would result in an increase in the allowable land use density and building heights along certain transit and commercial corridors (e.g., Geary Boulevard, Van Ness Avenue, Lombard Street, North Point Street, the western portion of Market Street, Ocean Avenue, Irving Street) and a reduction in the allowable land use density and building heights in certain residential areas adjacent to, but not immediately along, transit corridors (e.g., some areas adjacent to Geary Boulevard, Van Ness Avenue, Taraval Street, Judah Street). Overall, with incorporation of applicable mitigation measures similar to those identified in the FEIR and in this addendum, impacts associated with construction of the new or expanded public facilities (fire/emergency services, police, schools, libraries, and parks) required to accommodate anticipated future demand under the proposed rezoning program are anticipated to be less than significant with mitigation.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The FEIR determined that the adopted housing element, in combination with cumulative projects, would not result in a significant cumulative impact on public services. The new cumulative projects implemented subsequent to publication of the FEIR, the Great Highway Mobility Improvements Project and the Vision Zero Quick-Build program (see **Table 4**, p. 28), do not substantially alter the cumulative setting due to the nature of the cumulative projects (i.e., the creation of new open space and recreation facilities via traffic and roadway modifications and pedestrian and bicycle safety improvements in the right-of-way). Thus, the inclusion of the new cumulative projects would not alter the findings related to cumulative impacts on public services in the FEIR. Because the proposed rezoning program would not generate new impacts on public services that were not previously identified in the FEIR, and the new cumulative projects would not alter the FEIR's cumulative analysis, there would be no new significant cumulative impact on public services.

CONCLUSION

In summary, the proposed rezoning program would not result in new significant public services impacts that were not previously identified in the FEIR, nor would it result in more severe impacts than those previously identified. No new mitigation measures or changes to existing mitigation measures are required.

Biological Resources

FEIR FINDINGS

The potential biological resource impacts of the adopted housing element are analyzed under "Biological Resources" in Section 4.1, Effects Found Not to Be Significant, of the FEIR. The FEIR determined that the implementation of the adopted housing element would have less-than-significant impacts on biological resources.

The FEIR determined that future development associated with the adopted housing element would not affect any candidate, sensitive, or special-status species; riparian habitat; other sensitive natural communities; or federally protected wetlands, nor would it interfere with the movement of species. Specifically, the FEIR found that there would be potential for development under the adopted housing element to interact with the following resources: peregrine falcon, nesting birds, Townsend's big-eared bat, and western red bat. However, with respect to peregrine falcons, the FEIR found that, because falcons that nest in the city are acclimated to an already highly disturbed environment and heavy human disturbance, peregrine falcons would be able to continue to forage and nest on human-made structures. For nesting birds, compliance with existing state and federal regulations would ensure that future development consistent with the adopted housing element would have less-than-significant impacts on nesting birds, and no mitigation is required. For bats, required compliance with the open space element of the general plan, Chapter 8 of the San Francisco Environment Code, would avoid potential impacts.

The FEIR concluded that future development consistent with the adopted housing element would not be near riparian habitats, sensitive natural communities, or designated critical habitat areas. That is, future development consistent with the adopted housing element would be located on developed sites or urban infill sites without the riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). Similarly, development would not occur on sites close (i.e., within 100 feet) to state or federally protected wetlands, nor would it alter the course of a stream. In addition, all future development would be required to adhere to federal, state, and local regulations, as discussed above and in FEIR Impact BIO-1 and Impact HY-1. Therefore, compliance with policies and regulations would ensure that impacts from future actions consistent with the adopted housing element would be less than significant with respect to effects on riparian habitats, sensitive natural communities, and protected wetlands.

Lastly, for biological resources, the FEIR found that future development within the city consistent with the adopted housing element would abide by applicable regulations and obtain any necessary permits; therefore, it would not conflict with local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources.

PROPOSED REZONING PROGRAM IMPACTS

The approach to evaluating the proposed rezoning program is described above under "Analysis of Potential Environmental Effects," p. 32. The changes under the proposed rezoning program that would affect biological resources are addressed below.

An incremental increase in growth and a slightly different growth distribution under the proposed rezoning program could generate biological impacts if they were to result in future development near or in sensitive habitats (e.g., riparian habitats, sensitive natural communities, or designated critical habitat areas), as discussed in the FEIR. Although future development under the proposed rezoning would be more broadly distributed across the well-resourced areas and limited areas adjacent to

those compared to the adopted housing element, the development would continue to be limited to urban infill sites, as analyzed in the FEIR. Changes to growth distribution under the proposed rezoning program applicable to both species and habitats, as well as consistency with regulations, would not alter the FEIR's analysis regarding future projects and their being subject to plans, policies, ordinances, and regulations that protect biological resources.

Changes to building heights could result in new impacts on migratory species if they result in flight paths being obstructed, more bird strikes, or impacts on falcon nesting habitat. However, as discussed in the FEIR, future development under the proposed rezoning program would be subject to the same regulatory measures that are applicable to the identified species. This includes, as addressed in the Aesthetics section of the FEIR, planning code section 139, and the adopted Standards for Bird-Safe Buildings, in addition to all requirements noted above under "FEIR Findings" in this section.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The FEIR determined that the adopted housing element, in combination with cumulative projects, would not result in a significant cumulative impact on biological resources. The new cumulative projects implemented subsequent to publication of the FEIR, the Great Highway Mobility Improvements Project and the Vision Zero Quick-Build program (see **Table 4**, p. 28), do not substantially alter the cumulative setting due to the location of the cumulative projects compared to the proposed rezoned area and the nature of the cumulative projects (i.e., the creation of new open space and recreation facilities via traffic and roadway modifications and pedestrian and bicycle safety improvements in the right-of-way). Thus, the inclusion of the new cumulative projects would not alter the findings related to cumulative impacts on biological resources in the FEIR. Because the proposed rezoning program would not generate new biological resources impacts that were not previously identified in the FEIR, and the new cumulative projects would not alter the FEIR's cumulative analysis, there would be no new significant cumulative impact on biological resources.

CONCLUSION

In summary, the proposed rezoning program would not result in new significant biological resources impacts that were not previously identified in the FEIR, nor would it result in more severe impacts than those previously identified. No new mitigation measures or changes to existing mitigation measures are required.

Geology and Soils

FEIR FINDINGS

The potential geology and soil impacts of the adopted housing element are analyzed under "Geology and Soils" in Section 4.1, Effects Found Not to Be Significant, of the FEIR. The FEIR determined that implementation of the adopted housing element would result in less-than-significant impacts on geology and soils. With respect to earthquake-related impacts, the city is not within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone and does not cross any active faults. Future development resulting from the

adopted housing element would comply with state and local building regulations for seismic safety, ensuring compliance with the standards. With respect to soil erosion impacts, future development anticipated under the adopted housing element would occur in areas that are already built out and covered with impervious surfaces. Such development would comply with applicable regulations related to the prevention of soil erosion. With respect to unstable geologic units/soils or expansive soils, the FEIR concluded that the applicable regulations would ensure that people or structures would not be exposed to substantial adverse effects, including a risk of loss from rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic ground shaking, seismically related ground failure, landslides, unstable soil, or expansive soils.

PROPOSED REZONING PROGRAM IMPACTS

The approach to evaluating the proposed rezoning program is described above under "Analysis of Potential Environmental Effects," p. 32. The changes under the proposed rezoning program that would affect geology and soils are addressed below.

Although development under the proposed rezoning program could result in some taller buildings in some locations, as well as overall changes to the location of future growth, (with more development adjacent to well-resourced areas and transit corridors), there are no changes to the regulatory requirements surrounding individual building development. That is, as considered in the FEIR, development under the proposed rezoning program would be subject to the same policies and regulations detailed in the FEIR. Specifically, consistent with the state building code and Information Sheet S-05, Geotechnical Report Requirements, future development pursued under the proposed rezoning program would be required to conduct project-specific geotechnical site investigations. Pursuant to Administrative Bulletin 082, certain projects would also be subject to independent engineering design review by qualified engineering and geotechnical professionals and geologists, if appropriate, to review the geotechnical reports prepared for foundation design and construction. The required project-specific geotechnical review would consider foundation type (shallow or deep), foundation design, geotechnical and geological investigations, soil/foundation/structure interaction under static and seismic loading conditions, effects of dewatering and construction-related activities on the site and in the vicinity, and anticipated foundation or building settlement. In addition, for buildings greater than 240 feet in height, project sponsors may be required to contract qualified monitoring surveyors and instrumentation engineers to monitor the effects of settlement on the building and foundations for a period of 10 years after the issuance of the certificate of final completion and occupancy. Thus, development consistent with the proposed rezoning program, even new taller buildings in different locations, would comply with the state and local building codes and San Francisco's local building department implementing procedures to ensure building construction throughout the city is conducted with minimum life safety standards. would. Therefore, the impacts of development under the proposed rezoning program would continue to be less than significant for geology and soils.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The FEIR determined that the adopted housing element, in combination with cumulative projects, would not result in a significant cumulative impact on geology and soils. The new cumulative projects implemented subsequent to publication of the FEIR, the Great Highway Mobility Improvements Project and the Vision Zero Quick-Build program (see **Table 4**, p. 28), do not substantially alter the cumulative setting due to the nature of the cumulative projects (i.e., the creation of new open space and recreation facilities via traffic and roadway modifications and pedestrian and bicycle safety improvements in the right-of-way). Thus, the inclusion of the new cumulative projects would not alter the findings related to cumulative impacts on geology and soils in the FEIR. Because the proposed rezoning program would not generate new geology and soils impacts that were not previously identified in the FEIR, and the new cumulative projects would not alter the FEIR's cumulative analysis, there would be no new significant cumulative impact on geology and soils.

CONCLUSION

In summary, the proposed rezoning program would not result in new significant geology and soil impacts that were not previously identified in the FEIR, nor would it result in more severe impacts than those previously identified. No new mitigation measures or changes to existing mitigation measures are required.

Hydrology and Water Quality

FEIR FINDINGS

The potential hydrology and water quality impacts of the adopted housing element are analyzed under "Hydrology and Water Quality" in Section 4.1, Effects Found Not to Be Significant, of the FEIR. The FEIR determined that the implementation of the adopted housing element would result in less-than-significant impacts on hydrology and water quality. Specifically, because future development consistent with the adopted housing element would be served by the city's combined sewer system, wastewater treatment plant operators would comply with the water quality standards and waste discharge requirements specified in the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits for the city's wastewater treatment plants. In addition, stormwater runoff, construction site runoff, and construction dewatering discharges associated with future development consistent with the adopted housing element would be subject to water quality regulations designed to reduce the volume and pollutant load of stormwater and construction site wastewater in the city's combined system. Thus, the adopted housing element would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, or otherwise substantially degrade surface water or groundwater quality, by following the applicable water quality standards and regulations.

With respect to groundwater recharge, development under the adopted housing element could lead to an incremental increase in impervious surface coverage in areas of the city that could affect groundwater recharge (e.g., Westside Groundwater Basin and the Presidio). However, the FEIR

found that the changes in impervious surface coverage in these areas would be negligible relative to the total groundwater recharge areas of the groundwater basins. Therefore, future development consistent with the adopted housing element would not interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the proposed action would impede sustainable groundwater management.

The FEIR calculated that the proposed action would result in an increase of up to 5 percent in impervious surface coverage compared to the 2050 environmental baseline; however, stormwater runoff associated with this increase would not exceed the capacity of the city's stormwater collection and conveyance system. The FEIR concluded that future development would occur in a primarily built-out area and would not alter the course of streams or rivers, substantially increase stormwater runoff, or cause a capacity exceedance within stormwater drainage systems. For these reasons, development under the adopted housing element would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation onsite or offsite; substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner the would result in flooding onsite or offsite; create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or impede or redirect floodflows.

With respect to the release of pollutants from inundations due to flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, by shifting a greater portion of future growth away from low-lying areas near the bay on the east side of the city to transit corridors and well-resourced areas that are less vulnerable to water-related hazards, the FEIR found that development under the adopted housing element would reduce the risk from a release of pollutants due to these hazards relative to the 2050 environmental baseline. Therefore, the adopted housing element would not result in an increased risk from the release of pollutants due to inundation in flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones.

Lastly, the city does not require a groundwater management plan. Future development consistent with the adopted housing element would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan.

PROPOSED REZONING PROGRAM IMPACTS

The approach to evaluating the proposed rezoning program is described above under "Analysis of Potential Environmental Effects," p. 32. The changes under the proposed rezoning program that would affect hydrology and soils are addressed below.

Although development under the proposed rezoning program could result in some taller buildings in some locations, an incremental increase in overall units, and slightly different growth distribution with more development adjacent to well-resourced areas and transit corridors, there are no changes to the regulatory requirements surrounding individual building development related to hydrology and water quality. That is, as considered in the FEIR, development under the proposed rezoning program would be subject to the same policies and regulations detailed in the FEIR to reduce

impacts related to stormwater runoff from project construction and operation throughout the city. Namely, future development consistent with the proposed rezoning program would also be served by the city's combined sewer system, and wastewater treatment plant operators would comply with the water quality standards and waste discharge requirements specified in the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits for the city's wastewater treatment plants. In addition, stormwater runoff, construction site runoff, and construction dewatering discharges associated with future development consistent with the proposed rezoning program would be subject to water quality regulations designed to reduce the volume and pollutant load of stormwater and construction site wastewater in the city's combined system. Similarly, more concentrated development would not increase area exposure to hydrologic hazards, as discussed in the FEIR. The slight increase in projected growth under the proposed rezoning would not substantially increase impervious surfaces citywide as most new growth would consist of multifamily buildings, which means that additional housing units would be accommodated vertically rather than laterally and thus would not substantially increase impervious surface assumptions compared to the FEIR. Therefore, the FEIR's calculation of a 5 percent increase in new impervious surface area would still apply and the impacts of development under the proposed rezoning program would be less than significant for hydrology and water quality.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The FEIR determined that the adopted housing element, in combination with cumulative projects, would not result in a significant cumulative impact on hydrology and water quality. The new cumulative projects implemented subsequent to publication of the FEIR, the Great Highway Mobility Improvements Project and the Vision Zero Quick-Build program (see **Table 4**, p. 28), do not substantially alter the cumulative setting due to the location of the cumulative projects compared to the proposed rezoned area and the nature of the cumulative projects (i.e., the creation of new open space and recreation facilities via traffic and roadway modifications and pedestrian and bicycle safety improvements in the right-of-way). Thus, the inclusion of the new cumulative projects would not alter the findings related to cumulative impacts on hydrology and water quality in the FEIR. Because the proposed rezoning program would not generate new hydrology and water quality impacts that were not previously identified in the FEIR, and the new cumulative projects would not alter the FEIR's cumulative analysis, there would be no new significant cumulative impact on hydrology and water quality.

CONCLUSION

In summary, the proposed rezoning program would not result in new significant hydrology and water quality impacts that were not previously identified in the FEIR, nor would it result in more severe impacts than those previously identified. No new mitigation measures or changes to existing mitigation measures are required.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

FEIR FINDINGS

The potential impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials from the adopted housing element are analyzed under "Hazards and Hazardous Materials" in Section 4.1, Effects Found Not to Be Significant, of the FEIR. The FEIR determined that the implementation of the adopted housing element would result in less-than-significant impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials.

The FEIR determined that construction of future development would require the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials and hazardous wastes; however, hazardous materials uses associated with future development would adhere to applicable federal and state regulations. In addition, compliance with the city's Construction Site Runoff Control ordinance requires implementation of best practices to prevent contaminated runoff at construction sites. Construction on larger project sites require an erosion sediment control plan (ESCP) or a stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) would reduce or eliminate pollutants in stormwater as well as non-stormwater discharges. Moreover, hazardous materials used during operations would consist of commercial products that would be used in small or moderate amounts and would be cleaned up if releases occur.

Although numerous State Water Resources Control Board leaking underground storage tank (LUST) cleanup sites, cleanup program sites, military cleanup sites, Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) cleanup sites, and Cortese List[26] and Maher sites[27] exist throughout the city, the FEIR concluded that compliance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations would ensure that impacts associated with construction within contaminated media (from any of the listed hazardous materials site categories) would be less than significant. Similarly, adherence with existing regulations associated with hazardous waste disposal and demolition would also be required during construction and would reduce potential impacts to less than significant.

---

[26] The provisions in Government Code section 65962.5 are commonly referred to as the Cortese List. The list— specifically, a site's presence on the list—has bearing on the local permitting process as well as compliance with CEQA. The following sites fit the criteria of a Cortese List site:

- Hazardous waste and substances sites from the DTSC EnviroStor database
- LUST sites from the State Water Resources Control Board's GeoTracker database
- Solid waste disposal sites identified by the State Water Resources Control Board with waste constituents above hazardous waste levels outside the waste management unit
- Active "cease and desist orders" (CDO) and "cleanup and abatement orders"(CAO) from the State Water Resources Control Board
- Hazardous waste facilities subject to corrective action pursuant to section 25187.5 of the Health and Safety Code, as identified by DTSC.

[27] The Site Assessment and Mitigation Program (known as the Maher Program or Maher Ordinance), as authorized under article 22A of the San Francisco Health Code, applies to sites where there is potential to encounter hazardous materials, primarily industrial or formerly industrial zoning districts, sites with current or former industrial uses or USTs, sites with historic bay fill, and sites close to freeways. The Maher Ordinance, which is implemented by the San Francisco Department of Public Health, requires investigation and, if necessary, proper remediation of contaminated soils, groundwater, and soil vapors that are encountered in the building construction process. All projects in the city that disturb 50 cubic yards or more of soil on sites with potentially hazardous soil or groundwater are subject to this ordinance.

Universities, colleges, public schools, and private and charter schools are located throughout the city; thus, the FEIR concluded that construction of future development could occur within or immediately adjacent to hazardous material sites that are within a 0.25-mile radius of a school. As stated in the FEIR, compliance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations would ensure that impacts associated with the potential handling of hazardous materials near a school would be less than significant.

Lastly, the FEIR determined that development associated with the adopted housing element would not obstruct the implementation of the city's emergency response plan or interfere with emergency evacuation planning because future development would not include permanent road closures or other components that would physically impair or otherwise interfere with emergency access, response, or evacuation.

PROPOSED REZONING PROGRAM IMPACTS

The approach to evaluating the proposed rezoning program is described above under "Analysis of Potential Environmental Effects," p. 32. The changes under the proposed rezoning program that would affect hazards and hazardous materials are addressed below. The analysis generally follows a similar format as the FEIR: routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, results of reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions along with potential hazardous materials impacts associated with development on a Cortese site, hazardous emissions or the handling of hazardous materials near a school, and potential impacts to an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

The proposed rezoning program would change the distribution of where city population growth would occur compared to the FEIR. Additionally, the degree of growth would be similar, albeit slightly higher, compared to growth evaluated in the FEIR. As such, the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials and hazardous waste, both during construction and operations, would be similar to what was described in the FEIR; thus, the handling of hazardous materials and waste would adhere to applicable federal and state regulations. Similarly, a SWPPP would be implemented, as applicable, during construction to reduce or eliminate potential contaminant discharges, including those associated with hazardous materials use, into local waterways.

As mentioned, the FEIR considered LUST cleanup sites, cleanup program sites, military cleanup sites, DTSC cleanup sites, and Cortese List and Maher sites in all areas of the city. Because development under the proposed rezoning program would also occur throughout the city, the FEIR analysis related to potential impacts from the hazardous materials sites would also apply to this analysis. Whether as part of the FEIR study area or as part of the program elements being analyzed in this document, the city is an urban environment that contains numerous hazardous materials sites with a history of releases, thus housing development may require remediation of a site or multiple sites (under the direction and oversight of the appropriate agency and applicable programs) to required standards. Compliance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations associated with construction within contaminated media from onsite or nearby hazardous materials sites, along with regulations

pertaining to hazardous waste disposal and demolition, would reduce potential impacts associated with reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving hazardous material releases along with development within a documented Cortese site to less than significant. Compliance with applicable regulations would also ensure that impacts associated with hazardous materials handling near a school would be less than significant.

Similar to what was described in the FEIR analysis, future development under the proposed rezoning program would not include permanent road closures or other components that would physically impair or otherwise interfere with emergency access, response, or evacuation. Thus, potential impacts associated with interfering with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan would be less than significant.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The FEIR determined that the adopted housing element, in combination with cumulative projects, would not result in a significant cumulative impact on hazards. The new cumulative projects implemented subsequent to publication of the FEIR, the Great Highway Mobility Improvements Project and the Vision Zero Quick-Build program (see **Table 4**, p. 28), do not substantially alter the cumulative setting due to the location of the cumulative projects compared to the proposed rezoned area and the nature of the cumulative projects (i.e., the creation of new open space and recreation facilities via traffic and roadway modifications and pedestrian and bicycle safety improvements in the right-of-way). Thus, the inclusion of the new cumulative projects would not alter the findings related to cumulative impacts on hazards in the FEIR. Because the proposed rezoning program would not generate new hazards impacts that were not previously identified in the FEIR, and the new cumulative projects would not alter the FEIR's cumulative analysis, there would be no new significant cumulative impact on hazards.

CONCLUSION

In summary, the proposed rezoning program would not result in new significant hazards and hazardous materials impacts that were not previously identified in the FEIR, nor would it result in more severe impacts than those previously identified. No new mitigation measures or changes to existing mitigation measures are required.

Energy

FEIR FINDINGS

The potential energy impacts of the adopted housing element are analyzed under "Energy" in Section 4.1, Effects Found Not to Be Significant, of the FEIR. Future development associated with the adopted housing element would increase demand for energy resources in the city. However, temporary construction impacts would be less than significant with use of energy-efficient construction equipment. In addition, future development would be designed to adhere to current energy and efficiency standards and would not result in the wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during operations. The FEIR also concluded that future development consistent with the housing element

update would comply with energy and water efficiency standards and would not conflict with a plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. The FEIR determined that implementation of the housing element update would result in less-than-significant impacts on energy.

PROPOSED REZONING PROGRAM IMPACTS

The approach to evaluating the proposed rezoning program is described above under "Analysis of Potential Environmental Effects," p. 32. The changes under the proposed rezoning program that would affect energy are addressed below.

WASTEFUL, INEFFICIENT, OR UNNECESSARY CONSUMPTION OF ENERGY RESOURCES

As described in the FEIR, construction of future development consistent with the proposed rezoning program would result in a temporary increase in demand for energy resources. However, the increase in demand associated with construction of an additional 54,000 housing units under the proposed rezoning program over a period of approximately 30 years would be considered a small, temporary increase, occurring only during construction. The projected housing growth would not be constructed all at once but, rather, at an average rate of approximately 5,000 units per year through 2050, similar to the adopted housing element. This would be infill development in areas that are already served by existing energy infrastructure.[28] In addition, construction activities under future development consistent with proposed rezoning program would use the most energy-efficient construction equipment available at the time to meet state and local goals for criteria air pollutant and GHG emissions reductions. As such, construction activities associated with the proposed rezoning program would not result in the wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. Impacts would be less than significant, consistent with the adopted housing element.

Consistent with the adopted housing element, energy consumption associated with the operation of future development consistent with the proposed rezoning program would not include natural gas or propane due to the city's all-electric building ordinance requirements; rather, energy in the form of electricity would power the housing units. Diesel and gasoline would power vehicles. Electricity consumption resulting from future development consistent with the proposed rezoning program may be slightly higher than the approximately 696,350,000 kilowatt-hours (kWh) of electricity assumed under the adopted housing element for the operation of 50,000 housing units. In addition, as discussed above under "Transportation and Circulation," anticipated VMT per capita in San Francisco would be more than 15 percent below the regional average as a result of the proposed rezoning program, ensuring that the transportation-related consumption of gasoline and diesel fuel as a result of future development consistent with the proposed rezoning program would not be significant. Furthermore, future development consistent with the proposed rezoning program would be required to comply with all applicable city and state green building measures, including the California Green

[28] San Francisco Planning Department. Family Zoning Plan (Housing Element Rezoning Program): Infrastructure Memo, July 17, 2025, Record No.: 2021-005878CWP. *https://citypln-m-extnl.sfgov.org/Commissions/CPC/7_17_2025/Commission%20Packet/2021-005878CWP.pdf*. Accessed August 18, 2025.

Building Standards Code (CALGreen); the city's TDM program; electric-vehicle infrastructure requirements; and other energy and water efficiency standards, which are likely to become increasingly stringent over the coming years. Therefore, consistent with the adopted housing element, the proposed rezoning program would not result in the wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during operation. Impacts would be less than significant.

CONFLICT OR OBSTRUCT A STATE OR LOCAL RENEWABLE ENERGY OR ENERGY EFFICIENCY PLAN

Similar to the adopted housing element, future development under the proposed rezoning program would comply with Title 24 requirements, the San Francisco Green Building Code, and other energy and water efficiency standards in effect at the time that the future development is proposed. In addition, consistent with the FEIR, future development would be required to comply with the city's all-electric building code requirements, which applies to new buildings for which permits were filed after June 1, 2021.[29] Furthermore, future development under the proposed rezoning program would direct new housing to areas near transit infrastructure and transit corridors. Therefore, the proposed rezoning program would continue to result in less-than-significant impacts with regard to conflicts with or obstruction of a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency, consistent with the FEIR.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The FEIR determined that the adopted housing element, in combination with cumulative projects, would result in less-than-significant cumulative impacts related to energy. Consistent with the FEIR, it is anticipated that future development under the proposed rezoning program would become more energy efficient and less wasteful over time due to increasingly stringent regulations pertaining to renewable energy and energy efficiency, such as the 100 Percent Clean Energy Act of 2018 and the Pavley standards. Given this, and that future development would be infill projects in energy-efficient areas that are already served by existing energy infrastructure, it is likely that energy use on a per unit basis would decrease under the proposed rezoning program, similar to the adopted housing element. Furthermore, future development under the proposed rezoning program, like the adopted housing element, would be subject to energy and water efficiency standards in effect at the time the projects are proposed, as applicable. Therefore, consistent with the adopted housing element conclusions, the potential for future development under the proposed rezoning program to combine with other cumulative projects and create a significant cumulative impact related to energy would be less than significant.

CONCLUSION

In summary, the proposed rezoning program would not result in new significant energy impacts that were not previously identified in the FEIR, nor would it result in more severe impacts than those previously identified. No new mitigation measures or changes to existing mitigation measures are required.

---

[29] San Francisco Planning Department. Family Zoning Plan (Housing Element Rezoning Program): Infrastructure Memo, July 17, 2025, Record No.: 2021-005878CWP. *https://citypln-m-extnl.sfgov.org/Commissions/CPC/7_17_2025/Commission%20Packet/2021-005878CWP.pdf*. Accessed August 18, 2025.

Agricultural and Forest Resources, Mineral Resources, and Wildfire

FEIR FINDINGS

As discussed under "Not Applicable" in Section 4.1, Effects Found Not to Be Significant, of the FEIR, San Francisco does not contain any mineral resources that are of value on the state, regional, or local level. Furthermore, it does not contain prime farmland, other agricultural resources, or forest resources and is not located in a wildfire hazard zone. Therefore, mineral resources, agricultural and forest resources, and wildfire were not discussed further in the FEIR and are not applicable to the proposed action.

PROPOSED REZONING PROGRAM IMPACTS

There are no changes to the environmental setting or regulatory setting that would alter conditions relative to agricultural or forest resources, mineral resources, or wildfire. Therefore, consistent with the FEIR findings, agricultural resources, forestry and mineral resources, or wildfire are not applicable to the proposed rezoning program, and no mitigation measures are required.

CONCLUSION

In summary, agricultural and forest resources, mineral resources, or wildfire are not applicable to the proposed rezoning program. There would be no impacts in these topic areas.

Cultural Resources

FEIR FINDINGS

The potential cultural resources impacts of the adopted housing element are analyzed in Section 4.2, Cultural Resources, of the FEIR. At a program-level, the FEIR determined that implementation of the adopted housing element would lead to a significant and unavoidable impact with mitigation for built-environment cultural resources[30] (Impact CR-1: The proposed action would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to section 15064.5.). In addition, the FEIR determined that implementation would lead to significant impacts (Impact CR-2 [the proposed action has the potential to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource pursuant to section 15064.5] and Impact CR-3 [the proposed action has the potential to disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries]). Both impacts were determined to be less than significant with mitigation.

BUILT-ENVIRONMENT CULTURAL RESOURCES

Future development consistent with adopted housing element would have the potential to result in the demolition or alteration of historic resources in an adverse manner. Therefore, it is reasonable to anticipate that future development consistent with the adopted housing element would materially impair

[30] *Cultural resources* can be classified as built-environment resources, archeological resources, or human remains. *Built-environment resources* generally refer to above-ground constructed and landscape features that support an understanding of human history through historical, social, cultural, aesthetic/design, or construction qualities.

and diminish the significance of individual historic resources and historic districts, including previously known and yet-to-be-identified resources. Preservation-oriented policies in the adopted housing element would not prevent future development from demolishing or adversely altering significant built-environment resources—specifically, in those neighborhoods with a greater share of future housing compared to the 2050 environmental baseline. As a result, impacts of future development consistent with the adopted housing element on built-environment resources would be significant.

The FEIR included Mitigation Measures M-CR-1a through M-CR-1l (12 sub-measures). These measures present a range of possible mitigation measures that may be deemed suitable in reducing but not necessarily mitigating to less than significant the impacts of future projects consistent with the adopted housing element. Not all measures would be required for an individual project. During project-level environmental review for future projects, if applicable, the department would assess an individual project's impact. If a project's impact would be less than significant, no mitigation would be required. If a project's impact would be significant, the department would determine which aspects of Mitigation Measures M-CR-1a through M-CR-1l would be appropriate to implement, given the specific characteristics of the project and the affected resource.

The mitigation measures would partially compensate for impacts associated with future development consistent with the adopted housing element through feasible design changes, avoidance, preservation, relocation, comprehensive documentation, and memorialization of the affected resource. In some cases, one of the measures or a combination of measures may reduce the impact to less than significant. However, these measures may not fully avoid, rectify, reduce, or compensate for the loss of built-environment historic resources. Because demolition of built-environment historic resources or alteration in an adverse manner could still occur, the impact would be significant and unavoidable with mitigation.

ARCHEOLOGICAL CULTURAL RESOURCES AND HUMAN REMAINS

Soil disturbance associated with the construction of future development consistent with the adopted housing element has the potential to disturb and destroy archeological resources and human remains. The loss of significant historical, scientific, and cultural information about California, the region, and San Francisco would be a significant impact. Archeological sensitivity varies geographically throughout the city. Archeological sensitivity varies by location. The density of development as well as the volume and depth of soil excavation at a particular project site affects the potential for archeological resource impacts. Table 4.2-9 in the FEIR identified the relative potential impact on archeological resources under the adopted housing element by planning district.

The FEIR included Mitigation Measures M-CR-2a through M-CR-2d and M-TCR-1 for archeological cultural resources. The four sub-mitigation measures (a–d) are designed to mitigate impacts on archeological resources to less than significant through a range of avoidance, testing, documentation, and monitoring measures. M-TCR-1 requires tribal notification and consultation for projects identified by the department as affecting Native American archeological resources, which are considered potential tribal cultural resources, to reduce impacts on archeological tribal cultural resources to less than significant.

Not all measures would be required for an individual project. During project-level environmental review for future projects, as applicable, the department would assess an individual project's impact. If a project's impact would be less than significant, no mitigation would be required. If a project's impact would be significant, the department would determine which aspects of Mitigation Measures M-CR-2a through M-CR-2d and M-TCR-1 would be appropriate to implement, given the specific characteristics of the project and the affected resource.

PROPOSED REZONING PROGRAM IMPACTS

The approach to evaluating the proposed rezoning program is described above under "Analysis of Potential Environmental Effects," p. 32. The changes under the proposed rezoning program that would affect cultural resources are addressed below.

BUILT-ENVIRONMENT HISTORIC RESOURCES

Housing development throughout the city has the potential to affect areas with known and as yet unidentified built-environment historic resources, depending on the location. Although housing distribution would be different under the proposed rezoning program, the differences in housing distribution would not change the impact on built-environment cultural resources identified in the FEIR. Building heights may affect the setting of built-environment historical resources. Where new housing construction could occur within the vicinity of known individual resources, it is possible that new construction could materially impair the significance of a resource by removing or altering important features of that resource's historic setting or carrying out construction activities that damage historically or architecturally significant features of adjacent historic resources. The construction of new buildings with heights ranging from 40 to 500 feet, with two limited areas up to 650 feet, rather than 55 to 300 feet could result in significant and unavoidable impacts with mitigation related to built-environment cultural resources.

Specifically addressing the impacts of vibration during construction, according to the FEIR, groundborne vibration from the use of heavy equipment during construction of individual projects would result in a significant impact to built-environment historic resources because equipment would be used in proximity to historic buildings, vibration-sensitive structures, and buildings containing vibration-sensitive equipment. Implementation of Mitigation Measures M-NO-3a and M-NO-3b would reduce impacts from vibration through vibration protection measures and vibration monitoring as well as measures to prevent interference with sensitive equipment. This impact would be less than significant with mitigation. Even though the heights proposed by the rezoning are greater in some limited areas, the significance of the impact due to vibration would not substantially increase under the proposed rezoning program compared to the FEIR because the same methods for mitigating vibration effects would be available.

Similar to the adopted housing element, the proposed rezoning program would result in significant and unavoidable impacts with mitigation related to built-environment historic resources due to the potential for material impairment or demolition of known and not yet known built-environment historic resources. Previously developed mitigation measures would continue to apply.

ARCHEOLOGICAL RESOURCES AND HUMAN REMAINS

Sensitivity for archeological cultural resources varies by both geography and project element. Areas identified as sensitive for archeological cultural resources identified in the FEIR (refer to Tables 4.2-8 and 4.2-9 in the FEIR) would be affected by the adopted housing element. Because of the differences in housing distribution and proposed heights between the FEIR and proposed rezoning program, the proposed rezoning program would affect discreet but different project locations compared to the adopted housing element's program-level effect. However, the effects would be similar in nature so the differences would not affect the impact conclusions or mitigation measures identified in the FEIR. Implementation of Mitigation Measures M-CR-2a through M-CR-2d, as applicable, and M-TCR-1 for archeological cultural resources would reduce impacts. Those impacts were determined to be less than significant with mitigation.

For the consideration of archeological cultural resources, building heights can relate to the depth of the impact. Generally, taller buildings require deeper foundations and/or use of soil improvement measures to ensure stability and support the increased load. The depth of excavation is influenced by factors such as soil type and properties, load-bearing capacity, and environmental conditions. For high-rise buildings, pile or pier foundations are often used. These involve driving or drilling deep load-bearing elements into the soil. The depth of these piles or piers is determined by the building's height and the soil's properties. The sensitivity for buried archeological cultural resources varies throughout San Francisco, including submerged resources in the vicinity of the bay.

As with the adopted housing element, if human remains are encountered during soil disturbance associated with the proposed rezoning program, the treatment of human remains must comply with the provisions of state laws and codes, which identify protocols to be followed upon discovery of human remains (Public Resources Code section 5097.98 and Health and Safety Code section 7050.5). Previously developed mitigation measures, as applicable, would continue to apply. Those impacts were determined to be less than significant with mitigation.

For the reasons above, the proposed rezoning program would not have new or substantially greater environmental impacts on archeological resources and human remains, and new mitigation measures are not required.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The FEIR determined that the adopted housing element, in combination with cumulative projects, would result in a significant and unavoidable cumulative impact related to built-environment historical resources even with implementation of Mitigation Measures M-CR-1a through M-CR-1l. The new cumulative projects implemented subssquent to publication of the FEIR, the Great Highway Mobility Improvements Project and the Vision Zero Quick-Build program (see **Table 4**, p. 28), do not substantially alter the cumulative setting due to the location of the cumulative projects compared to the proposed rezoned area and the nature of the cumulative projects (i.e., the creation of new open space and recreation facilities via traffic and roadway modifications and pedestrian and bicycle safety improvements in the right-of-way). Thus, the inclusion of the new cumulative projects would not alter

the findings related to cumulative impacts on historical resources in the FEIR. Because the proposed rezoning program would not generate new impacts related to historical resources that were not previously identified in the FEIR, and the new cumulative projects would not alter the FEIR's cumulative analysis, there would be no new significant cumulative impact related to historical resources.

The FEIR determined that the adopted housing element, in combination with cumulative projects, would result in a significant cumulative impact related to archeological resources and human remains but that the impact would be reduced to less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures M-CR-2a through M-CR-2d and M-TCR-1. The new cumulative projects implemented subsequent to publication of the FEIR, the Great Highway Mobility Improvements Project and the Vision Zero Quick-Build program (see **Table 4**, p. 28), do not substantially alter the cumulative setting due to the location of the cumulative projects compared to the proposed rezoned area and the nature of the cumulative projects (i.e., the creation of new open space and recreation facilities via traffic and roadway modifications and pedestrian and bicycle safety improvements in the right-of-way). Thus, the inclusion of the new cumulative projects would not alter the findings related to cumulative impacts on archeological resources and human remains in the FEIR. Because the proposed rezoning program would not generate new impacts related to archeological resources and human remains that were not previously identified in the FEIR, and the new cumulative projects would not alter the FEIR's cumulative analysis, there would be no new significant cumulative impact related to archeological resources and human remains.

CONCLUSION

In summary, the proposed rezoning program would not result in new significant cultural resources impacts that were not previously identified in the FEIR, nor would it result in more severe impacts than those previously identified. No new mitigation measures or changes to existing mitigation measures are required.

Tribal Cultural Resources

FEIR FINDINGS

Section 4.3 of the FEIR, Tribal Cultural Resources, provides an evaluation of the proposed action's impacts on tribal cultural resources. The FEIR determined that the project area was highly sensitivity for precolonial tribal cultural resources and that the project could affect such resources during excavation (Impact TCR-1 [the proposed action would result in a substantial adverse change to an archeological tribal cultural resource] and Impact TCR-2 [the proposed action would result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of a non-archeological tribal cultural resource]). The FEIR also determined that impacts TCR-1 and TCR-2 would be less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures M-CR-2a–d and M-TCR-1.

The FEIR, on pp. 4.3-13 and 4.3-14, summarized a tribal outreach and consultation program conducted by the department in 2021 for the EIR that built on previous consultations performed in 2015 under CEQA section 21080.3.1. During these consultations between the department and local tribes, it was

determined that all archeological sites and human remains of Native American origin in San Francisco are potential tribal cultural resources. Native American representatives also noted the importance of historical water sources, such as areas in the vicinity of creeks, streams, and historical shoreline zones. These are culturally important to the Ohlone and have the potential to contain tribal cultural resources and possess symbolic cultural value. Based on Native American consultation, the following locations are identified as culturally important to local Ohlone and, therefore, determined to be potential tribal cultural resources:

- Locations modeled as having high sensitivity for Native American archeological resources
- The shoreline and marsh zones associated with natural environmental changes over the period between about 8,000 years ago and 170 years ago, including areas modeled as having high sensitivity for archeological resources that were submerged by the rising bay
- Known historic locations of creek channels, ponds, marshes, and other wetlands
- The modern San Francisco Bay and ocean shoreline as well as the shores of remnant creek channels, lakes, and ponds that are characterized by aboveground water today

As noted above, all Native American archeological resources in San Francisco are presumed to be potential tribal cultural resources. Construction activities associated with future development consistent with the adopted housing element have the potential to disturb or destroy both documented and previously undocumented Native American archeological resources. This would constitute a significant impact on archeological tribal cultural resources (Impact TCR-1). Because the locations identified above have also been identified as potential sites of symbolic cultural value, construction activities associated with the adopted housing element have the potential to disturb or destroy non-archeological tribal cultural resources. This would constitute a significant impact on non-archeological tribal cultural resources (Impact TCR-2).

The FEIR presented Mitigation Measures M-CR-2a–d and M-TCR-1. The four sub-mitigation measures (a–d) are designed to mitigate impacts on archeological tribal cultural resources to less than significant through a range of avoidance, testing, data collection, education, documentation, and monitoring measures. Mitigation measure M-TCR-1 requires tribal notification and consultation for projects identified by the department as affecting Native American archeological resources to reduce impacts on non-archeological tribal cultural resources to less than significant.

Not all measures would be required for an individual project. During project-level environmental review for future projects, as applicable, the department would assess an individual project's impact. If a project's impact would be less than significant, no mitigation would be required. If a project's impact would be significant, the department would determine which aspects of Mitigation Measures M-CR-2a–d and M-TCR-1 would be appropriate to implement, given the specific characteristics of the project and the affected resource.

PROPOSED REZONING PROGRAM IMPACTS

The approach to evaluating the proposed rezoning program is described above under "Analysis of Potential Environmental Effects," p. 32. The changes under the proposed rezoning program that would affect tribal cultural resources are addressed below.

The department sent out a notification concerning the proposed rezoning program to local Native American tribal representatives on February 29, 2024. Three tribal groups responded to the notification and the department is consulting with these tribal groups on implementation of tribal notification and tribal cultural resources measures for future development under the adopted housing element. Local Native American tribal groups did not identify new potential tribal cultural resources or an increased impact to tribal cultural resources as part of this consultation. Consultation has focused on coordination and implementation of FEIR mitigation measures.

Housing development throughout the city has the potential to affect areas with sensitivity for tribal cultural resources, depending on the location and sensitivity of the area. The proposed rezoning program would result in an incremental increase in overall units and a slightly different growth distribution compared to the adopted housing element. Under the proposed rezoning program, more growth would occur in well-resourced areas in the Downtown, Marina, Mission, Northeast, and Western Addition planning districts compared to the rezoning analysis assumptions in the FEIR, which projected that growth would be heavily concentrated in the Inner Sunset, Outer Sunset, and Richmond planning districts. These differences would not change the impact on tribal cultural resources identified in the FEIR. The impacts of the adopted housing element on areas identified as sensitive for tribal cultural resources, as identified in the FEIR and mapped in Figure 4.3-1, were determined to be less than significant with mitigation.

Building heights relate to the depth of the impact due to the types of foundations that support taller structures. Generally, taller buildings require deeper foundations to ensure stability and support the increased load. The depth of excavation is influenced by factors such as soil type and properties, load-bearing capacity, and environmental conditions. For high-rise buildings, pile or pier foundations are often used. These involve drilling or driving deep load-bearing elements into the soil. The depth of these piles or piers is determined by the building's height and the soil's properties. As discussed above, tribal representatives have identified the past and modern San Francisco shoreline; the historical corridors of creek networks, ponds, marshes, and other wetland locations; and modern locations of aboveground remnants of creeks and natural ponds and their associated shorelines as highly sensitive for the presence of tribal cultural resources. Additionally, as discussed above, all Native American archeological sites are also considered to be potential tribal cultural resources. The sensitivity for buried tribal cultural resources varies throughout San Francisco, including the potential for submerged tribal cultural resources within the vicinity of the bay.

The proposed rezoning program would affect discreet but different project locations compared to the adopted housing element's program-level effect. However, the differences in the distribution of development as well as higher building heights between the FEIR and proposed rezoning program

would not change the nature of the impact on archeological or other buried tribal cultural resources identified in the FEIR. Areas identified as sensitive for tribal cultural resources, as identified in the FEIR (refer to Table 4.2-9 in the FEIR), would be affected by the adopted housing element. Those impacts were determined to be less than significant with mitigation. Previously developed mitigation measures would continue to apply.

The proposed rezoning program would not have any new or substantially more severe environmental impacts on tribal cultural resources, and new mitigation measures are not required.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The FEIR determined that the adopted housing element, in combination with cumulative projects, would result in a significant cumulative impact related to tribal cultural resources but that the impact would be reduced to less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures M-CR-2a–d and M-TCR-1. The new cumulative projects implemented subsequent to publication of the FEIR, the Great Highway Mobility Improvements Project and the Vision Zero Quick-Build program (see **Table 4**, p. 28), do not substantially alter the cumulative setting due to the location of the cumulative projects compared to the proposed rezoned area and the nature of the cumulative projects (i.e., the creation of new open space and recreation facilities via traffic and roadway modifications and pedestrian and bicycle safety improvements in the right-of-way). Thus, the inclusion of the new cumulative projects would not alter the findings related to cumulative impacts on tribal cultural resources in the FEIR. Because the proposed rezoning program would not generate new impacts related to tribal cultural resources that were not previously identified in the FEIR, and the new cumulative projects would not alter the FEIR's cumulative analysis, there would be no new significant cumulative impact related to tribal cultural resources.

CONCLUSION

In summary, the proposed rezoning program would not result in new significant tribal cultural resources impacts that were not previously identified in the FEIR, nor would it result in more severe impacts than those previously identified. No new mitigation measures or changes to existing mitigation measures are required.

Transportation and Circulation

FEIR FINDINGS

The potential transportation and circulation impacts of the adopted housing element are analyzed in Section 4.4, Transportation and Circulation, of the FEIR. The FEIR identified less-than-significant impacts related to potentially hazardous conditions, accessibility, vehicle miles traveled (VMT), and parking. Mitigation measures were not required. The FEIR identified significant impacts related to construction, transit delay, and loading; mitigation measures were identified for transit delay and loading impacts and no feasible mitigation was identified for construction impacts. Even with implementation of the mitigation measures (i.e., Mitigation Measures M-TR-4a through M-TR-4d and M-TR-6), impacts related to transit delay and loading would remain significant and unavoidable. The FEIR

also identified construction-related transportation impacts as significant and unavoidable. The FEIR noted that the identification of significant travel delay, loading, and construction-related transportation impacts would not preclude finding less-than-significant or less-than-significant-with-mitigation impacts for future residential development projects consistent with the adopted housing element, based on the circumstances of such future development.

PROPOSED REZONING PROGRAM IMPACTS

The approach to evaluating the proposed rezoning program is described above under "Analysis of Potential Environmental Effects," p. 32. The changes under the proposed rezoning program that would affect transportation and circulation are addressed below.

As shown in **Table 3**, p. 19, the proposed rezoning program would result in an incremental increase in overall units and a slightly different growth distribution compared to the adopted housing element. The number of daily and peak-hour person trips generated by the approximately 54,000 units[31] under the proposed rezoning program would also be incrementally higher than the number of daily and peak-hour person trips generated under the adopted housing element. However, because growth under the proposed rezoning program would be more concentrated in the Downtown, Marina, Mission, Northeast, and Western Addition planning districts and would not shift as much future residential development to the west side of the city (e.g., Inner Sunset, Outer Sunset, and Richmond planning districts) as under the adopted housing element, there would be some shifts between ways of travel. The Downtown, Marina, Mission, Northeast, and Western Addition planning districts have a denser land use pattern and a greater concentration of commercial land uses than the west side; therefore, under the proposed rezoning program, more trips would rely on walking or taxis/transportation network company (TNC) vehicles and fewer trips would be in private automobiles compared to the adopted housing element. However, the overall number of vehicle trips under the proposed rezoning program is likely to be slightly more to that of the adopted housing element.

CONSTRUCTION

Like the adopted housing element, most individual development projects consistent with the proposed rezoning program would not result in significant construction-related transportation impacts, given their anticipated construction duration and intensity (e.g., most likely less than two years) and the city regulations and orders governing safety and access in and around construction sites. However, similar to the adopted housing element, given the potential magnitude of future development consistent with the proposed rezoning program and the uncertainty concerning construction schedules, construction activities associated with multiple overlapping projects could substantially delay transit or result in potentially hazardous conditions.

---

[31] Changes in housing units under the adopted housing element and proposed rezoning program are from the 2050 environmental baseline conditions. The FEIR used a future 2050 environmental baseline for the analysis of impacts associated with the adopted housing element.

The proposed rezoning program would result in an incremental increase in overall units and a slightly different growth distribution compared to the adopted housing element. Under the proposed rezoning program, more growth would occur in well-resourced areas in the Downtown, Marina, Mission, Northeast, and Western Addition planning districts compared to the rezoning analysis assumptions in the FEIR, which projected that growth would be heavily concentrated in the Inner Sunset, Outer Sunset, and Richmond planning districts. An incremental increase in the overall units and a slightly different growth distribution under the proposed rezoning program compared to the adopted housing element would not substantially increase the severity of the construction-related transportation impacts identified in the FEIR due to the localized nature of construction impacts; rather, the same types of impacts would occur in different locations in the city. No feasible mitigation measures for construction-related transportation impacts were identified in the FEIR for the adopted housing program. Therefore, consistent with the adopted housing element, the construction-related transportation impacts of future residential development consistent with the proposed rezoning action would be significant and unavoidable.

POTENTIALLY HAZARDOUS CONDITIONS AND ACCESSIBILITY

Consistent with the adopted housing element, the proposed rezoning program would not include street network changes. Any changes to the street network proposed as part of future development consistent with the proposed rezoning program would conform with city design standards and undergo review by city agencies. In addition, transportation features (e.g., curb cuts, sidewalk widening, changes to on-street parking regulations) would not change emergency access compared to 2050 environmental baseline conditions. Therefore, consistent with the adopted housing element, the proposed rezoning program would have less-than-significant impacts related to potentially hazardous conditions and accessibility, and no mitigation measures are required.

PUBLIC TRANSIT DELAY

The analysis provided in this section is based on the supporting information related to transit delay prepared by Fehr & Peers and LCW Consulting in support of the proposed rezoning program; it is included in Appendix B of this addendum.

Modified Transit Delay Methodology. Transit delay impacts of the adopted housing element were measured in terms of increases in weekday a.m. and p.m. peak-hour transit travel times for seven study corridors. The routes analyzed included seven representative bus routes (14 Mission, 14R Mission Rapid, 19 Polk, 28 19th Avenue, 28R 19th Avenue Rapid, 38 Geary, 38R Geary Rapid) and three representative light rail lines (K Ingleside, N Judah, and T Third) that run along the study corridors. As stated previously, housing units in the city would slightly increase and would be distributed somewhat differently under the proposed rezoning program compared to the adopted housing element. Therefore, the transit delay assessment for the proposed rezoning program analyzed seven of the 10 San Francisco Municipal Railway (Muni) bus routes/light rail lines on the seven study corridors in terms

of changes in transit travel times from those developed for the adopted housing element.[32] In addition, for the proposed rezoning program, three additional bus routes (7 Haight-Noriega route along Haight Street, the section of the 28 19th Avenue route along Lombard and North Point streets, and the 58 Lake Merced along Brotherhood Way) are included in the transit delay analysis to capture areas with a greater increase in housing units compared to the 2050 environmental baseline condition analyzed for the adopted housing element.

To determine the potential change in transit delay compared to the housing element, the proposed rezoning program analysis implements a ratio method approach. This approach is based on the change in housing units along the corridor[33] relative to the 2050 environmental baseline condition that was then applied to scale the transit delay calculated for the adopted housing element. A ratio of the delay increase per housing unit was calculated for each Muni route and used to determine the likely transit delay for the proposed rezoning program. The same thresholds of significance used in the transit delay analysis for the adopted housing element were used for the proposed rezoning program.

The 28 19th Avenue on Park Presidio Boulevard, Crossover Drive and 19th Avenue (analyzed in the FEIR) was selected as representative of transit operations and delay on the 28 19th Avenue route along Lombard and North Point streets. The segments were determined to be comparable because:

- It is the same transit route;
- Both segments include major arterials and highways (i.e., State Route 1 and U.S. 101) with multiple traffic lanes in each direction; and
- The population density[34] on both segments are generally similar.

The northern portion of the 19 Polk bus route[35] (i.e., north of Market Street) evaluated was selected as representative of transit operations and delay for the 7 Haight-Noriega route between Stanyan and Webster streets. The route was determined comparable because:

- Both routes travel within mixed-traffic lanes through commercial corridors that have one traffic lane in each direction;

---

[32] The 14 Mission and 14R Mission Rapid bus routes on the Mission Corridor and the T Third Street light rail line on the Third Street Corridor were not included in the analysis because the proposed rezoning program would not substantially change the number of housing units from that analyzed in the South Central or South Bayshore planning districts for the adopted housing element.

[33] A catchment area was defined for each corridor, comprising all transportation analysis zones that intersected a 0.25-mile buffer from the corridor.

[34] According to the American Community Survey (ACS) 2021 data, the census blocks groups immediately adjacent to the 19th Avenue corridor total to an average density of 20,000 persons per square mile, while the census block groups immediately adjacent to the Lombard and North Point corridor total to an average density of 19,000 persons per square mile.

[35] For the 19 Polk route, the transit delay calculated for the Plan Bay Area 2050 analysis (see EIR Chapter 6, Section E) was used for the proposed rezoning program because the Plan Bay Area 2050 analysis of housing unit growth along the 19 Polk route is more comparable to the proposed rezoning program.

- Both routes run parallel to major arterials (e.g., Van Ness Avenue for the 19 Polk route and Fell and Oak streets for the 7 Haight-Noriega bus route); and
- The population density[36] along both routes are generally similar.

The adopted housing element transit delay analyses for these comparable routes were then used as a basis for the ratio method approach.

For the 58 Lake Merced bus route along Brotherhood Way, a qualitative assessment rather than a quantitative analysis of transit travel time changes was deemed appropriate because none of the study corridors analyzed for the adopted housing element are comparable to conditions along Brotherhood Way (e.g., longer distances between signalized intersections along Brotherhood Way, limited land uses with direct access to Brotherhood Way, 30-minute headways on the 58 Lake Merced bus route, limited (three) bus stops over the 3,900 feet between Lake Merced Boulevard and the Junipero Serra Boulevard ramps, and higher speed limit of 45 miles per hour[37] (between Lake Merced Boulevard and Chumasero Drive). The qualitative assessment considered the location of housing unit increases within the Ingleside planning district, level of travel activity, roadways used to access future development consistent with the proposed rezoning program, and proximity of transit routes to the zones[38] where the proposed rezoning program would increase housing units relative to the adopted housing element. The department's screening criterion for the types of development projects that would typically not result in significant transit delay impacts was also considered in the qualitative assessment.[39]

Quantitative Transit Delay Analysis. Compared to the 2050 environmental baseline, the proposed rezoning program would result in approximately 54,000 housing units in the city (approximately 4,000 more housing units than the adopted housing element. As shown in **Table 3**, p. 19, and **Figure 2**, p. 20, the incremental increase in overall housing units would be distributed slightly different under the proposed rezoning program compared to the adopted housing element (e.g., fewer housing units than the adopted housing element in the Inner Sunset, Outer Sunset, and Richmond planning districts and incrementally more housing units in the Downtown, Marina, Mission, Northeast, and Western Addition planning districts).

---

36 According to the ACS 2021 data, the census block groups immediately adjacent to the Polk Street corridor total to an average density of 54,000 persons per square mile, while the census block groups immediately adjacent to the Haight Street corridor total to an average density of 45,0000 persons per square mile.

37 The speed limit on Brotherhood Way is 25 mph when children are present.

38 Planners use transportation analysis zones (TAZs, or zones) as part of transportation planning models for transportation analyses and other planning purposes. The zones vary in size from single city blocks in the downtown core to multiple blocks in outer neighborhoods or even larger in historically industrial areas such as the Hunters Point Shipyard area.

39 San Francisco Planning Department, Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines, *https://files.sfplanning.org/documents/environmental/Transportation_Impact_Analysis_Guidelines-October2019.pdf*. Appendix I describes the transit delay screening criteria.

Table 5 presents the:

- Change in transit travel times between the 2050 environmental baseline and the adopted housing element;
- Change in transit travel times between the 2050 environmental baseline and the proposed rezoning program on the study corridor bus routes and light rail lines for the a.m. and p.m. peak hours; and
- Comparison of the change in transit travel times between the adopted housing element and the proposed rezoning action.

Table 6, p. 74, presents this information for the Geary and the 19th Avenue corridors.

As shown in **Table 5**, compared to the adopted housing element, the proposed rezoning program would increase a.m. and p.m. peak-hour transit travel times on the 7 Haight-Noriega, 19 Polk, 28 19th Avenue (north segment), 38 Geary, and 38R Geary Rapid and decrease a.m. and p.m. peak-hour transit travel times on the 28 19th Avenue (west segment) and 28R 19th Avenue Rapid bus routes and the K Ingleside and N Judah light rail lines. Similar to the adopted housing element, under the proposed rezoning program, the 38R Geary Rapid route would exceed the threshold of significance in both the inbound and outbound directions during both peak hours. In addition, because the proposed rezoning program projects more housing units in the Northeast and Downtown planning districts compared to the adopted housing element, the proposed rezoning program would result in greater increases in the number of vehicle trips and delay for transit along the Polk-Potrero Hill corridor. Furthermore, the 19 Polk route would exceed the threshold of significance in the outbound direction (i.e., toward Hunters Point) during the a.m. peak hour and both directions during the p.m. peak hour.

As shown in **Table 6**, p. 74, similar to the adopted housing element, the corridor analysis of the 38 Geary and 38R Geary Rapid bus routes combined shows that the corridor would exceed the corridor threshold of significance for the proposed rezoning action during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours. However, under the proposed rezoning program, the 19th Avenue study corridor (i.e., the 28 19th Avenue [west] and 28R 19th Avenue Rapid bus routes combined) would not exceed the corridor threshold of significance during the p.m. peak hour (i.e., transit travel times would decrease under the proposed rezoning action compared to the adopted housing element). Thus, consistent with the adopted housing element, the proposed rezoning program could result in substantial transit delay impacts on certain study corridors while significance criteria would not be exceeded on other corridors.

Table 5: Muni Transit Travel Times by Route for Weekday A.M. and P.M. Peak Hours for 2050 Conditions

Muni Route/Line[a]	Threshold of Significance[b] (min:sec)	Adopted Housing Element Travel Time Change from 2050 Baseline (min:sec)		Proposed Rezoning Program Travel Time Change from 2050 Baseline (min:sec)		Travel Time Change between Adopted Housing Element and Proposed Rezoning Program (min:sec)	
		Inbound	Outbound	Inbound	Outbound	Inbound	Outbound
A.M. Peak Hour							
7 Haight-Noriega[c]	3:45	0:48	0:45	1:32	1:28	0:44	0:42
19 Polk[d]	4:00	0:33	0:45	3:57	**4:22**	3:24	3:37
28 19th Avenue – west[e]	4:00	1:28	1:21	0:55	0:51	-0:32	-0:30
28 19th Avenue – north[e]	4:00	0:16	0:15	0:37	0:34	0:21	0:19
28R 19th Avenue Rapid[e]	4:00	1:04	1:11	0:40	0:45	-0:24	-0:26
38 Geary[f]	2:45	2:04	1:49	2:31	2:13	0:27	0:24
38R Geary Rapid[f]	1:20	**2:41**	**1:45**	**3:17**	**2:07**	0:35	0:23
K Ingleside[g]	4:00	0:20	0:20	0:17	0:17	-0:02	-0:02
N Judah[h]	2:45	0:33	0:18	0:21	0:11	-0:12	-0:07
P.M. Peak Hour							
7 Haight-Noriega[c]	3:45	0:55	0:51	1:46	1:37	0:51	0:47
19 Polk[d]	4:00	1:31	0:57	**4:45**	**5:08**	3:14	4:11
28 19th Avenue – west[e]	4:00	2:10	2:12	1:22	1:23	-0:48	-0:49
28 19th Avenue – north[e]	4:00	0:23	0:24	0:54	0:55	0:31	0:31
28R 19th Avenue Rapid	4:00	1:52	1:44	1:11	1:05	-0:42	-0:38
38 Geary[f]	2:45	1:45	1:45	2:08	2:08	0:23	0:23
38R Geary Rapid[f]	1:20	**1:48**	**2:31**	**2:11**	**3:04**	0:24	0:33
K Ingleside[g]	4:00	0:28	0:28	0:25	0:25	-0:04	-0:04
N Judah[h]	3:00	0:34	0:49	0:22	0:31	-0:13	-0:18

Source: Fehr & Peers, 2025.

Muni Route/Line[a]	Threshold of Significance[b] (min:sec)	Adopted Housing Element Travel Time Change from 2050 Baseline (min:sec)		Proposed Rezoning Program Travel Time Change from 2050 Baseline (min:sec)		Travel Time Change between Adopted Housing Element and Proposed Rezoning Program (min:sec)	
		Inbound	Outbound	Inbound	Outbound	Inbound	Outbound

Bold and shaded text indicates the increase in transit travel time exceeds the significance threshold for the route (i.e., four minutes for routes and lines with service headways of more than eight minutes and half of the service headway for routes and lines with service headways of eight minutes or less).

Notes:

a. Inbound direction generally means headed toward downtown San Francisco. It is the opposite of the outbound direction. Routes that do not go downtown have a consistent definition for inbound and outbound, as noted for each route below. See Figure 4.4-4 for location of corridors.

b. The threshold of significance for Muni routes with service headways of eight minutes or more is four minutes. For Muni routes with service headways of less than eight minutes, the threshold of significance is half of the headway, rounded down to the nearest five seconds.

c. The study limits for the 7 Haight-Noriega bus route extends between Stanyan and Webster streets. The 7 Haight-Noriega route's inbound direction is toward downtown, and the outbound direction is toward Ocean Beach.

d. The Polk-Potrero Hill Corridor study limits for the 19 Polk bus route extends between North Point and 23rd streets. The 19 Polk route's inbound direction is toward Fisherman's Wharf/Marina, and the outbound direction is toward Hunters Point.

e. The 19th Avenue Corridor study limits for the 28 19th Avenue (west) and the 28R 19th Avenue Rapid 19 Polk bus routes extend between California Street and Junipero Serra Boulevard. The study limits for the 28 19th Avenue (north) route extend between Lyon and Powell streets. The 28 19th Avenue and the 28R 19th Avenue Rapid routes' inbound direction is toward the Marina/Van Ness Avenue, and the outbound direction is toward the Daly City BART station.

f. The Geary Corridor study limits for the 38 Geary and the 38R Geary Rapid extends between 34th Avenue and Powell Street. The 38 Geary and the 38R Geary Rapid routes' inbound direction is toward downtown, and the outbound direction is toward the Richmond District.

g. The West Portal-Ocean Corridor study limits for the K Ingleside light rail line extends between Ulloa Street and San José Avenue. The K Ingleside line's inbound direction is toward downtown, and the outbound direction is toward Balboa Park.

h. The Judah-Irving Corridor study limits for the N Judah light rail line extends between 43rd Avenue and Cole Street. The N Judah line's inbound direction is toward the Caltrain station via downtown, and the outbound direction is toward Ocean Beach.

Table 6: Muni Transit Travel Time Analysis for the 19th Avenue and Geary Corridors for 2050 Conditions

Representative Study Corridor	Threshold of Significance[a] (min:sec)	Adopted Housing Element Travel Time Change from 2050 Baseline (min:sec)		Proposed Rezoning Program Travel Time Change from 2050 Baseline (min:sec)		Proposed Rezoning Program Travel Time Change from Adopted Housing Element (min:sec)	
		Inbound	Outbound	Inbound	Outbound	Inbound	Outbound
A.M. Peak Hour							
19th Avenue Corridor[b]	2:20	1:28	1:21	0:55	0:51	-0:32	-0:30
Geary Corridor[c]	0:50	**2:41**	**1:49**	**3:17**	**2:13**	0:35	0:24
P.M. Peak Hour							
19th Avenue Corridor[b]	2:10	**2:10**	**2:12**	1:22	1:23	-0:48	-0:49
Geary Corridor[c]	0:50	**1:48**	**2:31**	**2:11**	**3:04**	0:24	0:33

Source: Fehr & Peers, 2025.

Bold and shaded text indicates the increase in transit travel time exceeds the significance threshold for the corridor.

a. The threshold of significance is based on the combined headway of the two routes that travel on each corridor and is half of the combined headway, rounded down to the nearest five seconds.

b. The 19th Avenue Corridor includes the 28 19th Avenue and the 28R 19th Avenue Rapid routes. The 28 19th Avenue and the 28R 19th Avenue Rapid routes' inbound direction is toward the Marina/Van Ness Avenue, and the outbound direction is toward the Daly City BART station.

c. The Geary Corridor includes the 38 Geary and the 38R Geary Rapid routes. The 38 Geary and the 38R Geary Rapid routes' inbound direction is toward downtown, and the outbound direction is toward the Richmond District.

In some cases, study corridors (e.g., Polk-Potrero Hill, Geary Corridor) would have greater increases in transit delay than the adopted housing element, while in other cases, study corridors (e.g., 19th Avenue, West Portal Ocean, Judah-Irving) would have decreases in transit delay. A similar mix of effects would be expected on other transit corridors that were not included as study corridors in the FEIR or this Addendum. The FEIR acknowledges that significant transit delay impacts could occur on bus routes along the Polk-Potrero Hill corridor due to changed circumstances, such as decreases in the headway on the 19 Polk route, which would reduce the significance threshold (FEIR p. 4.4-108), or a different distribution of housing units compared to the adopted housing element, such as greater housing unit growth in the Northeast planning district (FEIR p. 6-55). The study corridors analyzed in the FEIR represent a citywide cross-section of different transportation facilities and were selected to contextualize the transportation impacts of the adopted housing element, including on similar corridors in San Francisco. A similar mix of effects would be expected on other transit corridors that were not included as study corridors in the FEIR or this Addendum. Therefore, the proposed rezoning program would not result in more severe impacts on the study corridors than those previously identified for the adopted housing element.

Qualitative Transit Delay Analysis. A qualitative transit delay analysis was conducted for the 58 Lake Merced bus route along Brotherhood Way between Lake Merced and Junipero Serra boulevards because the proposed rezoning program projects a greater increase in housing units in the Lakeshore area of the Ingleside planning district compared to the 2050 environmental baseline conditions analyzed for the adopted housing element. Specifically, in the zone that encompasses the Lakeshore area between Stonestown and the county line, the proposed rezoning program projects an increase of approximately 2,400 housing units compared to none under the adopted housing element. The proposed rezoning program also projects fewer housing units in multiple zones in the northern and eastern portions of the Ingleside planning district compared to the adopted housing element. Overall, compared to the adopted housing element, the proposed rezoning program would slightly increase the number of housing units in the Ingleside planning district (i.e., by about 1,100 housing units, as shown in **Table 3**, p. 19).[40]

The Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines (transportation guidelines)[41] set forth a screening criterion for projects that would typically not result in significant public transit delay impacts. Any one residential development within the zone that includes the segment of Brotherhood Way between Lake Merced and Junipero Serra boulevards would not generate peak-hour vehicle trips

[40] The adopted housing element projects an increase of 6,800 housing units from 2050 environmental baseline conditions for the Ingleside planning district (composed of 62 transportation analysis zones), while the proposed rezoning program projects an increase of 7,900 housing units.

[41] San Francisco Planning Department, Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines, Appendix I, Public Transit, October 2019, *https://sfplanning.org/project/transportation-impact-analysis-guidelines-environmental-review-update#impact-analysis-guidelines*.

that would exceed the screening criterion of 300 vehicle trips during the peak hour;[42] however, vehicle trips associated with multiple projects with more than 1,900 housing units would exceed the screening criterion.

Brotherhood Way between Lake Merced and Junipero Serra boulevards is a major arterial connector with two traffic lanes each way, right- and/or left-turn lanes at intersections, and synchronized traffic signals. Within the 0.75-mile segment of Brotherhood Way, there are three stops for the 58 Lake Merced bus route (at Grace Community Church, Summit Way, and Chumasero Drive). The bus route operates with 30-minute service headways[43] during the peak periods. This segment of Brotherhood Way is part of the San Francisco County Transportation Authority's Congestion Management Program network. Monitored travel speeds on Brotherhood Way indicate a free flow of traffic (i.e., not experiencing congestion) during both a.m. and p.m. peak hours.[44] Thus, the additional peak-hour vehicles on Brotherhood Way associated with future residential development under the proposed rezoning program would not be considered a substantial increase relative to existing traffic volumes that would cause substantial delay.[45] In addition, the right- and left-turn lanes allow vehicles to change lanes and pass transit vehicles pulling out of the bus stops on the segment.

The transit travel times for the 58 Lake Merced bus route are not anticipated to increase under the proposed rezoning program to an extent that would exceed the threshold of significance of four minutes for the following reasons:

- There are multiple traffic lanes each way, dedicated turn lanes, and traffic signal synchronization on Brotherhood Way;
- There are limited bus stops and the relatively low service frequency on the 58 Lake Merced bus route; and
- There is a limited distance that vehicles generated by the new housing units would travel on Brotherhood Way.

Therefore, the proposed rezoning program would not substantially delay the 58 Lake Merced route.

---

[42] Future residential projects in the western part of the city with about 1,900 or fewer housing units (an estimated 2,850 bedrooms) would generate about 300 vehicle trips during the peak hour. An increase of 2,400 housing units (an estimated 3,657 bedrooms), as projected for the transportation zone that includes Brotherhood Way, would generate about 384 vehicles during the peak hour (see Appendix B of this addendum, pp. B-1 to B-5).

[43] Service headway is the number of minutes between buses or trains on a particular bus route or light rail line.

[44] San Francisco County Transportation Authority. San Francisco Congestion Dashboard *https://congestion.sfcta.org*. Accessed July 9, 2025.

[45] Peak-hour traffic volumes on Brotherhood Way west of Chumasero Drive collected in February and April 2023 and between Alemany Boulevard and Arch Street collected in October 2023 were used in the qualitative assessment. One-way traffic volumes on Brotherhood Way west of Chumasero Drive (i.e., within the zone where the proposed rezoning program projects new housing units) are between 1,080 and 1,250 vehicles per hour, depending on the peak hour (i.e., a.m. or p.m. peak hour) and peak direction of traffic (see Appendix B of this addendum, p. B-6).

Regional Transit Service. The proposed rezoning program would result in an incremental increase in overall units and a slightly different growth distribution compared to the adopted housing element. Under the proposed rezoning program, more growth would occur in well-resourced areas in the Downtown, Marina, Mission, Northeast, and Western Addition planning districts compared to the rezoning analysis assumptions in the FEIR, which projected that growth would be heavily concentrated in the Inner Sunset, Outer Sunset, and Richmond planning districts. This would result in more vehicles on the streets where Golden Gate Transit operates, such as along Lombard Street and Van Ness Avenue. Golden Gate Transit bus routes on Van Ness Avenue would continue to operate within the median transit-only lanes and stop at median platforms on Van Ness Avenue; therefore, the routes would not experience additional transit delay. On Lombard Street, Golden Gate Transit bus routes would continue to operate in mixed-traffic lanes.[46] As shown in **Table 5**, p. 72, the proposed rezoning program would increase transit travel times on the 28 19th Avenue bus route that operates along Lombard Street, but the increase would not exceed the threshold of significance of four minutes. Therefore, the threshold of significance for regional transit routes of half the service headways (i.e., generally between 10 and 30 minutes for Golden Gate Transit bus routes on Lombard Street) would also not be exceeded. Thus, the redistribution of vehicles on city streets and the passengers associated with future development consistent with the proposed rezoning program, compared to the adopted housing element, would not result in increases in regional transit travel times that would exceed the threshold of significance for regional transit or substantial passenger delay. Therefore, consistent with the adopted housing element, the proposed rezoning program would not substantially delay regional transit.

Conclusion. Consistent with the adopted housing element, the additional vehicles on city streets and the passengers associated with future development consistent with the proposed rezoning program could result in substantial delays for transit on certain corridors. In some instances, study corridors (e.g., Polk-Potrero Hill, Geary Corridor) would have greater increases in transit delay than the adopted housing element, while in other cases, study corridors (e.g., 19th Avenue, West Portal Ocean, Judah-Irving) would have decreases in transit delay. A similar mix of effects would be expected on other transit corridors that were not included as study corridors in the FEIR or this Addendum. Areawide increases in vehicle congestion under the proposed rezoning program could result in significant delays for transit, such as along the Geary, 19th Avenue, and Polk-Potrero Hill corridors. The study corridors that would experience significant transit delay impacts under the proposed rezoning program are consistent with those identified for the adopted housing element. Therefore, the slight shifts in distribution of future housing units and the incremental increases in some planning districts and associated vehicle trips and transit delay between the adopted housing element and the proposed rezoning program, as described above, do not represent a substantial worsening of the significant transit delay impact identified in the FEIR. Thus, consistent with the adopted housing element, the

[46] The SFMTA implemented a pilot project on Park Presidio Boulevard and Lombard Street to improve transit reliability. The project converted a curbside mixed-traffic lane to a high-occupancy vehicle 2+ lane in each direction. Only transit vehicles and private passenger vehicles with two or more people are allowed to use the lanes. The SFMTA is in the process of applying to Caltrans to make these changes permanent. For more information, see the project page at: *https://www.sfmta.com/projects/park-presidio-lombard-temporary-hov-lanes*.

proposed rezoning program could substantially delay Muni transit service but the impact would be similar and not substantially more severe. This would be a significant transit delay impact on Muni transit service.

With regards to regional transit service, the proposed rezoning program would not substantially affect regional transit operations or cause substantial traffic congestion or delay for regional transit. Therefore, consistent with the adopted housing element, the proposed rezoning program's impacts on regional transit would be less than significant.

To mitigate transit delay impacts to Muni vehicles, the FEIR identified Mitigation Measures M-TR-4a and M-TR-4b, which are included as planning code amendments as part of the proposed rezoning program. The discussion below identifies the extent to which the mitigation measures are met through the planning code amendments:

- Mitigation Measure M-TR-4a required the city to amend the planning code sections 151 and 151.1 to reduce the number of vehicle parking spaces permitted for applicable future development consistent with the adopted housing element by 50 percent or more compared to parking maximums as of April 2022. Alternately, the city could amend the planning code transportation demand management requirements in section 169 for applicable future development projects consistent with the adopted housing element to achieve a vehicle trip reduction equivalent of a 50 percent decrease in parking maximums.[47]

  The proposed rezoning program includes reductions in the maximum permitted vehicle parking spaces that range from 0 to 75 percent of the existing planning code requirements citywide rather than only for applicable future development projects consistent with the proposed rezoning program that would contribute considerably to or result in a significant transit delay impact. Because the proposed parking ratio change would affect all future development in the city, rather than only for applicable future development consistent with the housing element, the effect of the parking maximums reduction may be greater than what was anticipated under the FEIR. However, similar to the adopted housing element, it is uncertain to what degree the proposed parking maximum reductions would reduce vehicle trips that contribute to transit delay. As a result, this mitigation measure would partially meet the requirement identified in Measure A of M-TR-4a, but the degree to which it would meet the requirement is unknown as of publication of this addendum. Conservatively, subsequent individual development projects would still be required to implement Measure B of M-TR-4a as it is uncertain whether the planning code amendments to parking maximums fully met the vehicle trip reduction as specified in Measure A. This determination may be reevaluated in the future if new information comes to light regarding the correlation between parking and vehicle miles traveled,

[47] As discussed in the FEIR (Mitigation Measure Effectiveness and Conclusion, p. 4.4-114), Mitigation Measure M-TR-4a was developed based on the correlation between the availability of parking and vehicle miles traveled such that a reduction in parking supply generally results in a reduction in vehicle miles traveled. However, as discussed in the EIR, it is difficult to quantify with precision the exact degree that parking reduction would have on vehicle miles traveled since a person's decision to own a car and drive varies depending on a variety of neighborhood factors (e.g., proximity to transit, geography, personal preference, etc.). Furthermore, given the relative uncertainty that the city would adopt planning code amendments and to what degree, and the relative uncertainty of the precise effect of parking reduction on transit delay, the FEIR concluded that the proposed action future development would result in a significant impact on transit delay.

or regarding the effectiveness of the city's proposed parking maximums reduction. Therefore, consistent with the adopted housing element, substantial delay to public transit may continue to occur under the proposed rezoning program, even with implementation of the proposed vehicle parking restrictions.

- The proposed rezoning program includes amendments to the planning code sections 155(r) and 155(u) consistent with mitigation measure M-TR-4b to expand the geographic applicability for development projects required to prepare and implement a Driveway and Loading Operations Plan (DLOP) and to not permit curb cuts for garage entries, driveways, or other vehicular access along transit corridors. The proposed rezoning program's DLOP requirements and curb cut restrictions would be for applicable development projects citywide rather than only for applicable future development projects consistent with the proposed rezoning program that would contribute considerably to or result in a significant transit delay impact. Therefore, the amendments to the planning code fully comply with Measures A.1 and A.2 as specified in Mitigation Measure M-TR-4b and Measure B in the measure is not required to be implemented on a project-by-project basis.

  Consistent with the assessment of mitigation measure M-TR-4b conducted in the FEIR for the adopted housing element, DLOP requirements and curb cut restrictions would reduce significant transit delay impacts. Although the requirements of M-TR-4b are met through the planning code amendments, the DLOP requirements and curb cut restrictions may not always be feasible or may not reduce the significant impact to less-than-significant levels.

In addition to Mitigation Measures M-TR-4a and M-TR-4b, the FEIR identified Mitigation Measure M-TR-4c to reduce transit delay. Mitigation Measure M-TR-4c, which requires the city to implement measures to reduce transit delay on transit corridors where planning code amendments to implement the adopted housing program (i.e., the proposed rezoning program) would contribute considerably to or result in significant transit delay impacts, would be applicable to the proposed rezoning program. However, because approval by the SFMTA board and/or other transit agencies of the transit network improvements developed as part of mitigation measure M-TR-4c is uncertain and full funding for future transit network improvements has not been identified, implementation of this measure remains uncertain. Therefore, this mitigation measure remains applicable to the proposed rezoning program. Therefore, consistent with the adopted housing element, the proposed rezoning program's impacts related to transit delay on Muni transit service would remain significant and unavoidable with mitigation, as identified in the FEIR for the adopted housing element. With the application of the mitigation measures and the proposed planning code amendments for sections 155 (r) and 155 (u), there will not be a substantial increase in the severity of these already identified impacts.

VEHICLE MILES TRAVELED

Compared to the adopted housing element, the proposed rezoning program would result in slight increase in overall growth and a change in the distribution of housing units in the city. Despite the slight increase in unit growth compared to the adopted housing element, citywide and planning district average daily VMT per capita for residential uses under the proposed rezoning program would still be similar to that of the adopted housing element and more than 15 percent less than the regional average (i.e., the significance threshold). Consistent with the adopted housing element, individual development projects

under the proposed rezoning program would continue to be in zones where average daily VMT per capita for residential uses would be more than 15 percent below regional VMT. However, the proposed rezoning program would add more housing units than the adopted housing element in two of the three zones that do not meet the map-based screening criterion for residential uses (i.e., zones 99, 400 and 402).[48]

Within zone 99, in the Outer Sunset planning district, the proposed rezoning program projects an s of 240 housing units compared to an increase of 268 housing under the adopted housing element. Within zone 402, in the Ingleside planning district, the proposed rezoning program projects an increase of 2,442 housing units compared to a minor reduction in housing units under the adopted housing element. Consistent with the adopted housing element, the proposed rezoning program does not project new residential development in zone 400 in the Ingleside planning district.

Consistent with the adopted housing element, future development consistent with the proposed rezoning program in zones 99 and 402 may meet the department's map-based screening criterion for the following reasons:

- Average daily VMT per capita for residential uses in both zones 99 and 402 is close to meeting the map-based screening criterion. Average daily VMT per capita for residential uses under 2050 conditions is 13.5 percent below the regional average (i.e., compared to the below 15 percent threshold).
- Residential development would occur in areas where there are multiple Muni bus routes. For example, zone 99 is served by the 18 46th Avenue and 23 Monterey bus routes along Sloat Boulevard and the L Taraval light rail line. Zone 402 is served by the 58 Lake Merced bus route along Brotherhood Way, which connects with other nearby Muni bus routes (e.g., 14 Mission, 14R Mission Rapid, 28 19th Avenue, 28R 19th Avenue Rapid, 54 Felton, 57 Parkmerced), SamTrans bus routes (e.g., 110, 120, 121, 130, 130B, ECR, PCW, SKY), and BART lines that serve the BART Daly City station (e.g., Blue, Yellow, Green, and Red lines). In addition, these zones are within transit priority areas.[49, 50]
- Individual buildings with 10 or more housing units would be subject to planning code section 169 regarding TDM program requirements. This planning code section requires certain new development projects to incorporate design features, incentives, and tools to reduce VMT. Development projects must choose measures from a menu of options to develop an overall TDM plan. Some options overlap requirements elsewhere in the planning code (e.g., bicycle parking, car-share parking). Each development's TDM plan requires routine monitoring and reporting to the department to demonstrate compliance.

---

[48] Zone 99 is bounded by Sloat Boulevard, Lower Great Highway, Vicente Street, and 43rd Avenue. Zone 400 is bounded by Ocean Beach/Fort Funston, Lake Merced, and the San Francisco-San Mateo county line; it includes the San Francisco Zoo, San Francisco Public Utilities Commission water treatment facilities, and The Olympic Club golf course. Zone 402 is bounded by Lake Merced Boulevard, Brotherhood Way, Junipero Serra Boulevard, and the San Francisco-San Mateo county line; it includes primarily the San Francisco Golf Club and religious institutions.

[49] Transit priority areas are areas in which parcels are within 0.5 mile of a major transit stop, either existing or planned.

[50] Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), Transit Priority Areas (2021) for the nine-County Bay Region as defined in the California Public Resources Code, Section 21099. *https://opendata.mtc.ca.gov/datasets/transit-priority-areas-2021-1/explore?location=37.726809%2C-122.463571%2C14.68*. Accessed August 5, 2025.

- The proposed rezoning program includes planning code amendments to reduce maximum accessory parking limits and reduce parking maximums for certain development projects that would result in significant transit delay impacts. These planning code requirements would further reduce VMT from future residential development.

Consistent with the adopted housing element, the proposed rezoning program would not cause substantial additional VMT.

With respect to induced automobile travel, consistent with the adopted housing element, the transportation features of individual development projects consistent with the proposed rezoning program would be the types of projects that would not substantially induce automobile travel. In addition, consistent with the adopted housing element, the proposed rezoning program would be consistent with the region's sustainable communities strategy (Plan Bay Area 2050). Therefore, consistent with the adopted housing element, the proposed rezoning program would have less-than significant impacts related to VMT and induced automobile travel, and no mitigation measures are required.

LOADING

Consistent with the adopted housing element, most development projects consistent with the proposed rezoning program, by themselves, would not result in a loading deficit, and significant loading impacts would not occur. However, consistent with the adopted housing element, in some circumstances, the proposed rezoning program could result in a loading deficit (i.e., the demand for loading spaces cannot be accommodated within the supply, therefore resulting in a loading deficit) that could create potentially hazardous conditions for people walking, bicycling, or driving or potentially delay public transit. The proposed rezoning program would result in an incremental increase in overall units and a slightly different growth distribution compared to the adopted housing element. Under the proposed rezoning program, more growth would occur in well-resourced areas in the denser Downtown, Marina, Mission, Northeast, and Western Addition planning districts compared to the rezoning analysis assumptions in the FEIR, which projected that growth would be heavily concentrated in the Inner Sunset, Outer Sunset, and Richmond planning districts. The incremental increase in overall units as well as the slightly different growth distribution under the proposed rezoning program compared to the adopted housing element would not substantially increase the severity of the loading impacts identified in the FEIR for the adopted housing element. Rather, similar types of impacts would occur in different areas of the city.

The proposed rezoning program includes amendments to the planning code to require a driveway and loading operations plan (DLOP) as part of new development projects that are identified by the department as having significant loading impacts (FEIR Mitigation Measure M-TR-4b). In addition, Mitigation Measure M-TR-6 would require the department and SFMTA to develop a curb management plan for geographic areas in the proposed rezoning program that could result in significant loading

impacts (as detailed on FEIR pp. 4.4-127 and 4.4-128).[51] Implementation of the DLOP and Mitigation Measure M-TR-6 would reduce the significant loading impacts, but the measures may not always be feasible or may not reduce the significant loading impacts to less-than-significant levels. Therefore, consistent with the adopted housing element, the proposed rezoning program's loading impacts would be significant and unavoidable with mitigation.

PARKING

Future development consistent with the proposed rezoning program would be within the department's map-based screening area[52] for residential uses, except for zone 99 in the Outer Sunset planning district and zone 402 in the Ingleside planning district.[53] These two zones are in areas where there are multiple Muni bus routes and within transit priority areas. Furthermore, future development projects would be subject to planning code section 169, TDM program requirements, and the proposed rezoning program's planning code amendments to sections 151 and 151.1 which would further reduce parking demand. Thus, consistent with the adopted housing element, future development consistent with the proposed rezoning program within zones 99 and 402 may meet the department's map-based screening criterion.

Consistent with the adopted housing element, and in accordance with the transportation guidelines, future building projects consistent with the proposed rezoning program that comply with planning code requirements for parking (i.e., do not exceed maximum permitted vehicle parking space requirements) would not create a substantial vehicular parking deficit (i.e., demand for parking spaces that exceeds the available supply by 600 vehicle parking spaces), which could result in secondary effects, such as potentially hazardous conditions for people walking or bicycling or inadequate access for emergency vehicles, or substantially delay transit. Thus, the proposed rezoning program would not result in a substantial vehicle parking deficit that could result in secondary effects in the two zones. Therefore, consistent with the adopted housing element, the proposed rezoning program would have less-than significant impacts related to parking, and no mitigation measures are required.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The FEIR determined that the adopted housing element, in combination with cumulative projects, would not result in significant impacts related to potentially hazardous conditions, accessibility, VMT, or parking and would not require mitigation measures. The FEIR identified cumulative impacts related to transit delay and loading that would be significant and unavoidable with mitigation, along with

---

[51] Mitigation Measure M-TR-6, curb management plans, are required to be developed within 2 years of the Planning Department receiving applications for 200,000 gross square feet in the plan's geographic area.

[52] San Francisco Planning Department, Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines, *http://default.sfplanning.org/publications_reports/TIA_Guidelines.pdf*. Appendix L of the transportation guidelines describe VMT thresholds of significance. The map-based screening area refers to transportation analysis zones where existing VMT per capita is more than 15 percent below existing regional VMT per capita and/or where future VMT per capita is less than 15 percent below 2040 regional VMT per capita.

[53] Zone 400 in the Ingleside planning district is also not within the department's map-based screening area; however, neither the adopted housing element nor proposed rezoning program projects housing units in this zone.

cumulative significant and unavoidable construction-related transportation impacts. The cumulative context for the proposed rezoning element would be similar to that presented in the FEIR, with the exception of two transportation projects: the Great Highway Mobility Improvements Project and SFMTA's Vision Zero Quick-Build projects (see **Table 4**, p. 28). The SFMTA's Vision Zero Quick-Build projects are traffic safety improvements to enhance bicycle and pedestrian safety and improve transit operations and would not substantially affect the transportation network adjacent to future development consistent with the proposed rezoning program. The permanent closure of the Upper Great Highway between Lincoln Way and Sloat Boulevard in 2025 resulted in a shift in vehicles to multiple other north–south roadways on the west side of the city, including Sunset Boulevard, Chain of Lakes Drive, and 19th Avenue.[54] The shift in traffic volumes due to the Great Highway closure would not result in substantial changes to vehicle circulation or accessibility for people walking, bicycling or driving, or for emergency vehicles on these streets. Thus, for the same reasons described in the FEIR for the adopted housing element, the proposed rezoning program would have less-than-significant cumulative impacts related to potentially hazardous conditions, accessibility, VMT, and parking.

With respect to cumulative construction-related transportation impacts, similar to the adopted housing element, construction activities associated with future development consistent with the proposed rezoning program could overlap with simultaneous construction of other nearby projects. Under the proposed rezoning program, more growth would occur in well-resourced areas in the Downtown, Marina, Mission, Northeast, and Western Addition planning districts compared to the rezoning analysis assumptions in the FEIR, which projected that growth would be heavily concentrated in the Inner Sunset, Outer Sunset, and Richmond planning districts. Thus, the proposed rezoning program would have greater potential to overlap cumulative construction activities than the adopted housing element in the denser Downtown, Marina, Mission, Northeast, and Western Addition planning districts and lower potential to overlap cumulative construction activities than the adopted housing element on the west side of the city. Thus, consistent with the adopted housing element, the proposed rezoning program would contribute considerably to significant cumulative construction-related transportation impacts, which would be significant and unavoidable.

With respect to cumulative transit delay impacts, compared to the adopted housing element, growth under the proposed rezoning program would result in more vehicles in the Downtown, Marina, Mission, Northeast, and Western Addition planning districts and fewer vehicles on the west side of the city. Thus, compared to the adopted housing element, the proposed rezoning program would have greater potential for significant cumulative transit delay impacts in the denser Downtown, Marina, Mission, Northeast, and Western Addition planning districts than on the west side of the city. The permanent closure of the Upper Great Highway between Lincoln Way and Sloat Boulevard in 2025 resulted in a shift in vehicles to other north–south roadways on the west side of the city, including the 19th Avenue study corridor, along which

[54] SFMTA. New Data on Great Highway Road Closure. *https://www.sfmta.com/blog/new-data-great-highway-road-closure-how-were-supporting-your-trips*. Accessed August 5, 2025.

the 28 19th Avenue and the 28R 19th Avenue Rapid operate.[55] These bus routes experienced some additional travel times in the southbound direction because of the closure, however, the SFMTA is working on traffic signal adjustments that would reduce the transit travel times.[56]

As shown in **Table 5**, p. 72, and **Table 6**, p. 74, the proposed rezoning program would reduce transit delay on the 19th Avenue corridor bus routes compared to the adopted housing element; therefore, the proposed rezoning program would not combine with the Upper Great Highway closure to result in cumulative significant transit delay impacts. The Hyde Street Quick-Build Project between Geary and McAllister streets (completed in 2023) included a transit-only lane on Hyde Street between Eddy and McAllister streets, with the goal of improving transit reliability and reducing transit delay. This transportation project could offset some of the travel time increases identified for the 19 Polk bus route under the proposed rezoning program. The planning code amendments included as part of the proposed rezoning program (i.e., Mitigation Measures M-TR-4a and M-TR-4b) and Mitigation Measure M-TR-4c would reduce or minimize transit delay impacts associated with future development. However, due to the uncertainty about adoption of Mitigation Measure M-TR-4c and its effectiveness, it is not likely that transit delay impacts would be reduced to less-than-significant levels. Therefore, consistent with the adopted housing element, the proposed rezoning program would contribute considerably to significant cumulative transit delay impacts, which would be significant and unavoidable with mitigation.

With respect to cumulative loading impacts, compared to the adopted housing element, growth under the proposed rezoning program would result in more units in the Downtown, Marina, Mission, Northeast, and Western Addition planning districts and fewer units on the west side of the city. Thus, compared to the adopted housing element, the proposed rezoning program would have greater potential for overlap at locations with loading impacts from other residential and non-residential development in the denser Downtown, Marina, Mission, Northeast, and Western Addition planning districts than on the west side of the city. Consistent with the adopted housing element, the planning code amendment related to the driveway and loading operation plan included as part of the proposed rezoning program (Mitigation Measure M-TR-4b) and Mitigation Measure M-TR-6 would not reduce the loading impacts to less-than-significant levels. Thus, consistent with adopted housing element, the proposed rezoning program would contribute considerably to significant loading impacts, which would be significant and unavoidable with mitigation.

CONCLUSION

In summary, the proposed rezoning program would not result in new significant transportation and circulation impacts that were not previously identified in the FEIR, nor would it result in more severe impacts than those previously identified. No new mitigation measures or changes to existing mitigation measures are required.

---

55 SFMTA Memorandum, Spring 2025 Outer Sunset Traffic Data. *https://www.sfmta.com/reports/outer-sunset-traffic-report-spring-2025*. Accessed August 5, 2025.

56 SFMTA. New Data on Great Highway Road Closure. *https://www.sfmta.com/blog/new-data-great-highway-road-closure-how-were-supporting-your-trips*. Accessed August 5, 2025.

Noise and Vibration

FEIR FINDINGS

The potential noise and vibration impacts of the adopted housing element are analyzed in Section 4.5, Noise and Vibration, of the FEIR. The analysis covered development of seven representative building types ranging from accessory dwelling units to a 590-foot-tall residential mixed-use building with 984 housing units. The FEIR concluded that the adopted housing element would generate a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels due to noise from heavy equipment used for the construction of individual projects, resulting in a significant impact. This is largely due to the potential for the construction of multiple projects in proximity to sensitive receptors, which is likely given the compact, dense urban setting of the city. Individual projects may also result in a significant noise impact, depending on frequency, intensity, and duration of equipment use and proximity to sensitive receptors. For individual projects requiring night work, a significant noise impact may occur due to the potential proximity between an individual project and sensitive receptors. Mitigation measure M-NO-1 would reduce the severity of noise impacts through implementation of construction noise control mitigation. However, the FEIR determined that in situations where multiple projects would be constructed simultaneously in proximity to one another, the impact was determined to be significant and unavoidable with mitigation. However, the FEIR noted that this conclusion would not preclude a finding of less than significant or less than significant with mitigation for future projects consistent with the adopted housing element, including projects that meet the construction noise screening criteria identified under the discussion of Impact NO-1 in the FEIR, or projects for which a detailed noise analysis demonstrates that an established noise standard would not be exceeded.

Regarding operational impacts, the FEIR concluded the adopted housing element would result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient levels due to traffic noise on roadways in the city, primarily in the Central and Western planning districts, resulting in a significant impact. Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-TR-4a, Parking Maximums and Transportation Demand Management, could reduce vehicle trips on roadways where traffic noise impacts would occur, but there is uncertainty about the extent of the reduction that could be realized through this measure. Due to this uncertainty, operational impacts related to traffic noise would be significant and unavoidable with mitigation. However, the FEIR notes that residents of new development projects would not be affected by traffic noise resulting from operation of the adopted housing element because new buildings would be required to meet interior noise standards under title 24.

For permanent operation of buildings, heating, ventilation, and air-conditioning (HVAC) equipment could exceed the limits in section 2909(a) and 2909(d) of the city noise ordinance, resulting in a significant impact on existing sensitive receptors. Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-NO-2 would reduce impacts from HVAC equipment through use of noise attenuation to comply with noise ordinance limits. This impact would be less than significant with mitigation. Emergency backup generators would be operated infrequently and would be housed in attenuating enclosures, and as such noise from emergency generators would result in a less than significant impact. Loading activities

at buildings would not be noticeable above ambient sound levels and would generally occur during the day when people are less sensitive to noise. As such noise from loading activities would result in a less than significant impact.

According to the FEIR, groundborne vibration from the use of heavy equipment during construction of individual projects would result in a significant impact because equipment would be used in proximity to historic buildings, vibration-sensitive structures, and buildings containing vibration-sensitive equipment. Implementation of Mitigation Measures M-NO-3a and M-NO-3b would reduce impacts from vibration through vibration protection measures and vibration monitoring as well as measures to prevent interference with sensitive equipment. This impact would be less than significant with mitigation.

PROPOSED REZONING PROGRAM IMPACTS

The approach to evaluating the proposed rezoning program is described above under "Analysis of Potential Environmental Effects," p. 32. The changes under the proposed rezoning program that would affect noise and vibration are addressed below.

CONSTRUCTION

The proposed rezoning program would generate a substantial temporary increase in ambient levels due to noise from the heavy equipment used for the construction of individual projects, resulting in a significant impact for the same reasons as disclosed in the FEIR for the adopted housing element. However, under the proposed rezoning program, there would be an incremental increase in the amount and distribution of growth in some places compared to the adopted housing element. The intensity of construction would be greatest in the Downtown, Marina, Mission, Northeast, and Western Addition planning districts, whereas the adopted housing element would have greater intensity in the Ingleside, Inner Sunset, Outer Sunset, and Richmond planning districts on the west side of the city. As described in the FEIR, construction of multiple individual projects could potentially overlap within a single construction influence zone, resulting in an increased frequency, duration, and intensity of construction noise at existing sensitive receptors in these areas. For this reason, the proposed rezoning could result in a substantial temporary increase in ambient levels due to construction noise, even with implementation of Mitigation Measure M-NO-1. This significant and unavoidable impact is the same as the adopted housing element, except construction noise impacts would be expected to occur more frequently in the Downtown, Marina, Mission, Northeast, and Western Addition planning districts, rather than in the west side of the city. As a citywide effect, there would be no new or more severe impacts due to construction noise under the proposed rezoning program compared to the FEIR. For this reason, the proposed rezoning could result in a substantial temporary increase in ambient levels due to construction noise, even with implementation of Mitigation Measure M-NO-1. Therefore, this impact would be significant and unavoidable with mitigation, which is the same conclusion found in the FEIR.

TRAFFIC

The proposed rezoning program would result in an incremental increase in overall units and a slightly different growth distribution compared to the adopted housing element. There would be a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels due to traffic noise on roadways in the city under the proposed rezoning program due to the same factors found under the adopted housing element. Under the proposed rezoning program, more growth and the corresponding increase in traffic noise levels would occur in well-resourced areas in the Downtown, Marina, Mission, Northeast, and Western Addition planning districts compared to the rezoning analysis assumptions in the FEIR, which projected that growth and the corresponding increase in traffic noise levels would be heavily concentrated in the Inner Sunset, Outer Sunset, and Richmond planning districts. Traffic noise levels under the proposed rezoning program would be most similar to the Eastside Alternative evaluated in the FEIR. The analysis of SF-CHAMP data for the Eastside Alternative indicated that by 2050 traffic noise levels would increase by up to 10 dBA compared to environmental baseline conditions, with the location of greatest increase within the Northeast planning district, as well as increases above 7 dB in Central, Downtown, and South of Market planning districts (see Appendix H, Table H.8-4 of the FEIR). Overall the maximum increase of 10 dBA for the Eastside Alternative is lower than the adopted housing element, which had a maximum increase of 21.1 dBA compared to Environmental Baseline (Table 4.5-14 of the FEIR). Citywide, the average increase in traffic noise would be 0.2 dBA for both the Eastside Alternative and the proposed rezoning program in 2050. However, the substantial permanent increase due to traffic noise would still result in a significant impact. Due to uncertainty regarding how vehicle trips would be reduced with implementation of Mitigation Measure M-TR-4a, Parking Maximums and Transportation Demand Management, the impact would be significant and unavoidable with mitigation, which is the same conclusion as the FEIR, except traffic noise impacts would be expected to occur more frequently in the Downtown, Marina, Mission, Northeast, and Western Addition planning districts, rather than in the the west side of the city. As a citywide effect, there would be no new or more severe impacts due to traffic noise under the proposed rezoning program compared to the FEIR.

STATIONARY NOISE

Once operational, buildings constructed under the proposed rezoning would generate noise from sources such as HVAC systems, emergency backup generators, and loading activity. The noise levels generated by building systems would be similar to the adopted housing element, but the buildings where these systems would be operated would be concentrated more in the Downtown, Marina, Mission, Northeast, and Western Addition planning districts rather than the west side of the city. Operation of HVAC systems would result in a significant impact, and emergency generators and loading activity would result in a less than significant impact.

Regarding HVAC equipment, there would be a significant impact due to the same factors found under the adopted housing element. With implementation of Mitigation Measure M-NO-2, the impact from operation of HVAC systems would be less than significant with mitigation. These impact conclusions are the same as the FEIR, and as a citywide effect, there would be no new or more severe impacts due to stationary noise under the proposed rezoning program compared to the FEIR.

CONSTRUCTION VIBRATION

Groundborne vibration would occur due to heavy equipment operating in proximity to historic buildings, vibration-sensitive structures, and buildings with vibration-sensitive equipment under the same factors found under the adopted housing element. Vibration associated with construction under the proposed rezoning program would occur primarily in the Downtown, Marina, Mission, Northeast, and Western Addition planning districts rather than in the west side of the city. With implementation of Mitigation Measure M-NO-3a: Protection of Adjacent Buildings/Structures and Vibration Monitoring During Construction and Mitigation Measure M-NO-3b: Prevent Interference with Vibration-Sensitive Equipment, impacts would be less than significant with mitigation. As a citywide effect, there would be no new or more severe impacts due to groundborne vibration under the proposed rezoning program compared to the FEIR.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The FEIR determined that the adopted housing element, in combination with cumulative projects, would result in a significant and unavoidable cumulative construction noise impact even with implementation of Mitigation Measure M-NO-1. The new cumulative projects implemented subsequent to publication of the FEIR, the Great Highway Mobility Improvements Project and the Vision Zero Quick-Build program (see **Table 4**, p. 28), do not substantially alter the cumulative setting due to the location of the cumulative projects compared to the proposed rezoned area and the nature of the cumulative projects (i.e., the creation of new open space and recreation facilities via traffic and roadway modifications and pedestrian and bicycle safety improvements in the right-of-way). Thus, the inclusion of the new cumulative projects would not alter the findings related to cumulative construction noise impacts in the FEIR. Under the proposed rezoning program, there would be a greater potential for increased construction noise in the Downtown, Marina, Mission, Northeast, and Western Addition planning districts, rather than in the west side of the city. Similar to the adopted housing element, construction under the proposed rezoning program could occur at the same time as cumulative projects. Because the proposed rezoning program would not generate new construction noise impacts that were not previously identified in the FEIR, and the new cumulative projects would not alter the FEIR's cumulative analysis, there would be no new significant cumulative construction noise impact.

The FEIR determined that the adopted housing element, in combination with cumulative projects, would not result in a significant cumulative operational noise impact. The new cumulative projects implemented subsequent to publication of the FEIR, the Great Highway Mobility Improvements Project and the Vision Zero Quick-Build program (see **Table 4**, p. 28), do not substantially alter the cumulative setting due to the location of the cumulative projects compared to the proposed rezoned area and the nature of the cumulative projects (i.e., the creation of new open space and recreation facilities via traffic and roadway modifications and pedestrian and bicycle safety improvements in the right-of-way). Thus, the inclusion of the new cumulative projects would not alter the findings related to cumulative operational noise impacts in the FEIR. Regarding traffic noise, as discussed above under "Cumulative Impacts" in the "Transportation and Circulation" section, growth under the proposed rezoning program would result in more vehicles in the Downtown, Marina, Mission, Northeast, and

Western Addition planning districts and fewer vehicles on the west side of the city. However, the increase in vehicle trips would not result in a doubling of vehicle traffic relative to the Waterfront Plan Update, because areas of employment growth would not overlap spatially with the proposed rezoning area. Because the proposed rezoning program would not generate new impacts related to operational noise that were not previously identified in the FEIR, and the new cumulative projects would not alter the FEIR's cumulative analysis, there would be no new significant cumulative operational noise impact.

CONCLUSION

In summary, the proposed rezoning program would not result in new significant noise and vibration impacts that were not previously identified in the FEIR, nor would it result in more severe impacts than those previously identified. No new mitigation measures or changes to existing mitigation measures are required.

Air Quality

FEIR FINDINGS

The FEIR concluded that adopted housing element policies would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the air district's 2017 Clean Air Plan because the adopted housing element would support measures that achieve the goals of the Clean Air Plan. Subsequent development built under the adopted housing element would generally promote high-density land use patterns, allow or require reductions in off-street parking, encourage tree planting and water and energy conservation, divert waste, and promote transit, walking, and bicycling as primary modes of transport, which are goals that are consistent with the Clean Air Plan.

With respect to plan-level impacts resulting from net increases in criteria pollutants for which the region is in nonattainment, the FEIR evaluated the growth in VMT compared to the growth in service population in the city, which is the air district's recommend approach for evaluating plan-level impacts. The FEIR concluded that, because the increase in VMT relative to the baseline (6.4 percent) would be greater than the increase in service population (5.4 percent), which is the sum of population and employment, there would be a significant and unavoidable impact. Mitigation Measure M-TR-4a, Parking Maximums and Transportation Demand Management, from the FEIR would reduce the impact, but it would remain significant.

In addition to the plan-level analysis described above, the FEIR also identified the extent to which future development consistent with the adopted housing element could result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to criteria air pollutant emissions. The FEIR presented quantitative analysis of criteria air pollutant emissions from seven representative building types, ranging in size from an accessory dwelling unit to a 590-foot-tall residential mixed-use building with 984 housing units. Construction criteria air pollutants from projects involving up to a 240-foot-tall building with 495 units and a 4,000-square-foot commercial use would be below the level of significance. However, a significant construction impact was identified in the FEIR for future development for the largest building type, a 590-foot-tall building with 984 dwelling units. Accordingly, the FEIR determined that development projects resulting from adopted housing element policies that exceed 240 feet and

propose more than 495 dwelling units have the potential to contribute considerably to regional criteria pollutants during construction. However, the FEIR identified Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3, Clean Construction Equipment, to reduce the impact to less than significant. Similarly, the FEIR presented quantitative analysis of operational criteria air pollutant emissions from the seven representative building types. The FEIR concluded that operational criteria air pollutant impacts from future development under the adopted housing element would be below the level of significance for criterial air pollutants for all building types analyzed.

The FEIR evaluated health risks at two scales: a programmatic citywide evaluation that focused primarily on on-road vehicles and a project-level evaluation for construction and operation of the seven building types. The programmatic health risk assessment presented the estimated changes in cancer risk as well as concentrations of localized particulate matter 2.5 microns or less in diameter ($PM_{2.5}$) throughout the city due to on-road traffic anticipated with development under the adopted housing element. The programmatic health risk assessment in the FEIR estimates that the cancer risk and $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations from vehicles would decrease in some areas and increase in others. The maximum increase in cancer risk and $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations was found to be substantial in the FEIR, resulting in a significant and unavoidable air quality health risk impact, even though there would be health risk improvements in other areas of the city.

The project-level evaluation of health risks evaluated whether construction and operation of future development as a result of the legislation could expose sensitive receptors to substantial levels of $PM_{2.5}$ and toxic air contaminants and result in an excess cancer risk. The FEIR presented the range of health risk impacts that could occur from implementing the adopted housing element and concluded that health risks would be significant and unavoidable in some circumstances. The FEIR noted that future development would need to be evaluated on an individual basis at the time a specific project is proposed. Those site-specific studies may demonstrate less-than-significant impacts. Health risks would be reduced but not to a less-than-significant level by Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3: Clean Construction Equipment; Mitigation Measure M-TR-4a: Parking Maximums and Transportation Demand Management; and Mitigation Measure M-AQ-5: Best Available Control Technology for Diesel Engines. Odor impacts were found to be less than significant in the FEIR.

PROPOSED REZONING PROGRAM IMPACTS

The approach to evaluating the proposed rezoning program is described above under “Analysis of Potential Environmental Effects,” p. 32. The changes under the proposed rezoning program that would affect air quality are addressed below.

CONSISTENCY WITH THE BAY AREA AIR DISTRICT CLEAN AIR PLAN

For impacts pertaining to conflicts with the air district’s Clean Air Plan, the proposed rezoning program would result in impacts similar to those of the adopted housing element. Although there would be an incremental increase in overall units and slightly different growth distribution under the proposed rezoning program compared to the adopted housing element, the differences do not

appreciably change the consistency of future development in the city with respect to the Clean Air Plan. As noted in the FEIR, p. 4.6-42, new development in the city generally incorporates many control measures from the Clean Air Plan through planning code provisions and/or local and state policies. In addition, the policies from the adopted housing element that support the air district's goals to reduce transportation-related emissions would remain in place, even with the different growth distribution. Those policies encourage multi-family development in key transit areas (Policy 20), prioritization of neighborhoods that minimize the need for vehicular travel (Policy 32), and coordination between transit planning and housing development (Policy 33). Furthermore, p. 4.6-43 of the FEIR concludes that the adopted housing element would increase housing densities and thus be consistent with transportation control measures from the Clean Air Plan, such as TR3 (Local and Regional Bus Service), TR5 (Transit Efficiency and Use), and TR9 (Bicycle and Pedestrian Access and Facilities). That conclusion is also true of the proposed rezoning program because the associated densities would be similar overall to those of the adopted housing element. Another difference between the adopted housing element and the proposed rezoning program is that the proposed rezoning program would establish housing sustainability districts, whereas the adopted housing element identified potential areas for the districts for future consideration. The housing sustainability districts are areas located within 0.5 mile of public transit where at least 20 percent of all housing units would be designated as affordable; thus, the proposed rezoning program would be more consistent with the transportation and land use goals of the Clean Air Plan.

The proposed rezoning program would, like the adopted housing element, be consistent with the Clean Air Plan's applicable building energy– and solid waste–related measures because future development in the city would be subject to the energy efficiency and waste diversion requirements from the San Francisco Green Building Code, the all-electric new construction ordinance, and Policy 34 from the adopted housing element, which will facilitate the transition of existing homes in the city from natural gas appliances to electric ones. New development, whether built in accordance with the growth distribution of the adopted housing element or proposed rezoning program, would be subject to the requirements and thus consistent with the applicable energy and waste components of the Clean Air Plan.

For the public health aspects of the Clean Air Plan, the proposed rezoning program would be similar to the adopted housing element in that it would shift growth toward the western and northern areas of the city, which, in general, have fewer Air Pollution Exposure Zone (APEZ) areas. The growth distributions are different for the adopted housing element and the proposed rezoning; however, because the APEZ areas are more concentrated in the eastern areas of the city, both would generally encourage growth in areas with less overlap with APEZ areas.

The FEIR conclusion that adopted housing element policies would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the air district's 2017 Clean Air Plan is also applicable to the proposed rezoning program because both would support measures to achieve the goals of the Clean Air Plan. Subsequent development for both would generally promote high-density land use patterns and promote non-vehicular modes of transportation, which is a fundamental goal of the Clean Air Plan.

PLAN-LEVEL CRITERIA POLLUTANT INCREASE

The proposed rezoning program would not result in direct physical environmental impacts. Rather, future development proposals consistent with the adopted housing element, including the rezoning proposal, would have the potential to result in physical environmental impacts. Criteria air pollutant impacts are regional or cumulative in nature and addressed at the project-level only. To evaluate the programmatic effect of the adopted housing element's impacts on criteria pollutant increases at the plan level, the FEIR uses the air district's recommended approach for comparing growth in VMT and growth in the service population in the city. The proposed rezoning program would result in approximately 4,000 more housing units than the adopted housing element; however, as previously stated, the housing projected housing growth is likely overestimated due to uncertainties associated with housing production over the long term, and therefore the environmental analysis is a conservative analysis. Given the slight increase in growth, it would result in more gross VMT and more growth in the service population than the adopted housing element. But, given that both the service population and VMT would increase, the overall ratio of VMT growth with respect to the growth of service population in the city may not be affected. While VMT growth could still outpace service population growth, similar to the adopted housing element, the proposed rezoning would similarly result in a significant and unavoidable with mitigation impact. Overall, the proposed rezoning program would result in reduced densities in some areas balanced by increases in other areas, and the overall magnitude of density between the adopted housing element and rezoning would be similar.

As noted in Transportation and Circulation, future residential development consistent with the proposed rezoning program would be more concentrated in the planning districts that have a denser land use pattern (e.g., Downtown, Marina, Mission, Northeast, and Western Addition planning districts) and would not shift as much future residential development to the west side of the city (e.g., Inner Sunset, Outer Sunset, and Richmond planning districts), as under the adopted housing element where the land use pattern is less dense. Therefore, under the proposed rezoning program, more trips would occur by walking or taking taxis/TNC vehicles and fewer trips would occur in private automobiles than under the adopted housing element. However, the overall number of vehicle trips under the proposed rezoning program is likely to be slightly increased to that of the adopted housing element (i.e., fewer trips by private automobiles but more trips by taxis/TNC vehicles). Because the number of vehicle trips would be similar, it is likely that both would result in a similar rate of VMT per service population. In other words, it is unlikely that the proposed rezoning program would result in a greater imbalance between VMT growth and service population growth than the adopted housing element, considering its focus on the planning districts with a denser land use pattern. Furthermore, as noted on FEIR p. 4.6-46, adding growth to San Francisco per the adopted housing element would increase VMT more than the service population; however, the gap between VMT and service population would be even greater if the same amount of growth were added to a suburban area or other areas with higher per capita VMT values. This is also true of the proposed rezoning program in that, despite a significant impact with respect to VMT growth, the impact would be even greater if growth were to occur elsewhere in the

region. The impact of VMT growth, and thus net increases in criteria pollutants at the plan level, would be significant for the proposed rezoning program, which is the same conclusion reached in the FEIR regarding the adopted housing element.

For localized carbon monoxide concentrations, the impact of the proposed rezoning program would be less than significant, the same as the adopted housing element, because peak-hour intersection volumes would not exceed 44,000 vehicles per hour at any intersection. As noted in the FEIR on p. 4.6-47, the maximum intersection volume in 2050 would be 12,900 vehicles per hour. The proposed rezoning program would not appreciably increase that volume, despite the increase in units and differences in growth distribution.

Mitigation measure M-TR-4a, Parking Maximums and Transportation Demand Management, from the FEIR would also apply to this impact, and this measure would be partially implemented in that a reduction in parking maximums in a number of areas citywide would be codified as part of the proposed rezoning program. The codification of parking maximums would reduce VMT associated with new development and reduce the severity of the VMT growth impact. As noted in the FEIR, the department has not identified a more precise method to determine the correlation between what amount of reduction in VMT would result from a specific parking reduction or vice versa; it is not feasible to quantify the reduced VMT that would result from this mitigation measure. The impact would be significant and unavoidable with mitigation.

CRITERIA POLLUTANT INCREASE FROM FUTURE DEVELOPMENT

As noted above, the proposed rezoning program would not result in direct physical environmental impacts; however, future development proposals consistent with the rezoning program would have the potential to result in physical environmental impacts. The proposed rezoning program proposes higher building heights that would be allowed for future development than the adopted housing element. In the FEIR, construction and operational emissions for seven representative building types (providing a range in development intensity and density) were quantified to evaluate the significance of impacts associated with future development with respect to criteria pollutant increases. The proposed rezoning program and subsequent development is expected to result in the same significant criteria air pollutant impacts from construction but not substantially more severe impacts than those disclosed in the EIR. For both the adopted housing element and proposed rezoning program, the type of development would be of a similar character and size, representing the building types evaluated in the FEIR. Although the proposed rezoning program would allow for taller buildings than the tallest representative building type analyzed in the FEIR (i.e., a 590-foot-tall residential mixed-use building with 984 housing units), buildings constructed under both programs would not exceed the maximum floor space or number of units for the tallest representative building type. The square footage numbers associated with the representative building types are included in Table 2 of Appendix I.3 of the FEIR. As shown therein, the 590-foot-tall representative building included 935,745 square feet of residential area, 60,700 square feet of retail area, and 102,000 square feet of structured parking area. Although the proposed rezoning

program would allow for future development generally up to 500 feet, except in two areas where heights would be up to 650 feet, future buildings' square footage would be comparable to the 590-foot-tall representative building evaluated in the FEIR. For example, the 10 South Van Ness project, which included a 55-story tower and, as a project alternative, two 41-story towers, was located on a relatively small parcel.[57] Emissions for the 10 South Van Ness Avenue project or variant (55-story tower or 41-story towers) were considered to be approximately the same, which is notable, because it demonstrates that a project's emissions are primarily governed by its square footage and not height, assuming that the magnitude of excavation is the same. Consequently, construction emissions associated with the 590-foot-tall building, as presented in the FEIR, are representative of the maximum emissions that would occur from future development under both the adopted housing element and the proposed rezoning program.

Criteria pollutant emissions modeled with the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod), which was used to quantify emissions in the FEIR, are dependent on multiple factors; however, many of the model's key emissions assumptions are tied to square footage.[58] For this reason, the analysis of representative buildings in the FEIR is applicable to future development that would be constructed under the proposed rezoning program. FEIR p. 4.6-51 notes that criteria pollutant emissions during future building construction would exceed the air district's thresholds for oxides of nitrogen (NO_X) by 31 pounds per day for the 590-foot building.[59] That result would also apply to the proposed rezoning program, resulting in a significant impact. Mitigation measure M-AQ-3 from the FEIR would also apply to the proposed rezoning program and reduce exhaust-related emissions during construction of future development. The measure would require Tier 4 Final off-road construction equipment and other strategies to reduce exhaust emissions; with the measure, emissions from the 590-foot building would be below the air district's thresholds, resulting in a less-than-significant impact. Similarly, impacts from fugitive dust would be less than significant, like the adopted housing element, because most future development would need to comply with the Construction Dust Control Ordinance, which requires construction projects on larger sites to prepare a dust control plan for approval by the Department of Public Health. No new mitigation would be required.

For the reasons noted regarding construction-related criteria pollutant emissions, operational emissions from future development under the proposed rezoning program would be within the analysis conducted for the FEIR. The same general type of development would be constructed for both the adopted housing element and the proposed rezoning program. The maximum operational emissions are represented by the 590-foot-tall building analyzed in the FEIR, even though, in rare circumstances, some buildings could exceed 590-feet under the proposed rezoning program. FEIR

---

[57] City and County of San Francisco. 2018. 10 South Van Ness Avenue Mixed-Use Project. *https://sfmea.sfplanning.org/2018-10-17_DEIR_10SVN_reduced.pdf*. Accessed August 11, 2025.

[58] Building height is not a variable that can be inputted in CalEEMod for residential and/or commercial buildings. Building sizes in CalEEMod are defined by other variables, such as square footage, number of units, and surface area.

[59] As noted in the FEIR, this result does not imply that all development of buildings of this size under the proposed rezoning program would cause an exceedance of the threshold. Future projects would be required to conduct a project-level criteria pollutant assessment to determine whether thresholds would actually be exceeded.

pp. 4.6-55 and 4.6-56 discuss the types of sources that would generate emissions during operation of future development (e.g., on-road mobile sources, architectural coatings and consumer products, and stationary sources). The conclusion in the FEIR is that total operational emissions for future development would be below the air district's thresholds of significance for all pollutants. That conclusion also applies to the proposed rezoning program. Operational emissions would not exceed any thresholds for any representative building type that would be constructed under the proposed rezoning program, and the impact would be less than significant.

SENSITIVE RECEPTOR POLLUTANT EXPOSURE

The programmatic citywide evaluation of $PM_{2.5}$ and health risks from on-road vehicle traffic conducted for the FEIR was specific to the conditions expected to occur under the adopted housing element. It found that $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations and health risks would increase relative to the baseline in some locations and decrease in other locations. Although the FEIR results are specific to the growth distribution anticipated in the FEIR, similar results can be expected for the proposed rezoning program as both the health risk modeling and the citywide growth modeling were conservative and may overestimate growth and resulting impacts. Furthermore, the proposed rezoning program would result in a net increase of 4,000 units relative to the adopted housing element, but the increase would be distributed across the city and incremental in most neighborhoods. Because sensitive receptor exposure to $PM_{2.5}$ and toxic air contaminants is a localized concern and the net increase in growth and thus vehicle traffic in most neighborhoods would be relatively minor, the FEIR results are anticipated to be reasonably representative of the effects from the proposed rezoning program. Conservatively, the slight increase in growth in neighborhoods may result in a similarly slight increase in localized $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations and cancer risk, but the overall conclusion would remain the same.

Additionally, as noted previously, since adoption of the FEIR the city published updated maps defining the APEZ areas in 2025. Updates to the APEZ areas are undertaken routinely, and the update for 2025 slightly expands the APEZ coverage in the city. The same general areas of the city remain affected by the APEZ between the 2020 and 2025 maps; however, the 2025 update has identified some new APEZ areas in the Sunset District and in the Lakeshore area. **Figure 4** shows the changes in APEZ areas between 2020 and 2025.

As noted above, the proposed rezoning program would result in an incremental increase in overall units and a slightly different growth distribution, where more housing growth would occur in the Downtown, Marina, Mission, Northeast, and Western Addition planning districts compared to the rezoning analysis assumptions in the FEIR, which projected that growth would be heavily concentrated in the Inner Sunset, Outer Sunset, and Richmond planning districts. Thus, the distribution of $PM_{2.5}$ and the cancer risk would be similarly different from both the baseline and the FEIR analysis; however, there would very likely be air quality benefits in some locations, along with concentration and risk increases in other locations, like the adopted housing element. Although the distribution of $PM_{2.5}$ and the cancer risks would be slightly different, the magnitude of the results is



Graphics ... Gy_SF_Planning Rezoning 104844 (8-14-25) tg

Family Zoning Plan - Housing Element Rezoning Program
Case Nos. 2019-016230ENV, 2021-005878CWP, and 2021-005878GPA

Figure 4
2025 Air Pollution Exposure Zone Areas Compared to the 2020 Air Pollution Exposure Zone Areas

expected to be reasonably similar, because the net increase would be distributed across the city. Additionally, because the APEZ areas have expanded since 2020, the proposed rezoning program may result in a small proportion of additional rezoned parcels being in the APEZ, which could increase the number of people exposed to the generally high pollutant concentrations in the APEZ. Although the specific results and locations of a $PM_{2.5}$ and cancer risk analysis cannot be determined at this time, the proposed rezoning program would not substantially worsen a significant impact from the FEIR. It would result in more net housing units than the adopted housing element, but the increase would be distributed across the city, decreasing the likelihood that $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations or cancer risks would meaningfully exceed the maximum values modeled in the FEIR. The additional parcels that may be added in the expanded APEZ areas (see **Figure 4**, p. 96) would also not constitute a substantially worse impact, because the APEZ expansion is the result of changes to background (i.e. non-project-related) sources of emissions. Similarly, although the proposed rezoning program would result in a net increase in housing units in some areas that are more affected by the 2020 APEZ area[60] (i.e. Northeast planning area), relative to the adopted housing element, this change does not constitute a substantially worse impact.

The maximum increases in $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations and cancer risks would not be meaningfully different than those found in the FEIR analysis, and the results would most likely still be above the air district's thresholds and thus significant and unavoidable with mitigation.

For future development, health risks and $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations were modeled for the same representative building types discussed previously. As already noted, the representative buildings analyzed in the FEIR are also representative of those under the proposed rezoning program, even if, in rare cases, buildings taller than 590 feet may be constructed in limited locations. The FEIR determined that construction of future development in combination with the use of emergency generators during project operation would result in both significant $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations and cancer risks in some circumstances. The FEIR cites an example of a 240-foot-tall building with a significant $PM_{2.5}$ and cancer risk impact at receptors located 98 feet from a future development project site. That scenario, a receptor 98 feet from a project site and the $PM_{2.5}$ concentration and cancer risk results being above the air district thresholds, would also apply to the proposed rezoning program. Many additional combinations of building types and receptor distances could also result in significant impacts. The full results from the representative building type analysis for $PM_{2.5}$ and health risks are included in Appendix I.3 of the FEIR and is applicable to the proposed rezoning program as well. To mitigate the significant impact, the FEIR analysis considered Mitigation Measures M-AQ-3, Clean Off-Road Construction Equipment; M-TR-4a, Parking Maximums and Transportation Demand Management; and M-AQ-5, Best Available Control Technology for Diesel Engines. These measures would also apply to the proposed rezoning program. However, even with the measures, the FEIR analysis demonstrated that significant $PM_{2.5}$ and cancer risk impacts would still occur for the representative building types. This impact would be significant and unavoidable with mitigation for the proposed rezoning program.

[60] Although the APEZ was expanded in 2025, the proposed rezoning program may result in a net increase in housing units in the 2020 APEZ area, which is also included within the 2025 APEZ area.

ODOR EMISSIONS

The proposed rezoning program would, like the adopted housing element, result in exhaust-related odors and reactive organic gas (ROG) emissions from the application of architectural coatings as future development is constructed. The distribution of growth and the locations where construction-related odors would be emitted would be different for the proposed rezoning program because it proposes development in some areas that are different from those of the adopted housing element. However, the type and magnitude of the construction-related odors would not vary substantially between the adopted housing element and the proposed rezoning program because the same general type of development would be constructed under both (i.e., residential and commercial buildings). As noted in the FEIR, odors from diesel fumes, asphalt paving, and architectural coatings would be temporary and would disperse rapidly with distance from the source. The proposed rezoning program would not result in the frequent exposure of sensitive receptors to objectionable odor emissions.

With respect to operational odors, both the adopted housing element and proposed rezoning program would result in future development (e.g., residential and commercial/retail uses) that is not typically a generator of substantial odor emissions. Thus, the proposed rezoning program would not involve siting a new facility that would generate substantial odors. Like the adopted housing element, the proposed rezoning program would have a less-than-significant impact with respect to generating objectionable odors that would affect substantial numbers of people.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The FEIR determined that the adopted housing element would result in significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts regarding $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations and health risks because emissions from future development could combine with emissions from other projects to result in even greater impacts than the impacts resulting from the adopted housing element alone. As concluded in the FEIR, the cumulative effect of toxic air contaminants and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions would result in concentrations and cancer risks that would exceed the air district thresholds. It also found that there is an existing cumulative health risk impact in the city, and the adopted housing element's contribution to that impact would be cumulatively considerable. Cumulative impacts related to odors were found to not be significant, however.

As discussed for the project-level effects, the contribution of $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations and toxic air contaminants resulting from the proposed rezoning program would be similar to that of the adopted housing element. Thus, the contribution to the existing cumulative health risk impact would remain cumulatively considerable.

CONCLUSION

In summary, the proposed rezoning program would not result in new significant air quality impacts that were not previously identified in the FEIR, nor would it result in more severe impacts than those previously identified. No new mitigation measures or changes to existing mitigation measures are required.

Wind

FEIR FINDINGS

The potential wind impacts of the adopted housing element are analyzed in Section 4.7, Wind, of the FEIR. The FEIR identified eight key areas for the analysis of impacts from wind (i.e., Key Areas 1 through 8). The areas were selected to show a range of potential wind conditions throughout the city, representing locations where the greatest amount of future development consistent with the adopted housing element would likely occur in comparison to the 2050 environmental baseline. As determined in the FEIR, based on future representative conditions, wind hazard exceedances would likely not occur in Key Areas 1, 4, 5, 7, and 8 under the 2050 baseline or with development consistent with the adopted housing element. However, wind hazard exceedances would be expected in Key Areas 2, 3, and 6.

As detailed in the FEIR, wind hazard exceedances are predicted under both the 2050 environmental baseline and the adopted housing element in Key Area 2. However, in Key Areas 3 and 6, a wind hazard exceedance would not likely occur under the 2050 environmental baseline but would likely occur under the adopted housing element. Therefore, in Key Areas 2, 3, and 6, development consistent with the adopted housing element that exceeds 85 feet in height would likely create wind hazards in publicly accessible areas with substantial pedestrian use, resulting in a significant impact.[61]

Implementation of Mitigation Measures M-WI-1a, Wind Minimization, and M-WI-1b, Maintenance Plan for Landscaping on or off the Project Site and Wind Baffling Measures in the Public Right-of-Way, would be effective in reducing or avoiding the potential for a wind hazard exceedance. However, there are uncertainties regarding the ability of project sponsors to obtain approvals for wind baffling measures that would require modifications off-site, including in public rights-of-way or additions to buildings that project out over the public-right-of way. Therefore, Mitigation Measures M-WI-1a and M-WI-1b may not reduce wind impacts to a less-than-significant level for every project. As such, the FEIR determined that the adopted housing element would result in a significant and unavoidable wind impacts, even with mitigation.

PROPOSED REZONING PROGRAM IMPACTS

The approach to evaluating the proposed rezoning program is described above under “Analysis of Potential Environmental Effects,” p. 32. The changes under the proposed rezoning program that would affect wind are addressed below.

[61] As detailed on p. 4.7-8 of the FEIR, the department, in consultation with qualified technical specialists who evaluate wind impacts, determined that buildings measuring less than 85 feet in height would not have the potential to create wind hazard impacts in San Francisco; thus, the department would not require a quantitative wind hazards impact analysis for buildings that are 85 feet or less in height.

The analysis provided in this section is based on the "Pedestrian-Level Wind Assessment, San Francisco Housing Element April 2025 Updates" prepared by RWDI in support of the proposed rezoning program; it is included in Appendix C of this addendum.[62] The key areas evaluated in the FEIR are representative of conditions in the city where buildings over 85 feet could result in accelerated ground-level wind speeds under the adopted housing element. Under the proposed rezoning program, buildings over 85 feet in height could be built in more areas of the city, and three new representative key areas (Key Areas 9, 10, and 11) were identified by the department for the evaluation of wind impacts to allow a representative data set that would cover multiple combinations of all relevant parameters (e.g., topography, wind directionality, change in building heights, spacing between buildings, etc.) that would affect wind impacts, as listed below and in Appendix C:[63]

- Key Area 9: Van Ness Avenue between Lombard Street and McAllister Street
- Key Area 10: Market Street between Castro Street and Van Ness Avenue
- Key Area 11: Geary Boulevard between Second Street and Divisadero Street

It is anticipated that these key areas could experience height increases resulting in buildings between 50 to 500 feet, with two limited areas up to 650 feet, under the proposed rezoning program.[64] The three new key areas expand the representative areas analyzed in the FEIR.

This impact analysis is consistent with the FEIR methodology, which identifies a significant impact as any net new exceedance(s) of the 26-mile-per-hour equivalent wind speed wind hazard criterion for a single hour in a year.

KEY AREA 9

The FEIR evaluated a section of Van Ness Avenue between Jackson Street and Sutter Street in Key Area 3. The FEIR determined that future development consistent with the adopted housing element would be substantially taller than the surrounding buildings under the 2050 environmental baseline due to the general low height of development west of Area 3 and the open expanse of Lafayette Park, which would increase the exposure of the proposed tall buildings to predominant winds. Under the proposed rezoning program, the allowable building heights within Key Area 3 would increase to approximately 35 stories, or 350 feet, and extend over a longer stretch of Van Ness Avenue (i.e., Key Area 9) and into an area where existing building heights are low and height changes were not specifically proposed under the adopted housing element. Like Key Area 3, the increase in building heights and redistribution of growth allowed under the proposed rezoning program could result in increased ground-level wind speeds in Key Area 9 - along Van Ness Avenue and at cross streets near

---

62 RWDI, Pedestrian-Level Wind Assessment, San Francisco Housing Element, June 2025 Update, August 14, 2025.

63 The FEIR evaluated Key Areas 1 through 8; thus, the new key areas evaluated in this addendum are Key Areas 9 through 11.

64 Under the proposed rezoning program, buildings with heights generally up to 500 feet, except up to 650 feet, would be allowed in very limited areas within the city (i.e., near the intersections of Van Ness Avenue and Geary Boulevard and Van Ness Avenue and Market Street).

tall buildings. Downwashing, corner acceleration and channeling flows are expected around the base of tall buildings that are downwind (or east of) the much lower existing developments. Similar to impacts in Key Area 3, the resulting wind activity would likely result in exceedances of the hazard criterion along all areas with a proposed height increase of up to 35 stories. However, this would not constitute a substantial increase in the severity of the wind impact identified in the FEIR because the wind impacts in this key area are similar to those in the other areas studied in the FEIR's representative analysis (i.e., it is neither a new impact nor a more severe impact) and because Mitigation Measures M-WI-1a and M-WI-1b would continue to apply to all buildings over 85 in height and subject to CEQA, throughout the city if analysis demonstrates a significant wind impact.

KEY AREA 10

The FEIR determined that future development consistent with the adopted housing element would have an allowable height of approximately 85 feet or less along Market Street between Castro Street and Van Ness Avenue, allowing winds to blow over the area without much disruption and negligible building-induced impacts. Under the proposed rezoning program, allowable heights in Key Area 10 would increase to approximately 16 stories, or 160 feet, at street intersections and 14 stories, or 140 feet, in other places along this segment of Market Street. In addition, the proposed rezoning program would extend the higher height limits to a longer stretch of Market Street and into an area where existing heights are currently approximately 85 feet. In adjacent blocks that do not front Market Street directly, the allowable height under the proposed rezoning program would be approximately 50 feet, an increase of 10 feet from 40 feet or no change in height as 50 feet under existing conditions. Downwashing, corner acceleration, and channeling flows would be expected around the base of the tall buildings in Key Area 10. The low building heights on the adjacent blocks coupled with the increased building heights on Market Street within this area would result in wind activity that would be expected to exceed the hazard criterion on Market Street and at cross streets, with greater wind speeds anticipated at the intersections of Market Street at Church Street and at Gough Street, where the allowed heights are approximately 240 to 250 feet, or approximately 100 feet taller than the approximately 140-foot heights allowed in the adjacent blocks. However, this would not constitute a substantial increase in the severity of the wind impact identified in the FEIR because wind impacts in this key area are similar to those in the other areas studied in the FEIR's representative analysis (i.e., it is neither a new impact nor a more severe impact) and because Mitigation Measures M-WI-1a and M-WI-1b would continue to apply to all buildings over 85 in height, throughout the city, if subject to CEQA and if analysis demonstrates a significant wind impact.

KEY AREA 11

The FEIR determined that future development consistent with the adopted housing element would include building heights of up to approximately 85 feet along most of Geary Boulevard, with taller heights up to approximately 240 feet to 300 feet around the intersection at Masonic Avenue. Under the proposed rezoning program, the allowable building heights in the west half of Key Area 11 would decrease to approximately 80 feet in certain blocks and increase to 140 feet in others where

the previously allowed height under the adopted housing element was approximately 85 feet. In the east half of Key Area 11, allowable building heights under the proposed rezoning program would range from approximately 140 to 490 feet compared to the approximately 85 to 300 feet allowed under the adopted housing element. Downwashing, corner acceleration, and channeling flows would be expected around the base of tall buildings on Geary Boulevard. The height difference between the rezoned blocks and the surrounding blocks with low heights would result in wind speeds that would likely exceed the hazard criterion. However, this would not constitute a substantial increase in the severity of the wind impact identified in the FEIR because wind impacts in this key area are similar to those in the other areas studied in the FEIR's representative analysis (i.e., it is neither a new impact nor a more severe impact) and because Mitigation Measures M-WI-1a and M-WI-1b would continue to apply to all buildings over 85 in height throughout the city, if subject to CEQA and if analysis demonstrates a significant wind impact.

As stated above, this analysis assumes a worst-case future scenario under the proposed rezoning program. In Key Area 9, buildings on some blocks along Van Ness Avenue could be built to the maximum height with buildings to the west being less than half of the maximum height. If more tall buildings are constructed on the blocks to the west of those along Van Ness Avenue, Key Area 9 would be more protected from prevailing winds and fewer wind hazard exceedances may occur. In Key Areas 10 and 11 substantial building height differences would result in a larger area of exposure of tall buildings to prevailing winds which could lead to wind hazard exceedances under the proposed rezoning program, particularly around blocks with allowed building heights of approximately 240 to 250 feet in Key Area 10 and 240 to 290 feet in Key Area 11.

Analysis of the additional key areas discloses that there would be wind hazard exceedances due to the higher heights proposed in limited areas of the city added by the proposed rezoning program. Like the adopted housing element, this analysis is programmatic and represents a worst-case future scenario of potential ground-level wind impacts and is significant and unavoidable with mitigation. Mitigation Measures M-WI-1a and M-WI-1b would continue to apply to all buildings over 85 in height and subject to CEQA as determined applicable, throughout the city.

PROPOSED SECTION 148 AMENDMENT AND CHANGE FROM ONE-HOUR TO NINE-HOUR HAZARD STANDARD

The proposed rezoning program includes an amendment to planning code section 148 to consolidate existing wind controls into one section of the code and to modify the one-hour hazard standard to a nine-hour standard. This change was not addressed in the FEIR but would implement Housing Element Implementation Actions 8.4.12 and 8.5.6. Below is the environmental analysis for this change.

Existing Wind Analysis Requirements. Wind impact analysis compares existing ground-level wind conditions with anticipated conditions resulting from a development project. Natural land features and building characteristics—such as height, massing, and orientation to the prevailing winds — are factors affecting how a new development changes ground-level wind speed and direction in its vicinity.

In San Francisco, proposed projects over 85 feet in height require a wind impact analysis under two conditions:

1. The site is within a zoning district with wind controls per the San Francisco Planning Code and/or;
2. The project is subject to environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

Planning code section 148, Reduction of Ground-Level Wind Currents in Downtown Commercial (C-3) Districts, requires buildings in C-3 zoning districts to be shaped so as not to cause ground-level wind currents to exceed defined pedestrian comfort and hazard criteria. The pedestrian comfort and hazard criteria for certain zoning districts elsewhere in the city (e.g., the Downtown Residential Districts, the Folsom and Main Residential/Commercial Special Use District, and the Van Ness Special Use District) are the same as those established for the C-3 zoning districts by section 148 (see sections 243, 249.1, and 825). There are also wind controls for the Central SoMa Special Use District (see section 249.79 (d)(9). The wind controls for Central SoMa include both comfort and hazard criteria, but are slightly more permissive than in C-3 and other zoning districts, as described further, below.

The pedestrian comfort criteria are based on pedestrian-level wind speeds averaged over one minute, the same averaging time as used for the National Weather Service's wind data. The comfort criteria consist of 11 mph for areas of substantial pedestrian use and 7 mph in public seating areas and reflect the winds speeds above which the spaces would be uncomfortable for the intended uses. The hazard criterion is 26 miles per hour (mph) "equivalent wind speed" which is defined in the planning code as "an hourly mean wind speed adjusted to incorporate the effects of gustiness or turbulence on pedestrians" for one hour in a year. The wind hazard criterion of 26 mph is based on wind speeds averaged over one hour. This is equivalent to a one-minute average of 36 mph, as such locations with gusts of 36 mph (or greater) are considered to be wind hazards exceedances.[65]

Projects may receive exceptions from the planning code by the Zoning Administrator, the department or planning commission for comfort exceedances. However, a building subject to planning code wind controls that results in a net new hazard exceedance compared with existing conditions would have a significant wind impact under CEQA, if applicable, and could not be approved, unless the project sponsor amends the project to reduce or eliminate the wind hazard.

To comply with the Code requirements for comfort criteria, a project must go through a wind tunnel test - a quantitative assessment - because comfort criteria cannot be assessed qualitatively. Proposed development within the zoning districts with wind controls must address a wind hazard exceedance through modification of the building design (height, massing, and orientation), with the incorporation of wind baffling measures such as canopies, or the addition of wind-reducing features such as landscaping or wind screens at the ground level.

[65] A.D. Penwarden. Build Sci. Acceptable Wind Speeds in Towns, Vol. 8, pp. 259-267. Pergamon Press 1973.

For the purpose of CEQA, the department conducts wind impact analysis for proposed buildings over 85 feet in height citywide and only with respect to the hazard criterion set forth in Section 148 (i.e., 26 miles per hour for one hour in a year). Proposed buildings must not result in any net new hazard exceedance(s) compared with existing conditions. Unlike for Code compliance, wind impact analysis for CEQA compliance may be qualitative or quantitative. In some instances, there is enough information for a wind consultant to determine that hazardous winds would not result from a proposed development because of factors such as the orientation of the building to prevailing winds, location, topography, and the characterization (primarily height and massing) of existing development surrounding a project site. When a qualitative analysis demonstrating no hazardous winds is adequate, wind tunnel testing is not required for CEQA purposes.

Environmental Impacts. In San Francisco, wind impact analysis for CEQA assesses whether a project would have a significant effect by creating wind hazards in publicly accessible areas of substantial pedestrian use. Exceedances of the comfort criteria are not an impact under CEQA. Therefore, removal of the comfort criteria would not result in a significant environmental impact related to wind hazards or safety and no further analysis of this change is required. The discussion below focuses on the change from the one-hour standard to the nine-hour standard for generation of hazardous wind.

Proposed Wind Analysis Requirements - Amendments to Planning Code Section 148. Subsequent to certification of the FEIR, the department determined that the one-hour hazard criterion is too conservative for purposes of CEQA, as well as for wind analysis for purpose of planning code regulation and should be changed, as currently proposed. The proposed change and the reasons for this change, both from a technical and policy perspective, are described below.

The proposed rezoning program includes amendments to the existing planning code wind controls. The modified wind controls would continue to apply in areas that are currently subject to such controls, but they would be consolidated into an amended Section 148, while sections 243, 249.1, 249.78(d)(9), and 825 would be repealed. In areas where planning code wind controls exist, the comfort criteria would be eliminated – that is, project sponsors would not be required to measure wind comfort conditions that could result from their project and would not be subject to seeking exceptions for any exceedances. In some cases, such as when qualitative analysis can demonstrate there would be no hazardous winds, elimination of comfort criteria would remove the requirement for a wind tunnel test. In addition, the hazard criterion would be modified such that proposed development must not create any net new exceedance of 26 mph equivalent wind speed for nine hours or more in a year, rather than one hour, compared with existing conditions. Similar to current practice, no exceptions would be granted for net new exceedance(s) of the nine-hour hazard standard compared with the existing conditions.

The City proposes to change the hazard criterion from a one-hour standard to a nine-hour standard for the following policy reasons. The San Francisco wind requirements were developed as part of the Downtown Area Plan between 1983 and 1985 to standardize the procedures for determining

which buildings required wind analysis, how the analysis should be conducted, and what criteria should be used to determine if a project met the City's requirements. The department set a limit of one hour of hazardous wind annually during the Downtown Plan process (1985). However, the one-hour standard is very conservative, requiring proposed projects to demonstrate that windspeeds of 26 mph or more may not be exceeded for one hour in a year. To determine if a project complies with the hazard criterion, a project sponsor must hire a wind consultant to conduct extensive, time-consuming, and expensive studies and possible redesigns of their projects. The City has since determined that these studies and redesigns serve as an overly conservative constraint to housing development. Most jurisdictions with wind controls use a more reasonable standard of up to nine hours in a year.[66]

In August 2016, the department hosted a Wind Analysis Roundtable Discussion (2016 roundtable) attended by academic and industry experts. The roundtable was convened because the department had identified inconsistencies in wind tunnel testing and wished to solicit feedback from an expert panel on how to address the inconsistencies. The long-term goal was to standardize wind tunnel testing and eliminate/minimize inconsistencies. The roundtable resulted in suggestions for refinement to wind analysis standards that should be considered as part of an update to the planning code section 148 as well as the protocols for conducting wind studies in San Francisco.

The 2016 roundtable recommended that the City: 1) improve the weather data used as an input for wind tunnel tests; 2) expand the number of wind directions analyzed from four directions to 16 or 32 directions;[67] 3) allow landscape features to be included in wind tunnel tests; and 4) modify the one-hour standard to allow up to 10 hours in a year.

The City addressed recommendations 1 and 2 through services of a consultant that updated the climatology data that has been used for wind tunnel test since 2023.[5] This data allows testing for 36 wind directions, resulting in more accurate results. The City also has included landscaping in wind tunnel testing, consistent with recommendation 3.

To date, the City has implemented recommendations 1, 2, and 3, which were changes that could be made administratively. Recommendation 4, however, requires an amendment to the planning code, and until now it was not deemed a priority for the department to make this change. However, in response to the October 2023 California Department of Housing and Community Development's (HCD) Housing Policy and Practice Review (PPR) Required Action 2.2 and the City's Housing Element Implementation actions 8.4.12 and 8.5.6, the department conducted a thorough review of the department's wind impact analysis requirements for both planning code wind controls and for environmental review. This was the first comprehensive review that had been conducted since the development of wind controls for the Central SoMa Plan in planning code section 249(d)(9).

---

[66] RWDI, Pedestrian-Level Wind Assessment, San Francisco Housing Element, June 2025 Update, August 14, 2025.

[67] The 2016 roundtable experts indicated that four directions were adequate for assessing wind comfort, but that 16 or 32 directions were needed to assess hazardous winds (2016 Roundtable Meeting minutes).

For the response to the HCD PRR, the department concluded that wind is an appropriate topic for environmental review given the wind conditions in San Francisco. However, the department recognized that the procedures in place to conduct wind analysis should be improved. The 2016 roundtable had recommended the change to a nine-hour standard. In addition, the environmental review for the Central SoMa Plan, an area plan of the General Plan adopted in 2019, acknowledged that the nine-hour standard was more reasonable and more broadly accepted as an industry standard.[68] The Central SoMa Special Use District wind controls allow exceptions to the one-hour hazard standard provided that the nine-hour standard is met.[69]

The department now proposes to implement the change from the one-hour standard to the nine-hour standard, a modified version of recommendation 4 from the 2016 roundtable. The threshold of 26 mph is a commonly used wind safety guideline derived from the wind condition that would generate a three-second gust of wind at 20 meters per second. The 2016 roundtable did not recommend changing this threshold.

From a policy perspective, changing the requirement to find a significant hazardous wind impact from net new location(s) of one-hour of winds exceeding 26 mph to a nine-hour standard would remove a constraint for housing development by easing the ability of housing projects to comply more quickly and with less cost.

The City would still require screening-level analysis for projects greater than 85 feet in height for CEQA and planning code review purposes, as applicable. If the screening analysis indicates the potential for hazardous winds (speeds greater than 26 mph), the City would require a wind tunnel test. There would be no significant wind impact identified if the wind tunnel demonstrated no net new locations with hours of exceedance of 9 hours or more. Net new exceedances of the 26 mph equivalent wind speeds for nine or more hours in a year would indicate a potential impact and require application of wind-reducing features as mitigation measures and/or modification of project features.

As a result of the changed wind hazard criterion from one to nine hours, under the proposed rezoning some tall buildings (greater than 85 feet in height) for projects subject to CEQA and/or the proposed wind controls *could* be permitted and no significant impact would identified; there would be no implementation of mitigation measures or project redesign. This may lead to accelerated ground-level winds at or above 26 mph equivalent wind speeds for one to eight hours per year in a location, and incremental increases in wind gusts *may* be experienced by pedestrians in areas surrounding tall buildings for time limited to nine hours in a year at one location and is negligible. The nine-hour standard considers that the strongest wind gusts occur during storm events, and storm events on average last about three hours. Therefore, incidental gusts occurring during two storm events is tolerable; once there is a pattern of gusts during three storm events or more, wind-reducing features are

[68] RWDI, Pedestrian-Level Wind Assessment, San Francisco Housing Element, June 2025 Update, August 14, 2025.

[69] San Francisco Planning Code. Section 249.78. Central SoMa Special Use District. Added by ordinance 296-18. Effective 12/16/2019. *https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/san_francisco/latest/sf_planning/0-0-0-60331*. Accessed August 26, 2025.

warranted.[70] Also people generally avoid walking during storms, if possible, particularly people that are less able-bodied and more likely to be injured by wind gusts. Therefore, this leads to a very low likelihood of wind impacts to pedestrians. However, if hazardous wind levels rise above nine hours in any one location as a result of a development proposal, then wind-reducing features would be required.

Based on these facts, the department has determined that the proposed changes to the planning code wind controls and the CEQA impact threshold would not result in "new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects," under Public Resources Code Section 21166 and Guidelines Section 15162. Therefore, the FEIR adequately disclosed the significant-and-unavoidable-with-mitigation impact of the proposed rezoning program and no supplemental or subsequent EIR is required.

CONCLUSION

The FEIR identified eight key areas in the city where development under the adopted housing element could result in buildings over 85 feet in height; these key areas were selected to represent a variety of wind conditions throughout the city, based on geographic location; exposure to prevailing winds; and characteristics of the existing built environment. In five of these key areas, no wind hazard exceedances occur under 2050 baseline conditions, and none were projected with development under the adopted housing element. Wind hazard exceedances were expected in the other three key representative areas.

However, the FEIR conservatively concluded that all buildings over 85 feet tall have the potential to result in accelerated ground-level wind speeds and could lead to wind hazard exceedances. As such, FEIR Mitigation Measures M-WI-1a and M-WI-1b apply to all buildings over 85 feet, if subject to CEQA and a significant wind impact is identified, citywide.

Similarly, under the proposed rezoning program, construction of buildings over 85 feet in height could occur in more areas of the city, and three new representative key areas were identified. Key areas 9, 10, and 11 were selected because they represent areas with the greatest height increases under the proposed rezoning. When compared to existing height limits and the heights of existing buildings, tall buildings in these locations would be more exposed to prevailing winds because they would not be shielded by tall buildings on the windward side. As a result, these key areas tend to be representative of worst-case conditions in terms of wind hazard exceedances and confirm the finding that all buildings over 85 feet in height could result in accelerated ground-level wind speeds that could result in wind hazard exceedances. As such, mitigation measures M-WI-1a and M-WI-1b would continue to apply to all buildings over 85 in height and subject to CEQA, throughout the city.

Although wind hazard exceedances are expected within Key Areas 9, 10, and 11, the analysis of the additional key areas does not indicate that there would be new significant or more severe significant impacts related to wind. By expanding the number of representative key areas, the analysis confirms that the nature and severity of the wind impacts under the proposed rezoning

[70] Personal communication between department staff and RWDI, November 2024.

program would be similar to the wind impacts disclosed in the FEIR for the adopted housing element. That is, the proposed rezoning program would not result in worsened or more widespread wind impacts just because wind hazard exceedances are expected in more key areas. Rather, the analysis of the additional key areas, which were not evaluated in the FEIR, provides a more comprehensive representative analysis of potential wind impacts in the city.

As discussed above, this impact analysis is consistent with the FEIR methodology which identifies a significant impact as any net new exceedance(s) of the 26-mile-per-hour equivalent wind speed wind hazard criterion for a single hour in a year. In summary, although the proposed rezoning would allow buildings over 85 feet to be developed in additional areas which could lead to accelerated wind speeds at additional locations, the FEIR mitigation measures would apply to projects with significant wind impacts subject to CEQA. Nonetheless, as discussed herein and in the FEIR, application of the mitigation measures may not always eliminate all wind hazard exceedances. Therefore, wind impacts would continue to be significant and unavoidable, even with mitigation. In addition, FEIR Mitigation Measure M-WI-1a: Wind Minimization and Mitigation Measure M-WI-1b: Maintenance Plan for Landscaping on or off the Project Site and Wind Baffling Measures in the Public Right-of-Way have both been revised for clarity and to conform with updated the 9-hour standard for hazardous winds, as follows (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~ and inserted text is shown in double underline):

> ***Mitigation Measure M-WI-1a: Wind Minimization.***
> If the screening-level assessment conducted by the department, or an assessment submitted to the department by a qualified consultant for approval, determines wind tunnel testing is required due to the potential for one or more proposed buildings to create or exacerbate a wind hazard exceedance, such testing shall be conducted by a professionally qualified firm. The proposed buildings tested in the wind tunnel may incorporate wind baffling features or landscaping. Such features must be tested in the wind tunnel and discussed in a wind report in the order of preference discussed below, with the overall intent being to reduce ground-level wind speeds such that the project shall not cause a net new location where equivalent wind speeds ~~to~~ reach or exceed the 26-mph wind hazard criterion for ~~a single~~ nine hours of the year in areas of substantial use by people walking (e.g., sidewalks, plazas, building entries, etc.):
>
> ~~1. ***Building Massing.*** New buildings and additions to existing buildings shall be shaped to minimize ground-level wind speeds. Examples of these shapes include setbacks, stepped façades, and vertical steps in the massing to help disrupt wind flows.~~
>
> 1~~2~~. ***Wind Baffling Measures on the Building or on the Project Site***. Wind baffling measures shall be included on future buildings and/or on the project site to disrupt vertical wind flows along tower façades and through the project site. Examples of these may include setbacks, stepped façades, and vertical steps in the massing, staggered balcony arrangements on main tower façades, screens and canopies attached to the buildings, rounded building corners, covered walkways, colonnades, art, free-standing canopies, or wind screens. Only after incorporating all feasible features to reduce wind impacts via building massing and wind baffling, and documenting any such features deemed infeasible shall the following be considered:

2~~3~~. ***Landscaping on or off the Project Site and/or Wind Baffling Measures in the Public Right-of-Way.*** Landscaping and/or wind baffling measures shall be installed in the public right-of-way to slow winds along sidewalks and protect places where people walking are expected to gather or linger. ~~Landscaping and/or wind baffling measures shall be installed on the windward side (i.e., the direction from which the wind is blowing) of the areas of concern.~~ Examples of wind baffling measures may include street art to provide a sheltered area for people to walk and free-standing canopies and wind screens in areas where people walking are expected to gather or linger. Preferred landscaping includes groups of street trees of moderate maturity. If landscaping on or off the project site or wind baffling measures in the public right-of-way are required as one of the features to mitigate wind impacts, Mitigation Measure M-WI-1b shall also apply.

Mitigation Measure M-WI-1b: Maintenance Plan for Landscaping on or off the Project Site and Wind Baffling Measures in the Public Right-of-Way.
If it is determined infeasible to fully mitigate wind hazards via ~~massing and~~ wind baffling measures on the subject building pursuant to Mitigation Measure M-WI-1a1~~ and M-WI-1a2~~, the project sponsor shall prepare a maintenance plan for review and approval by the department to ensure maintenance of the features required pursuant to Mitigation Measure M-WI-~~1a3~~ 1a2 in perpetuity. The maintenance plan shall also be reviewed and approved by public works for landscaping or wind baffling measures in the public right-of-way.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The FEIR determined that the adopted housing element, in combination with cumulative projects, would not result in a significant cumulative wind impact. The new cumulative projects implemented subsequent to publication of the FEIR, the Great Highway Mobility Improvements Project and the Vision Zero Quick-Build program (see **Table 4**, p. 28), do not substantially alter the cumulative setting due to the location of the cumulative projects compared to the proposed rezoned area and the nature of the cumulative projects (i.e., the creation of new open space and recreation facilities via traffic and roadway modifications and pedestrian and bicycle safety improvements in the right-of-way). The Great Highway Mobility Improvements Project and the Vision Zero Quick-Build projects would not involve the development of buildings or structures that would be more than 85 feet in height; therefore, those projects would not alter the wind environment or create additional wind hazards in publicly accessible areas of substantial pedestrian use. Thus, the inclusion of the new cumulative projects would not alter the findings related to cumulative wind impacts in the FEIR. Because the proposed rezoning program would not generate new wind impacts that were not previously identified in the FEIR, and the new cumulative projects would not alter the FEIR's cumulative analysis, there would be no new significant cumulative wind impact.

CONCLUSION

In summary, the proposed rezoning program would not result in new significant wind impacts that were not previously identified in the FEIR, nor would it result in more severe impacts than those previously identified. In addition, the change in the hazard criterion from one-hour in a year to nine-hours in a year would not result in a new significant impact or a more severe impact than identified in the FEIR. No new mitigation measures are required.

Shadow

FEIR FINDINGS

The potential shadow impacts of the adopted housing element are analyzed in Section 4.8, Shadow, of the FEIR. The FEIR identified 30 representative open spaces throughout the city to show a range of potential shadow conditions throughout the city in representative locations as a result of future development consistent with the adopted housing element.Of the representative open spaces, 23 are under San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department jurisdiction (subject to planning code section 295) and seven are under the jurisdiction of other agencies.

For open space subject to planning code section 295, the FEIR analysis found that there would be no impact related to new shadow on the following seven open spaces: Margaret Hayward Playground, Civic Center Plaza, Mission Playground, Mission Dolores Park, Portrero Hill Recreation Center and Playground, Garfield Square, and Bay View KC Jones Playground. The FEIR also determined that there would less-than-significant impacts on the following 12 open spaces because the overall duration of shading with implementation of the adopted housing element would be similar to the duration under 2050 environmental baseline conditions: Lafayette Park, Helen Wills Park, Portsmouth Square, Union Square, South Park, Victoria Manolo Draves Park, Grattan Playground, Oceanview Park, Balboa Park, McCoppin Square, Fulton Playground, and Aptos Playground. The FEIR determined that there would be significant shadow impacts on three open spaces: Duboce Park, Larsen Playground, and Laurel Hill Playground. These three open spaces would experience noticeable increases in shadow durations (30 to 120 minutes longer at Duboce Park during winter, 15 to 30 minutes longer year-round at Larsen Playground, and longer morning shadows in winter at Laurel Hill Playground) as a result of implementation of the adopted housing element. For open spaces that are not subject to section 295, the FEIR determined that most impacts would be less than significant, except for those related to the outdoor recreation space at Roosevelt Middle School, which would experience significant impacts due to the up to 45 minutes of additional daily winter shadow as a result of implementation of the adopted housing element.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-SH-1, Shadow Minimization, would reduce or avoid the potential for significant shadow impacts by requiring a redesign to reduce or avoid the creation of new shadow that would substantially or adversely affect the use and enjoyment of publicly accessible open spaces, to the extent feasible. However, the specific massing and design of individual future projects consistent with the adopted housing element is currently unknown and would be subject to future project-level CEQA review. In addition, there are uncertainties regarding the feasibility of redesigning projects to reduce or avoid significant shadow impacts. Therefore, the ability of Mitigation Measure M-SH-1 to reduce potential

impacts of future development to a less-than-significant level is uncertain and evaluation on a project-by-project basis would be required. As such, the FEIR determined that the adopted housing element would result in a significant and unavoidable impact with mitigation related to shadow.

PROPOSED REZONING PROGRAM IMPACTS

The approach to evaluating the proposed rezoning program is described above under "Analysis of Potential Environmental Effects," p. 32. The changes under the proposed rezoning program that would affect shadow are addressed below.

Based on the proposed increase in building heights and growth distribution under the proposed rezoning program, the department re-evaluated the same 30 open spaces that were identified in the FEIR as well as five additional representative parks located near areas where height changes have been proposed to evaluate anticipated shadow impacts associated with the proposed rezoning program. The five additional open spaces are Francisco Park, Golden Gate Park, Joe DiMaggio Playground, Noe Valley Town Square, and Rachele Sullivan Park. To evaluate the net change in shadow effects between the FEIR and the proposed rezoning program, the department evaluated the net change in heights and projected growth distribution in areas surrounding the selected open spaces in order to determine the likelihood of any changes in shadow effects on these open spaces. **Table 7** presents a summary of the anticipated shadow effects on open spaces as a result of the proposed rezoning program compared to the adopted housing element.

EFFECTS ON OPEN SPACES SUBJECT TO SECTION 295

Consistent with the FEIR, there would be no change or increase in the severity of shadow impacts to 14 of the previously evaluated open spaces subject to section 295 as a result of the proposed rezoning program compared to the adopted housing element. Specifically, there would be no impact on the following five open spaces: Margaret Hayward Playground, Civic Center Plaza, Potrero Hill Recreation Center and Playground, Garfield Square, and Bay View Park KC Jones Playground. The proposed rezoning program would also result in less than significant impacts on the following eight open spaces: Portsmouth Square, Union Square, South Park, Victoria Manolo Draves Park, Grattan Playground, Mission Playground, Oceanview Playground, and Aptos Playground. Shadow impacts on Larsen Playground would continue to be significant and unavoidable under the proposed rezoning program; however, there would most likely be no increase or change in the levels of new shadow cast on these open spaces compared to what was evaluated in the FEIR.

As detailed in **Table 7**, regarding the five additional open spaces that were not evaluated in the FEIR (i.e., Francisco Park, Golden Gate Park, Joe DiMaggio Playground, Noe Valley Town Square, Rachele Sullivan Park), there would be a less than significant impacts on the following four open spaces: Francisco Park, Golden Gate Park, Joe DiMaggio Playground, and Rachele Sullivan Park. Shadow impacts on Noe Valley Town Square would be significant and unavoidable under the proposed rezoning program due to height increases to immediately adjacent parcels identified in the FEIR analysis as likely to be redeveloped thereby increasing the likelihood of increased shadow effects on this open space.

Table 7: Summary of Projected Shadows on Open Spaces from Future Development Consistent with the Proposed Rezoning Program Compared to the Adopted Housing Element

Open Space (Jurisdiction)	Active Uses	Projected Shadow Under the Adopted Housing Element	Adopted Housing Element Impact Conclusion	Proposed Rezoning Program Criteria for Shadow Impact Evaluation	Projected Shadow under the Proposed Rezoning Program	Proposed Rezoning Program Impact Conclusion
Open Spaces Subject to Section 295						
Lafayette Park (SFRPD)	Children's play area, tennis courts, a dog play area, and meadow, picnic tables, and seating areas. Paths and walkways.	A. Similar areas of the park would be affected by periodic shading, year-round. B. Locations of longest shadow durations would be similar. C. Seasonal variation in shadow durations would be similar. D. Annual range in shadow durations would be similar. E. Duration of shading on the majority of the park would be similar.	LTS	**Building Heights**: Rezoned heights up to approximately 350 feet along the nearby Van Ness Avenue and California Street corridor would represent an increase over what was evaluated in the FEIR, as would increases in height from 40 to 65 feet for some lots surrounding the park. However, these height increases would be offset by the reductions in building heights up to approximately 200 feet in the intervening areas between Gough Street and Van Ness Avenue along Washington, Clay, and Sacramento Streets. **Growth Distribution**: Approximately 1,000 additional units are anticipated within the area east of the park, while areas in the immediate vicinity and west of the park would have a reduction of approximately 500 units.	Based on the criteria, while the specific patterns of morning shadow may change under the proposed rezoning program due to the building height increases to the east of the park, overall, the park would not be likely to receive additional shadow from the proposed rezoning program above what was evaluated in the FEIR.	LTS

Open Space (Jurisdiction)	Active Uses	Projected Shadow Under the Adopted Housing Element	Adopted Housing Element Impact Conclusion	Proposed Rezoning Program Criteria for Shadow Impact Evaluation	Projected Shadow under the Proposed Rezoning Program	Proposed Rezoning Program Impact Conclusion
Helen Wills Park (SFRPD)	Children's play area, tennis court, basketball court, a clubhouse, and a volleyball court/half basketball court.	A. Similar areas of the park would be affected by periodic shading, from fall through spring, with a slightly larger area affected over summer. B. Locations of longest shadow durations would be similar. C. Seasonal variation in shadow durations would be similar. D. Annual range in shadow durations would be similar. E. Duration of shading on the majority of the park would be similar.	LTS	**Building Heights:** Lots immediately to the south and west of the park along Pacific Avenue and Larkin Street would be rezoned from approximately 40 feet to approximately 65 to 85 feet, and other lots within 2 blocks to the west of the park along the Van Ness Avenue corridor would be rezoned from approximately 240 feet to 350 feet. In addition, lots along Polk Street, closer to the park, would be downzoned from approximately 140 feet to approximately 85 feet. **Growth Distribution**: Approximately 900 additional units are anticipated in the areas surrounding and south of the park, while areas in the immediate vicinity and west of the park would have a reduction of approximately 500 units.	Based on the criteria, the park would be more likely to receive additional new shadow due to the rezoning program than what was evaluated under the adopted housing element; particularly during afternoon and evening hours year-round, and throughout the day during winter months.	SUM

Open Space (Jurisdiction)	Active Uses	Projected Shadow Under the Adopted Housing Element	Adopted Housing Element Impact Conclusion	Proposed Rezoning Program Criteria for Shadow Impact Evaluation	Projected Shadow under the Proposed Rezoning Program	Proposed Rezoning Program Impact Conclusion
Duboce Park (SFRPD)	Grassy areas, dog play area, basketball court, 2 children's play areas, and an arts center.	A. Similar areas of the park would be affected by periodic shading during summer, with larger areas in the central portion of the park affected by afternoon shadow during spring and fall, and longer midday shadow durations over winter. B. Areas of longest shadow durations would be similar, from spring through fall, and larger during winter along the southern edge of the park (including both children's play areas and the basketball courts). C. Seasonal variation in shadow durations would be similar. D. Annual range in shadow durations would be similar. E. Duration of shading on the majority of the park would be similar from spring through fall, and longer (30 to 120 minutes) throughout the day over winter, especially during midday hours.	SUM	**Building Heights**: Lots immediately to the south of the park along Duboce Avenue would be rezoned from approximately 40 feet to approximately 85 feet, and lots along the north side of Duboce Park east of the park have also been rezoned from approximately 40 feet to between approximately 65 to 85 feet. Other lots within 2 blocks of the park to the southeast along Market Street would also be rezoned, including some lots from approximately 85 feet to approximately 240 feet. Lots immediately north of, and to the west of, the park would be downzoned from approximately 65 or 85 feet to approximately 40 feet. **Growth Distribution:** Approximately 550 additional units are anticipated within the areas to the south and east of the park, while areas in the immediate vicinity and west of the park would have a reduction of approximately 120 units.	Based on the criteria, while some spring and fall shading would be reduced due to the downzoning to the west of the park, overall the park would be more likely to receive additional new shadow due to the proposed rezoning program than what was evaluated in the FEIR; particularly from late fall through early spring, and throughout the day during winter months.	SUM

Open Space (Jurisdiction)	Active Uses	Projected Shadow Under the Adopted Housing Element	Adopted Housing Element Impact Conclusion	Proposed Rezoning Program Criteria for Shadow Impact Evaluation	Projected Shadow under the Proposed Rezoning Program	Proposed Rezoning Program Impact Conclusion
Mission Dolores Park (SFRPD)	Tennis courts, dog play areas, picnic tables, a multi-sport court, basketball court, large grassy areas, and Helen Diller Playground.	A. Approximately half the park area would be shaded at various times daily during summer, approximately two thirds would be shaded during fall and spring, and all park areas would be periodically shaded over winter. B. Longest shadow durations occur near the east and west edges of the park from spring through fall and along the southern edge over winter. C. Longer shadow durations occur over winter with shorter durations from spring through fall. D. Range in shadow durations between zero to 45 minutes from spring through fall, and less than 15 to over 180 minutes over winter. E. Majority of the park shaded daily between 0 to 15 minutes from spring through fall, and under 30 minutes over winter.	NI	**Building Heights**: Lots surrounding the park on the south and west sides would be rezoned from approximately 40 feet to approximately 50 or 65 feet. **Growth Distribution:** Approximately 75 additional units are anticipated in areas to the south and west of the park.	Based on the criteria, the park would potentially receive some slight incremental shadow as a result of the proposed rezoning program above what was evaluated in the FEIR. However, due to the modest increase in height and growth distribution, the increase in shadow would not be significant.	LTS

Open Space (Jurisdiction)	Active Uses	Projected Shadow Under the Adopted Housing Element	Adopted Housing Element Impact Conclusion	Proposed Rezoning Program Criteria for Shadow Impact Evaluation	Projected Shadow under the Proposed Rezoning Program	Proposed Rezoning Program Impact Conclusion
Balboa Park (SFRPD)	Baseball/softball fields, large multi-purpose grass areas, skate park, children's play area, dog play area, tennis courts, soccer stadium, and pool.	A. Similar areas of the park would be affected by periodic shading, year-round. B. Locations of longest shadow durations would be similar. C. Seasonal variation in shadow durations would be similar. D. Annual range in shadow durations would be similar. E. Duration of shading on the majority of the park would be similar.	LTS	**Building Heights:** Lots near the southeast corner of the park would be rezoned from approximately 45 feet to approximately 85 or 120 feet. **Growth Distribution:** Approximately 300 additional units are anticipated to the east and south of the park.	Based on the criteria, the park would potentially receive some slight incremental shadow on the southern portion of the park as a result of the proposed rezoning above what was evaluated in the FEIR. However, due to the modest increase in height and growth distribution, the increase in shadow would not be significant.	LTS
McCoppin Square (SFRPD)	Baseball/softball field with bleachers, tennis court, half-court basketball court, children's play area, and a large grassy area.	A. Larger areas of the park, specifically wooded area near the southwest corner of the park would be affected by periodic shading during winter, and the same areas would be affected from spring through fall. B. Locations of longest shadow durations would be similar. C. Seasonal variation in shadow durations would be similar. D. Annual range in shadow durations would be similar. E. Duration of shading on the majority of the park would be similar.	LTS	**Building Heights:** Lots along the eastern and western sides of the square would be downzoned from approximately 55 feet to approximately 40 feet, while the lots along the southern edge of the square on Taraval Street would be rezoned from approximately 65 feet to approximately 85 feet. **Growth Distribution:** No substantial changes in the vicinity of the square.	Based on the criteria, the square would potentially receive less morning and afternoon shadow due to the downzoning on the eastern and western sides of the square, and potentially more midday winter shadow from the rezoned lots to the south of the square. However, altogether, the square would likely not receive additional new shadow as a result of the proposed rezoning program compared to what was evaluated in the FEIR.	LTS

Open Space (Jurisdiction)	Active Uses	Projected Shadow Under the Adopted Housing Element	Adopted Housing Element Impact Conclusion	Proposed Rezoning Program Criteria for Shadow Impact Evaluation	Projected Shadow under the Proposed Rezoning Program	Proposed Rezoning Program Impact Conclusion
Fulton Playground (SFRPD)	Tennis court, 2 children's play areas, half-court basketball court, full basketball court, seating areas located next to the play areas, and clubhouse.	A. Larger areas of the park would be affected by periodic shading from spring through fall, and similar areas would be affected over winter. B. Locations of longest shadow durations would be similar. C. Seasonal variation in shadow durations would be similar. D. Annual range in shadow durations would be similar. E. Duration of shading on the majority of the park would be longer from spring through fall (between less than 15 to 30 minutes), and similar over winter.	LTS	**Building Heights:** Lots half a block south of the playground along Fulton Street would be rezoned from approximately 45 feet to approximately 85 feet. **Growth Distribution:** Fewer units would be anticipated in the areas surrounding the playground.	Based on the criteria, the playground would receive some additional shadow during late fall and early winter as a result of the proposed rezoning program. However, this increase would be considered less than significant, consistent with what was evaluated in the FEIR.	LTS
Francisco Park (SFRPD)	Picnic area, playground, and dog play area	The possible effects of shadow on Francisco Park were not evaluated in the FEIR; however, this park is located near an area where changes in height are proposed under the proposed rezoning program.	--	**Building Heights:** Several lots to the east, west and south of the park would be upzoned from 40 to 65 feet while other lots further removed to the north, east and south would be upzoned from 40 to 50 feet up to 65 feet. However, many of the upzoned lots surrounding the park already contain developments taller than 65 feet, so shadow would not increase on these lots. **Growth Distribution:** No substantial changes in the vicinity of the park.	Based on the criteria, this open space would potentially receive an incremental amount of additional new shadow from the proposed rezoning program above what would occur under the adopted housing element, but the amount of possible new shadow would be considered less than significant.	LTS

Open Space (Jurisdiction)	Active Uses	Projected Shadow Under the Adopted Housing Element	Adopted Housing Element Impact Conclusion	Proposed Rezoning Program Criteria for Shadow Impact Evaluation	Projected Shadow under the Proposed Rezoning Program	Proposed Rezoning Program Impact Conclusion
Golden Gate Park (SFRPD)	Archery field, basketball courts, athletic fields, baseball fields, disc golf course, golf course, handball/raquet-ball courts, stadium, polo field, roller skating paved area, trails, tennis center, volleyball courts, and skate park.	The possible effects of shadow on Golden Gate Park were not evaluated in the FEIR; however, this park is located near an area where changes in height are proposed under the proposed rezoning program.	--	**Building Heights:** Majority of lots along Lincoln Way to the south of Golden Gate Park and many along Stanyan Street to the east would be upzoned from 40 to 55 feet up to 65 feet. A few clusters of lots along Fulton Street north of the park have also been upzoned from between 55 to 80 feet up to 85 feet. **Growth Distribution:** No substantial changes in the vicinity of the park.	Based on the criteria, this open space could receive some incremental additional new shadow from the proposed rezoning program above what would occur under the adopted housing element. However given the large size of Golden Gate Park and dense tree cover along the boundary of Lincoln Way, any shadows cast by taller developments would not affect the vast majority of park areas.	LTS
Joe DiMaggio Playground (SFRPD)	Basketball courts, tennis courts, bocce courts, pool and clubhouse, picnic area, and sports courts.	The possible effects of shadow on Joe DiMaggio Playground were not evaluated in the FEIR; however, this park is located near an area where changes in height are proposed under the proposed rezoning program.	--	**Building Heights:** Lots surrounding the playground would be upzoned from 40 to 50 or 65 feet. **Growth Distribution:** No substantial changes in the vicinity of the playground.	Based on the criteria, some incremental additional net new shadow from the proposed rezoning program might occur above what would occur under the adopted housing element. However, this increase would be considered less than significant.	LTS

Open Space (Jurisdiction)	Active Uses	Projected Shadow Under the Adopted Housing Element	Adopted Housing Element Impact Conclusion	Proposed Rezoning Program Criteria for Shadow Impact Evaluation	Projected Shadow under the Proposed Rezoning Program	Proposed Rezoning Program Impact Conclusion
Noe Valley Town Square (RPD)	Café seating, exercise classes, and music events.	The possible effects of shadow on Noe Valley Town Square were not evaluated in the FEIR; however, this park is located near an area where changes in height are proposed under the proposed rezoning program.	--	**Building Heights:** All lots in the vicinity of the square would be upzoned from 40 to 65 feet. **Growth Distribution:** No substantial changes in the vicinity of the square.	Based on the criteria, this open space could receive additional new shadow from the proposed rezoning program above what would occur under the adopted housing element if sites within a very close proximity to the square on the east, west, or south sides of the park were to be developed. Development on sites farther from the square would not result in net new shadow due to the presence of existing adjacent 2 to 3 story buildings that cast shadow on the square under current conditions.	SUM

Open Space (Jurisdiction)	Active Uses	Projected Shadow Under the Adopted Housing Element	Adopted Housing Element Impact Conclusion	Proposed Rezoning Program Criteria for Shadow Impact Evaluation	Projected Shadow under the Proposed Rezoning Program	Proposed Rezoning Program Impact Conclusion
Rachele Sullivan Park (11th & Natoma site) (SFRPD)	Basketball court, fitness area, children's play area, and tables and seating.	The possible effects of shadow on Rachele Sullivan Park were not evaluated in the FEIR; however, this park is located near an area where changes in height are proposed under the proposed rezoning program.	--	**Rezoned heights in the vicinity:** Lots just west of the park across 11th Street would be upzoned from 55 to 85 feet while two lots a block west of the park on Van Ness Avenue would be upzoned from 400 to 650 feet and 120 to 250 feet, respectively. Additional sites farther to the west have also been upzoned from 85 to 140 feet. **Growth Distribution:** Approximately 425 fewer units anticipated in the block west of the park.	Based on the criteria, this open space would potentially receive additional incremental new shadow from the rezoning program above what would occur under the housing element update due to taller buildings across the street from the park. The two lots with more substantial height increases would not likely change the shadow conditions substantially given shadow from these sites would frequently be cast on and beyond the park even under the adopted housing element heights. Therefore, additional height would not often increase the amount of shadow. Shadow from sites farther west would likely have little effect given heights of intervening buildings. Overall, while some increase in shadow might occur under the proposed rezoning program, it would be considered less than significant.	LTS

Open Space (Jurisdiction)	Active Uses	Projected Shadow Under the Adopted Housing Element	Adopted Housing Element Impact Conclusion	Proposed Rezoning Program Criteria for Shadow Impact Evaluation	Projected Shadow under the Proposed Rezoning Program	Proposed Rezoning Program Impact Conclusion
Open Spaces Not Subject to Section 295						
Sutro Heights Park (GGNRA)	Walking trails, vista points, pathways, and open grassy area.	A. Larger areas of the park would be affected by periodic shading, year-round. B. Locations of longest shadow durations would be similar. C. Seasonal variation in shadow durations would be similar. D. Annual range in shadow durations would be similar. E. Duration of shading on the majority of the park would slightly increase across all seasons.	LTS	**Building Heights**: Most of the lots adjacent to the park along 48th Avenue would be downzoned from approximately 55 or 65 feet to approximately 40 feet, or approximately 85 feet to approximately 65 feet. Lots on Balboa Street near the southeast corner of the park would be rezoned from approximately 40 feet to approximately 65 feet. **Growth Distribution**: Fewer units would be anticipated in the areas surrounding the park.	Based on the criteria, the park would potentially receive additional shadow near the southeastern corner of the park, but less shadow along the eastern edge. However, altogether, the park would not receive additional new shadow as a result of the proposed rezoning program compared to what was evaluated in the FEIR.	LTS

Open Space (Jurisdiction)	Active Uses	Projected Shadow Under the Adopted Housing Element	Adopted Housing Element Impact Conclusion	Proposed Rezoning Program Criteria for Shadow Impact Evaluation	Projected Shadow under the Proposed Rezoning Program	Proposed Rezoning Program Impact Conclusion
Roosevelt Middle School (SFUSD)	Schoolyard is paved and contains full and half-court basketball courts, and a multi-use court.	A. Same areas of the schoolyard would be affected by periodic shading. B. Locations of longest shadow durations would be similar. C. Seasonal variation in shadow durations would be similar. D. Annual range in shadow durations would be similar. E. Duration of shading on the majority of the schoolyard similar from spring through fall, but with longer winter durations throughout the day of 90 to 165 minutes concentrated in the southern half of the schoolyard, with midday hours receiving the most additional new shadow.	SUM	**Building Heights**: Nearly all lots on the east, west, and north sides of the school would be downzoned from approximately 85 feet to approximately 40 feet, with a few lots to the south of the school rezoned from approximately 85 feet to approximately 140 feet. **Growth Distribution:** Approximately 200 more units would be anticipated in areas surrounding the school.	Based on the criteria, the school would likely receive less additional new shadow during morning hours, year-round, but some additional midday winter shadow as a result of the proposed rezoning program. However, this increase would be consistent with what was evaluated in the FEIR.	SUM

Source: Prevision, 2025.
Notes: SFRPD = San Francisco Recreation and Park Department; GGNRA = Golden Gate National Recreation Area; SFUSD = San Francisco Unified School District; NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; SUM = significant and unavoidable with mitigation; -- indicates not applicable

As detailed in **Table 7**, p. 112, the proposed rezoning program would result in a change in shadow impacts on seven open spaces compared to the FEIR. Under the proposed rezoning program, Mission Dolores Park, Lafayette Park, Balboa Park, McCoppin Square, and Fulton Playground would experience slightly different patterns of shadow on the open spaces due to changes in building height and growth distribution proposed under the rezoning program when compared to the FEIR. However, these open spaces would either receive no additional new shadow or minimal additional shadow beyond what was evaluated in the FEIR as a result of the proposed rezoning program. Impacts would therefore remain less than significant for these open spaces. Furthermore, while Duboce Park would likely have less shading during the spring and fall under the proposed rezoning program, overall, the park would likely receive additional new shadow compared to the FEIR, particularly from late fall through early spring, and throughout the day during winter months. Nonetheless, shadow impacts on Duboce Park would continue to be significant, consistent with the FEIR, and no new mitigation measures are required.

Due to changes in building heights and growth distribution proposed under the rezoning program, Helen Wills Park would be more likely to receive additional new shadow compared to what was evaluated under the FEIR. Specifically, under the proposed rezoning program, Helen Wills Park would receive additional shadow during the afternoon and evening hours year-round, and throughout the day during the winter months. Impacts would be significant at this representative park, and greater than the less-than-significant impact that would occur under the adopted housing element. However, Mitigation Measure M-SH-1, Shadow Minimization, would reduce or avoid the potential for significant shadow impacts and future development would be required to implement this mitigation measure. No new mitigation measures are required.

EFFECTS ON OPEN SPACES NOT SUBJECT TO SECTION 295

Consistent with the FEIR, there would be no change or increase in the severity of shadow impacts to six of the eight previously evaluated open spaces not subject to section 295 as a result of the proposed rezoning program compared to the housing element. Specifically, there would be no impact related to new shadow on Daniel Webster Elementary School, and Francis Scott Key Elementary School. The proposed rezoning program would also result in less than significant impacts on the following four open spaces: Rincon Park, Salesforce Park, Sunset Boulevard, and Yerba Buena Gardens.

As detailed in **Table 7**, p. 112, the proposed rezoning program would result in a change in shadow impacts on two parks compared to the FEIR. Sutro Heights Park would experience changes in the patterns of shadow on the open spaces due to changes in building heights and growth distribution proposed under the rezoning program when compared to the FEIR; however, Sutro Heights Parks would not receive a net increase in shadow beyond what was evaluated in the FEIR as a result of the proposed rezoning program and impacts would remain less than significant. In addition, while Roosevelt Middle School would likely have less shading during morning hours, year-round, it would have some additional midday winter shading as a result of the proposed rezoning program.

However, overall, the change in shading on Roosevelt Middle Schools under the proposed rezoning program would be consistent with what was evaluated in the FEIR. Impacts to Roosevelt Middle School would continue to be significant, consistent with the FEIR.

CONCLUSION

Consistent with the FEIR, future development consistent with the proposed rezoning program would be subject to future project-level CEQA review, as applicable. If subject to CEQA and the department determines that future development consistent with the proposed rezoning program would have a significant shadow impact, Mitigation Measure M-SH-1, applicable from the FEIR, would be required. However, consistent with the FEIR, the specific massing, location, orientation, and design of individual future projects consistent with the proposed rezoning program is currently unknown, and there would continue to be uncertainties regarding the feasibility of redesigning projects to reduce or avoid significant shadow impacts. Therefore, the ability of Mitigation Measure M-SH-1 to reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level would continue to be uncertain and would be required to be evaluated on a project-by-project basis.

The analysis of the additional parks does not indicate that there would be new significant or more severe significant impacts related to shadow. By expanding the number of representative open spaces, the analysis confirms that the nature and severity of the shadow impacts under the proposed rezoning program would be similar to the shadow impacts disclosed in the FEIR for the adopted housing element. That is, the proposed rezoning program would not result in new impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of shadow impacts. Rather, the analysis of additional parks not evaluated in the FEIR, combined with a reevaluation of previously analyzed parks, provides a more comprehensive representative analysis of potential shadow impacts in the city.

The proposed rezoning program would continue to result in a significant and unavoidable with mitigation impact related to shadow, consistent with the FEIR. While impacts may be different at different locations and at different times of day than what was disclosed in the FEIR, citywide there would be no appreciable increase in severity of the significant and unavoidable impact.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The FEIR determined that the adopted housing element, in combination with cumulative projects, would not result in a significant cumulative shadow impact. The new cumulative projects implemented subsequent to publication of the FEIR, the Great Highway Mobility Improvements Project and the Vision Zero Quick-Build program (see **Table 4**, p. 28), do not substantially alter the cumulative setting due to the location of the cumulative projects compared to the proposed rezoned area and the nature of the cumulative projects (i.e., the creation of new open space and recreation facilities via traffic and roadway modifications and pedestrian and bicycle safety improvements in the right-of-way). Consistent with the FEIR, impacts associated with shadow are generally site specific; in general, shadow impacts from cumulative projects would result from new buildings or structures constructed in a project area or adjacent to a project's boundaries. Thus, the inclusion of the new

cumulative projects would not alter the findings related to cumulative shadow impacts in the FEIR. Because the proposed rezoning program would not generate new shadow impacts that were not previously identified in the FEIR, and the new cumulative projects would not alter the FEIR's cumulative analysis, there would be no new significant cumulative shadow impact.

CONCLUSION

In summary, the proposed rezoning program would not result in new significant shadow impacts that were not previously identified in the FEIR, nor would it result in more severe impacts than those previously identified. No new mitigation measures or changes to existing mitigation measures are required.

Utilities and Service Systems

FEIR FINDINGS

WATER

The potential utilities and service system impacts of the adopted housing element are analyzed in Section 4.9, Utilities and Service Systems, of the FEIR. The FEIR concluded that future development associated with implementation of the adopted housing element would increase water demand, and if the Bay-Delta Plan Amendment is implemented, significant levels of rationing would be required in dry years and the SFPUC may need to expand existing or develop new water supply facilities to address projected water supply shortfalls. The scope of construction of water supply facilities is unknown at this time. While construction-related mitigation measures could reduce potential impacts resulting from the construction of water supply facilities, the extent of impacts resulting from construction and rationing is unknown at this time and therefore, the FEIR determined that future development would have significant and unavoidable impacts related to water supply rationing and construction of new or expanded water supply facilities.

WASTEWATER AND STORMWATER

The FEIR determined that there would be less-than-significant impacts related to the relocation or construction of wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage facilities within the bayside drainage basin and that existing facilities within the bayside drainage basin would have adequate capacity to accommodate the increased wastewater and stormwater flows generated as a result of implementation of the adopted housing element. However, future development associated with implementation of the adopted housing element would very likely require construction and operation of new or expanded wastewater treatment infrastructure at the Oceanside Water Pollution Control Plant within the westside drainage basin. Expansion of the plant would be subject to future project-level CEQA review at the time it is proposed. However, based on an environmental review for a project completed in 2021 that installed a recycled water treatment plant at the Oceanside Water Pollution Control Plant, with improvements similar to those needed for wastewater treatment expansion, it is possible that the significant impacts of the improvements could be mitigated to less-than-significant levels. Nonetheless, because the specific impacts of the expansion cannot be determined at this time, the impact would be significant and unavoidable with mitigation.

ELECTRICITY AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS

The FEIR concluded that future development associated with the adopted housing element could require construction of new or expanded electric power or telecommunication facilities or relocation of such facilities. If future development should require new or expanded facilities, any such project would be subject to project-level CEQA review at the time it is proposed. Although specific impacts of such projects could not be determined at the time the FEIR was prepared, the FEIR determined that the impacts would most likely be similar to the impacts identified in the FEIR resulting from the construction and operation of future development projects consistent with the adopted housing element and subject to the same or similar regulatory requirements and mitigation measures. Such mitigation measures could include those identified in the FEIR related to construction. Implementation of the construction-related mitigation measures would likely reduce impacts from the construction of new or expanded electric and telecommunication facilities to a less-than-significant level.

SOLID WASTE

With respect to solid waste, the adopted housing element determined that future projects consistent with the adopted housing element would comply with the San Francisco Mandatory Recycling and Composting Ordinance, as well as the city's 2018 waste reduction commitment, and would not generate solid waste in excess of local infrastructure capacity. Therefore, overall solid waste impacts as a result of future development consistent with the adopted housing element would be less than significant.

PROPOSED REZONING PROGRAM IMPACTS

The approach to evaluating the proposed rezoning program is described above under "Analysis of Potential Environmental Effects," p. 32. The changes under the proposed rezoning program that would affect utilities and service systems are addressed below.

WATER

The water supply analysis provided in this section is consistent with the approach and analysis provided in the FEIR but based on the more recent data provided in the 2023 Interim Water Demand Projects for the City and County of San Francisco prepared by the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC), and the Family Zoning Plan (Housing Element Rezoning Program): Infrastructure Memo prepared by the department.[71, 72] Analysis included in the memo is considered below.

As described in the FEIR, there is considerable uncertainty as to whether the Bay-Delta Plan Amendment will be implemented. Therefore, water supply scenarios with and without implementation of the Bay-Delta Amendment were used to evaluate the availability of long-term water supplies for the city and future development. Based on updated 2023 SFPUC projections, without the Bay-Delta Plan Amendment, the SFPUC would have adequate supplies to meet projected water

---

[71] San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, 2023 Interim Water Demand Projections for the City and County of San Francisco, September 2023.

[72] San Francisco Planning Department. Family Zoning Plan (Housing Element Rezoning Program): Infrastructure Memo, July 17, 2025, Record No.: 2021-005878CWP. *https://citypln-m-extnl.sfgov.org/Commissions/CPC/7_17_2025/Commission%20Packet/2021-005878CWP.pdf*. Accessed August 18, 2025.

demands in normal hydrologic years, single dry years, and multiple dry years in 2025, 2030, 2035, 2040, and 2045.[73] In comparison, the adopted housing element determined that the SFPUC would have adequate supplies during normal hydrologic years and in single dry years but would experience shortfalls in multiple dry years, which would require customers to reduce water use through voluntary rationing (i.e., up to 5.3 percent). Based on the 2023 SFPUC projections, if the Bay-Delta Plan Amendment is implemented, water supplies would be available to meet projected demands in normal years with no shortfalls. However, there would be significant shortfalls in single dry years and multiple dry years through 2045.[74] Consistent with the FEIR, the shortfalls would result exclusively from supply reductions from implementation of the Bay-Delta Plan Amendment. The city would not have adequate water supplies available to serve the additional growth associated with the proposed rezoning program during dry and multiple dry years if the Bay-Delta Plan Amendment is implemented.

Consistent with the FEIR, if the Bay-Delta Plan Amendment is implemented, the SFPUC would need to impose higher levels of rationing (i.e., higher than its regional water system level-of-service goal of no more than 20 percent rationing). However, the proposed rezoning program would also encourage infill housing, which promotes water efficiency by default. Specifically, higher-density multi-family housing typically uses less water per capita than lower density development, especially single-family homes. In addition, the new infill housing constructed under the proposed rezoning program would generally be more water-efficient compared to existing housing due to code requirements, building practices, and required installation of water-conserving features.[75] In addition, future development consistent with the proposed rezoning program would be required to adhere to San Francisco's water conservation program and the Non-potable Water Ordinance, as applicable. Furthermore, the SFPUC would continue to implement its water conservation program, invest and replace aging infrastructure, and seek new, expanded, diversified, or alternative water supply facilities, such as local groundwater, recycled water, and purified water projects.[76] Nonetheless, consistent with the FEIR, given the long lead times associated with developing additional water supplies, the SFPUC's expected near-term response to implementation of the Bay-Delta Plan Amendment would be to ration in accordance with the procedures in its Water Shortage Contingency Plan. Both direct and indirect environmental impacts could result from high levels of rationing. The proposed rezoning program would continue to result in significant and unavoidable impacts related to water supplies, consistent with the FEIR.

WASTEWATER AND STORMWATER

Consistent with the FEIR, future development consistent with the proposed rezoning program would be served by San Francisco's combined sewer system, which has two primary drainage basins (bayside drainage basin and westside drainage basin). The bayside drainage basin is served by the Southeast

---

[73] Ibid.

[74] Ibid.

[75] San Francisco Planning Department. Family Zoning Plan (Housing Element Rezoning Program): Infrastructure Memo, July 17, 2025, Record No.: 2021-005878CWP. *https://citypln-m-extnl.sfgov.org/Commissions/CPC/7_17_2025/Commission%20Packet/2021-005878CWP.pdf*. Accessed August 18, 2025.

[76] Ibid.

Water Pollution Control Plant, and the westside drainage basin is served by the Oceanside Water Pollution Control Plant. As such, impacts under the proposed rezoning program would be similar to those provided in the FEIR.

As determined in the FEIR, the Southeast Water Pollution Control Plant would have adequate capacity to serve future development consistent with the proposed rezoning program in combination with existing wastewater flows. It is likely that the Oceanside Water Pollution Control Plant would experience reduced pollutant loads under the proposed rezoning program compared to the adopted housing element because housing growth distribution under the proposed rezoning program would be more evenly distributed in the western and northern parts of the city and along transit corridors, instead of heavily concentrated in the Inner Sunset, Outer Sunset, and Richmond planning districts as assumed under the adopted housing element; thus pollutant load generation, would be more evenly distributed throughout the city rather than concentrated in the western portion of the city. Nonetheless, the Oceanside Water Pollution Control Plant would still require expanded facilities to serve the growth anticipated under the proposed rezoning program as determined in the FEIR. Expansion of the wastewater treatment facilities would be subject to project-level CEQA review at the time it is proposed, which would identify any potentially significant impacts that would result from construction and operation of the facilities and applicable mitigation measures. The impacts would most likely be similar to those identified in the FEIR and would be subject to the same regulatory requirements and mitigation measures, as applicable. The proposed rezoning program would be required to implement the following mitigation measures from the FEIR, as applicable: Mitigation Measures M-CR-2a, Archeological Resources Requirements for Projects Involving Soil Disturbance; M-CR-2b, Archeological Monitoring Program; M-CR-2c, Archeological Testing Program; M-CR-2d, Treatment of Submerged and Deeply Buried Resources; M-TCR-1, Tribal Notification and Consultation; M-NO-1, Construction Noise Control; M-NO-3a, Protection of Adjacent Buildings/Structures and Vibration Monitoring during Construction; M-NO-3b, Prevent Damage to Vibration-Sensitive Equipment; and M-AQ-3, Construction Air Quality.

Implementation of the applicable mitigation measures from the FEIR would very likely reduce potential impacts from the construction and operation of expanded wastewater treatment facilities to a less-than-significant level. However, because the specific impacts and mitigation measures associated with expansion of the Oceanside Water Pollution Control Plant cannot be determined at this time, the proposed rezoning program would continue to result in significant and unavoidable impacts with mitigation related to wastewater facilities, consistent with the FEIR.

ELECTRIC POWER AND TELECOMMUNICATION FACILITIES

Future development consistent with the proposed rezoning program would result in up to approximately 54,000 additional housing units compared to the approximately 50,000 housing units assumed under the adopted housing element. Consistent with the FEIR, future development under the proposed rezoning program would be infill development in areas already served by existing electric and telecommunication facilities. If new future development were to require the construction or expansion of such facilities, any such projects would be subject to project-level CEQA review at the time it is proposed and would identify any potentially significant impacts and applicable mitigation measures that would result from

construction and operation of these facilities. These impacts would most likely be similar to those identified in the FEIR and subject to the same regulatory requirements and mitigation measures, as applicable. The proposed rezoning program would be required to implement the following mitigation measures from the FEIR, as applicable: Mitigation Measures M-CR-2a, Archeological Resources Requirements for Projects Involving Soil Disturbance; M-CR-2b, Archeological Monitoring Program; M-CR-2c, Archeological Testing Program; M-CR-2d, Treatment of Submerged and Deeply Buried Resources; M-TCR-1, Tribal Notification and Consultation; M-NO-1, Construction Noise Control; M-NO-3a, Protection of Adjacent Buildings/Structures and Vibration Monitoring during Construction; M-NO-3b, Prevent Damage to Vibration-Sensitive Equipment; and M-AQ-3, Construction Air Quality. Implementation of the applicable mitigation measures from the FEIR would very likely reduce potential impacts from construction and operation of expanded electric and telecommunication facilities to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the proposed rezoning program would continue to result in less-than-significant impacts with mitigation related to electric power and telecommunication facilities, consistent with the FEIR.

SOLID WASTE

All projects are required to comply with San Francisco's Mandatory Recycling and Compositing Ordinance as well as the city's 2018 waste reduction commitment. As with the adopted housing element, compliance with the requirements would reduce the amount of solid waste generated by construction and operation of future development consistent with the proposed rezoning program. In addition, the city's building ordinance would require all future development consistent with the proposed rezoning program to provide adequate areas for recycling, composting, and storing trash, along with in-building collection systems that provide equal convenience for all users with respect to separating the three material streams.

The proposed rezoning program would result in approximately 54,000 more housing units being constructed compared to the approximately 50,000 housing units assumed under the adopted housing element. Consistent with the FEIR, based on the national average for solid waste production (i.e., 4.9 pounds per day per capita) and an average household size of 2.36 persons, new housing units under the proposed rezoning program would generate approximately 283 tons of solid waste per day. In comparison, the FEIR assumed that approximately 279 tons of solid waste would be generated. The proposed rezoning program's waste generation equals 5.7 percent of the San Francisco Solid Waste Transfer and Recycling Center's permitted maximum disposal capacity of 5,000 tons per day. Therefore, given that future development under the proposed rezoning program would be required to comply with the city's diversion and waste reduction requirements and future long-term capacity would be available at the San Francisco Solid Waste Transfer and Recycling Center and other area landfills the serve San Francisco, consistent with the FEIR, the proposed rezoning program would be served by a landfill with adequate permitted capacity to accommodate solid waste disposal needs. The proposed rezoning program would comply with applicable statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Impacts would be less than significant, consistent with the adopted housing element, and no mitigation measures are required.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The FEIR determined that the adopted housing element, in combination with cumulative projects, would not result in a significant cumulative impact on utilities and service systems. The new cumulative projects implemented subsequent to publication of the FEIR, the Great Highway Mobility Improvements Project and the Vision Zero Quick-Build program (see **Table 4**, p. 28), do not substantially alter the cumulative setting due to the location of the cumulative projects compared to the proposed rezoned area and the nature of the cumulative projects (i.e., the creation of new open space and recreation facilities via traffic and roadway modifications and pedestrian and bicycle safety improvements in the right-of-way). The Great Highway Mobility Improvements Project and the Vision Zero Quick-Build program would most likely require the use of electricity and the generation of solid waste during construction. However, the projects would have no effect on the long-term demand for electricity or the generation of solid waste due to the nature of the projects. Thus, the inclusion of the new cumulative projects would not alter the findings related to cumulative impacts on utilities and service systems in the FEIR. Because the proposed rezoning program would not generate new impacts on utilities and service systems that were not previously identified in the FEIR, and the new cumulative projects would not alter the FEIR's cumulative analysis, there would be no new significant cumulative impact on utilities and service systems.

CONCLUSION

In summary, the proposed rezoning program would not result in new significant utilities and service systems impacts that were not previously identified in the FEIR, nor would it result in more severe impacts than those previously identified. No new mitigation measures or changes to existing mitigation measures are required.

Paleontological Resources

FEIR FINDINGS

The potential paleontological resources impacts of the adopted housing element are analyzed in Section 4.10, Paleontological Resources, of the FEIR. As detailed in the FEIR, sedimentary deposits of Middle Holocene age or older, bay clay and beach deposits, the Colma Formation, and the Merced Formation, all of which are found within the city, have the potential to yield unique fossils. Currently, no geologic units with high or very high sensitivity for paleontological resources have been identified within San Francisco. Nonetheless, anticipated future development associated with the adopted housing element would result in increased construction activities, such as excavation, which could affect unique paleontological resources. Destruction of a unique paleontological resource would be a significant impact.

If a future project-specific evaluation finds that project construction activities would affect geologic units with moderate sensitivity for paleontological resources, including moderately sensitive units that exist at depth below unknown sensitive units, the FEIR determined that Mitigation Measure M-GE-5, Inadvertent Discovery of Paleontological Resources during Construction, would be required. This measure would require construction worker awareness training conducted by a qualified paleontologist and procedures

to be followed should a fossil find occur during construction. In the event a fossil find is determined to be unique, development of a paleontology monitoring plan by a qualified paleontologist would be required to monitor construction activities that could affect moderately sensitive geologic units. The FEIR determined that implementation of the adopted housing element would result in less-than-significant impacts with mitigation for paleontological resources.

PROPOSED REZONING PROGRAM IMPACTS

The approach to evaluating the proposed rezoning program is described above under "Analysis of Potential Environmental Effects," p. 32. The changes under the proposed rezoning program that would affect paleontological resources are addressed below.

As described above, the FEIR determined that sedimentary deposits of Middle Holocene age or older, bay clay and beach deposits, the Colma Formation, and the Merced Formation are found within the city (refer to Figures 4.10-1a through 4.10-1d, Paleontological Potential, of the FEIR). Sedimentary deposits of middle Holocene age or older have the potential to contain unique fossils; bay clay and beach deposits, the Colma Formation, and the Merced Formation have moderate paleontological potential to yield unique fossils. No geologic units with high or very high sensitivity for paleontological resources have been identified within the city.

As described in the FEIR, the department conducts preliminary paleontological resource impact evaluations to determine the potential for projects to affect a unique paleontological resource and would continue to do so under future projects consistent with the proposed rezoning program. In addition to identifying specific geologic units that could be disturbed, the evaluations also consider the amount and depth of excavation, the type of ground-disturbing activities, and the paleontological potential of the geologic units that the activities could disturb.

Anticipated future development consistent with the proposed rezoning program would have the potential to destroy unique paleontological resources in locations where excavations would extend as deep as moderately sensitive geologic units. The proposed rezoning program would allow increased building heights compared to the adopted housing element. Under the adopted housing element, building heights would range from 55 to 300 feet; under the proposed rezoning program, building heights would range from 40 to 500 feet, with two limited areas to 650 feet. In areas where taller structures would be constructed, excavation would very likely be deeper and therefore disturb older sediments, which are more likely to have moderate paleontological potential. Accordingly, future development consistent with the proposed rezoning project could have significant impacts on paleontological resources.

If the project-specific preliminary paleontological resource impact evaluation finds that project construction activities would affect geologic units with moderate sensitivity for paleontological resources, including moderately sensitive units that exist at depth below unknown sensitive units, implementation of Mitigation Measure M-GE-5, applicable to the adopted housing element, would also apply to the proposed rezoning program. Consistent with the FEIR, implementation of Mitigation

Measure M-GE-5 would ensure that the proposed rezoning program would not result in the destruction of unique paleontological resources. Therefore, the proposed rezoning program would result in less-than-significant impacts with regard to paleontological resources.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The FEIR determined that the adopted housing element, in combination with cumulative projects, would not result in a significant cumulative impact related to paleontological resources. The new cumulative projects implemented subsequent to publication of the FEIR, the Great Highway Mobility Improvements Project and the Vision Zero Quick-Build program (see **Table 4**, p. 28), do not substantially alter the cumulative setting due to the location of the cumulative projects compared to the proposed rezoned area and the nature of the cumulative projects (i.e., the creation of new open space and recreation facilities via traffic and roadway modifications and pedestrian and bicycle safety improvements in the right-of-way). Consistent with the FEIR, impacts associated with paleontological resources are generally site specific; in general, only cumulative projects occurring on adjacent sites have the potential to combine and result in significant cumulative impacts related to paleontological resources. As such, future development consistent with the proposed rezoning program would be subject to department paleontological resource impact evaluations, as applicable. Impacts on paleontological resources would be fully addressed by department evaluations as well as project-specific mitigation measures similar to Mitigation Measure M-GE-5, described above, if the potential for effects is found to be significant. Thus, the inclusion of the new cumulative projects would not alter the findings related to cumulative paleontological resources impacts in the FEIR. Because the proposed rezoning program would not generate new impacts related to paleontological resources that were not previously identified in the FEIR, and the new cumulative projects would not alter the FEIR's cumulative analysis, there would be no new significant cumulative impact related to paleontological resources.

CONCLUSION

In summary, the proposed rezoning program would not result in new significant paleontological resources impacts that were not previously identified in the FEIR, nor would it result in more severe impacts than those previously identified. No new mitigation measures or changes to existing mitigation measures are required.

Conclusion

Based on the foregoing, it is concluded that the analyses conducted and the conclusions reached in the final EIR certified on November 17, 2022, remain valid and that no supplemental environmental review is required. The proposed rezoning program would not cause new significant impacts not identified in the FEIR, and no new mitigation measures would be necessary to reduce significant impacts. No changes have occurred with respect to circumstances surrounding the adopted housing element that would cause significant environmental impacts to which the housing element update would contribute considerably, and no new information has become available that shows that the housing element update would cause significant environmental impacts. Therefore, no supplemental environmental review is required beyond this addendum pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15162.

I do hereby certify that the above determination has been made pursuant to state and local requirements.

Lisa Gibson

Lisa Gibson
Environmental Review Officer

September 2, 2025
Date of Determination:

cc: San Francisco Planning Commission
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Project Distribution List

Addendum Preparers

REPORT AUTHORS

San Francisco Planning Department Environmental Planning Division
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400
San Francisco, CA 94103

Environmental Review Officer:	Lisa Gibson
Principal Environmental Planner:	Debra Dwyer
Principal Environmental Planner:	Chelsea Fordham
Principal Environmental Planner:	Allison Vanderslice
Senior Environmental Planner:	Ryan Shum
Senior Environmental Planner (transportation):	Elizabeth White
Senior Environmental Planner (wind):	Rachel Schuett
Senior Environmental Planner (air quality):	Josh Pollak

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTANT

ICF
595 Market Street, Suite 950
San Francisco, CA 94105

Project Director:	Heidi Mekkelson
Project Manager:	Jessica Viramontes
Environmental Planner:	Jennifer Ostner
Environmental Planner:	Devan Atteberry
Hazards and Hazardous Materials Specialist:	Mario Barrera
Noise Specialist:	Jason Volk
Air Quality Specialist:	Cory Matsui
Archaeologist:	Lindsley Britton
Architectural Historian:	Allison Lyons-Medina
GIS Specialist:	David Haughton
Editor:	John Mathias

TRANSPORTATION CONSULTANTS

Fehr & Peers
345 California Street, Suite 450
San Francisco, CA 94104

Matt Goyne
Kevin Zamzow-Pollock
Taylor McAdam

LCW Consulting
3990 20th Street
San Francisco, CA 94114 Luba C. Wyznyckyj

SHADOW CONSULTANT

PreVision Design
1806 Belles Street, Suite 6B
San Francisco, CA 94129 Adam Phillips

WIND CONSULTANT

RWDI
600 Southgate Drive
Guelph, Ontario N1G 4P6 Neetha Vasan
Shelby Ness

PROJECT SPONSOR

San Francisco Planning Commission

San Francisco Planning Department
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400
San Francisco, CA 94103

Planning Director:	Sarah Dennis Phillips
Director (Citywide Division):	Rachael Tanner
Deputy Director (Citywide Division):	Joshua Switzky
Principal Planner:	Lisa Chen
Senior Planner:	Esmeralda Jardines
Senior Planner:	James Pappas
Senior Planner:	Malena Leon-Farrera
Senior Planner:	Mat Snyder
Senior Planner:	Reanna Tong
Planner:	David Hernandez Garcia
Planner:	Dylan Hamilton
Planner:	Sarah Richardson
GIS Specialist:	Diana La
GIS Specialist:	Scott Edmondson
Communications Specialist:	Annie Yalon
Senior Community Development Specialist:	Carla de Mesa

APPENDIX A: AMENDED MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

APPENDIX A

San Francisco Planning

AGREEMENT TO IMPLEMENT MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Record No.:	2019-016230ENV, 2021-005878CWP, and 2021-005878GPA	*Block/Lot:*	Multiple
		Lot Size:	Not Applicable
Project Title:	~~San Francisco Housing Element 2022 Update~~ Family Zoning Plan – Housing Element Rezoning Program	*Project Sponsor:*	San Francisco Planning Commission, Lisa Chen, (628) 652-7422
BPA Nos:	Not Applicable	*Lead Agency:*	San Francisco Planning Department
Zoning:	Multiple Use Districts Multiple Height and Bulk Districts	*Staff Contact:*	Ryan Shum, (628) 652-7542 Elizabeth White – 628.652.7557

The table below indicates when compliance with each mitigation measure must occur. Some mitigation measures span multiple phases. Substantive descriptions of each mitigation measure's requirements are provided on the following pages in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program. Amendments to Mitigation Measures M-W-1a and 1b for clarity and conformance with Planning Code amendments are included, with deletions shown in ~~strikethrough~~ and additions shown in double underline.

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Period of Compliance			Compliance with Mitigation Measure Completed?
	Prior to the Start of Construction*	During Construction**	Post-construction or Operational	
Mitigation Measure M-CR-1a: Avoid or Minimize Effects on Identified Built Environment Resources	X			
Mitigation Measure M-CR-1b: Best Practices and Construction Monitoring Program for Historic Resources	X	X		
Mitigation Measure M-CR-1c: Relocation Plan	X	X		
Mitigation Measure M-CR-1d: Documentation	X			
Mitigation Measure M-CR-1e: Oral History	X	X		
Mitigation Measure M-CR-1f: Salvage Plan	X	X		
Mitigation Measure M-CR-1g: Interpretation	X	X		
Mitigation Measure M-CR-1h: Historic Context	X	X		
Mitigation Measure M-CR-1i: Walking or Building Tour	X	X		
Mitigation Measure M-CR-1j: Educational Program	X	X		
Mitigation Measure M-CR-1k: Community Memorial Event	X			

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Period of Compliance			Compliance with Mitigation Measure Completed?
	Prior to the Start of Construction*	During Construction**	Post-construction or Operational	
Mitigation Measure M-CR-1l: Revise Historic District Documentation	X	X		
Mitigation Measure M-CR-2a: Procedures for Discovery of Archeological Resources for Projects Involving Soil Disturbance	X	X		
Mitigation Measure M-CR-2b: Archeological Monitoring Program	X	X		
Mitigation Measure M-CR-2c: Archeological Testing Program	X	X		
Mitigation Measure M-CR-2d. Treatment of Submerged and Deeply Buried Resources	X	X		
Mitigation Measure M-TCR-1: Tribal Notification and Consultation	X			Yes – Family Rezoning Plan
Mitigation Measure M-TR-4a: Parking Maximums and Transportation Demand Management	X			
Mitigation Measure M-TR-4b: Driveway and Loading Operations Plan and Curb Cut Restrictions	X			
Mitigation Measure M-TR-4c: Implement Transit Travel Times Measures to Reduce Transit Delay	X	X	X	
Mitigation Measure M-TR-6: Curb Management Plans	X	X		
Mitigation Measure M-NO-1: Construction Noise Control	X			
Mitigation Measure M-NO-2: Noise Analysis and Attenuation	X			
Mitigation Measure M-NO-3a: Protection of Adjacent Buildings/Structures and Vibration Monitoring During Construction	X	X		
Mitigation Measure M-NO-3b: Prevent Interference with Vibration-Sensitive Equipment	X	X		
Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3: Clean Construction Equipment	X			
Mitigation Measure M-AQ-5: Best Available Control Technology for Diesel Engines	X	X	X	
Mitigation Measure M-WI-1a: Wind Minimization	X			
Mitigation Measure M-WI-1b: Maintenance Plan for Landscaping on or off the Project Site and Wind Baffling Measures in the Public Right-of-Way	X			
Mitigation Measure M-SH-1: Shadow Minimization	X			
Mitigation Measure M-GE-5: Inadvertent Discovery of Paleontological Resources during Construction	X	X		

NOTES:

* Prior to any ground disturbing activities at the project site.

** Construction is broadly defined to include any physical activities associated with construction of a development project including, but not limited to: site preparation, clearing, demolition, excavation, shoring, foundation installation, and building construction.

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
MITIGATION MEASURES AGREED TO BY PROJECT SPONSOR					
CULTURAL RESOURCES					
Mitigation Measure M-CR-1a: Avoid or Minimize Effects on Identified Built Environment Resources. The project sponsor of a future development project consistent with the housing element update that would result in material impairment to a built-environment historic resource, either an individual resource or a historic district, shall consult with the department's preservation and design staff on feasible means for avoiding or reducing significant adverse effects on built-environment resources per applicable department guidelines, such as residential design guidelines and policies in the urban design element. The project sponsor, in consultation with preservation and design staff, shall provide at minimum drawings and rendering of a proposed project that avoids material impairment of the historic resource in order for the environmental review officer (ERO) to determine if such a project is feasible. Additional studies and reports, such as an economic feasibility analysis, may be required as directed by the ERO. If the project is determined infeasible based on the above criteria, the project sponsor shall consult with the department's preservation and design staff to determine an approach to reduce the significant impact on built-environment resources. This could include, but is not limited to, retaining a portion of the existing building or retaining specific character-defining features and incorporating them into the project. The project sponsor shall demonstrate the feasibility, as defined in CEQA Guidelines section 15364 and as determined by the ERO, of retention of character-defining features or a portion of the existing building to the department's preservation and design staff by providing drawings and renderings along with other requested studies and reports.	Required for future development consistent with the housing element update that would not comply with the secretary's standards, would demolish historic resources, or would substantially alter important characteristics of a resource's historic setting	Project sponsor	Prior to approval of the future development project	Planning Department (preservation and design staff)	Considered complete upon review and approval of a proposed project

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
Mitigation Measure M-CR-1b: Best Practices and Construction Monitoring Program for Historic Resources. Prior to the issuance of demolition, building, or site permits, the project sponsor of a future development project consistent with the housing element update using heavy-duty construction equipment on a project site that contains a historic resources or on a project site that is adjacent to a historic resource shall incorporate into contract specifications a requirement that the contractor(s) use all feasible means to protect and avoid damage to onsite and adjacent historic resources as identified by the department, including, but not necessarily limited to, staging of equipment and materials so as to avoid direct damage, maintaining a buffer zone when possible between heavy equipment and historic resources, or covering the roof of adjacent structures to avoid damage from falling objects. Specifications shall also stipulate that any damage incurred to historic resources as a result of construction activities shall be reported to the environmental review officer within three days. Prior to the issuance of demolition, building, or site permits, the project sponsor shall submit to the department preservation staff for review and approval, a list of measures to be included in contract specifications to avoid damage to historic resources. If damage to a historic resource occurs during construction, the project sponsor shall hire a qualified professional who meets the standards for history, architectural history, or architecture (as appropriate), as set forth by the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards (36 Code of Federal Regulations, part 61). Damage incurred to the historic resource shall be repaired per the secretary's standards in consultation with the qualified professional and department preservation staff. If directed by department preservation staff, the project sponsor shall engage a qualified preservation professional to undertake a monitoring program to ensure that best practices are being followed. If monitoring is required, the qualified preservation professional shall prepare a monitoring plan to direct the monitoring program that shall be reviewed and approved by department preservation staff.	Required for future development consistent with the housing element update that would use heavy-duty construction equipment on a project site that contains a historic resource or on a project site that is adjacent to a historic resource	Project sponsor, qualified historic professional	Prior to the issuance of demolition, building, or site permits for the list of measures to be included in contract specifications; during construction if damage to a historic resource occurs.	Planning Department (preservation and design staff)	Considered complete when Planning Department preservation staff approve a list of measures to be included in contract specifications to avoid damage to historic resources. If damage occurs, considered complete upon approval of repair to historic resource and/or monitoring plan by Planning Department preservation staff.
Mitigation Measure M-CR-1c: Relocation Plan. If the department determines relocation of a historic resource is a feasible means of reducing impacts to the resource, the project sponsor shall retain a qualified historical architect who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards (36 Code of Federal Regulations, part 61) and structural engineer with experience in moving historic resources to prepare a relocation plan.	Required for future development consistent with the housing element update	Project sponsor, qualified historical architect,	Prior to the approval of any permits for the relocation plan; implementation of the relocation	Planning Department (preservation and design staff)	Considered complete upon implementation of a Planning Department-

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
The relocation plan will be reviewed and approved by the department to ensure that character-defining features of the buildings will be retained. The department's review and approval of the relocation plan shall occur prior to the approval of any permits for the proposed project. The relocation plan shall include required qualifications for the building relocation company to ensure that relocation is undertaken by a company that is experienced in moving historic buildings of a similar size and/or structural system as the historic resource. The relocation plan shall ensure that the historic resource will be moved without irreparable damage to the character-defining historic fabric of the resource. The project sponsor will incorporate into construction specifications for the proposed project a requirement that the construction contractor(s) use all feasible means to avoid damage to the subject property during its relocation, including, but not limited to, relocation methods and relocation activity routes, closures, and timing.	if relocation of a historic resource is a feasible means of reducing impacts to the resource	structural engineer	plan prior to the issuance of occupancy permit		approved relocation plan
Mitigation Measure M-CR-1d: Documentation. Prior to the issuance of demolition, building, or site permits, the project sponsor shall submit to the department for review photographic and narrative documentation of the subject building, structure, object, material, and landscaping. Documentation may apply to individually significant resources as well as district contributors and shall focus on the elements of the property that the project proposes to demolish or alter. The documentation shall be funded by the project sponsor and undertaken by a qualified professional who meets the standards for history, architectural history, or architecture (as deemed appropriate by the department's preservation staff), as set forth by the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards (36 Code of Federal Regulations, part 61). The department's preservation staff will determine the specific scope of the documentation depending upon the individual property's character-defining features and reasons for significance. The documentation scope shall be reviewed and approved by the department prior to any work on the documentation. A documentation package shall consist of the required forms of documentation and shall include a summary of the historic resource and an overview of the documentation provided. The types and level of documentation will be determined by department staff and may include any of the following formats: • *HABS/HALS-Like Measured Drawings* –A set of Historic American Building/Historic American Landscape Survey-like (HABS/HALS-like) measured drawings that depict the existing size, scale, and dimension of the subject property. The	Required for future development consistent with the housing element update that proposes to demolish or substantially alter a built-environment historic resource with distinctive physical qualities that contribute to the value of the physical environment and/or the public's	Project sponsor, qualified historic consultant	Prior to the issuance of demolition, building, or site permits	Planning Department preservation staff	Considered complete upon distribution by the project sponsor of completed documentation approved by Planning Department preservation staff

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
department's preservation staff will accept the original architectural drawings or an as-built set of architectural drawings (plan, section, elevation, etc.). The department's preservation staff will assist the consultant in determining the appropriate level of measured drawings. A cover sheet may be required that describes the historic significance of the property. • *HABS/HALS-Like Photographs* – Digital photographs of the interior and the exterior of the subject property. Large-format negatives are not required. The scope of the digital photographs shall be reviewed by the department's preservation staff for concurrence, and all digital photography shall be conducted according to current National Park Service standards. The photography shall be undertaken by a qualified professional with demonstrated experience in HABS photography. • *HABS/HALS-Like Historical Report* – If the department determines that existing survey information or historic resource evaluations of a property do not sufficiently document the historic resources' significant associations, a written historical narrative and report shall be provided in accordance with the HABS/HALS Historical Report Guidelines. The written history shall follow an outline format that begins with a statement of significance supported by the development of the architectural and historical context in which the structure was built and subsequently evolved. The report shall also include architectural description and bibliographic information. • *Print-on-Demand Book* – The Print-on-Demand book shall be made available to the public for distribution by the project sponsor. The project sponsor shall make the content from the historical report, historical photographs, HABS photography, measured drawings, and field notes available to the public through a preexisting print-on-demand book service. This service will print and mail softcover books containing the aforementioned materials to members of the public who have paid a nominal fee. The project sponsor shall not be required to pay ongoing printing fees once the book has been made available through the service. • *Digital Recordation* – In coordination with the department's preservation staff, the project sponsor may be required to prepare some other form of digital recordation of the historic resource. The most commonly requested digital	understanding of San Francisco history				

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
recordation is video documentation but other forms of digital recordation, include 3D laser scan models or 3D virtual tours, Gigapan/Matterpoint or other high-resolution immersive panoramic photography, time-lapse photography, photogrammetry, audio/olfactory recording, or other ephemeral documentation of the historic resource may be required. The purpose of these digital records is to supplement other recordation measures and enhance the collection of reference materials that would be available to the public and inform future research. This digital recordation could also be incorporated into the public interpretation program. Digital recordation shall be conducted by individuals with demonstrated experience in the requested type of digital recordation. If video documentation is required, it shall be conducted by a professional videographer with experience recording architectural resources. The professional videographer shall provide a storyboard of the proposed video recordation for review and approval by the department's preservation staff. • The project sponsor, in consultation with the department, shall conduct outreach to determine which repositories may be interested in receiving copies of the documentation. Potential repositories include but are not limited to, the San Francisco Public Library, the Environmental Design Library at the University of California, Berkeley, the Northwest Information Center, San Francisco Architectural Heritage, the California Historical Society, and Archive.org. The final approved documentation shall be provided in electronic form to the department and the interested repositories. The department will make electronic versions of the documentation available to the public for their use at no charge. • The professional(s) shall submit the completed documentation for review and approval by the department's preservation staff. All documentation must be reviewed and approved by the department prior to the issuance of any demolition, building or site permit is approved for a proposed project.					
Mitigation Measure M-CR-1e: Oral History. The project sponsor shall retain the services of a qualified historian with experience in oral history to undertake an oral history about the historic resource. This oral history project shall consist of interviews and recollections of individuals with a connection to the historic resource that may include owners, occupants, or other related community members. The success of this effort will depend primarily on the	Required for future development consistent with the housing element update when a future	Project sponsor, qualified historian	Prior to the issuance of occupancy permits	Planning Department preservation staff	Considered complete when Planning Department staff approves the oral history

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
ability of the project sponsor to locate such persons, and on their willingness/ability to participate. Therefore, the project sponsor shall make a good faith effort to publicize the oral history project, conduct public outreach, and identify a wide range of potential interviewees. To accomplish this, the sponsor shall employ a range of measures that may include hosting events that allow participants to record their recollections, and hosting a website that allows interviewees to contribute remotely. Prior to undertaking this effort, the scope and methodology of the oral history project shall be reviewed and approved by the department's preservation staff. In addition to potentially use for the on-site interpretive program or documentation, the project sponsor shall have the recordings of the oral history project transcribed and indexed, and the department shall host the transcribed and indexed recordings, which will made available to the public at no charge. The department will also ensure that any information provided in the oral histories are integrated with SF Survey and Citywide historic context statement summarized above. Transcribed and indexed recordings will also be made available to other archives and repositories in order to allow for remote, off-site historical interpretation of the historic resources.	project proposes to demolish or substantially alter an individual resource or historic district whose significance is closely associated with the lifeways or cultural heritage of an individual or group				
Mitigation Measure M-CR-1f: Salvage Plan. Prior to the issuance of demolition, building, or site permits that would remove character-defining features of a built environment historic resource that would have a significant impact, the project sponsor shall consult with the department's preservation staff as to whether any such features may be salvaged, in whole or in part, during demolition or alteration. The project sponsor shall make a good faith effort to salvage and protect materials of historical interest to be used as part of the interpretative program (if required), incorporated into the architecture of the new building that will be constructed on the site, or offered to non-profit or cultural affiliated groups. If this proves infeasible, the sponsor shall attempt to donate significant character-defining features or features of interpretative or historical interest to a historical organization or other educational or artistic group. The project sponsor shall prepare a salvage plan for review and approval by the department's preservation staff prior to issuance of any site demolition permit.	Required for future development consistent with the housing element update that would result in material impairment to a built-environment historic resource or would involve the removal of physical elements of a historic resource	Project sponsor, qualified historic consultant	Prior to the issuance of demolition, building, or site permits; prior to issuance of an occupancy permit for completed implementation of the salvage plan.	Planning Department preservation staff	Considered complete when Planning Department preservation staff approve the salvage plan and confirms project sponsor has completed all actions identified in the salvage plan

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
	that have discrete and identifiable significance				
Mitigation Measure M-CR-1g: Interpretation. The project sponsor shall facilitate the development of a public interpretive program focused on the history of the project site, its identified historic resources, and its significant historic context. The interpretive program should be developed and implemented by a qualified design professional with demonstrated experience in displaying information and graphics to the public in a visually interesting manner, as well as a professionally qualified historian or architectural historian, or community group approved by the department. Through consultation with department preservation staff, coordination with local artists should occur. The primary goal of the program is to educate visitors and future residents about the property's historical themes, associations, and lost contributing features within broader historical, social, and physical landscape contexts. The interpretive program shall be initially outlined in an interpretive plan subject to review and approval by the department's preservation staff prior to approval of demolition, building, or site permits for the project. The plan shall include the general parameters of the interpretive program including the substance, media, and other elements of the interpretative program. The interpretive program shall include within publicly accessible areas of the project site permanent display(s) of interpretive materials concerning the history and design features of the affected historic resource, including both the site as a whole and the individual contributing buildings and features. The display shall be placed in a prominent, public setting within, on the exterior of, or in the vicinity of newly constructed buildings or other features within the project site. The interpretive material(s) shall be made of durable all-weather materials and may also include digital media in addition to a permanent display. The interpretive material(s) shall be of high quality and installed to allow for high public visibility. Content developed for other mitigation measures, as applicable, including the oral history and documentation programs, may be used to inform and provide content for the interpretive program. For properties that do not have a completed Historic Resource Evaluation, the professionally qualified consultant shall undertake research to sufficiently place the historic resource within its larger historic	Required for future development consistent with the housing element update that would demolish or substantially alter an individual built-environment historic resource or historic district associated with significant social, cultural, architectural, or historical themes or narratives	Project sponsor, qualified design professional, qualified historian or architectural historian, or community group	Prior to approval of demolition, building, or site permits for interpretation plan; prior to issuance of an occupancy permit for installation and maintenance of interpretation program	Planning Department preservation staff	Considered complete when Planning Department preservation staff approve the installation of interpretation program; maintenance of interpretation program ongoing

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
context (geographic and thematic). The interpretive program may also incorporate video documentation completed under M-CR-1f, Documentation, as applicable to provide a narrated video that describes the materials, construction methods, current condition, historical use, historic context and cultural significance of the historic resource. The detailed content, media, and other characteristics of such an interpretive program shall be coordinated and approved by the department's preservation staff. The final components of the public interpretation program shall be constructed and an agreed upon schedule for their installation and a plan for their maintenance shall be finalized prior to issuance of a Temporary Certificate of Occupancy. The interpretive program shall be developed in coordination with the other interpretative programs as relevant, such as interpretation required under archeological resource mitigation measures and tribal cultural resource mitigation measures, Native American land acknowledgments, or other public interpretation programs. The department will also ensure that any information gathered through the interpretative program development is integrated with SF Survey and Citywide historic context statement summarized above.					
Mitigation Measure M-CR-1h: Historic Context. To assist in the collection of information that will inform and direct the historical interpretation, the sponsor shall fund a historic context study prepared by a professionally qualified historian or architectural historian, or community group approved by the department to identify significant trends and events associated with a relevant topic to the identified historic resource, as well as identify other associated buildings and sites throughout San Francisco. The objective of this study is to provide background information that will enrich the historical contexts that have already been established for the subject building and to place the subject building within the wider relevant context, for the benefit of the general public interpretation program. The department will also ensure that the historic context is integrated with SF Survey and Citywide historic context statement summarized above.	Required for future planning code amendments to implement the housing element update or required for future development consistent with the housing element update that would demolish or substantially	Planning department or project sponsor, professionally qualified historian or architectural historian, or community group	Prior to implementation of future planning code amendments or for future development projects, prior to approval of demolition, building, or site permits for study scope; prior to issuance of occupancy permit for	Planning Department preservation staff	Considered complete upon approval of historic context study by Planning Department preservation staff. Planning department preservation staff will include historic context statement into the SF Survey and Citywide

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
	alter an individual built-environment historic resource or historic district associated with significant social, cultural, architectural, or historical themes or narratives		completion of the approved historic context		historic context statement.
Mitigation Measure M-CR-1i: Walking or Building Tour. The project sponsor shall engage with SF City Guides, or another tour guide group or association as approved by the department's preservation staff, to develop content for a walking or building tour relevant to the historic resource. The project sponsor shall reach out to the list of tour guide groups provided by preservation staff and provide copies of communication with those groups. Once a tour guide group has been identified, the project sponsor shall engage a qualified architectural historian meeting the qualifications set forth in the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards to work with the sponsor and selected tour guide group to develop content for the tour. Tour content shall use information found in the Historic Resources Evaluation and the Historic Resources Evaluation Response prepared for the project, other available background information on the resource, and the content from other mitigation measures. Other existing information, including photographs, news articles, oral histories, memorabilia and video, may be used to develop information for the walking tour as necessary. The qualified architectural historian and scope of work must be reviewed by preservation staff prior to the issuance of demolition, building, or site permits. Preservation staff must review and approve final content of the walking tour and must receive proof of receipt by the approved tour group or association prior to issuance of temporary certificate of occupancy.	Required for future development consistent with the housing element update that would demolish or substantially alter an individual built-environment historic resource or historic district associated with significant social, cultural, architectural, or historical themes or narratives	Project sponsor, qualified architectural historian, community or tour group	Prior to the issuance of demolition, building, or site permits project sponsor will obtain a qualified architectural historian and Planning Department approval of a scope of work; prior to issuance of occupancy permit Planning Department will review and approve walking or building tour content	Planning Department preservation staff	Considered complete when proof of receipt from approved tour group or association received by Planning Department preservation staff

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
Mitigation Measure M-CR-1j: Educational Program. The project sponsor shall fund the preparation of an educational program that describes the history and significant associations of the historic resource. The scope of the program shall be determined in consultation with the department and shall be prepared by a professionally qualified historian, architectural historian, or historical architecture (as appropriate), as set forth by the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards (36 Code of Federal Regulations, part 61), or community or educational group approved by the department. The purpose of the educational program is to package the relevant history and significant associations into an educational format that engages the public in the significance of the resource, which could serve as a teaching curriculum or presentation the public could easily understand. Other mitigation measures may provide materials that aid in the preparation of the educational program.	Required for future development consistent with the housing element update that would demolish or substantially alter an individual built-environment historic resource or historic district associated with significant social, cultural, architectural, or historical themes or narratives	Project sponsor, professionally qualified historian, architectural historian, or historical architecture, or community or educational group	Prior to the issuance of demolition, building, or site permits Planning Department will approve scope of work; prior to issuance of occupancy permit Planning Department will approve educational program	Planning Department preservation staff	Considered complete upon distribution of educational program approved by Planning Department preservation staff
Mitigation Measure M-CR-1k: Community Memorial Event. For the public benefit in commemorating a publicly accessible historic resource that is significant for association with a community, social group, or neighborhood, the project sponsor shall organize and fund a commemorative event recognizing the historic resource's significance in the form of a public gathering. The project sponsor shall reach out to relevant community groups associated with the historic resource that may be interested in co-sponsoring the organization of the commemorative event. The purpose of the event would be to commemorate the site's history and provide a public space to gather information, stories, or other histories relevant to the historic resource that may inform other mitigation measures including documentation, oral histories, and interpretation. The form of the event shall be determined in coordination with department staff and may take on a variety of forms. This could include a publicly led tour or open house that takes place at the site of the historic resource, or an event held nearby the historic resource.	Required for future development consistent with the housing element update that would demolish or substantially alter an individual built-environment historic resource or historic district associated with	Project sponsor	Prior to the issuance of demolition, building, or site permits	Planning Department preservation staff	Considered complete after community memorial event; community event form and content approved by Planning Department preservation staff

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
	significant social, cultural, architectural, or historical themes or narratives				
Mitigation Measure M-CR-1l: Revise Historic District Documentation. The project sponsor shall coordinate with preservation planning staff to determine the project's contribution towards any impairment of a historic district, review the historic district documentation, and determine if the district boundaries should be revised to retain a portion of the district that still expresses some aspects of its historical significance. Based on the extent of contribution, preservation planning staff may require the project sponsor to engage a professionally qualified architectural historian, as set forth by the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards (36 Code of Federal Regulations, part 61) to prepare documentation of the revised district boundary and justification of its retained integrity. The revised documentation shall be submitted to the appropriate reviewing agency, depending upon its previous level of evaluation or designation. Such documentation may include a historic district assessment report for review by the department's preservation staff, or a National Register of Historic Places designation form for review by the State Historic Preservation Office.	Required for future planning code amendments to implement the housing element update or future development consistent with the housing element update that would result in material impairment to a historic district listed in or eligible for listing in local, state, or national registers	Planning Department or project sponsor, professionally qualified architectural historian	Prior to implementation of future planning code amendments or for future development projects, prior to the issuance of occupancy permit	Planning Department preservation staff	Considered complete upon approval of revised documentation by Planning Department preservation staff
Mitigation Measure M-CR-2a: Procedures for Discovery of Archeological Resources for Projects Involving Soil Disturbance. The following mitigation measure shall be implemented for any project for which the preliminary archeological review conducted by department staff identifies the potential for significant archeological impacts. This measure applies to discoveries made in the absence of an archeologist and to discoveries during archeological monitoring or testing.	Required for future development consistent with the housing element update if the site has	Project sponsor	Prior to and during soils-disturbing activities	Planning Department cultural resources staff	Considered complete when Environmental Review Officer receives the signed affidavit

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
ALERT sheet. The project sponsor shall distribute the planning department archeological resource "ALERT" sheet to the project prime contractor; to any project subcontractor (including demolition, excavation, grading, foundation, pile driving, etc. firms); or utilities firm involved in soils-disturbing activities within the project site. Prior to any soils-disturbing activities being undertaken, each contractor is responsible for ensuring that the "ALERT" sheet is circulated to all field personnel, including machine operators, field crew, pile drivers, supervisory personnel, etc. The project sponsor shall provide the environmental review officer (ERO) with a signed affidavit from the responsible parties (prime contractor, subcontractor(s), and utilities firm) confirming that all field personnel involved in soil-disturbing activities have received copies of the "ALERT" sheet. ***Procedures Upon Discovery of a Suspected Archeological Resource.*** The following measures shall be implemented in the event of a suspected archeological discovery during project soil-disturbing activities: ***Discovery Stop Work and Environmental Review Officer Notification.*** Should any indication of an archeological resource be encountered during any soils-disturbing activity of the project, the project sponsor shall immediately notify the ERO and shall immediately suspend any soils-disturbing activities in the vicinity of the discovery and protect the find in place until the significance of the find has been evaluated and the ERO has determined whether and what additional measures are warranted, and these measures have been implemented, as detailed below.	moderate archeological sensitivity, anticipated archeological site types that would be identifiable by construction crews, and construction methods that allow for archeological site identification (such as shallow excavation) or based on the outcome of preliminary archeological review conducted by department staff				
Archeological Consultant Identification. If the preliminary archeological review did not require archeological monitoring or testing, and an archeological discovery during construction occurs prior to the identification of a project archeologist, and the ERO determines that the discovery may represent a significant archeological resource, the project sponsor shall retain the services of an archeological consultant (hereinafter "project archeologist") from a firm listed on the Qualified Archeological Consultant list maintained by the department to identify, document, and evaluate the resource, under the direction of the ERO. The project sponsor shall ensure that the project archeologist or designee is empowered, for the remainder of soil-disturbing project activity, to halt soil disturbing activity in the vicinity of potential archeological finds, and that work remains halted until the discovery has been assessed and a treatment determination made, as detailed below.		Project sponsor, archeological consultant/ project archeologist, Environmental Review Officer	During soils-disturbing activities if archeological resources are encountered	Planning Department cultural resources staff	Considered complete when archeological consultant completes additional measures as directed by the Environmental Review Officer as warranted

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
Resource Evaluation and Treatment Determination. If an archeological find is encountered during construction or archeological monitoring or testing, the project archeologist shall redirect soil-disturbing and heavy equipment activity in the vicinity away from the find. If in the case of pile driving activity (e.g., foundation, shoring, etc.), the project archeologist has cause to believe that the pile driving activity may affect an archeological resource, the project sponsor shall ensure that pile driving is halted until an appropriate evaluation of the resource has been made. The ERO may also require that the project sponsor immediately implement a site security program if the archeological resource is at risk from vandalism, looting, or other damaging actions. Initial documentation and assessment. The project archeologist shall document the find and make a reasonable effort to assess its identity, integrity, and significance of the encountered archeological deposit through sampling or testing, as needed. The project sponsor shall make provisions to ensure that the project archeologist can safely enter the excavation, if feasible. The project sponsor shall ensure that the find is protected until the ERO has been consulted and has determined appropriate subsequent treatment in consultation with the project archeologist, and the treatment has been implemented, as detailed below. The project archeologist shall make a preliminary assessment of the significant and physical integrity of the archeological resource and shall present the findings to the ERO. If, based on this information, the ERO determines that construction would result in impacts to a significant resource, the ERO shall consult with the project sponsor and other parties regarding the feasibility and effectiveness of preservation-in-place of the resource, as detailed below. Native American Archeological Deposits and Tribal Notification. All Native American archeological deposits shall be assumed to be significant unless determined otherwise in consultation with the ERO. If a Native American archeological deposit is encountered, soil disturbing work shall be halted as detailed above. In addition, the ERO shall notify any tribal representatives who, in response to the project tribal cultural resource notification, requested to be notified of discovery of Native American archeological resources in order to coordinate on the treatment of archeological and tribal cultural resources. Further the project archeologist shall offer a Native American representative the opportunity to monitor any subsequent soil disturbing activity that could affect the find.					

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
Submerged Paleosols. Should a submerged paleosol be identified, the project archeologist shall extract and process samples for dating, paleobotanical analysis, and other applicable special analyses pertinent to identification of possible cultural soils and for environmental reconstruction. Archeological Site Records. After assessment of any discovered resources, the project archeologist shall prepare an archeological site record or primary record (DPR 523 series) for each documented resource. In addition, a primary record shall be prepared for any prehistoric isolate. Each such record shall be accompanied by a map and GIS location file. Records shall be submitted to the planning department for review as attachments to the archeological resources report (see below) and once approved by the ERO, to the Northwest Information Center. Plans and Reports. All archeological plans and reports identified herein and in the subsequent measures, shall be submitted by the project archeologist directly to the ERO for review and comment and shall be considered draft reports subject to revision until final approval by the ERO. The project archeologist may submit draft reports to the project sponsor simultaneously with submittal to ERO. Limit on Construction Delays for Archeological Treatment. Archeological testing and as applicable data recovery programs required to address archeological discoveries, pursuant to this measure, could suspend construction of the project for up to a maximum of four weeks. At the direction of the ERO, the suspension of construction can be extended beyond four weeks only if such a suspension is the only feasible means to reduce to a less than significant level potential effects on a significant archeological resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines. Preservation-in-Place Consideration. Should an archeological resource that meets California register significance criteria be discovered during construction, archeological testing, or monitoring, preservation-in-place (i.e., permanently protect the resource from further disturbance and take actions, as needed, to preserve depositional and physical integrity) of the entire deposit or feature is the preferred treatment option. The ERO shall consult with the project sponsor and, for Native American archeological resources, with tribal representatives, if requested, to consider 1) the feasibility of permanently preserving the resource in place, feasible and effective, the project archeologist, in consultation with the ERO, shall prepare a Cultural Resources Preservation Plan. For Native American archeological resources, the project archeologist shall also consult with the tribal representatives, and the Cultural Resources Preservation Plan shall take into					

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
consideration the cultural significance of the tribal cultural resource to the tribes. Preservation options may include measures such as design of the project layout to place open space over the resource location; foundation design to avoid the use of pilings or deep excavations in the sensitive area; a plan to expose and conserve the resource and include it in an on-site interpretive exhibit; tribal representatives for review and for ERO approval. The project sponsor shall ensure that the approved plan is implemented and shall coordinate with the department to ensure that disturbance of the resource will not occur in future, such as establishing a preservation easement. If, based on this consultation, the ERO determines that preservation-in-place is infeasible or would be ineffective in preserving the significance of the resource, archeological data recovery and public interpretation of the resource shall be carried out, as detailed below. The ERO in consultation with the project archeologist shall also determine whether and what additional treatment is warranted, which may include additional testing, construction monitoring, and public interpretation of the resource, as detailed below. Coordination with Descendant Communities. On discovery of an archeological site associated with descendant Native Americans, Chinese, or other identified descendant cultural group, the project archeologist shall contact an appropriate representative of the descendant group and the ERO. The representative of the descendant group shall be offered the opportunity to monitor archeological field investigations of the site and to offer recommendations to the ERO regarding appropriate archeological treatment of the site and data recovered from the site, and, if applicable, any interpretative treatment of the site. The project archeologist shall provide a copy of the Archeological Resources Report (ARR) to the representative of the descendant group. Compensation. Following on the initial tribal consultation, the ERO, project sponsor and project archeologist, as appropriate, shall work with the tribal representative or other descendant or descendant community representatives to identify the scope of work for a representative to fulfill the requirements of this mitigation measure, which may include participation in archeological monitoring, preparation and review of deliverables (e.g., plans, interpretive materials, art work). Tribal representatives or other descendant community representatives for archeological resources or tribal cultural resources, who complete tasks in the agreed upon scope of work project, shall be compensated for their work as identified in the agreed upon scope of work.					

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
Archeological Data Recovery Program. The project archeologist shall prepare an archeological data recovery plan if all three of the following apply: (1) a potentially significant resource is discovered, (2) preservation-in-place is not feasible, as determined by the ERO after implementation of the Preservation-in-Place Consideration procedures, and (3) the ERO determines that archeological data recovery is warranted. When the ERO makes such a determination, the project archeologist, project sponsor, ERO and, for tribal cultural archeological resources, the tribal representative, if requested by a tribe, shall consult on the scope of the data recovery program. The project archeologist shall prepare a draft archeological data recovery plan and submit it to the ERO for review and approval. If the time needed for preparation and review of a comprehensive archeological data recovery plan would result in a significant construction delay, the scope of data recovery may instead by agreed upon in consultation between the project archeologist and the ERO and documented by the project archeologist in a memo to the ERO. The archeological data recovery plan/memo shall identify how the proposed data recovery program will preserve the significant information the archeological resource is expected to contain. That is, the archeological data recovery plan/memo will identify what scientific/historical research questions are applicable to the expected resource, what data classes the resource is expected to possess, and how the expected data classes would address the applicable research questions. Data recovery, in general, should be limited to the portions of the property that could be adversely affected by the proposed project. Destructive data recovery methods shall not be applied to portions of the archeological resource that would not otherwise by disturbed by construction if nondestructive methods are practical. The archeological data recovery plan shall include the following elements: • Field Methods and Procedures: Descriptions of proposed field strategies, procedures, and operations • Cataloguing and Laboratory Analysis: Description of selected cataloguing system and artifact analysis procedures • Discard Policy: Description of and rationale for field and post-field discard and deaccession policies • Security Measures: Recommended security measures to protect the archeological resource from vandalism, looting, and non-intentionally damaging activities		Project sponsor, project archeologist, Environmental Review Officer, tribal representative (if requested)	After determination by the Environmental Review Officer that an archeological data recovery program is required	Planning Department cultural resources staff	Considered complete upon approval of archeological data recovery program by Environmental Review Officer

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
• Report of Data Recovery Results: Description of proposed report format and distribution of results • Public Interpretation: Description of potential types of interpretive products and locations of interpretive exhibits based on consultation with project sponsor • Curation: Description of the procedures and recommendations for the curation of any recovered data having potential research value, identification of appropriate curation facilities, and a summary of the accession policies of the curation facilities The project archeologist shall implement the archeological data recovery program upon approval of the archeological data recovery plan/memo by the ERO. ***Coordination of Archeological Data Recovery Investigations.*** In cases in which the same resource has been or is being affected by another project for which data recovery has been conducted, is in progress, or is planned, the following measures shall be implemented to maximize the scientific and interpretive value of the data recovered from both archeological investigations: • In cases where an investigation has not yet begun, project archeologists for each project impacting the same resource and the ERO, as applicable, shall consult on coordinating and collaborating on archeological research design, data recovery methods, analytical methods, reporting, curation and interpretation to ensure consistent data recovery and treatment of the resource. • In cases where archeological data recovery investigation is under way or has been completed for a project, the project archeologist for the subsequent project shall consult with the prior project archeologist, if available; review prior treatment plans, findings and reporting; and inspect and assess existing archeological collections/inventories from the site prior to preparation of the archeological treatment plan for the subsequent discovery, and shall incorporate prior findings in the final report for the subsequent investigation. The objectives of this coordination and review of prior methods and findings shall be to identify refined research questions; determine appropriate data recovery methods and analyses; assess new findings relative to prior research findings; and integrate prior findings into subsequent reporting and interpretation.					

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
Treatment of Human Remains and Funerary Objects. If human remains or suspected human remains are encountered during construction, the contractor and project sponsor shall ensure that ground-disturbing work within 50 feet of the remains is halted immediately and shall arrange for the protection in place of the remains until appropriate treatment and disposition have been agreed upon and implemented in accordance with this measure. The treatment of any human remains and funerary objects discovered during any soil- disturbing activity shall comply with applicable state laws, including Health and Safety Code section 7050.5 and Public Resources Code section 5097.98. Upon determining that the remains are human, the project archeologist shall immediately notify the Medical Examiner of the City and County of San Francisco, the ERO, and the project sponsor of the find. If the remains cannot be permanently preserved in place, the landowner or designee shall consult with the most likely descendant and may consult with the project archeologist, project sponsor and the ERO on recovery of the remains and any scientific treatment alternatives. The landowner shall then make all reasonable efforts to develop a burial agreement (agreement) with the most likely descendant, as expeditiously as possible, for the treatment and disposition, with appropriate dignity, of human remains and funerary objects (as detailed in CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5(d)). Per Public Resources Code section 5097.98(c)(1), the agreement shall address, as applicable and to the degree consistent with the wishes of the most likely descendant, the appropriate excavation, removal, recordation, scientific analysis, custodianship prior to reinternment or curation, and final disposition of the human remains and funerary objects. If the most likely descendant agrees to scientific analyses of the remains and/or funerary objects, the project archeologist shall retain possession of the remains and funerary objects until completion of any such analyses, after which the remains and funerary objects shall be reinterred or curated as specified in the agreement. If the landowner or designee and the most likely descendant are unable to reach an agreement on scientific treatment of the remains and/or funerary objects, the ERO, in consultation with the project sponsor shall ensure that the remains and/or funerary objects are stored securely and respectfully until they can be reinterred on the project site, with appropriate dignity, in a location not subject to further or future subsurface disturbance, in accordance with the provisions of state law.		Project sponsor, archeological consultant in consultation with the San Francisco Medical Examiner, Environmental Review Officer, and Native American Heritage Commission and most likely descendant as warranted.	Discovery of human remains	Planning Department cultural resources staff, Medical Examiner, and Native American Heritage Commission and most likely descendant as warranted.	Considered complete on finding by the Environmental Review Officer that all state laws regarding human remains/burial objects have been adhered to, consultation with the most likely descendant is completed as warranted, and disposition of human remains has occurred as specified in agreement

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
Treatment of historic-period human remains and/or funerary objects discovered during any soil-disturbing activity shall be in accordance with protocols laid out in the research design in the project archeological monitoring plan, archeological testing plan, archeological data recovery plan, and other relevant agreements established between the project sponsor, medical examiner, and the ERO. The project archeologist shall retain custody of the remains and associated materials while any scientific study scoped in the treatment document is conducted and the remains shall then be curated or respectfully reinterred by arrangement on a case-by case-basis.					
Cultural Resources Public Interpretation Plan and Land Acknowledgement. If a significant archeological resource (i.e., a historical resource or unique archeological resources as defined by CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5) is identified and the ERO determines in consultation with Native American representatives for Native American archeological resources, that the public interpretation is warranted, the project archeologist shall prepare a Cultural Resources Public Interpretation Plan. The Cultural Resources Public Interpretation Plan shall describe the interpretive products, locations or distribution of interpretive materials or displays, the proposed content and materials, the producers or artists of the displays or installation, and a long-term maintenance program. If the resource to be interpreted is a tribal cultural resource, the department shall notify Native American tribal representatives that public interpretation is being planned. If requested by tribal representatives, the Cultural Resources Public Interpretation Plan shall be prepared in consultation with and developed with the participation of Native American tribal representatives. For public projects or projects that include dedicated public spaces, the interpretive materials may include an acknowledgement that the project is located upon traditional Ohlone lands. For interpretation of a tribal cultural resource, the interpretive program may include a combination of artwork, preferably by local Native American artists, educational panels or other informational displays, a plaque, or other interpretative elements including digital products that address Native American experience and the layers of history. As feasible, and where landscaping is proposed, the interpretive effort may include the use and the interpretation of native and traditional plants incorporated into the proposed landscaping.		Archeological consultant at the direction of the Environmental Review Officer will prepare Cultural Resources Public Interpretation Plan. Measures laid out in Cultural Resources Public Interpretation Plan are implemented by project sponsor	Following completion of treatment and analysis of significant archeological resource by archeological consultant	Planning Department cultural resources staff	Cultural Resources Public Interpretation Plan is complete on review and approval of Environmental Review Officer. Interpretive program is complete on notification to Environmental Review Officer from the project sponsor that program has been implemented

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
The project archeologist shall submit the cultural resources public interpretation plan and drafts of any interpretive materials that are subsequently prepared to the ERO for review and approval. The project sponsor shall ensure that the cultural resources public interpretation plan is implemented prior to occupancy of the project.					
Archeological Resources Report. If significant archeological resources, as defined by CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5, are encountered, the project archeologist shall submit a confidential draft Archeological Resources Report to the ERO. This report shall evaluate the significance of any discovered archeological resource, describe the archeological and historical research methods employed in the archeological programs undertaken, the results and interpretation of analyses, and discuss curation arrangements. Once approved by the ERO, the project archeologist shall distribute the approved Archeological Resources Report as follows: copies that meet current information center requirements at the time the report is completed to the California Archeological Site Survey Northwest Information Center, and a copy of the transmittal of the approved Archeological Resources Report to the Northwest Information Center to the ERO; one bound hardcopy of the Archeological Resources Report, along with digital files that include an unlocked, searchable PDF version of the Archeological Resources Report, GIS shapefiles of the site and feature locations, any formal site recordation forms (CA DPR 523 series), and/or documentation for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places/California Register of Historical Resources, via USB or other stable storage device, to the environmental planning division of the planning department; and, if a descendant group was consulted, a digital or hard copy of the Archeological Resources Report to the descendant group, depending on their preference.		Archeological consultant at the direction of the Environmental Review Officer	Following completion of treatment by archeological consultant as determined by the Environmental Review Officer	Planning Department cultural resources staff	Complete on certification to Environmental Review Officer that copies of the approved Archeological Resources Report have been distributed
Curation. If archeological data recovery is undertaken, the project archeologist and the project sponsor shall ensure that any significant archeological collections and paleoenvironmental samples of future research value shall be permanently curated at an established curatorial facility. The facility shall be selected in consultation with the ERO. Upon submittal of the collection for curation the project sponsor or archeologist shall provide a copy of the signed curatorial agreement to the ERO.		Project archeologist prepares collection for curation and project sponsor pays for curation costs	In the event a significant archeological resource is discovered and upon acceptance by the	Planning Department cultural resources staff	Considered complete upon acceptance of the collection by the curatorial facility

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
			Environmental Review Officer of the Archeological Resources Report		
Mitigation Measure M-CR-2b: Archeological Monitoring Program. If required based on the outcome of preliminary archeological review conducted by department staff, to avoid and mitigate impacts from the proposed action on significant archeological resources found during construction, the project archeologist shall develop and implement an archeological monitoring program as specified herein, and shall conduct an archeological testing and/or data recovery program if required to address archeological discoveries or the assessed potential for archeological discoveries, pursuant to this measure and Mitigation Measure M-CR-2a. ***Qualified Archeologist Identification.*** After the first project approval action or as directed by the environmental review officer (ERO), the project sponsor shall contact the department archeologist to obtain the names and contact information for three qualified archeological consultants on the department's list of qualified archeological consultants, and shall retain one of those archeological consultants ("project archeologist") to develop and implement an archeological monitoring program under the direction of the ERO.	Required for future development consistent with the housing element update based on the outcome of preliminary archeological review conducted by department staff	Project sponsor/ archeological consultant at the direction of the Environmental Review Officer	After the first project approval action or as directed by the Environmental Review Officer, prior to issuance of construction permits and throughout the construction period	Planning Department cultural resources staff	Complete when project sponsor retains qualified archeological consultant
Construction Crew Archeological Awareness. Prior to any soil-disturbing activity, the project archeologist shall conduct a brief on-site archeological awareness training that describes the types of resources that might be encountered and how they might be recognized, and requirements and procedures for work stoppage, resource protection and notification in the event of a potential archeological discovery. The project archeologist also shall distribute an "Alert" wallet card (based on the department's "ALERT" sheet) to all field personnel (e.g., machine operators, field crew, pile drivers, supervisory personnel) involved in soil disturbing activities, which summarizes stop work requirements and provides information on how to contact the project archeologist and ERO. The project archeologist shall repeat the training at intervals during construction, as determined necessary by the ERO, including when new construction personnel start work and prior to periods of soil disturbing work when the project archeologist will not be on site.		Project archeologist for awareness training, Native American representative for Native American cultural resources sensitivity	Prior to any soil-disturbing activity	Planning Department cultural resources staff	Considered complete when all trainings conducted

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
Tribal Cultural Resources Sensitivity Training. In addition to the archeological awareness training, for sites at which the ERO has determined that there is the potential for the discovery of Native American archeological resources or if requested by a tribe pursuant to the department's tribal cultural resources notification process, the project sponsor shall ensure that a Native American representative is afforded the opportunity to provide a Native American cultural resources sensitivity training to all construction personnel.		training (if requested)			
Archeological Monitoring Program. Based on the results of information provided in the preliminary archeological review and additional historical research as needed, the project archeologist shall consult with the ERO prior to the commencement of any project-related soils disturbing activities to determine the appropriate scope of archeological monitoring, allowing for required document preparation and review time. The archeological monitoring program shall be set forth in an Archeological Monitoring Plan, as detailed below. The project archeologist shall be present on the project site according to a schedule agreed upon by the project archeologist and the ERO until the ERO has, in consultation with the project archeologist, determined that project construction activities could have no effects on significant archeological deposits. The project archeologist shall prepare a daily monitoring log documenting activities and locations monitored, soil disturbance depth, stratigraphy, and findings. The project archeologist has the authority to temporarily stop soil disturbing construction activity in the vicinity of a suspected find to document the resource, collect samples as needed, and assess its significance. The project sponsor shall ensure that the find is protected in place in accordance with the archeologist's direction, and that it remains protected until the archeologist, after consultation with the ERO, notifies the project sponsor that assessment and any subsequent mitigation are complete. The project sponsor shall also ensure that the construction foreperson or other on-site delegee, is aware of the stop work and protection requirements. In the event of a discovery of a potentially significant archeological resources during monitoring or construction, the project archeologist shall conduct preliminary testing of the discovery, including the collection of soil samples and artifactual/ ecofactual material, as needed to assess potential significance and integrity. Once this initial assessment has been made, the project archeologist shall consult with the ERO on the results of the assessment. If the resource is assessed as potentially		Project archeologist at the direction of the Environmental Review Officer	Prior to issuance of construction permits and throughout the construction period	Planning Department cultural resources staff	After implementation of Archeological Monitoring Plan approved by the Environmental Review Officer

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
significant, the project sponsor shall ensure that soil disturbance remains halted at the discovery location until appropriate treatment has been determined in consultation with the ERO and implemented, as detailed below. ***Archeological Monitoring Plan.*** The archeological monitoring plan shall include the following provisions: • Project Description: Description of all anticipated soil disturbing activities (e.g., foundation and utility demolition, hazardous soils remediation, site grading, shoring excavations, piles or soil improvements, and foundation, elevator, car stacker, utility, and landscaping excavations), with project plans and profiles, as needed, to illustrate the anticipated soil disturbance. • Site Specific Environmental and Cultural Context: Pre-contact and historic environmental and cultural setting of the project site as pertains to potential Native American use and historic period development; any available information pertaining to subsequent soil disturbance, current knowledge of soil stratigraphy. As appropriate based on the scale and scope of the project, the Archeological Monitoring Plan should include historic maps, as a basis for predicting resource types that might be encountered and their potential locations. An overlay of the project site on the city's prehistoric sensitivity model mapping should be included, as should the locations of all known archeological sites within 0.25 mile of the project site. • Anticipated Resources or Resource Types: Likely resources that might be encountered and at what locations and depths, based on known resources in the vicinity, the site's predevelopment setting and development history, and the anticipated depth and extent of project soil disturbances. • Proposed Scope of Archeological Monitoring: Include soil-disturbing activities/ disturbance depths to be monitored. • Synopsis of Required Procedures: For the assessment and treatment of discoveries, ERO and Native American consultation requirements; burial treatment procedures; and reporting and curation requirements, consistent with the specifications of Mitigation Measure M-CR-2a.					

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
Resource Evaluation and Treatment Determination. Upon discovery of a suspected archeological resource during construction or archeological monitoring, Mitigation Measure M-CR-2a's Resource Evaluation and Treatment Determination stipulations shall be implemented as specified in that measure. ***Additional Applicable Measures.*** If a significant archeological resource is identified, and data recovery is required under Mitigation Measure M-CR-2a's Resource Evaluation and Treatment Determination stipulations, the following additional measures identified in the Mitigation Measure M-CR-2a shall be implemented as specified in that measure: • Archeological Data Recovery Program • Treatment of Human Remains and Funerary Objects (as applicable) • Coordination of Archeological Data Recovery Investigations • Cultural Resources Public Interpretation Plan and Land Acknowledgement (as applicable) • Archeological Resources Report • Curation		Project archeologist at the direction of the Environmental Review Officer	Upon discovery of suspected archeological resource	Planning Department cultural resources staff	Completed when Environmental Review Officer concurs that the status of the additional measures identified in Mitigation Measure M-CR-2a are completed
Mitigation Measure M-CR-2c: Archeological Testing Program. If required based on the outcome of preliminary archeological review conducted by department staff, to avoid and mitigate impacts from the proposed action on significant archeological resources found during construction, the project archeologist shall develop and implement an archeological testing program as specified herein, and shall conduct an archeological monitoring and/or data recovery program if required to address archeological discoveries or the assessed potential for archeological discoveries, pursuant to this measure and Mitigation Measure M-CR-2a: Procedures for Discovery of Archeological Resources for Projects Involving Soil Disturbance. ***Qualified Archeologist Identification.*** After the first project approval action or as directed by the ERO, the project sponsor shall contact the department archeologist to obtain the names and contact information for the next three qualified archeological consultants on the department's list and shall retain a qualified archeologist (hereinafter "project archeologist") from this list of three to develop and implement the archeological testing program.	Required for future development consistent with the housing element update based on the outcome of preliminary archeological review conducted by department staff	Project sponsor/ archeological consultant at the direction of the Environmental Review Officer	After the first project approval action or as directed by the Environmental Review Officer and prior to issuance of construction permits and throughout the construction period	Planning Department cultural resources staff	Complete when project sponsor retains qualified archeological consultant

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
Construction Crew Archeological Awareness. Prior to any soils-disturbing activities being undertaken, the project archeologist shall conduct a brief on-site archeological awareness training that describes the types of resources that might be encountered and how they might be recognized, and requirements and procedures for work stoppage, resource protection and notification in the event of a potential archeological discovery. The project archeologist also shall distribute an "Alert" wallet card, based on the department's "ALERT" sheet, that summarizes stop work requirements and provides necessary contact information for the project archeologist, project sponsor and the to all field personnel involved in soil disturbing activities, including machine operators, field crew, pile drivers, supervisory personnel, etc., have received. The project archeologist shall repeat the training at intervals during construction, as determined necessary by the ERO, including when new construction personnel start work and prior to periods of soil disturbing work when the project archeologist will not be on site. ***Tribal Cultural Resources Sensitivity Training.*** In addition to and concurrently with the archeological awareness training, for sites at which the ERO has determined that there is the potential for the discovery of Native American archeological resources or if requested by a tribe pursuant to the department's tribal cultural resources notification process, the project sponsor shall ensure that a Native American representative is afforded the opportunity to provide a Native American cultural resources sensitivity training to all construction personnel.		Project archeologist for awareness training, Native American representative for Native American cultural resources sensitivity training (if requested)	Prior to any soil-disturbing activity	Planning Department cultural resources staff	Considered complete when all trainings conducted
Archeological Testing Program. The project archeologist shall develop and undertake an archeological testing program as specified herein to determine to the extent possible the presence or absence of archeological resources in areas of project soil disturbance and to identify and to evaluate whether any archeological resource encountered on the site constitutes an historical resource under CEQA. In addition, the consultant shall be available to conduct an archeological monitoring and/or data recovery program if required to address archeological discoveries or the assessed potential for archeological discoveries, pursuant to this measure. ***Archeological Testing Plan.*** The project archeologist shall consult with the ERO reasonably prior to the commencement of any project-related soils disturbing activities to determine the appropriate scope of archeological testing. The archeological testing program shall be conducted in accordance with an approved Archeological Testing Plan, prepared by the project archeologist consistent with the		Project archeologist at the direction of the Environmental Review Officer	Prior to issuance of construction permits and throughout the construction period	Planning Department cultural resources staff	After consultation with and approval by the Environmental Review Officer of Archeological Testing Plan and review and approval of archeological testing results memo by

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
approved scope of work. The Archeological Testing Plan shall be submitted first and directly to the ERO for review and comment and shall be considered a draft subject to revision until final approval by the ERO. Project-related soils disturbing activities shall not commence until the testing plan has been approved and any testing scope to occur in advance of construction has been completed. The project archeologist shall implement the testing as specified in the approved Archeological Testing Plan prior to and/or during construction. The Archeological Testing Plan shall include the following: • Project Description: Description of all anticipated soil disturbing activities, with locations and depths of disturbance, including foundation and utility demolition, hazardous soils remediation, site grading, shoring excavations, piles or soil improvements, and foundation, elevator, car stacker, utility and landscaping excavations, with project plans and profiles, as needed, to illustrate the locations of anticipated soil disturbance. • Site Specific Environmental and Cultural Context: Pre-contact and historic environmental and cultural setting of the project site as pertinent to potential Native American use and historic period development, any available information pertaining to past soil disturbance; soils information, such as stratigraphic and water table data from prior geotechnical testing. As appropriate based on the scale and scope of the project, the Archeological Testing Plan should include historic maps as a basis for predicting resource types that might be encountered and their potential locations. An overlay of the project site on the city's prehistoric sensitivity model mapping should be included, as should the locations of all known archeological sites within 0.25 mile of the project site. • Brief Research Design: Scientific/historical research questions applicable to the expected resource(s), what data classes potential resources may be expected to possess, and how the expected data classes would address the applicable research questions. • Anticipated Resources or Resource Types: Likely resources that might be encountered and at what locations and depths, based on known resources in the vicinity, the site's predevelopment setting and development history, and the anticipated depth and extent of project soil disturbances.					Environmental Review Officer.

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
• Proposed Scope of Archeological Testing and Rationale: Testing methods to be used (e.g., coring, mechanical trenching, manual excavation, or combination of methods); locations and depths of testing in relation to anticipated project soil disturbance; strata to be investigated; any uncertainties on stratigraphy that would affect locations or depths of tests and might require archeological monitoring of construction excavations subsequent to testing. • Resource Documentation and Significance Assessment Procedures: ERO and Native American consultation requirements upon making a discovery; pre-data recovery assessment process, burial treatment procedures, and reporting and curation requirements, consistent with the specifications of Mitigation Measure M-CR-2a. ***Archeological Testing Results Memo.*** Irrespective of whether archeological resources are discovered, the project archeologist shall submit a written summary of the findings to the ERO at the completion of the archeological testing program. The findings report/memo shall describe each resource, provide an initial assessment of the integrity and significance of encountered archeological deposits encountered during testing, and provide recommendations for subsequent treatment of any resources encountered.					
Resource Evaluation and Treatment Determination. Upon discovery of a suspected archeological resource during construction or archeological testing, Mitigation Measure M-CR-2a's Resource Evaluation and Treatment Determination stipulations shall be implemented as specified in that measure. ***Additional Applicable Measures.*** If a significant archeological resource is identified, and data recovery is required under Mitigation Measure M-CR-2a's Resource Evaluation and Treatment Determination stipulations, the following additional measures identified in the Mitigation Measure M-CR-2a shall be implemented as specified in that measure: • Archeological Data Recovery Program • Treatment of Human Remains and Funerary Objects (as applicable) • Coordination of Archeological Data Recovery Investigations		Project archeologist at the direction of the Environmental Review Officer	Upon discovery of suspected archeological resource	Planning Department cultural resources staff	Completed when Environmental Review Officer concurs that the status of the additional measures identified in Mitigation Measure M-CR-2a are completed

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
• Cultural Resources Public Interpretation Plan and Land Acknowledgement (as applicable) • Archeological Resources Report • Curation					
Mitigation Measure M-CR-2d. Treatment of Submerged and Deeply Buried Resources. This measure applies to projects that would include subgrade excavation to depths that would penetrate to native soil or below Young Bay Mud, or entail the use of piles, soil improvements or other deep foundations in landfill areas within former creeks, ponds, bay marshes or waters of the bay that may be sensitive for submerged or buried historical or Native American archeological resources; and shall be implemented in the event of the discovery of a submerged or deeply buried resource during archeological testing, archeological monitoring, or soil-disturbing construction activities that occur when an archeologist is not present. In addition to the measures detailed below, for any project during which a significant archeological resource is identified, a preservation or treatment determination shall be made consistent with the provisions of Mitigation Measure M-CR-2a: Procedures for Discovery of Archeological Resources for Projects Involving Soil Disturbance. If data recovery is required, the following additional measures identified in measure M-CR-2a shall be implemented, as specified in that measure: • Archeological Data Recovery Program • Treatment of Human Remains and Funerary Objects (as applicable) • Coordination of Archeological Data Recovery Investigations • Cultural Resources Public Interpretation Plan and Land Acknowledgement (as applicable) • Archeological Resources Report • Curation The following additional measures shall be undertaken upon discovery of a potentially significant deeply buried or submerged resource to minimize significant effects from deep project excavations, soil improvements, pile construction, or	Required for future development consistent with the housing element update based on the outcome of preliminary archeological review conducted by department staff	Project sponsor, archeological consultant, the Environmental Review Officer, and tribal representative (for Native American archeological resources)	In the event of the discovery of a submerged or deeply buried archeological resource	Planning Department cultural resources staff	After completed implementation of treatment program by project sponsor identified in approved treatment program memo

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
construction of other deep foundation systems, in cases where the environmental review officer (ERO) has determined through consultation with the project sponsor, and with tribal representatives as applicable, that preservation –in place—the preferred mitigation— is not a feasible or effective option. ***Submerged or Buried Resource Treatment Determination.*** If the resource cannot feasibly or adequately be preserved in place, documentation and/or archeological data recovery shall be conducted, as described in Mitigation Measure M-CR-2a. However, by definition, submerged or deeply buried resources sometimes are located deeper than the maximum anticipated depth of project excavations, such that the resource would not be exposed for investigation, and/or under water or may otherwise pose substantial access, safety or other logistical constraints for data recovery; or the cost of providing archeological access to the resource may demonstrably be prohibitive. In circumstances where the constraints identified above limit physical access for documentation and data recovery, the ERO, project sponsor, project archeologist, and tribal representative (for Native American archeological resources), shall consult to explore alternative documentation and treatment options to be implemented in concert with any feasible archeological data recovery. The appropriate treatment elements, which would be expected to vary with the type of resource and the circumstances of discovery, shall be identified by the ERO based on the results of consultation from among the treatment measures listed below. Additional treatment options may be developed and agreed upon through consultation if it can be demonstrated that they would be equally or more effective in recovering or amplifying the value of the data recovered from physical investigation of the affected resources by addressing applicable archeological research questions and in disseminating data and meaningfully interpreting the resource to the public. Each treatment option below, or a combination of the treatment measures, in concert with any feasible standard data recovery methods applied as described above, would be effective in mitigating significant impacts to submerged and buried resources. The ERO, in consultation with the project archeologist and project sponsor, shall identify which of these measures that, individually or in combination, will be applicable and effective in recovering sufficient data, enhancing the research value of the data recovery, meaningfully interpreting the resource to the public, or otherwise effectively mitigating the loss of data or associations that will result from					

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
project construction. Multiple treatment measures shall be adopted in combination, as needed to adequately mitigate data loss and, as applicable, impacts to tribal cultural values, as determined in consultation with the ERO and, as applicable, tribal representatives. The project archeologist shall document the results of the treatment program consultation with respect to the agreed upon scope of treatment in a treatment program memo, for ERO review and approval. Upon approval by the ERO, the project sponsor shall ensure that treatment program is implemented prior to and during construction, as applicable. Reporting, interpretive, curation and review requirements are the same as delineated under the other cultural resources mitigation measures that are applicable to the project, as noted above. The project sponsor shall be responsible for ensuring the implementation of all applicable mitigation measures, as identified in the treatment program memo. ***Treatment Options*** • Remote Archeological Documentation. Where a historic feature cannot be recovered or adequately accessed in place by the archeologist due to size, bulk or inaccessibility, the archeologist shall conduct all feasible remote documentation methods, such as 3-D photography using a remote access device, remote sensing (e.g., ground penetrating radar with a low range (150 or 200 MHz) antenna), or other appropriate technologies and methods, to document the resource and its context. The project sponsor and contractor shall support remote archeological documentation as needed, by assisting with equipment access (e.g., drone, lights and camera or laser scanner mounted on backhoe); providing personnel qualified to enter the excavation to facilitate remote documentation; and accommodating training of construction personnel by the project archeologist so that they can assist in measuring or photographing the resource from inside the excavation in cases when the archeologist cannot enter. • Modification of Contractor's Excavation Methods. At the request of the ERO, the project sponsor shall consult with the project archeologist and the ERO to identify potential modifications to the contractor's excavation and shoring methods to facilitate data recovery to prevent damage to the resource before it has been documented, to assist in exposure and facilitate observation and documentation, and to assist in data recovery. Examples include improved dewatering during excavation, use of a smaller excavator bucket or toothless					

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
bucket, providing a location where spoils can be spread out and examined by the archeologist prior to being offhauled, and phasing or benching of deep excavations to facilitate observation and/or deeper archeological trenching. • Data Recovery through Open Excavation. If a project will include mass excavation to the depth of the buried/submerged deposit, archeological data recovery shall include manual (preferred) or controlled mechanical sampling of the deposit. If project construction would not include mass excavation to the depth of the deposit but would impact the deposit through deep foundation systems or soil improvements, the ERO and the project sponsor shall consult to consider whether there are feasible means of providing direct archeological access to the deposit (e.g., excavation of portion of the site that overlies the deposit to the subject depth so that a sample can be recovered). The feasibility consideration shall include an estimate of the project cost of excavating to the necessary depth and of providing shoring and dewatering sufficient to allow archeological access to the deposit for manual or mechanical recovery. • Mechanical Recovery. If site circumstances limit access by archeologists to the find, the ERO, project archeologist, and project sponsor shall consult on the feasibility of mechanically removing the feature/ deposit or portion of it intact for off-site documentation and analysis, preservation, and interpretive use. The consultation above shall include consideration as to whether such recovery is logistically feasible and can be accomplished without major data loss. The specific means and methods and the type and size of the sample shall be identified, and the recovery shall be implemented as determined feasible by the ERO. The project sponsor shall assist with mechanical recovery and transport and curation of recovered materials and shall provide for an appropriate and secure off-site location for archeological documentation and storage as needed. • Salvage of Historic Materials. Samples or sections of historical features that cannot be preserved in place (e.g., structural members of piers or wharves, sections of wooden sea wall, rail alignments, or historic utility or paving features of particular data value or interpretive interest) shall be tested for contamination and, if not contaminated, shall be salvaged for interpretive use or other reuse, such as display of a reconstructed resource; use of timbers or planks for site furniture and signage structures; installation in publicly accessible open spaces; or other uses of public interest. Historic wood and other salvageable historic					

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
structural material not used for interpretation shall be recovered for reuse, consistent with the San Francisco Ordinance No. 27-06, which requires recycling or reuse of all construction and demolition debris material removed from a project. If the project has the potential to encounter such features, the project sponsor shall plan in advance for reuse of salvaged historic materials to the greatest extent feasible, including identification of a location for interim storage and identification of potential users and reuses. • Data Recovery Using Geoarcheological Cores. If it is deemed infeasible to expose a significant deposit resource for archeological data recovery, geoarcheological coring of the identified deposit shall be conducted at horizontal grid intervals of no greater than 15 feet within areas that will be impacted by project construction. The maximum feasible core diameter shall be used for data recovery coring. The objective of coring is to obtain a minimum of a five percent sample of the estimated total volume of the resource within areas that will impacted by project construction. However, due to the small size of each core, this method alone generally cannot recover a 5 percent sample volume or a sufficient quantity of data to adequately characterize the range of activities that took place at the site. For this reason, if the coring sample constitutes less than five percent of the estimated total volume of the archeological deposit that will be directly impacted by project construction, the project sponsor may elect implementation of one or more of the following additional compensatory measures to amplify the value of the recovered data. • Compensatory Treatment Measures: – *Scientific Analysis of Data from Comparable Archeological Sites/ "Orphaned Collections."* The ERO and the project archeologist shall consult to identify a known archeological site or historical feature, or curated collections or samples recovered during prior investigation of similar sites or features are available for further analysis; and for which site-specific or comparative analyses would be expected to provide data relevant to the interpretation or context reconstruction for the affected site. Examples would include reanalysis or comparative analysis of artifacts or archival records; faunal or paleobotanical analyses; dating; isotopes studies; or such other relevant studies based on the research design developed for the affected site and on data sets available from the impacted resource and comparative collections.					

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
The scope of analyses shall be determined by the ERO based on consultation with the project archeologist, the project sponsor and, for sites of Native American origin Native American representatives. *Additional Off-Site Data Collection and/or Analysis for Historical and Paleoenvironmental Reconstruction.* The ERO and project archeologist shall identify existing geoarcheological data and geotechnical coring records on file with the city; and/or cores extracted and preserved during prior geotechnical or geoarcheological investigations that could contribute to reconstruction of the environmental setting in the vicinity of the identified resource, to enhance the historical and scientific value of recovered data by providing additional data about Native American archeological environmental setting and stratigraphic sensitivity; and/or provide information pertinent to the public interpretation of the significant resource. Relevant data may also be obtained through geoarcheological coring at accessible sites identified by the ERO through consultation with San Francisco public agencies and private project sponsors.					
TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES					
Mitigation Measure M-TCR-1: Tribal Notification and Consultation. ***Applicability*:** This measure applies to both archeological tribal cultural resources and non-archeological tribal cultural resources. This measure shall be implemented for the following types of future development consistent with the proposed action: • For each project for which preliminary archeological review, conducted by department archeologists, identifies the potential for impacts on a Native American archeological resource, which is presumed to be a tribal cultural resource, and • At the initiation of planning for public interpretation of a significant Native American archeological resource, and • For projects with one or more of the following characteristics where the project is located in an area identified as a potential tribal cultural resource: – Development footprint greater than or equal to 10,000 square feet and any soil disturbance greater than or equal to 10 feet deep – Use of piles or other deep foundation or deep soil improvements	Required for future planning code amendments to implement the housing element update or required for future development consistent with the housing element update that meet one or more of the following criteria:	Planning Department cultural resources staff, Planning Department or project sponsor, Native American tribal representative	Prior to implementation of future planning code amendments; or for future development projects, during environmental review for notification and consultation; prior to issuance of demolition permit for identified measures	Planning Department cultural resources staff	Considered complete if no tribal cultural resource is identified, or tribal cultural resource is identified and implementation of identified tribal cultural resource measures.

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
– Total soil excavation volume in excess of 1,500 cubic yards – Development for which the city requires the inclusion of public open space, public art, or other public interpretative programs – Development that includes habitat restoration, creek daylighting, or channelization that could affect native plants – Development for which the department requires a streetscape plan under the Better Streets Plan (planning code section 138.1) ***Notification.*** The department shall distribute a notification for projects that meet any of the characteristics above to parties on its local Native American tribal distribution list, including the Association of Ramaytush Ohlone and other interested Ohlone parties list. The notification shall include the project description; project location; anticipated depth and extent of soil disturbance necessary for construction; information on changes to public access, removal or addition of native plantings or habitat, and any proposed public interpretation, as relevant; the conclusions of the preliminary archeological review regarding potential impacts on Native American archeological tribal cultural resources; anticipated next steps, including proposed archeological identification and/or treatment for archeological tribal cultural resources; an invitation to consult on the project; and a timeline for requesting consultation, which is within 30 days after receipt of a notification. ***Consultation.*** The department and project sponsor shall ensure that Native American tribal representatives who respond to the notification shall be provided the opportunity to consult on the proposed project. Consultation shall follow requirements identified in CEQA section 21080.3.2; if the Native American tribal representatives request consultation regarding alternatives to the project, recommended mitigation measures, or significant effects, the consultation shall include those topics. Consultation meetings shall occur primarily between department staff members and Native American representatives, with department staff members coordinating with the project sponsor. Project sponsors may join in consultation meetings if requested and agreed to by the Native American representative. Native American representatives shall be provided with project plans and details to review and given an opportunity to provide input with respect to whether the project as designed would affect a tribal cultural resource and, if so, how such an impact might be avoided or mitigated. For archeological tribal cultural resources, the department shall ensure that Native American representatives are	• Preliminary archeological review identifies potential impacts on a Native American archeological resource • Initiation of planning for public interpretation of a significant Native American archeological resource • Projects located in an area identified as a potential tribal cultural resource and have one of the following: – Development footprint greater than or equal to 10,000 square feet and any soil				

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
informed of the sensitivity of the project site, as assessed by the department, and the presence of any known or discovered resources so that they can provide input on the archeological steps to be implemented, per Mitigation Measures M-CR-2a: Archeological Resources Requirements for Projects Involving Soil Disturbance and, as applicable, Mitigation Measure M-CR-2b: Archeological Monitoring Program; Mitigation Measure M-CR-2c: Archeological Testing Program; and Mitigation Measure M-CR-2d: Treatment of Submerged and Deeply Buried Resources, if requested by those tribal representatives. Additional measures on the treatment of tribal cultural resources may be developed through consultation. Consultation shall be concluded as defined in CEQA section 21080.3.2(b). Site-specific measures identified through consultation to reduce or eliminate impacts would be implemented by the project sponsor in coordination with department staff members. Site-specific measures could include, but would not be limited to: • Sampling and paleoenvironmental analysis of soils that would be affected by project piles or excavation for reconstruction of the Native American environmental setting • Native planting and vegetation treatments in publicly accessible open spaces and community gathering areas that emphasize native and/or environmentally sustainable shoreline plants, such as those traditionally used by the Ohlone • Public interpretive exhibits that educate the public and/or reflect tribal cultural heritage and values and address local Native American experience and history • Ohlone land acknowledgements • Public art by local Native American artists • For projects that include public open spaces or onsite public access spaces within the project site (such as a community room), make the spaces available for events organized by the local Native American community, by arrangement with event space organizers • Other educational tools and applications identified by tribal representatives through consultation with the tribe and determined by the environmental review officer (ERO) and the project sponsor to be feasible for inclusion in the project. Different or additional project-specific mitigation measures may be identified through Native American consultation if, in consultation with the tribal	disturbance greater than or equal to 10 feet deep – Use of piles or other deep foundation or deep soil improvements – Soil excavation in excess of 1,500 cubic yards – Requires public open space, public art, or other public interpretative programs – Habitat restoration, creek daylighting, or channelizatio n that could affect native plants – Streetscape plan under the Better Streets Plan				

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
representative, the project sponsor, and the ERO, they are determined to be equally effective as or more effective than the measures identified above in mitigating the specific impacts of development on tribal cultural resources. Project-specific mitigation measures applicable to the specific proposal shall be agreed upon by the tribal consultants and the department in coordination with the project sponsor and implemented by the project sponsor, if determined feasible by the ERO. If no tribal group requests consultation but the ERO determines that a proposed project may have a potential significant adverse effect on a tribal cultural resource, based on prior consultation, then the site-specific measures and treatments listed above, as applicable, may be required at the discretion of the ERO. ***Compensation.*** Following on the initial tribal consultation, the ERO, project sponsor, and project archeologist, as appropriate, shall work with the tribal representative to identify the scope of work to fulfill the requirements of this mitigation measure, which may include participation in archeological monitoring, preparation and review of deliverables (e.g., plans, interpretive materials, art work). Tribal representatives shall be compensated for their work as identified in the agreed upon scope of work.					
TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION					
Mitigation Measure M-TR-4a: Parking Maximums and Transportation Demand Management. The city shall reduce vehicle trips from future planning code amendments (e.g., future rezonings or housing sustainability district designations) to implement the proposed action or future development projects that contribute considerably to or result in a significant transit delay impact, as defined in the Housing Element 2022 Update EIR's transit analysis for future development. This mitigation measure shall not apply to future planning code amendments, or future development projects implementing the proposed action, that do not contribute considerably to or result in a significant transit delay impact. The city may achieve this vehicle trip reduction through one of the following measures A, B, or C:	Required for future planning code amendments to implement the housing element update or future development consistent with the housing element update until such planning code amendments are made	City (e.g., SFMTA, Planning Department) or project sponsors of future development projects	Prior to implementation of future planning code amendments or prior to the commencement of any project-related soils disturbing activities	Planning Department	Considered complete when planning code sections 151 and 151.1 or section 169 is amended or issuance of an applicable future development project's entitlement

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
• Measure A: Amend planning code parking maximums for residential uses (sections 151 and 151.1) by a 50 percent or more reduction than such maximums as of April 2022; OR • Measure B: Amend planning code transportation demand management requirements (section 169) for residential uses or its associated program standards for residential uses by an equivalent amount to achieve the vehicle trip reduction estimated by implementation of a 50 percent reduction in planning code parking maximums, compared to parking maximums as of April 2022; OR • Measure C: The department shall apply vehicle trip reduction measures A or B on future development projects consistent with the housing element on project-by-project basis until the city amends the planning code consistent with measures A or B.					
Mitigation Measure M-TR-4b: Driveway and Loading Operations Plan and Curb Cut Restrictions. The city shall reduce potential conflicts between driveway and loading operations, including passenger and freight loading activities, and people walking, bicycling, riding transit, and driving, from future planning code amendments to implement the proposed action (e.g., future rezonings or housing sustainability district designations) or future development projects that would contribute considerably to or result in a significant transit delay or significant loading impacts, as defined in the Housing Element 2022 Update EIR's transit and loading analysis for future development. This mitigation measure shall not apply to future planning code amendments, or future development projects implementing the proposed action, that do not contribute considerably to or result in a significant transit delay or significant loading impacts. The city may achieve this through one of the following measures A or B: • Measure A.1: Amend planning code section 155(r) to not permit curb cuts for garage entries, driveways, or other vehicular access to off-street parking or loading along the street(s) of the significant transit delay and significant loading impacts (may not apply to streets with protected center-running transit-only lanes); AND • Measure A.2: Amend the geographic applicability of planning code section 155(u) for projects to prepare and implement a Driveway and Loading Operations Plan (DLOP). Applicable projects shall prepare and submit a draft DLOP to the	Required for future planning code amendments to implement the housing element update or future development consistent with the housing element update with significant transit delay or loading impacts as described in the EIR	City (e.g., SFMTA, Planning Department) or project sponsors of applicable future development projects	Prior to implementation of future planning code amendments or prior to the commencement of any project-related soils disturbing activities	Planning Department	Considered complete when planning code section 155 is amended or issuance of an applicable future development project's DLOP in accordance with any guidelines issued by the Planning Department

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
department for their review and approval, in consultation with the SFMTA. The DLOP shall be written in accordance with any guidelines issued by the department and shall respond to any applicable SFMTA curb management plans (e.g., see Mitigation Measure M-TR-6: Curb Management Plans); OR • Measure B: The department shall apply measures A.1 and A.2 on a development project by development project basis until the city amends the planning code consistent with measures A.1 and A.2.					
Mitigation Measure M-TR-4c: Implement Transit Travel Times Measures to Reduce Transit Delay. The city (e.g., SFMTA, department) shall implement measures to reduce transit delay on the Geary and 19th Avenue corridors. This measure shall also apply to other transit corridors where future planning code amendments (e.g., future rezonings or housing sustainability district designations) to implement the proposed action would contribute considerably to or result a significant transit delay impact (thresholds of significance), as defined in the Housing Element 2022 Update EIR. The city will consider the improvements in the below table. The table presents the three levels (i.e., tiers) or transit improvements in terms of infrastructure changes that would be applicable to the different street network types and transit operating characteristics, depending on the nature of transit delay. The Tier 1 and 2 improvements include traffic engineering measures that are consistent with San Francisco's Muni Forward (such measures may include transit stop changes, traffic lane modifications, parking and turn restrictions, traffic signal and stop sign changes, and pedestrian improvements) and are organized to distinguish between measures that do not restrict private vehicle movements (Tier 1) and those that do restrict private vehicle movements (Tier 2). The Tier 3 improvements are consistent with those major capital projects (e.g., subways) various government agencies are considering as a part of San Francisco's ConnectSF and Bay Area Rapid Transit and Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Authority Link21.	Required for future planning code amendments to implement the housing element update with significant transit delay impacts as described in the EIR	City (e.g., SFMTA, Planning Department)	Within two years of the final approval of any future planning code amendments (e.g., future rezonings or housing sustainability district designations) to implement the proposed action	Planning Department	Considered complete when the city implements identified measures

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
Table: Improvements to Reduce Transit Delay Based on Street Network and Transit Operating Characteristics					

Street Network/Transit Operating Characteristics	Tier 1 Improvements	Tier 2 Improvements	Tier 3 Improvements
	Transit bulbs, boarding islands, prepaid boarding, stop consolidation, transit signal priority, traffic signals	Side-running transit-only or HOV lanes, or protected center-running transit-only lanes	Grade separation of transit service (subway)
Bus routes that operate primarily in mixed-traffic lanes	X	X	X
Bus routes or light rail lines that operate in a mix of transit-only lanes and mixed-traffic lanes	X	X	X
Bus routes or light rail lines that operate primarily in transit-only lanes		X	X

Note: The city's selection of which specific transit network improvements to implement as a part of this measure would depend on the future transit network and roadway conditions within the rezoning area. If transit is not already protected, the city would start with tier 1 improvements and move toward tier 2 and then tier 3 when these features are already in place.

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
The city shall implement measures consistent with Muni Forward and ConnectSF plans, studies, and toolkits to reduce transit delay associated with traffic congestion and passenger boarding. The city may develop transit network improvement plans for routes that would be affected by future planning code amendments to implement the proposed action, which could include identifying the specific measures and implementation timing of the measures. Potential measures could include, but are not limited to, those shown in the table above. The city shall identify the specific measures within two years of the final approval of any future planning code amendments (e.g., future rezonings or housing sustainability district designations) to implement the proposed action that will exceed the thresholds of significance. Additionally, the city shall make every effort to seek and obtain new funding sources to fund transit delay improvements identified in the above table. This may include increasing the existing transportation sustainability fee or assessing a new transit impact fees to future development projects consistent with the proposed action as part of future planning code amendments. This may also include seeking applicable state or federal funding sources.					
Mitigation Measure M-TR-6: Curb Management Plans. The SFMTA shall develop a curb management plan(s) for the geographic area(s) under future planning code amendments (e.g., future rezonings or housing sustainability district designations) to implement the proposed action that result in significant loading impacts as defined in the Housing Element 2022 Update EIR's loading analysis for future development. The SFMTA shall develop the plan to be consistent with the recommendations in the SFMTA's adopted Curb Management Strategy. Such a plan may include, but would not be limited to, components such as identifying the necessary curb regulations based on curb function priorities and parking and loading needs, and issues related to transit, accessibility, and safety. The SFMTA shall develop the plan within two years after the department has received project applications under future planning code amendments to implement the proposed action that cumulatively total greater than 200,000 gross square feet in the plan's geographic area. The SFMTA shall implement applicable components of the plan prior to the city's issuance of certificate of occupancy for the project applications. Project sponsors for project applications for individual development projects may also implement applicable components of the plan, including if	Required for future planning code amendments to implement the housing element update	San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency	Within two years after the Planning Department has received project applications under future planning code amendments to implement the proposed action that cumulatively total greater than 200,000 gross square feet in the plan's	Planning Department	Considered complete when the curb management plan(s) are implemented

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
identified with any driveway and loading operations guidelines issued by the department. The SFMTA shall monitor conditions in the geographic area and update the plan, as needed.			geographic area; and prior to the city's issuance of certificate of occupancy for the project applications		
NOISE AND VIBRATION					
Mitigation Measure M-NO-1: Construction Noise Control. The project sponsor shall submit a project-specific construction noise control plan to the environmental review officer (ERO) for approval prior to issuance of any demolition or building permit. The construction noise control plan shall be prepared by a qualified acoustical engineer, with input from the construction contractor, and include all feasible measures to reduce construction noise. The construction noise control plan shall identify noise control measures to ensure that construction noise levels shall not exceed 90 dBA 1-hour L_{eq}, 10 dBA above the ambient noise level, nor an interior level of 45 dBA during nighttime hours at noise sensitive receptors (residences, hospitals, convalescent homes, schools, churches, hotels, and motels). The project sponsor shall ensure that requirements of the construction noise control plan are included in contract specifications. If nighttime construction is required, the plan shall include specific measures to reduce nighttime construction noise. The plan shall also include measures for notifying the public of construction activities, complaint procedures, and a plan for monitoring construction noise levels in the event complaints are received. The construction noise control plan shall include the following measures to the degree feasible, or other effective measures, to reduce construction noise levels: • Use construction equipment that is in good working order, and inspect mufflers for proper functionality; • Select "quiet" construction methods and equipment (e.g., improved mufflers, use of intake silencers, engine enclosures); • Use construction equipment with lower noise emission ratings whenever possible, particularly for air compressors;	Required for future development consistent with the housing element update if project-level analysis finds that the frequency, duration, and intensity of construction noise would result in a significant construction noise impact or a considerable contribution to a significant cumulative construction noise impact	Project sponsor, project sponsor's qualified acoustical consultant	Prior to issuance of demolition or building permit	Planning Department	Considered complete upon implementation of Planning Department approved project-specific construction noise control plan and following completion of all construction activities

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
• Prohibit the idling of inactive construction equipment for more than five minutes; • Locate stationary noise sources (such as compressors) as far from nearby noise sensitive receptors as possible, muffle such noise sources, and construct barriers around such sources and/or the construction site. • Avoid placing stationary noise-generating equipment (e.g., generators, compressors) within noise-sensitive buffer areas (as determined by the acoustical engineer) immediately adjacent to neighbors. • Enclose or shield stationary noise sources from neighboring noise-sensitive properties with noise barriers to the extent feasible. To further reduce noise, locate stationary equipment in pit areas or excavated areas, if feasible; and • Install temporary barriers, barrier-backed sound curtains and/or acoustical panels around working powered impact equipment and, if necessary, around the project site perimeter. When temporary barrier units are joined together, the mating surfaces shall be flush with each other. Gaps between barrier units, and between the bottom edge of the barrier panels and the ground, shall be closed with material that completely closes the gaps, and dense enough to attenuate noise. The construction noise control plan shall include the following measures for notifying the public of construction activities, complaint procedures and monitoring of construction noise levels: • Designation of an on-site construction noise manager for the project; • Notification of neighboring noise sensitive receptors within 300 feet of the project construction area at least 30 days in advance of high-intensity noise-generating activities (e.g., pier drilling, pile driving, and other activities that may generate noise levels greater than 90 dBA at noise sensitive receptors) about the estimated duration of the activity; • A sign posted on-site describing noise complaint procedures and a complaint hotline number that shall always be answered during construction; • A procedure for notifying the planning department of any noise complaints within one week of receiving a complaint;					

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
• A list of measures for responding to and tracking complaints pertaining to construction noise. Such measures may include the evaluation and implementation of additional noise controls at sensitive receptors; and • Conduct noise monitoring (measurements) at the beginning of major construction phases (e.g., demolition, grading, excavation) and during high-intensity construction activities to determine the effectiveness of noise attenuation measures and, if necessary, implement additional noise control measures. The construction noise control plan shall include the following additional measures during pile-driving activities: • When pile driving is to occur within 600 feet of a noise-sensitive receptor, implement "quiet" pile-driving technology (such as pre-drilling of piles, sonic pile drivers, auger cast-in-place, or drilled-displacement, or the use of more than one pile driver to shorten the total pile-driving duration [only if such measure is preferable to reduce impacts to sensitive receptors]) where feasible, in consideration of geotechnical and structural requirements and conditions; • Where the use of driven impact piles cannot be avoided, properly fit impact pile driving equipment with an intake and exhaust muffler and a sound-attenuating shroud, as specified by the manufacturer; and • Conduct noise monitoring (measurements) before, during, and after the pile driving activity.					
Mitigation Measure M-NO-2: Noise Analysis and Attenuation. The project sponsor shall undertake a detailed noise analysis of noise-generating activities or equipment (e.g., heating, ventilation, and air-conditioning equipment; outdoor gathering areas; places of entertainment). This analysis shall be conducted prior to the first project approval action. This analysis shall include a site survey to identify potential noise-sensitive uses (residences, hospitals, convalescent homes, schools, churches, hotels and motels) and include at least one 24-hour noise measurement to determine ambient noise levels throughout the day and nighttime hours. The analysis shall be prepared by persons qualified in acoustical analysis and/or engineering and shall demonstrate with reasonable certainty that the proposed use would not adversely affect nearby noise-sensitive uses, would not substantially	Required for future development consistent with the housing element update, as applicable	Project sponsor's qualified acoustical or engineering consultant	Prior to the commencement of any project-related soils disturbing activities	Planning Department	Considered complete upon completion of noise analysis and installation of noise attenuation features into future building design and operations.

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
increase ambient noise levels, and would not result in a noise level in excess of any applicable standards, such as those in section 2909 of the noise ordinance. All recommendations from the acoustical analysis necessary to ensure that noise sources would meet applicable requirements of the noise ordinance and/or not result in substantial increases in ambient noise levels shall be incorporated into the building design and operations. Should concerns remain regarding potential excessive noise, completion of a detailed noise control analysis (by a person qualified in acoustical analysis and/or engineering), and incorporation of noise reduction measures (including quieter equipment, construction of barriers or enclosures, etc.) into the building design and operations prior to the first project approval action shall be required. Acoustical treatments may include, but are not limited to: • Enclosing noise-generating mechanical equipment • Installing relatively quiet models of air handlers, exhaust fans, and other mechanical equipment • Using mufflers or silencers on equipment exhaust fans • Orienting or shielding equipment to protect noise sensitive receptors to the greatest extent feasible • Increasing the distance between noise-generating equipment and noise-sensitive receptors • Placing barriers around the equipment to facilitate the attenuation of noise					
Mitigation Measure M-NO-3a: Protection of Adjacent Buildings/Structures and Vibration Monitoring During Construction. Prior to issuance of any demolition or building permit, the project sponsor shall submit a project-specific Pre-construction Survey and Vibration Management and Monitoring Plan to the ERO or the ERO's designee for approval. The plan shall identify all feasible means to avoid damage to potentially affected buildings. The project sponsor shall ensure that the following requirements of the Pre-Construction Survey and Vibration Management and Monitoring Plan are included in contract specifications, as necessary. ***Pre-construction Survey.*** Prior to the start of any ground-disturbing activity, the project sponsor shall engage a consultant to undertake a pre-construction survey of potentially affected buildings. If potentially affected buildings and/or structures are	Required for future development consistent with the housing element update, as applicable	Project sponsor, qualified historic preservation professional (for effects on historic buildings and/or structures) and/or	Prior to issuance of any demolition, building, or site permit and monitoring and reporting throughout construction, as necessary	Planning Department	Considered complete when the final Vibration Monitoring Results Report is approved by the Environmental Review Officer and following completion of all construction

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
not potentially historic, a structural engineer or other professional with similar qualifications shall document and photograph the existing conditions of the potentially affected buildings and/or structures. The project sponsor shall submit the survey to the ERO or the officer's designee for review and approval prior to the start of vibration-generating construction activity. If nearby affected buildings are potentially historic, the project sponsor shall engage a qualified historic preservation professional and a structural engineer or other professional with similar qualifications to undertake a pre-construction survey of potentially affected historic buildings. The pre-construction survey shall include descriptions and photograph of all identified historic buildings including all façades, roofs, and details of the character-defining features that could be damaged during construction, and shall document existing damage, such as cracks and loose or damaged features (as allowed by property owners). The report shall also include pre-construction drawings that record the pre-construction condition of the buildings and identify cracks and other features to be monitored during construction. The qualified historic preservation professional shall be the lead author of the pre-construction survey if historic buildings and/or structures could be affected by the project. The pre-construction survey shall be submitted to the ERO for review and approval prior to the start of vibration-generating construction activity. ***Vibration Management and Monitoring Plan.*** The project sponsor shall undertake a monitoring plan to avoid or reduce project-related construction vibration damage to adjacent buildings and/or structures and to ensure that any such damage is documented and repaired. Prior to issuance of any demolition or building permit, the project sponsor shall submit the Plan to the ERO for review and approval. The Vibration Management and Monitoring Plan shall include, at a minimum, the following components, as applicable: • Maximum Vibration Level. Based on the anticipated construction and condition of the affected buildings and/or structures on adjacent properties, a qualified acoustical/vibration consultant in coordination with a structural engineer (or professional with similar qualifications) and, in the case of potentially affected historic buildings/structures, a qualified historic preservation professional, shall establish a maximum vibration level that shall not be exceeded at each building/structure on adjacent properties, based on existing conditions, character-defining features, soil conditions, and anticipated construction		structural engineer (for effects on historic and non-historic buildings and/or structures)			activities (including repairs of adjacent buildings damaged during construction)

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
practices (common standards are a peak particle velocity [PPV] of 0.25 inch per second for historic and some old buildings, a PPV of 0.3 inch per second for older residential structures, and a PPV of 0.5 inch per second for new residential structures and modern industrial/commercial buildings). • Vibration-generating Equipment. The plan shall identify all vibration-generating equipment to be used during construction (including, but not limited to: site preparation, clearing, demolition, excavation, shoring, foundation installation, and building construction). • Alternative Construction Equipment and Techniques. The plan shall identify potential alternative equipment and techniques that could be implemented if construction vibration levels are observed in excess of the established standard (e.g., drilled shafts [caissons] could be substituted for driven piles, if feasible, based on soil conditions, or smaller, lighter equipment could be used in some cases). • Pile Driving Requirements. For projects that would require pile driving, the project sponsor shall incorporate into construction specifications for the project a requirement that the construction contractor(s) use all feasible means to avoid or reduce damage to potentially affected buildings. Such methods may include one or more of the following: – Incorporate "quiet" pile-driving technologies into project construction (such as drilled shafts, using sonic pile drivers, auger cast-in-place, or drilled-displacement), as feasible; and/or – Ensure appropriate excavation shoring methods to prevent the movement of adjacent structures. • Buffer Distances. The plan shall identify buffer distances to be maintained based on vibration levels and site constraints between the operation of vibration-generating construction equipment and the potentially affected building and/or structure to avoid damage to the extent possible. • Vibration Monitoring. The plan shall identify the method and equipment for vibration monitoring to ensure that construction vibration levels do not exceed the established standards identified in the plan.					

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
– Should construction vibration levels be observed in excess of the standards established in the plan, the contractor(s) shall halt construction and put alternative construction techniques identified in the plan into practice, to the extent feasible. – The qualified historic preservation professional (for effects on historic buildings and/or structures) and/or structural engineer (for effects on historic and non-historic buildings and/or structures) shall inspect each affected building and/or structure (as allowed by property owners) in the event the construction activities exceed the vibration levels identified in the plan. – The structural engineer and/or historic preservation professional shall submit monthly reports to the ERO during vibration-inducing activity periods that identify and summarize any vibration level exceedances and describe the actions taken to reduce vibration. – If vibration has damaged nearby buildings and/or structures that are not historic, the structural engineer shall immediately notify the ERO and prepare a damage report documenting the features of the building and/or structure that has been damaged. – If vibration has damaged nearby buildings and/or structures that are historic, the historic preservation consultant shall immediately notify the ERO and prepare a damage report documenting the features of the building and/or structure that has been damaged. – Following incorporation of the alternative construction techniques and/or planning department review of the damage report, vibration monitoring shall recommence to ensure that vibration levels at each affected building and/or structure on adjacent properties are not exceeded. • Periodic Inspections. The plan shall identify the intervals and parties responsible for periodic inspections. The qualified historic preservation professional (for effects on historic buildings and/or structures) and/or structural engineer (for effects on historic and non-historic buildings and/or structures) shall conduct regular periodic inspections of each affected building and/or structure on adjacent properties (as allowed by property owners) during vibration-generating construction activity on the project site. The plan will specify how often inspections shall occur.					

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
• Repair Damage. The plan shall also identify provisions to be followed should damage to any building and/or structure occur due to construction-related vibration. The building(s) and/or structure(s) shall be remediated to their pre-construction condition (as allowed by property owners) at the conclusion of vibration-generating activity on the site. For historic resources, should damage occur to any building and/or structure, the building and/or structure shall be restored to its pre-construction condition in consultation with the qualified historic preservation professional and planning department preservation staff. ***Vibration Monitoring Results Report.*** After construction is complete the project sponsor shall submit to the ERO a final report from the qualified historic preservation professional (for effects on historic buildings and/or structures) and/or structural engineer (for effects on historic and non-historic buildings and/or structures). The report shall include, at a minimum, collected monitoring records, building and/or structure condition summaries, descriptions of all instances of vibration level exceedance, identification of damage incurred due to vibration, and corrective actions taken to restore damaged buildings and structures. The ERO shall review and approve the Vibration Monitoring Results Report.					
Mitigation Measure M-NO-3b: Prevent Interference with Vibration-Sensitive Equipment. Prior to construction, the project sponsor and its contractors shall designate and make available a community liaison to respond to vibration complaints from occupants at the building containing vibration-sensitive equipment. Through the community liaison, the project sponsor's team shall provide notification to property owners and occupants of the building at least 10 days prior to construction activities involving equipment that can generate vibration capable of interfering with vibration-sensitive equipment, informing them of the estimated start date and duration of vibration-generating construction activities. If feasible, the project sponsor team shall identify potential alternative equipment and techniques that could reduce construction vibration levels. For example, alternative equipment and techniques may include, but are not limited to: • Pre-drilled piles • Caisson drilling	Required for future development consistent with the housing element update, as applicable	Project sponsor	Prior to issuance of any demolition, building, or site permit project sponsor will identify community liaison: notification at least 10 days prior to construction activities involving equipment that can generate	Planning Department	Considered complete after construction activities involving equipment that can generate vibration capable of interfering with vibration-sensitive equipment is completed

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
• Oscillating or rotating pile installation • Jetting piles into place using a water injection at the tip of the pile could be substituted for driven piles, if feasible, based on soil conditions • Static rollers could be substituted for vibratory rollers in some cases If concerns are raised prior to construction or complaints received during construction related to equipment interference, the community liaison shall work with the project sponsor's team and the affected building occupants to resolve the concerns. Vibration control measures shall meet the performance target (i.e., threshold of 65 VdB for vibration-sensitive equipment) set forth by the Federal Transit Administration. To resolve concerns raised by building occupants, the community liaison shall convey the details of the complaints to the project sponsor team, planning department, and the complainant. The liaison shall convey the details of the measures being implemented to ensure that the vibration level is not exceeded. These measures may include evaluation by a qualified noise and vibration consultant; scheduling certain construction activities outside the hours of operation for vibration-sensitive equipment or when specific vibration-sensitive equipment is in use, if feasible; and/or conducting groundborne vibration monitoring to document that an individual project can meet the performance target of 65 VdB at specific distances or locations. Groundborne vibration monitoring, if appropriate to resolve concerns, shall be conducted by a qualified noise and vibration consultant.			vibration capable of interfering with vibration-sensitive equipment		
AIR QUALITY					
Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3: Clean Construction Equipment. The project sponsor shall comply with the following: A. Engine Requirements: 1. All off-road equipment greater than 25 horsepower and operating for more than 20 total hours over the entire duration of construction activities shall have engines that meet or exceed either U.S. EPA or air resources board Tier 4 Final off-road emission standards. 2. Where access to alternative sources of power are available, portable diesel engines shall be prohibited.	Required for future development consistent with the housing element update, as applicable	Project sponsor	Prior to issuance of demolition, building, or site permits project sponsor to submit: 1. Construction emissions minimization	Planning Department	Considered complete upon Environmental Review Officer review and acceptance of construction emissions minimization plan, implementation

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
3. Diesel engines, whether for off-road or on-road equipment, shall not be left idling for more than two minutes at any location, except as provided in exceptions to the applicable state regulations regarding idling for off-road and on-road equipment (e.g., traffic conditions, safe operating conditions). The project sponsor shall post legible and visible signs in English, Spanish, and Chinese in designated queuing areas and at the construction site to remind operators of the two-minute idling limit. If the majority of the project sponsor's construction staff speak a language other than these, then the signs shall be posted in that language as well. 4. The project sponsor shall instruct construction workers and equipment operators on the maintenance and tuning of construction equipment and require that such workers and operators properly maintain and tune equipment in accordance with manufacturers' specifications. 5. Any other best available technology in the future may be included, provided that the project sponsor submits documentation to the department demonstrating that (1) the technology would result in emissions reductions and (2) it would not increase other pollutant emissions or result in other additional impacts, such as noise. This may include new alternative fuels or engine technology for off-road or other construction equipment (such as electric or hydrogen fuel cell equipment) that is not available as of 2022. B. Waivers: The environmental review officer (ERO) may waive the requirement of subsection (A)(2) regarding an alternative source of power if an alternative source is limited or infeasible at the project site. If the ERO grants the waiver, the project sponsor must submit documentation that the equipment used for onsite power generation meets the engine requirements of subsection (A)(1). The ERO may waive the equipment requirements of subsection (A)(1) if a particular piece of Tier 4 Final off-road equipment is technically not feasible, the equipment would not produce the desired emissions reduction because of expected operating modes, or a compelling emergency requires the use off-road equipment that is not Tier 4 compliant. In seeking an exception, the project sponsor shall demonstrate that the project shall use the cleanest piece of construction equipment available and feasible and submit documentation that average daily construction emissions of ROG, NOx, PM2.5 would not exceed 54 pounds per day, and PM10 emissions would not exceed 82 pounds per day.			plan for review and approval, and 2. Signed certification statement		of the plan, and submittal of final report summarizing use of construction equipment pursuant to the plan

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
C. Construction Emissions Minimization Plan: Before starting onsite construction activities, the project sponsor shall submit a Construction Emissions Minimization Plan (Plan) to the ERO for review and approval. The Plan shall state, in reasonable detail, how the project sponsor will meet the engine requirements of Section A. • The Plan shall include estimates of the construction timeline by phase, with a description of each piece of off-road equipment required for every construction phase. The description may include, but is not limited to, equipment type, equipment manufacturer, equipment identification number, engine model year, engine certification (tier rating), horsepower, engine serial number, and expected fuel use and hours of operation. For off-road equipment using alternative fuels, the description shall also specify the type of alternative fuel being used. • The project sponsor shall ensure that all applicable requirements of the Plan have been incorporated into the project sponsor's contract specifications. The Plan shall include a certification statement that the project sponsor agrees to comply fully with the Plan. • The project sponsor shall make the Plan available to the public for review onsite during working hours. The project sponsor shall post at the construction site a legible and visible sign summarizing the Plan. The sign shall also state that the public may ask to inspect the Plan for the project at any time during working hours and shall explain how to request to inspect the Plan. The project sponsor shall post at least one copy of the sign in a visible location on each side of the construction site facing a public right-of-way. D. Monitoring: • After start of construction activities, the project sponsor shall submit reports every six months to the ERO documenting compliance with the Plan. After completion of construction activities and prior to receiving a final certificate of occupancy, the project sponsor shall submit to the ERO a final report summarizing construction activities, including the start and end dates, duration of each construction phase, and the specific information required in the Plan.					

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
Mitigation Measure M-AQ-5: Best Available Control Technology for Diesel Engines. All diesel engines used for building operations shall have engines that meet U.S. EPA (1) Tier 4 Final emissions standards, (2) Tier 4 interim emissions standards, or (3) Tier 2 or Tier 3 emission standards and are equipped with an air resources board Level 3 verified diesel emissions control strategy. For each new diesel engine submitted for future projects subject to this mitigation measure, including any associated generator pads, engine and filter specifications shall be submitted to the ERO for review and approval prior to issuance of a permit for the engine from the building department. Once operational, all diesel generators shall be maintained in good working order in perpetuity, and any future replacement for the diesel engines shall be required to be consistent with emissions specifications. The operator of the facility shall maintain records of the testing schedule for each diesel engine for the life of that engine and provide the information for review to the ERO within three months of requesting such information.	Required for future development consistent with the housing element update if a project-level analysis finds that a future development project would result in a significant health risk impact or make a considerable contribution to a health risk impact.	Project sponsor	Prior to issuance of building permit. Maintenance, ongoing	Planning Department	Equipment specifications portion considered complete when equipment specifications approved by the Environmental Review Officer. Maintenance is ongoing and records are subject to Planning Department review upon request.
WIND					
Mitigation Measure M-WI-1a: Wind Minimization. If the screening-level assessment conducted by the department, or an assessment submitted to the department by a qualified consultant for approval, determines wind tunnel testing is required due to the potential for one or more proposed buildings to create or exacerbate a wind hazard exceedance, such testing shall be conducted by a professionally qualified firm. The proposed buildings tested in the wind tunnel may incorporate wind baffling features or landscaping. Such features must be tested in the wind tunnel and discussed in a wind report in the order of preference discussed below, with the overall intent being to reduce ground-level wind speeds such that the project shall not cause a net new location where equivalent wind speeds ~~to~~ reach or exceed the 26-mph wind hazard criterion for a ~~single~~ nine hours of the year in areas of substantial use by people walking (e.g., sidewalks, plazas, building entries, etc.):	Required for future development consistent with the housing element update if wind screening-level assessment determines a wind tunnel test is required, and the wind-tunnel testing	Project sponsor, professionally qualified wind consultant	During permit review of future development project consistent with the housing element update	In coordination with San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency and San Francisco Public Works, the Planning Department to review and approve wind testing	Considered complete upon approval of final demolition, building, or site permit

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
~~1. ***Building Massing.*** New buildings and additions to existing buildings shall be shaped to minimize ground-level wind speeds. Examples of these shapes include setbacks, stepped façades, and vertical steps in the massing to help disrupt wind flows.~~ 1~~2~~. ***Wind Baffling Measures on the Building or on the Project Site***. Wind baffling measures shall be included on future buildings and/or on the project site to disrupt vertical wind flows along tower façades and through the project site. Examples of these may include setbacks, stepped façades, and vertical steps in the massing, staggered balcony arrangements on main tower façades, screens and canopies attached to the buildings, rounded building corners, covered walkways, colonnades, art, free-standing canopies, or wind screens. Only after incorporating all feasible features to reduce wind impacts via building massing and wind baffling, and documenting any such features deemed infeasible shall the following be considered: 2~~3~~. ***Landscaping on or off the Project Site and/or Wind Baffling Measures in the Public Right-of-Way.*** Landscaping and/or wind baffling measures shall be installed in the public right-of-way to slow winds along sidewalks and protect places where people walking are expected to gather or linger. ~~Landscaping and/or wind baffling measures shall be installed on the windward side (i.e., the direction from which the wind is blowing) of the areas of concern.~~ Examples of wind baffling measures may include street art to provide a sheltered area for people to walk and free-standing canopies and wind screens in areas where people walking are expected to gather or linger. Preferred landscaping includes groups of street trees of moderate maturity. If landscaping on or off the project site or wind baffling measures in the public right-of-way are required as one of the features to mitigate wind impacts, Mitigation Measure M-WI-1b shall also apply.	determines the project has the potential for a new or worsened wind hazard exceedance				
Mitigation Measure M-WI-1b: Maintenance Plan for Landscaping on or off the Project Site and Wind Baffling Measures in the Public Right-of-Way. If it is determined infeasible to fully mitigate wind hazards via massing and wind baffling measures on the subject building pursuant to Mitigation Measure M-WI-1a1 ~~and M-WI-1a2~~, the project sponsor shall prepare a maintenance plan for review and approval by the department to ensure maintenance of the features required pursuant to Mitigation Measure M-WI-~~1a3~~ 1a2 in perpetuity. The maintenance plan shall also be reviewed and approved by public works for landscaping or wind baffling measures in the public right-of-way.	Required for future development consistent with the housing element update if it is determined infeasible to fully mitigate	Project sponsor with a roof height greater than 85 feet	During the permit review of a future development project consistent with the housing element update	In coordination with San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency and San Francisco Public Works, Planning Department to	Ongoing and in perpetuity for the lifetime of the building

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
	wind hazards via massing and wind baffling measures on the subject building pursuant to Mitigation Measure M-WI-1a1 and M-WI-1a2			review and approve	
SHADOW					
Mitigation Measure M-SH-1: Shadow Minimization. If it is determined that a future project consistent with the housing element update would create new shadow that would substantially and adversely affect the use and enjoyment of publicly accessible open space, the project sponsor shall redesign the proposed project to reduce or avoid significant shadow impacts to the extent feasible, as determined by the environmental review officer (ERO). Redesign could include changes to building height, massing, and/or orientation.	Required for future development consistent with the housing element update if it is determined that a future project would create new shadow that would substantially and adversely affect the use and enjoyment of publicly accessible open space	Project sponsor	During the permit review of a future development project consistent with the housing element update	Planning Department	Considered complete upon Environmental Review Officer's approval of revised design or concurrency that redesign is not feasible

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES					
Mitigation Measure M-GE-5: Inadvertent Discovery of Paleontological Resources during Construction. **Worker Awareness Training** – Prior to commencing construction, and ongoing throughout ground-disturbing activities (e.g., excavation, utility installation), the project sponsor and/or their designee shall engage a qualified paleontologist meeting the standards specified by the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology (Society of Vertebrate Paleontology 2010) to train all project construction workers regarding how to recognize paleontological resources and on the contents of the paleontological resources alert sheet, as provided by the department. The paleontological resources alert sheet shall be prominently displayed at the construction site during ground-disturbing activities for reference regarding potential paleontological resources. In addition, the paleontologist shall inform the project sponsor, contractor, and construction personnel of the immediate stop work procedures and other procedures to be followed if bones or other potential fossils are unearthed at the project site. Should new workers that will be involved in ground-disturbing construction activities begin employment after the initial training has occurred, the construction supervisor shall ensure that they receive the worker awareness training as described above. The paleontologist shall complete the standard form/affidavit confirming the timing of the worker awareness training and submit it to the environmental review officer (ERO). The affidavit shall confirm the project's location, the date of training, the location of the informational handout display, and the number of participants. The affidavit shall be transmitted to the ERO within five business days of conducting the training. **Paleontological Resource Discoveries** - In the event of the discovery of an unanticipated paleontological resource during project construction, ground-disturbing activities shall temporarily be halted within 25 feet of the find until the discovery is examined by a qualified paleontologist as recommended by the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology standards (Society of Vertebrate Paleontology 2010) and best practices in mitigation paleontology (Murphey et al. 2019). The paleontologist shall consult the ERO. Work within the sensitive area shall resume only when deemed appropriate by the qualified paleontologist in consultation with the ERO. The qualified paleontologist shall determine 1) if the discovery is scientifically significant; 2) the necessity for involving other responsible or resource agencies and	Required for future development consistent with the housing element update if the project-specific evaluation finds that the scope of project construction activities are greater than screening thresholds and would adversely affect geologic units with moderate sensitivity for paleontological resources	Project sponsor, qualified paleontologist	Prior to the start of construction, and ongoing throughout ground-disturbing activities	Planning Department	Ongoing during construction. Considered complete once ground disturbing activities are complete or once the Environmental Review Officer approves the Paleontological Resources Report, if required.

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
stakeholders, if required or determined applicable; and 3) methods for resource recovery. If a paleontological resource assessment results in a determination that the resource is not scientifically important, this conclusion shall be documented in a paleontological evaluation letter to demonstrate compliance with applicable statutory requirements (e.g., Federal Antiquities Act of 1906, CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5, Public Resources Code Chapter 17, section 5097.5, Paleontological Resources Preservation Act 2009). The paleontological evaluation letter shall be submitted to the ERO for review within 30 calendar days of the discovery. If in consultation with the ERO the qualified paleontologist determines that a paleontological resource is of scientific importance, the qualified paleontologist shall make a recommendation as to what action, if any, is warranted and prepare a paleontological mitigation program. The mitigation program shall include measures to fully document the resource of scientific importance. The qualified paleontologist shall submit the mitigation program to the ERO for review and approval within ten business days of the discovery. Upon approval by the ERO, ground-disturbing activities in the project area shall resume and be monitored as determined by the qualified paleontologist for the duration of such activities. The mitigation program shall include: 1) procedures for construction monitoring at the project site; 2) fossil preparation and identification procedures; 3) curation of paleontological resources of scientific importance into an appropriate repository; and 4) preparation of a Paleontological Resources Report (report or paleontology report) at the conclusion of ground-disturbing activities. The report shall include dates of field work, results of monitoring, fossil identifications to the lowest possible taxonomic level, analysis of the fossil collection, a discussion of the scientific significance of the fossil collection, conclusions, locality forms, an itemized list of specimens, and a repository receipt from the curation facility. The project sponsor shall be responsible for the preparation and implementation of the mitigation program, in addition to any costs necessary to prepare and identify collected fossils, and for any curation fees charged by the paleontological repository. The paleontology report shall be submitted to the ERO for review within 30 business days from conclusion of ground-disturbing activities, or as negotiated following consultation with the ERO.					

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program[a]			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria

NOTES:

[a] Definitions of MMRP Column Headings:

- *Adopted Mitigation and Improvements Measures:* Full text of the mitigation measure(s) copied verbatim from the final CEQA document.
- *Implementation Responsibility:* Entity who is responsible for implementing the mitigation measure. Project sponsor for a future development project consistent with the housing element update may also include the project's sponsor's contractor/consultant.
- *Mitigation Schedule:* Identifies milestones for when the actions in the mitigation measure need to be implemented. Occupancy permit may refer to a temporary certificate and/or a final permit.
- *Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility:* Identifies who is responsible for monitoring compliance with the mitigation measure and any reporting responsibilities. In most cases it is the planning department that is responsible for monitoring compliance with the mitigation measure. If a department or agency other than the planning department is identified as responsible for monitoring, there should be an expressed agreement between the planning department and that other department/agency. In most cases the project sponsor of the future development project consistent with the housing element update, their contractor, or their consultant is responsible for any reporting requirements.
- *Monitoring Actions/Completion Criteria:* Identifies the milestone at which the mitigation measure is considered complete. This may also identify requirements for verifying compliance.

PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK

APPENDIX B: TRANSIT DELAY SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Proposed Rezoning Program Addendum
Travel Demand Summary for Housing Units in TAZ 402

Number of Residential Units	Number of Bedrooms [2)	PM Peak Hour Trip Generation (1)			
		Person trips (3)	Vehicle trips		
			inbound	outbound	total
1,900	2,850	1,140	245	54	299
2,438	3,657	1,463	314	70	384

Notes:
(1) SF Planning Department Travel Demand Spreadsheet, Residential, Place Type 3, District 8, Sunset
(2) Assumes 50 percent one-bedroom and 50 percent two-bedroom units.
(3) Person trips by all ways of travel

INSTRUCTIONS:FILL IN INPUTS IN GREEN CELLS UNDER *STEP 1* ONLY

50 percent 1 bedrooms + 50 percent 2+bedrooms applied to 1,900 housing units

STEP 1: USER INPUTS

Land Use	Res
Number of Bedrooms	2850
1000s of Square Feet	1900
Distribute By	District
Place Type	3
District Number	8
District Name	Sunset

STEP 2: PERSON TRIP GEN (UPDATED 2018) - PLACETYPE

Daily Person Trip Rate	4.5
Total Daily Person Trips	12825
PM Person Trip Rate	0.4
Total PM Person Trips	1140

STEP 3: PM MODE SPLIT (UPDATED 2018) - PLACETYPE

Auto Split	39%	443
Taxi TNC Split	4%	40
Public Transit	19%	217
Walk	34%	391
Bike	4%	44
	100%	

INSTRUCTIONS:FILL INPUTS (GREEN TABS) FOR YOUR PROJECT'S APPLICABLE LAND USE TYPE(S). THIS PROJECT SUMMARY TAB PRESENTS TOTAL PROJECT PERSON/VEHICLE TRIPS ACROSS LAND USE TYPES BASED ON YOUR INPUTS.

Person Trips by Mode

	Residential	Office	Retail	Restaurant (Quality Sit Down)	Restaurant (Composite)	Superm arket	Hotel	Total
Auto Split	443	-	-	-	-	-	-	443
Taxi TNC Split	40	-	-	-	-	-	-	40
Public Transit	217	-	-	-	-	-	-	217
Walk	391	-	-	-	-	-	-	391
Bike	44	-	-	-	-	-	-	44

OD PERSON TRIPS BY TRIP PURPOSE AND DIRECTION - DISTRICT

Outbound

		1 Downtown/ NorthBeach	2 SoMa	3 Marina/Wes ternMarket	4 Mission/Pot rero	5 OuterMissio n/Hills	6 Bayshore	7 Richmond	8 Sunset	9 Islands	10 South Bay	11 East Bay	12 North Bay	Total
Auto Person Trips	**PM Work Trips**	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	-	-	9
	PM Non-Work Trips	4	-	14	-	14	-	18	15	-	3	4	-	72
Taxi / TNC Person Trips	**PM Work Trips**	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1
	PM Non-Work Trips	0	-	1	-	1	-	2	1	-	0	0	-	6
Transit Person Trips	**PM Work Trips**	-	-	7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7
	PM Non-Work Trips	-	-	23	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	23
Auto VehicleTrips*	**PM Work Trips**	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	5
	PM Non-Work Trips	3	-	9	-	8	-	11	9	-	2	2	-	45
Taxi / TNC Vehicle Trips*	**PM Work Trips**	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	0
	PM Non-Work Trips	0	-	1	-	1	-	1	1	-	0	0	-	4
														54

Inbound

		1 Downtown/ NorthBeach	2 SoMa	3 Marina/Wes ternMarket	4 Mission/Pot rero	5 OuterMissio n/Hills	6 Bayshore	7 Richmond	8 Sunset	9 Islands	10 South Bay	11 East Bay	12 North Bay	Total
Auto Person Trips	**PM Work Trips**	7	6	-	3	2	28	-	8	-	23	9	9	94
	PM Non-Work Trips	9	-	24	-	14	-	9	199	-	3	-	11	269
Taxi / TNC Person Trips	**PM Work Trips**	1	1	-	0	0	3	-	1	-	2	1	1	8
	PM Non-Work Trips	1	-	2	-	1	-	1	18	-	0	-	1	24
Transit Person Trips	**PM Work Trips**	9	69	1	5	-	-	4	4	-	-	62	-	154
	PM Non-Work Trips	-	4	4	-	1	-	3	21	-	-	-	-	33
Auto VehicleTrips*	**PM Work Trips**	4	4	-	2	1	17	-	5	-	14	5	6	58
	PM Non-Work Trips	6	-	15	-	8	-	6	123	-	2	-	7	166
Taxi / TNC Vehicle Trips*	**PM Work Trips**	0	0	-	0	0	2	-	0	-	1	0	1	5
	PM Non-Work Trips	1	-	1	-	1	-	1	11	-	0	-	1	15
														245
														299

*Auto vehicle trips based on rolling up of shared ride 2, shared ride 3, and drive alone person trips divided by an AVO of 2,3.5, and 1, respectively

Loading Demand

	Residential	Office	Retail	Restaurant (Quality Sit Down)	Restaurant (Composite)	upermark	Hotel	Total
Pax Loading Demand								
Peak Hour Spaces of Demand	1.311	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.311
Peak 15-minutes Spaces of Demand	2.622	0	0	0	0	0	0	2.622
Freight Loading Demand								
Peak Hour Spaces of Demand	3.29861111	0	0	0	0	0	0	3.2986

INSTRUCTIONS:FILL IN INPUTS IN GREEN CELLS UNDER *STEP 1* ONLY

50 percent 1 bedrooms + 50 percent 2+bedrooms applied to 2,438 housing units

STEP 1: USER INPUTS

Land Use	Res
Number of Bedrooms	3657
1000s of Square Feet	2438
Distribute By	District
Place Type	3
District Number	8
District Name	Sunset

STEP 2: PERSON TRIP GEN (UPDATED 2018) - PLACETYPE

Daily Person Trip Rate	4.5
Total Daily Person Trips	16457
PM Person Trip Rate	0.4
Total PM Person Trips	1462.8

STEP 3: PM MODE SPLIT (UPDATED 2018) - PLACETYPE

Auto Split	39%	569
Taxi TNC Split	4%	51
Public Transit	19%	278
Walk	34%	502
Bike	4%	57
	100%	

INSTRUCTIONS:FILL INPUTS (GREEN TABS) FOR YOUR PROJECT'S APPLICABLE LAND USE TYPE(S). THIS PROJECT SUMMARY TAB PRESENTS TOTAL PROJECT PERSON/VEHICLE TRIPS ACROSS LAND USE TYPES BASED ON YOUR INPUTS.

Person Trips by Mode

	Residential	Office	Retail	Restaurant (Quality Sit Down)	Restaurant (Composite)	Superm arket	Hotel	Total
Auto Split	569	-	-	-	-	-	-	569
Taxi TNC Split	51	-	-	-	-	-	-	51
Public Transit	278	-	-	-	-	-	-	278
Walk	502	-	-	-	-	-	-	502
Bike	57	-	-	-	-	-	-	57

OD PERSON TRIPS BY TRIP PURPOSE AND DIRECTION - DISTRICT

Outbound

		1 Downtown/ NorthBeach	2 SoMa	3 Marina/Wes ternMarket	4 Mission/Pot rero	5 OuterMissio n/Hills	6 Bayshore	7 Richmond	8 Sunset	9 Islands	10 South Bay	11 East Bay	12 North Bay	Total
Auto Person Trips	**PM Work Trips**	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11	-	-	11
	PM Non-Work Trips	5	-	19	-	18	-	23	20	-	4	5	-	92
Taxi / TNC Person Trips	**PM Work Trips**	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1
	PM Non-Work Trips	0	-	2	-	2	-	2	2	-	0	0	-	8
Transit Person Trips	**PM Work Trips**	-	-	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9
	PM Non-Work Trips	-	-	29	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	29
Auto VehicleTrips*	**PM Work Trips**	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	-	-	7
	PM Non-Work Trips	3	-	12	-	11	-	14	12	-	3	3	-	57
Taxi / TNC Vehicle Trips*	**PM Work Trips**	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1
	PM Non-Work Trips	0	-	1	-	1	-	1	1	-	0	0	-	5
														70

Inbound

		1 Downtown/ NorthBeach	2 SoMa	3 Marina/Wes ternMarket	4 Mission/Pot rero	5 OuterMissio n/Hills	6 Bayshore	7 Richmond	8 Sunset	9 Islands	10 South Bay	11 East Bay	12 North Bay	Total
Auto Person Trips	**PM Work Trips**	8	8	-	4	2	36	-	10	-	29	11	12	120
	PM Non-Work Trips	12	-	30	-	18	-	12	256	-	4	-	14	345
Taxi / TNC Person Trips	**PM Work Trips**	1	1	-	0	0	3	-	1	-	3	1	1	11
	PM Non-Work Trips	1	-	3	-	2	-	1	23	-	0	-	1	31
Transit Person Trips	**PM Work Trips**	12	88	1	6	-	-	5	6	-	-	79	-	198
	PM Non-Work Trips	-	5	5	-	1	-	3	28	-	-	-	-	42
Auto VehicleTrips*	**PM Work Trips**	5	5	-	3	1	22	-	6	-	18	7	7	75
	PM Non-Work Trips	7	-	19	-	11	-	7	158	-	3	-	8	214
Taxi / TNC Vehicle Trips*	**PM Work Trips**	0	0	-	0	0	2	-	1	-	2	1	1	7
	PM Non-Work Trips	1	-	2	-	1	-	1	14	-	0	-	1	19
														314
														384

*Auto vehicle trips based on rolling up of shared ride 2, shared ride 3, and drive alone person trips divided by an AVO of 2,3.5, and 1, respectively

Loading Demand

	Residential	Office	Retail	Restaurant (Quality Sit Down)	Restaurant (Composite)	upermark	Hotel	Total
Pax Loading Demand								
Peak Hour Spaces of Demand	1.68222	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.6822
Peak 15-minutes Spaces of Demand	3.36444	0	0	0	0	0	0	3.3644
Freight Loading Demand								
Peak Hour Spaces of Demand	4.23263889	0	0	0	0	0	0	4.2326

Housing Element Rezoning Program
Peak Hour Traffic Volumes and v/c Ratios on Brotherhood Way

Brotherhood Way Street Segment	Traffic capacity per direction (veh/hour) [d]	AM PEAK HOUR				PM PEAK HOUR			
		Eastbound		Westbound		Eastbound		Westbound	
		Vehicles	v/c [e]	Vehicles	v/c [e]	Vehicles	v/c [e]	Vehicles	v/c [e]
West of Chumasero Way [a]	1,600	1,138	71%	1,084	68%	1,254	78%	1,220	76%
Proposed Rezoning Program Test [c]		1,438	90%	1,384	87%	1,554	97%	1,520	95%
Alemany Blvd to Arch St [b]	1,600	1,122	70%	971	61%	1,185	74%	890	56%
Proposed Rezoning Program Test [c]		1,422	89%	1,271	79%	1,485	93%	1,190	74%

Notes:

[a] StreetLight Data was used to provide estimates of weekday traffic volumes on Brotherhood Way west of Chumasero Drive. Average peak hour traffic volumes for all Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Thursdays between February 1, 2023 and April 30, 2023.

[b] Quality Counts count data of weekday hourly traffic volumes on Brotherhood Way between Alemany Boulevard and Arch Street. Counts conducted on October 10th through October 13, 2023. See attached. Average peak hour traffic volumes for Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday (October 10-12, 2023).

[c] Proposed Rezoning Program projected housing unit increase from 2050 environmental baseline conditions in TAZ 402 of 2,438 units would generate about 384 vehicle trips during the p.m. peak hour (inbound and outbound). Because not all vehicles generated by the projected housing units would travel on count segment, test conducted by adding 300 vehicles per hour in both eastbound and westbound directions.

[d] Traffic lane capacity based on two travel lanes each way using capacity from Exhibit 10-7 Examples Service Volumes for Urban Streets, Highway Capacity Manual, Transportation Research Board, Washington DC, June 2006

[e] v/c = volume to capacity ratio (i.e., traffic volume divided by total capacity)

Brotherhood Way between Alemany Boulevard and Arch Street, San Francisco
Hourly Traffic Volumes

	Eastbound				Westbound			
Start Time	**Tuesday 10/10/23**	**Wednesday 10/11/23**	**Thursday 10/12/23**	**Average Weekday**	**Tuesday 10/10/23**	**Wednesday 10/11/23**	**Thursday 10/12/23**	**Average Weekday**
12:00 AM	127	124	133	128	126	132	131	130
1:00 AM	70	63	77	70	64	58	79	67
2:00 AM	49	44	49	47	52	51	65	56
3:00 AM	60	52	52	55	69	58	75	67
4:00 AM	84	92	91	89	103	99	111	104
5:00 AM	236	232	220	229	248	264	250	254
6:00 AM	520	519	489	509	400	409	373	394
7:00 AM	894	887	886	889	771	768	791	777
8:00 AM	**1,117**	**1,134**	**1,116**	**1,122**	**957**	**993**	**962**	**971**
9:00 AM	1,020	1,083	943	1,015	945	932	864	914
10:00 AM	759	817	833	803	752	760	669	727
11:00 AM	768	800	805	791	664	686	707	686
12:00 PM	856	929	890	892	669	676	694	680
1:00 PM	795	937	859	864	689	728	683	700
2:00 PM	1,072	1,102	979	1,051	747	894	767	803
3:00 PM	1,043	1,075	1,028	1,049	857	863	847	856
4:00 PM	1,107	1,183	1,028	1,106	**883**	**915**	873	**890**
5:00 PM	**1,125**	**1,240**	**1,189**	**1,185**	879	894	**880**	884
6:00 PM	1,123	1,152	1,139	1,138	844	883	837	855
7:00 PM	860	901	1,012	924	616	696	628	647
8:00 PM	648	734	701	694	477	557	530	521
9:00 PM	582	614	600	599	407	464	403	425
10:00 PM	383	421	452	419	278	333	361	324
11:00 PM	204	237	229	223	198	241	213	217
Day Total	15,502	16,372	15,800	15,891	12695	13354	12793	12,947

Source: Quality Counts, October 2023. See Attached.

Type of report: Tube Count - Volume Data

LOCATION: Brotherhood Way btwn Arch St and Alemany Blvd — **QC JOB #:** 16353031

SPECIFIC LOCATION: — **DIRECTION:** EB

CITY/STATE: San Francisco, CA — **DATE:** Oct 10 2023 - Oct 16 2023

Start Time	Mon	Tue 10 Oct 23	Wed 11 Oct 23	Thu 12 Oct 23	Fri 13 Oct 23	Average Weekday Hourly Traffic	Sat 14 Oct 23	Sun 15 Oct 23	Average Week Hourly Traffic	Average Week Profile
12:00 AM		127	124	133	170	139	228	258	173	
01:00 AM		70	63	77	80	73	145	162	100	
02:00 AM		49	44	49	64	52	99	112	70	
03:00 AM		60	52	52	61	56	91	76	65	
04:00 AM		84	92	91	115	96	66	56	84	
05:00 AM		236	232	220	223	228	143	108	194	
06:00 AM		520	519	489	461	497	250	197	406	
07:00 AM		894	887	886	850	879	435	262	702	
08:00 AM		**1117**	**1134**	**1116**	**1084**	**1113**	668	409	**921**	
09:00 AM		1020	1083	943	1015	1015	791	636	915	
10:00 AM		759	817	833	839	812	831	748	805	
11:00 AM		768	800	805	856	807	**983**	**801**	836	
12:00 PM		856	929	890	936	903	**1071**	847	922	
01:00 PM		795	937	859	833	856	1018	865	885	
02:00 PM		1072	1102	979	951	1026	1054	957	1019	
03:00 PM		1043	1075	1028	999	1036	1033	**976**	1026	
04:00 PM		1107	1183	1028	**1130**	1112	973	969	**1065**	
05:00 PM		**1125**	**1240**	**1189**	853	1102	988	958	1059	
06:00 PM		1123	1152	1139	1083	**1124**	863	852	1035	
07:00 PM		860	901	1012	887	915	754	733	858	
08:00 PM		648	734	701	753	709	693	553	680	
09:00 PM		582	614	600	675	618	633	539	607	
10:00 PM		383	421	452	554	453	518	356	447	
11:00 PM		204	237	229	340	253	390	215	269	
Day Total		15502	16372	15800	15812	15874	14718	12645	15143	
% Weekday Average		97.7%	103.1%	99.5%	99.6%					
% Week Average		102.4%	108.1%	104.3%	104.4%	104.8%	97.2%	83.5%		
AM Peak Volume		8:00 AM 1117	8:00 AM 1134	8:00 AM 1116	8:00 AM 1084	8:00 AM 1113	11:00 AM 983	11:00 AM 801	8:00 AM 921	
PM Peak Volume		5:00 PM 1125	5:00 PM 1240	5:00 PM 1189	4:00 PM 1130	6:00 PM 1124	12:00 PM 1071	3:00 PM 976	4:00 PM 1065	

Comments:

Report generated on 6/12/2024 12:03 PM

SOURCE: Quality Counts, LLC (http://www.qualitycounts.net)

Type of report: Tube Count - Volume Data

LOCATION: Brotherhood Way btwn Arch St and Alemany Blvd
QC JOB #: 16353031
SPECIFIC LOCATION:
DIRECTION: EB
CITY/STATE: San Francisco, CA
DATE: Oct 10 2023 - Oct 16 2023

Start Time	Mon 16 Oct 23	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Average Weekday Hourly Traffic	Sat	Sun	Average Week Hourly Traffic	Average Week Profile
12:00 AM	144					144			144	
01:00 AM	61					61			61	
02:00 AM	61					61			61	
03:00 AM	53					53			53	
04:00 AM	93					93			93	
05:00 AM	209					209			209	
06:00 AM	508					508			508	
07:00 AM	855					855			855	
08:00 AM	**1122**					**1122**			**1122**	
09:00 AM	984					984			984	
10:00 AM	811					811			811	
11:00 AM	781					781			781	
12:00 PM	857					857			857	
01:00 PM	842					842			842	
02:00 PM	980					980			980	
03:00 PM	1083					1083			1083	
04:00 PM	1094					1094			1094	
05:00 PM	**1190**					**1190**			**1190**	
06:00 PM	1135					1135			1135	
07:00 PM	932					932			932	
08:00 PM	688					688			688	
09:00 PM	522					522			522	
10:00 PM	354					354			354	
11:00 PM	185					185			185	
Day Total	15544					15544			15544	
% Weekday Average	100%									
% Week Average	100%					100%				
AM Peak Volume	8:00 AM 1122					8:00 AM 1122			8:00 AM 1122	
PM Peak Volume	5:00 PM 1190					5:00 PM 1190			5:00 PM 1190	

Comments:

Report generated on 6/12/2024 12:03 PM

SOURCE: Quality Counts, LLC (http://www.qualitycounts.net)

Type of report: Tube Count - Volume Data

LOCATION: Brotherhood Way btwn Arch St and Alemany Blvd
QC JOB #: 16353031
SPECIFIC LOCATION:
DIRECTION: WB
CITY/STATE: San Francisco, CA
DATE: Oct 10 2023 - Oct 16 2023

Start Time	Mon	Tue 10 Oct 23	Wed 11 Oct 23	Thu 12 Oct 23	Fri 13 Oct 23	Average Weekday Hourly Traffic	Sat 14 Oct 23	Sun 15 Oct 23	Average Week Hourly Traffic	Average Week Profile
12:00 AM		126	132	131	168	139	248	234	173	
01:00 AM		64	58	79	97	75	152	158	101	
02:00 AM		52	51	65	60	57	117	123	78	
03:00 AM		69	58	75	70	68	71	88	72	
04:00 AM		103	99	111	109	106	79	69	95	
05:00 AM		248	264	250	244	252	128	86	203	
06:00 AM		400	409	373	383	391	209	144	320	
07:00 AM		771	768	791	736	767	428	268	627	
08:00 AM		**957**	**993**	**962**	**956**	**967**	760	435	**844**	
09:00 AM		945	932	864	873	904	646	631	815	
10:00 AM		752	760	669	663	711	**792**	671	718	
11:00 AM		664	686	707	680	684	749	**675**	694	
12:00 PM		669	676	694	670	677	**778**	694	697	
01:00 PM		689	728	683	691	698	770	667	705	
02:00 PM		747	894	767	732	785	739	710	765	
03:00 PM		857	863	847	**907**	869	711	**711**	**816**	
04:00 PM		**883**	**915**	873	834	**876**	694	653	809	
05:00 PM		879	894	**880**	805	865	661	615	789	
06:00 PM		844	883	837	756	830	610	581	752	
07:00 PM		616	696	628	650	648	526	474	598	
08:00 PM		477	557	530	528	523	454	482	505	
09:00 PM		407	464	403	389	416	457	431	425	
10:00 PM		278	333	361	391	341	380	362	351	
11:00 PM		198	241	213	329	245	342	256	263	
Day Total		12695	13354	12793	12721	12894	11501	10218	12215	
% Weekday Average		98.5%	103.6%	99.2%	98.7%					
% Week Average		103.9%	109.3%	104.7%	104.1%	105.6%	94.2%	83.7%		
AM Peak Volume		8:00 AM 957	8:00 AM 993	8:00 AM 962	8:00 AM 956	8:00 AM 967	10:00 AM 792	11:00 AM 675	8:00 AM 844	
PM Peak Volume		4:00 PM 883	4:00 PM 915	5:00 PM 880	3:00 PM 907	4:00 PM 876	12:00 PM 778	3:00 PM 711	3:00 PM 816	

Comments:

Report generated on 6/12/2024 12:03 PM

SOURCE: Quality Counts, LLC (http://www.qualitycounts.net)

Type of report: Tube Count - Volume Data

LOCATION: Brotherhood Way btwn Arch St and Alemany Blvd
QC JOB #: 16353031
SPECIFIC LOCATION:
DIRECTION: WB
CITY/STATE: San Francisco, CA
DATE: Oct 10 2023 - Oct 16 2023

Start Time	Mon 16 Oct 23	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Average Weekday Hourly Traffic	Sat	Sun	Average Week Hourly Traffic	Average Week Profile
12:00 AM	144					144			144	
01:00 AM	76					76			76	
02:00 AM	57					57			57	
03:00 AM	64					64			64	
04:00 AM	102					102			102	
05:00 AM	247					247			247	
06:00 AM	387					387			387	
07:00 AM	778					778			778	
08:00 AM	**937**					**937**			**937**	
09:00 AM	896					896			896	
10:00 AM	737					737			737	
11:00 AM	661					661			661	
12:00 PM	705					705			705	
01:00 PM	703					703			703	
02:00 PM	777					777			777	
03:00 PM	**869**					**869**			**869**	
04:00 PM	862					862			862	
05:00 PM	842					842			842	
06:00 PM	822					822			822	
07:00 PM	563					563			563	
08:00 PM	441					441			441	
09:00 PM	365					365			365	
10:00 PM	290					290			290	
11:00 PM	191					191			191	
Day Total	12516					12516			12516	
% Weekday Average	100%									
% Week Average	100%					100%				
AM Peak Volume	8:00 AM 937					8:00 AM 937			8:00 AM 937	
PM Peak Volume	3:00 PM 869					3:00 PM 869			3:00 PM 869	

Comments:

Report generated on 6/12/2024 12:03 PM

SOURCE: Quality Counts, LLC (http://www.qualitycounts.net)

APPENDIX C: PEDESTRIAN-LEVEL WIND ASSESSMENT

PEDESTRIAN LEVEL WIND ASSESSMENT

SAN FRANCISCO HOUSING ELEMENT JUNE 2025 UPDATE

SAN FRANCISCO, CA

PROJECT #: 2401677
AUGUST 14, 2025

SUBMITTED TO

Jessica Viramontes
Senior Environmental Planner
jessica.viramontes@icf.com

ICF
201 Mission Street, Suite 1500
San Francisco, CA 94105
T: 415.205.2268

SUBMITTED BY

Neetha Vasan, M.A.Sc., LEED AP
Senior Specialist | Associate
Neetha.Vasan@rwdi.com

Shelby Ness, CPHC® PMP
Senior Project Manager | Associate
Shelby.Ness@rwdi.com

RWDI
601 SW 2nd Ave, Suite 1140
Portland, OR 97204
T: 503.457.4710

This document is intended for the sole use of the party to whom it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged and/or confidential. If you have received this in error, please notify us immediately. ® RWDI name and logo are registered trademarks in Canada and the United States of America.

INTRODUCTION & PROJECT INFORMATION

RWDI USA LLC (RWDI) was retained by ICF to assess the pedestrian wind conditions for the proposed updates to the San Francisco Housing Element Program under the Proposed Rezoning Program June 2025.

RWDI previously completed a qualitative assessment of the program in March 2022 to support the San Francisco Housing Element Program 2022 EIR. The 2022 EIR was certified in January 2023. The proposed action (height and density distribution scenario) evaluated in the certified EIR is hereafter referred to as the **"adopted housing element"**.

We understand that updates have been proposed to the program under the Proposed Rezoning Program, that include changes to the heights, densities and distribution thereof, primarily in the west and north sides of the city. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the impacts on the pedestrian level wind environment that could result from adoption and implementation of the Proposed Rezoning Program June 2025 (hereby referred to as the "**proposed rezoning**") which is an update to the San Francisco Housing Element Program 2022.

RWDI completed this assessment in three phases:

- Kick off Meeting and Review of Information
- Wind Analysis
- Summary Text to be incorporated by ICF into final Addendum

This report provides the Summary Text and a description of our initial review and wind analysis comparing the Proposed Rezoning to the 2022 EIR. The assessment was based on the following:

- A review of regional long-term meteorological data for San Francisco;
- ArcGIS models received from Environmental Planning (EP) San Francisco in June and July 2025;
- A review of wind-tunnel studies and desktop assessments undertaken by RWDI for projects in San Francisco;
- our engineering judgement and knowledge of wind flows around buildings[1-3]; and,
- The use of 3D software developed by RWDI (*WindEstimator*[2]) for estimating the potential wind conditions around generalized building forms.

This approach provides a screening-level estimation of potential wind conditions. Scale model wind tunnel testing was not carried out for this assessment.

---

1. H. Wu and F. Kriksic (2012). "Designing for Pedestrian Comfort in Response to Local Climate", *Journal of Wind Engineering and Industrial Aerodynamics*, vol.104-106, pp.397-407.
2. H. Wu, C.J. Williams, H.A. Baker and W.F. Waechter (2004), "Knowledge-based Desk-Top Analysis of Pedestrian Wind Conditions", *ASCE Structure Congress 2004,* Nashville, Tennessee.
3. C.J. Williams, H. Wu, W.F. Waechter and H.A. Baker (1999), "Experience with Remedial Solutions to Control Pedestrian Wind Problems", *10th International Conference on Wind Engineering*, Copenhagen, Denmark.

FEIR FINDINGS

KEY AREAS



Image Source: Figure 4.7-1 - *San Francisco Planning Department, San Francisco Housing Element 2022 Update Final Environmental Impact Report, Planning Department Case No. 2019-016230ENV, State Clearinghouse No. 2021060358, certified January 31, 2023.*

LIST OF KEY AREAS

1. Downtown Area Surrounding the Transbay Center Bound by Market Street to the North, Main Street to the East, Folsom Street to the South and 3rd Street to the West
2. Central SoMA Area Bound by Harrison Street to the North, 3rd Street to the East, Townsend Street to the South and 5th Street to the West
3. Area near Lafayette Park Bound by Jackson Street to the North, Polk Street to the East, Sutter Street to the South and Laguna Street to the West
4. Area Bound by Lake Street to the North, Arguello Boulevard to the East, Anza Street to the South And Funston Avenue to the West
5. Geary Boulevard between 16th Avenue and 28th Avenue
6. Irving Street between 19th Avenue to the east and 27th Avenue to the west
7. 19th Avenue between Ortega Street and Santiago Street
8. Taraval Street between 40th Avenue and 48th Avenue

IMAGES ARE NOT TO SCALE

SUMMARY

SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

KEY AREAS	2050 ENV. BASELINE	HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE	PLAN BAY AREA 2050	EASTSIDE ALTERNATIVE
AREA 1	NO	NO	NO	NO
AREA 2	YES	YES	YES	YES
AREA 3	NO	YES	YES	YES
AREA 4	NO	NO	NO	NO
AREA 5	NO	NO	NO	NO
AREA 6	YES	YES	YES	NO
AREA 7	NO	NO	NO	NO
AREA 8	NO	NO	NO	NO

The darker the shade of orange, the greater the average wind speeds expected as evaluated under the San Francisco Hazard Criterion. The higher the speeds, the more difficult it is typically to manage or mitigate the significant wind impact. However, a comprehensive evaluation would also involve weighing the contributions from not only building height and exposure, but also the grouping of tall buildings of similar height, the positions of each massing relative to the shape and massing in other scenarios etc. Details to this effect will be elaborated in the EIR through RWDI's collaboration with ICF.

PRELIMINARY INPUT

KICK-OFF AND INFORMATION REVIEW

PRELIMINARY INPUT

RWDI provided ICF and EP San Francisco the following preliminary inputs on June 11, 2025, based on our understanding of the project scope and GIS information provided by the City of San Francisco communicated to RWDI up to that date, including the Proposed Rezoning Plan April 2025:

- Within the limited scope of this project/assessment, RWDI prioritized the preliminary inputs around the potential for the proposed rezoning plan to create more severe significant impacts compared to the adopted housing element program (FEIR Housing Element Update 2022), over areas where a reduction of significant impacts may occur.
- A reduction in heights by itself is unlikely to result in more significant impacts.
- An increase in height (delta between allowable heights in the adopted housing element and proposed rezoning) of over 50 ft may have some notable impacts on pedestrian level wind conditions. The impact may be more substantial with higher deltas and in areas that are primarily surrounded by shorter buildings.
- In addition to the absolute height deltas, it is important to evaluate the delta in relation to the original height of the development areas in the adopted housing element plan in further detail.

In this preliminary stage, based on the absolute height deltas (i.e. increase in height compared to the adopted housing element plan), the potential for new significant impacts are expected in the following new key areas (see image on following page) numbered in sequence following the 8 key areas in the FEIR:

9. Van Ness Ave between Lombard St and McAllister St
10. Market Street between Castro St and Van Ness Ave
11. Geary Blvd between 2nd St and Divisadero St

These areas noted a height increase of 51 to 520 feet in the April 2025 update that the preliminary findings were based on. In the June 2025 update of the Rezoning Plan, these areas note a greater height increase of 50 to 650 ft, therefore the three areas continue to be relevant for this assessment.

The three new key areas were not previously assessed for the FEIR. Conclusions made from a detailed evaluation of the above three key areas should provide representative information that would be applicable to other areas with similar height increases as well.

PRELIMINARY INPUT

New Key Areas Selected for Assessment



IMAGES ARE NOT TO SCALE

KEY AREA SELECTION AND REPRESENTATION

KEY AREA SELECTION AND REPRESENTATION

The adopted housing element and proposed rezoning would introduce varying levels of changes to the height and built density in several parts of the city. In order to assess the impact of the changes in an effective and efficient manner, and to provide meaningful findings to support the updates, RWDI selected a limited number of 'key areas' from across the city to evaluate in detail – eight key areas in the FEIR and three additional key areas in relation to the proposed rezoning discussed in the Addendum appendix.

Wind impacts due to building and city development can be attributed to several factors like topography, wind directionality, upwind terrain in a region, change in built density, change in building heights, spacing between buildings, etc. Some of these factors (like spacing and specific design aspects of individual buildings) in the adopted housing element update and proposed rezoning cannot be known at this time, so, the conservative approach would be to assume a worst-case scenario that buildings will be built to the maximum allowable height. With regards to the other factors listed above, wind impacts are not only dependent on the individual contributions of those factors, but different permutations and combinations of these factors can also create varying levels of wind impacts.

Through consultation with the City, the key areas were selected to allow a representative data set that would cover multiple combinations of all relevant parameters that would affect wind impacts in a meaningful way as determined through RWDI's extensive expertise and experience in the assessment of pedestrian level wind impacts on for projects in the city of San Francisco and globally. The tables that follow provide an overview of the representative selection parameters.

Conclusions made from a detailed evaluation of the selected eleven key areas in the FEIR and the Addendum should provide representative information that would be applicable to other areas with similar properties as well.

KEY AREA SELECTION AND REPRESENTATION

#	Key Area	Current Height	Other Considerations	Current Wind Impact and Hazard Exceedances	Expected Updates in the Adopted Housing Element and/or Proposed Rezoning Increase in:		Expected Wind Impact in the Adopted Housing Element and/or Proposed Rezoning
					Height	Built density	
1	Downtown Area Surrounding the Transbay Center Bound by Market Street to the North, Main Street to the East, Folsom Street to the South and 3rd Street to the West	High-rise	Downtown core	Low	No	Yes	Low
2	Central SoMA Area Bound by Harrison Street to the North, 3rd Street to the East, Townsend Street to the South and 5th Street to the West	Low-rise	Low and Mid-rise buildings and under development with many tall building proposals	Moderate	Yes	Yes	High
3	Area near Lafayette Park Bound by Jackson Street to the North, Polk Street to the East, Sutter Street to the South and Laguna Street to the West	Mid-rise	Upwind Topography (hill and park)	Low	Yes	Yes	High
4	Area Bound by Lake Street to the North, Arguello Boulevard to the East, Anza Street to the South And Funston Avenue to the West	Low-rise	Large blocks of varying height and density increases	Low	Yes	Yes	Low

KEY AREA SELECTION AND REPRESENTATION

#	Key Area	Current Height	Other Considerations	Current Wind Impact and Hazard Exceedances	Expected Updates in the Adopted Housing Element and/or Proposed Rezoning Increase in:		Expected Wind Impact in the Adopted Housing Element and/or Proposed Rezoning
					Height	Built density	
5	Geary Boulevard between 16th Avenue and 28th Avenue	Low-rise	Requested by CPC, Key transit-corridor, Irregular topography	Low	No	No	Low
6	Irving Street between 19th Avenue to the east and 27th Avenue to the west	Low-rise	Requested by CPC	Low	No	Yes	Moderate
7	19th Avenue between Ortega Street and Santiago Street	Low-rise	Requested by CPC	Low	Yes	Yes	Low
8	Taraval Street between 40th Avenue and 48th Avenue	Low-rise	Requested by CPC	Low	Yes	No	Low
9	Van Ness Ave between Lombard St and McAllister St	Mid-rise	Extension of Area 3	Moderate	Yes	Yes	High
10	Market Street between Castro St and Van Ness Ave	Low-rise	Area curently under development with many taller building proposals.	Low	Yes	Yes	High
11	Geary Blvd between 2nd St and Divisadero St	Low-rise	Irregular topography, addition of high-rise buildings	Low	Yes	Yes	Moderate

WIND DATA AND CRITERIA

WIND DATA

Long-term wind data generated using a Weather Research and Forecasting (WRF) model for the entire City of San Francisco[4] is referenced for this assessment; this is the standard meteorological data currently used for all projects in the City. The Image below presents the WRF-generated wind data for the downtown area that is in reasonable proximity to the three key areas being assessed. The wind rose represents calculated wind speeds from 07:00 to 18:00 between 2000 and 2019, scaled to 33 ft above an open terrain.

Average wind speeds in San Francisco are the highest in the summer and lowest in winter. However, the strongest peak winds occur in winter. Winds approach predominantly from the west and west-southwest as indicated by the wind rose in Image 4; peak wind speeds (although relatively less frequent) also occur from the south and north. Winds from these directions are most important for the current project, but winds from other directions are also considered in our analysis.

This data set differs from the wind data that was used in the wind assessment conducted for the FEIR in wind directionality and speed distribution. The differences would be relevant for a quantitative study that would use the data to calculate specific speeds at project sites. For the high-level qualitative nature of the current assessment, reasonable considerations have been given to account for the updates to the data and still form a fair comparison to the EIR assessment.



Map of Wind Zones in San Francisco



Annual Distribution of Winds (07:00 to 18:00, 2000 to 2019)

4. Rowan Williams Davies & Irwin Inc. (2021). "San Francisco Wind Climatology Study", Climate Analysis, RWDI #1700178, February 9, 2021.

WIND CRITERIA

San Francisco Planning Code Section 148, Reduction of Ground-level Wind Currents in C-3 Districts, requires buildings to be shaped so as not to cause ground-level wind currents to exceed defined comfort and hazard criteria. The hazard criterion requires that buildings not cause equivalent wind speeds to reach or exceed the hazard level of 26 mph as averaged from a single full hour for the year. For the purposes of environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the wind hazard criterion is used to determine if a proposed project would have significant wind impacts.

The hazard criterion is based on winds that are measured for one hour and averaged. The corresponding one-minute hazard criterion speed is 36 mph. The Planning Code defines these wind speeds in terms of equivalent wind speeds, which are average wind speed (mean velocity), adjusted to include the level of gustiness and turbulence. The text in the report simply refers to the data as wind speeds.

Planning Code Amendments:

RWDI understands that the proposed rezoning program includes amendments to base zoning which includes an update to Section 148 of the Planning Code. The amendment would consolidate all existing wind controls in the planning code into a single section, eliminate the wind comfort criteria, and modify the wind hazard criterion. Wind controls would continue to apply to areas with existing wind controls.

The updated wind hazard criteria will be relevant to determining substantial wind impacts. The proposed update would redefine 'significant impacts' as equivalent speeds exceeding the hazard level (26 mph as averaged from a single full hour for the year) for 9 or more hours in a year (compared to zero hours in the current by-law). This redefinition in essence represents a greater tolerance for wind gusts, accounting for the natural occurrence of gusts statistically in a year and result in a reduced number of significant impacts in the City. The findings of the current wind assessment using the existing 1-hour criterion will be conservative compared to the anticipated findings following the implementation of the legislative amendment that will shift to the 9-hour hazard criterion.

Validity of the 9-hour hazard criterion: A comparison to Standards in Other North American Municipalities

The assessment of pedestrian wind comfort is common practice in many municipalities in the US and Canada and other parts of the world. Some of these municipalities have published standards and guidelines that are adhered to for all building projects, similar to the practice in San Francisco. The criteria for evaluating hazard or pedestrian safety are associated with a wind speed threshold (often gusts as opposed to a mean speed) and an occurrence frequency, that go hand-in-hand with each other. The thresholds have, through research, been related to observed conditions in nature and effect of wind force on people.

Commonly used criteria are based on the works of T.V. Lawson, A.G. Davenport, W.H. Melbourne, A.D. Penwarden, Admiral Beaufort and C.J. Williams, et.al.(RWDI). In the criteria adopted by many municipalities, the allowed hours of occurrence of threshold gusts range between 1 hour (ex. Based on the work by T.V. Lawson, in the City of London, England) to 90 hours (based on the work by Melbourne in the City of Boston, USA) and are associated with varying gust speeds. RWDI and several North American municipalities use a threshold of 9 hours that falls within the aforementioned extreme limits. Hence, the proposed Planning Code amendment and update to a 9-hour criterion in San Francisco, aligns with a broadly adopted industry standard.

5. Lawson, T.V. (1973). "Wind Environment of Buildings: A Logical Approach to the Establishment of Criteria", Report No. TVL 7321, Department of Aeronautic Engineering, University of Bristol, Bristol, England.
6. Davenport, A.G. (1972). “Approach to the Human Comfort Criteria for Environmental Wind Conditions”, Colloquium on Building Climatology, Stockholm (1972)
7. Melbourne, W.H. (1978). “Criteria for environmental wind conditions”, Journal of Wind Engineering and Industrial Aerodynamics, Vol.3, pp.241-249.
8. Penwarden, A.D. (1973). “Acceptable wind speeds in towns”, Building Science, Vol.8, pp.259-267.
9. Williams, C.J., Hunter, M.A. and Waechter, W.F. (1990). "Criteria for Assessing the Pedestrian Wind Environment," Journal of Wind Engineering and Industrial Aerodynamics, Vol.36, pp.811-815.
10. Williams, C.J., Soligo M.J. and Cote, J. (1992). "A Discussion of the Components for a Comprehensive Pedestrian Level Comfort Criteria," Journal of Wind Engineering and Industrial Aerodynamics, Vol.41-44, pp.2389-2390.
11. City of Boston. Redevelopment Authority Code. Section 49A-4. Municode Library. Accessed August 14, 2025. URL:https://library.municode.com/ma/boston/codes/redevelopment_authority?nodeId=ART49AGROVDI_S49A-4LAPRREGEDEENST
12. City of London Corporation (2019). “Wind Microclimate Guidelines for Developments in the City of London”, Accessed August 14, 2025. https://www.cityoflondon.gov.uk/assets/Services-Environment/wind-microclimate-guidelines.pdf
13. City of Toronto Urban Design, City Planning. (2022). “Pedestrian Level Wind Study Terms of Reference Guide”, Accessed August 14, 2025. https://www.toronto.ca/city-government/planning-development/application-forms-fees/building-toronto-together-a-development-guide/application-support-material-terms-of-reference/
14. City of Edmonton. (2021). “Wind Impact Assessments Terms of Reference”. Accessed August 14, 2025. https://www.edmonton.ca/sites/default/files/public-files/assets/Wind_Impact_Assessments_TermsofReference.pdf.

WIND FLOW MECHANISMS AROUND BUILDINGS

Predicting wind speeds and occurrence frequencies is complicated. It involves the combined assessment of building geometry, orientation, position and height of surrounding buildings, upstream terrain and the local wind climate. Over the years, RWDI has conducted thousands of wind-tunnel model studies on pedestrian wind conditions around buildings, yielding a broad knowledge base. This knowledge has been incorporated into RWDI's proprietary software that allows, in many situations, for a qualitative, screening-level numerical estimation of pedestrian wind conditions without wind tunnel testing.

In our discussion of anticipated wind conditions, reference is made to the generalized wind flows illustrated and defined on the right side. Buildings taller than their immediate surrounds tend to intercept the naturally stronger winds at higher elevations and redirect them down to pedestrian level. Such a downwashing flow is often the main cause for wind accelerations around tall buildings. These winds can be relatively strong and turbulent, especially around exposed building corners and in relatively narrow passageways between buildings.

If these building and wind combinations occur for prevailing directions, there is a greater potential for increased wind activity and wind hazard concerns.



Downwashing

Tall buildings tend to intercept the stronger winds at higher elevations and redirect them to the ground level. This is often the main cause for wind accelerations around large buildings at the pedestrian level.



Corner Acceleration

Winds approach at an oblique angle to a tall façade and are deflected down causing a localized increase in the wind activity or corner acceleration around the exposed building corner(s) at pedestrian level.



Channeling

When two buildings are situated side by side or an underpass is created, wind flow tends to accelerate through the space due to channeling effect caused by the narrow gap.

PROPOSED REZONING PROGRAM IMPACTS

AREA 9

Van Ness Ave between Lombard St and McAllister St





EIR Scenario

DAG224

- 55' Height Allowed
- 65' Height Allowed
- 85' Height Allowed
- 140' Height Allowed
- 240' Height Allowed
- 300' Height Allowed
- No height change, density decontrol
- Increased density up to four units (six units on corner lots)

June 2025 - For Public Map- Local Heights

Rezoning Change

- 40' Height Allowed and density decontrol under Local Program
- 50' Height Allowed and density decontrol under Local Program (40' Base Height)
- 65' Height Allowed
- 80' Height Allowed
- 105' Height Allowed
- 120' Height Allowed
- 130' Height Allowed
- 140' Height Allowed
- 160' Height Allowed
- 180' Height Allowed
- 240' Height Allowed
- 250' Height Allowed
- 300' Height Allowed
- 350' Height Allowed
- 490' Height Allowed
- 500' Height Allowed
- 650' Height Allowed

IMAGES ARE NOT TO SCALE

Project #: 2401677
August 14, 2025

AREA 9

Van Ness Ave between Lombard St and McAllister St

KEY POINTS

The assessment completed for the FEIR reviewed a section of Van Ness Avenue between Jackson Street and Sutter Street under Key Area 3. Future development consistent with the adopted housing element included buildings of the order of 15 to 24 that would be substantially taller than the surrounding buildings in the 2019 and 2050 Existing development. The general low height of the 2019 and 2050 existing development to the west of Area 3 and the open Lafayette Park would increase the exposure of these tall buildings to the predominant winds.

In the proposed rezoning program, the allowed heights in this section has increased to about 35 stories (350'). The program also extends this allowable height to a longer stretch of Van Ness Avenue (Area 9), where existing heights are low and no height changes were proposed in the adopted housing element. The increased height, and density of development resulting from this update would lead to increased wind hazard exceedances along Van Ness Avenue and it's cross-streets near the tall buildings.

Downwashing, corner acceleration and channeling flows are expected around the base of all buildings that are downwind (or east of) the much lower developments. The resulting wind activity is expected to exceed the hazard criterion along all areas proposing a height increase up to 35 stories/350'.

New wind hazard exceedances are expected because of the proposed rezoning. Average wind speeds in the proposed rezoning are expected to be higher than in the 2050 environmental baseline as well as the adopted housing element.

Impact of growth distribution:
It should be noted that this conclusion assumes a worst-case future condition in the proposed rezoning where buildings in some blocks along Van Ness will be built to the maximum height with buildings to the west being less than half the maximum height – i.e. a low to moderate density of tall buildings. If/when the density of tall buildings in the blocks to the west of those along Van Ness increases, Area 9 would be more protected from the prevailing wind and wind hazard exceedances may be reduced.

Impact of Planning Code Amendment:
The Planning Code amendment would replace the 1-hour hazard criterion with a 9-hour hazard criterion, which would result in fewer projects exceeding the 9-hour criterion.

AREA 10

Market Street between Castro St and Van Ness Ave

June 2025 - For Public Map- Local Heights

EIR Scenario

DAG224

- 55' Height Allowed
- 65' Height Allowed
- 85' Height Allowed
- 140' Height Allowed
- 240' Height Allowed
- 300' Height Allowed
- No height change, density decontrol
- Increased density up to four units (six units on corner lots)

Rezoning Change

- 40' Height Allowed and density decontrol under Local Program
- 50' Height Allowed and density decontrol under Local Program (40' Base Height)
- 65' Height Allowed
- 80' Height Allowed
- 105' Height Allowed
- 120' Height Allowed
- 130' Height Allowed
- 140' Height Allowed
- 160' Height Allowed
- 180' Height Allowed
- 240' Height Allowed
- 250' Height Allowed
- 300' Height Allowed
- 350' Height Allowed
- 490' Height Allowed
- 500' Height Allowed
- 650' Height Allowed



IMAGES ARE NOT TO SCALE

Project #: 2401677
August 14, 2025

AREA 10

Market Street between Castro St and Van Ness Ave

KEY POINTS

Future development consistent with the adopted housing element presented an allowed height of 85 ft or lower along most of Market Street. Buildings of these heights typically, do not create significant impacts in San Francisco, particularly in the Market Street section. The general low height of the 2019 and 2050 existing development in and to the west of Area 10 would allow wind to blow over the area without much disruption and negligible building-induced wind effects.

The proposed rezoning program increases the allowed heights in Area 10 to approximately 16 stories (160') at street intersections and 14 stories (140') elsewhere along Market Street. The program also extends these allowable heights to a longer stretch of Market Street where existing heights are currently low (less than 85') and no height changes were proposed in the adopted housing element. In adjacent blocks that are not directly fronting Market Street, the allowed height in the proposed rezoning program is 50'. The substantially low surroundings relative to the allowed heights on Market Street would result in the tall buildings being exposed to the prevailing winds. Downwashing, corner acceleration and channeling flows are expected around the base of the tall buildings in Area 10. The resulting wind activity is expected to exceed the hazard criterion on Market Street and its cross streets. Wind hazard exceedances are likely to be higher around the blocks at the intersections of Market Street at Church Street and Gough Street where the allowed heights are 240'-250' which is 100' taller than the 140' allowed heights in the adjacent blocks.

New wind hazard exceedances are expected because of the proposed rezoning. Average wind speeds in the proposed rezoning are expected to be higher than in the 2050 environmental baseline as well as the adopted housing element.

Impact of growth distribution:
The proposed rezoning extends the allowed height of over 140' to a longer stretch of Market Street, while retaining much of the surrounding blocks at an allowed height of 50'. The substantial height difference and the extension of the tall-building zone to a larger area would result in a larger area of wind hazard exceedances compared to the adopted housing element.

Impact of Planning Code Amendment:
The Planning Code amendment would replace the 1-hour hazard criterion with a 9-hour hazard criterion, which would result in fewer projects exceeding the 9-hour criterion. However, it is likely that 9-hour wind hazard exceedances will be seen around the blocks with allowed heights of 240'-250'.

AREA 11

Geary Blvd between 2nd St and Divisadero St

EIR Scenario

DAG224

- 55' Height Allowed
- 65' Height Allowed
- 85' Height Allowed
- 140' Height Allowed
- 240' Height Allowed
- 300' Height Allowed
- No height change, density decontrol
- Increased density up to four units (six units on corner lots)

June 2025 - For Public Map- Local Heights

Rezoning Change

- 40' Height Allowed and density decontrol under Local Program
- 50' Height Allowed and density decontrol under Local Program (40' Base Height)
- 65' Height Allowed
- 80' Height Allowed
- 105' Height Allowed
- 120' Height Allowed
- 130' Height Allowed
- 140' Height Allowed
- 160' Height Allowed
- 180' Height Allowed
- 240' Height Allowed
- 250' Height Allowed
- 300' Height Allowed
- 350' Height Allowed
- 490' Height Allowed
- 500' Height Allowed
- 650' Height Allowed



IMAGES ARE NOT TO SCALE

AREA 11

Geary Blvd between 2nd St and Divisadero St

KEY POINTS

Future development consistent with the adopted housing element included buildings of heights up to 85' along most of Geary Boulevard in Area 11, with taller heights of 240'-300' at around the intersection at Masonic Avenue. The taller blocks would result in wind hazard exceedances around that intersection.

In the proposed rezoning program, the allowed heights in the west half of Area 11 has decreased to 80' in some blocks and increased to 140' in others (where allowed height was 85' in the adopted housing element). The decreased height to 80' is not expected to have an impact on wind effects. However, the increased height of 140' is considered substantial considering the neighbouring blocks that are not directly on Geary Boulevard are zoned at 40' which is less than half the taller allowed height on Geary Boulevard. The massing of the taller buildings extending above the general surroundings will redirect wind and increase wind speeds at ground level relative to the 2050 environmental baseline, as well as the adopted housing element.

In the east half of Area 11, allowed height in the proposed rezoning program range from 140' to 490' (compared to the 85'-300' range in the adopted housing element). These blocks will be surrounded by blocks where height increases are not proposed (retained at an allowed height of 40'-50').

Downwashing, corner acceleration and channeling flows are expected around the base of all tall buildings on Geary Boulevard. The wind impacts resulting from the height difference between the rezoned blocks and surrounding low blocks would result in wind speeds exceeding the hazard criterion by a larger margin and across a longer stretch of Geary Boulevard compared to the adopted housing element.

New wind hazard exceedances are expected because of the proposed rezoning. Average wind speeds in the proposed rezoning are expected to be higher than in the 2050 environmental baseline as well as the adopted housing element.

Impact of growth distribution:
The proposed rezoning extends the allowed height of over 140' to a longer stretch of Market Street, while retaining much of the surrounding blocks at an allowed height of 40'. The substantial height difference and the extension of the tall-building zone to a larger area would result in a larger area of wind hazard exceedances compared to the adopted housing element.

Impact of Planning Code Amendment:
The Planning Code amendment would replace the 1-hour hazard criterion with a 9-hour hazard criterion, which would result in fewer projects exceeding the 9-hour criterion. However, it is likely that 9-hour wind hazard exceedances will be seen around the blocks with allowed heights of 240'-490'

IMAGES ARE NOT TO SCALE

PROPOSED REZONING IMPACTS ON KEY AREAS 2, 3 AND 6

PROPOSED REZONING IMPACTS ON KEY AREAS 2, 3 AND 6

Wind hazard exceedances were predicted in Key areas 2, 3 and 6 in the FEIR assessment of the adopted housing element. In the proposed rezoning program, we find the following general observations:,

Area 2: No height change is proposed in the proposed rezoning relative to the adopted housing element. Therefore, conclusions in the FEIR continue to be applicable.

Area 3: The proposed rezoning introduces a height increase of 100' on Van Ness Avenue and a height decrease of 100 ft on Franklin Street which is west of Van Ness Avenue. Thus, the taller buildings on Van Ness would be more exposed to the prevailing winds and increased wind hazard exceedances relative to the adopted housing element are likely.

Area 6: The proposed rezoning introduces a height increase from 85' to 140' at the intersection of Geary Boulevard and 19th Avenue, which can result in increased wind hazard exceedances relative to the adopted housing element at the intersection. The program introduced a reduction in height in many parts of Area 6; however, these areas were not predicted to show wind hazard exceedances in the adopted housing element and are not expected under the proposed rezoning.

CONCLUSIONS

CONCLUSIONS

KEY POINTS

In the proposed rezoning program, the allowed heights in many blocks within the selected key areas increased by over 100', some up to 190'.

The increased height of 140' is considered substantial considering the neighbouring blocks in many of these areas are zoned at 40'-50' which is less than half the taller allowed height in the rezoned blocks. The proposed rezoning also extends the allowed taller heights to a longer stretch of the selected areas. The massing of the taller buildings extending above the general surroundings will redirect wind and increase wind speeds at ground level relative to the 2050 environmental baseline, as well as the adopted housing element.

Downwashing, corner acceleration and channeling flows are expected around the base of all tall buildings in the selected key areas. The wind impacts resulting from the height difference between the rezoned blocks and surrounding low blocks would result in wind speeds exceeding the hazard criterion by a larger margin and across a larger area compared to the adopted housing element.

New or exacerbated wind hazard exceedances are expected because of the proposed rezoning. Average wind speeds in the proposed rezoning are expected to be higher than in the 2050 environmental baseline as well as the adopted housing element.

Impact of growth distribution:

The proposed rezoning extends the blocks zoned for substantially increased allowed height to a larger area within the selected key areas while retaining much of the surrounding blocks at an allowed height of 40'-50'. The substantial height difference and the extension of the tall-building zone to a larger area would result in a larger area of wind hazard exceedances compared to the adopted housing element.

Impact of Planning Code Amendment:
The Planning Code amendment would replace the 1-hour hazard criterion with a 9-hour hazard criterion, which would result in fewer projects exceeding the 9-hour criterion. However, it is likely that 9-hour wind hazard exceedances will be seen around the blocks with allowed heights of over 240' surrounded by shorter blocks of allowed heights of 85' or lower.

Impact on Key Areas 2, 3 and 6

Overall, new or exacerbated wind hazard exceedances are likely in Areas 3 and 6 due to the proposed rezoning, while no changes are expected in Area 2. Average wind speeds are expected to be higher than in the development under the adopted housing element in Areas 3 and 6.

STATEMENT OF LIMITATIONS

7. STATEMENT OF LIMITATIONS

Design Assumptions

The findings/recommendations in this report are based on the information communicated to RWDI up to July 11, 2025. Should the details of the proposed design and/or geometry of the building change significantly, results may vary.

Limitations

This report was prepared by RWDI USA LLC for ICF ("Client"). The findings and conclusions presented in this report have been prepared for the Client and are specific to the project described herein and authorized scope. The conclusions and recommendations contained in this report are based on the information available to RWDI when this report was prepared. Because the contents of this report may not reflect the final design of the Project or subsequent changes made after the date of this report, RWDI recommends that it be retained by Client to verify that the results and recommendations provided in this report have been correctly interpreted in the final design of the Project.

The conclusions and recommendations contained in this report have also been made for the specific purpose(s) set out herein. Should the Client or any other third party utilize the report and/or implement the conclusions and recommendations contained therein for any other purpose or project without the involvement of RWDI, the Client or such third party assumes any and all risk of any and all consequences arising from such use and RWDI accepts no responsibility for any liability, loss, or damage of any kind suffered by Client or any other third party arising therefrom.

Finally, it is imperative that the Client and/or any party relying on the conclusions and recommendations in this report carefully review the stated assumptions contained herein and to understand the different factors which may impact the conclusions and recommendations provided.

APPENDIX D: MEMORANDUM REGARDING POTENTIAL ZONING MAP CHANGES IN SUPERVISOR DISTRICT 3

San Francisco Planning

49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400
San Francisco, CA 94103
628.652.7600
www.sfplanning.org

APPENDIX D
MEMORANDUM REGARDING POTENTIAL ZONING MAP CHANGES IN SUPERVISOR DISTRICT 3

Background

The San Francisco Planning Department (department) is considering potential changes to the current proposed rezoning program described in Addendum No. 1 to the certified the San Francisco Housing Element 2022 Update Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) (San Francisco Planning Department Case No. 2019-016230ENV). The potential changes include: adding two small areas to the proposed rezoned area along Polk Street and Sansome Street in Supervisor District 3 in the City and County of San Francisco (city) and decreasing heights on blocks near Fisherman's Wharf and the Embarcadero. No decision has yet been made regarding the inclusion of these potential changes in the proposed rezoning program; thus, these changes are not included in the analysis in the addendum. These potential changes are minor relative to the proposed rezoning program as a whole. Consequently, this memorandum provides the analysis for these potential changes to determine whether the changes, if implemented, would alter the impact determinations in the addendum. These potential changes are described in further detail below and are considered potential future rezoning areas. The analysis of the potential future rezoning areas contained herein and incorporates by reference analysis in the addendum and meets the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in accordance with CEQA Statute section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines sections 15162–15164.

Description of Potential Future Rezoning Areas

The changes described below would be incorporated as a whole – that is, changes would not be made to one area of the city without the changes in the other two areas. In aggregate, the potential future rezoning of these three areas of the city would result in a net increase of approximately 39 housing units within Supervisor District 3, which is in the Northeast Planning District.

Polk Street Area Revisions

The area proposed along Polk Street is centered around the intersection of Polk Street and Sacramento Street and bounded by Clay Street to the north, Larkin Street to the east, California Street to the south, and Van Ness Avenue to the west, as shown in Figure 1 below. All figures referenced in this appendix are attached at the end of this memorandum. The following parcels are included (block/lots):

- 0621/ -014, -015, -022, and -023
- 0622/ -001, -002, -003, -004, -005, -006, and -017
- 0643/ -001, -001A, -002, -004, -007, and -019
- 0644/ -010, -011, -012, -013, -014, -015, -016, and -017

The potential future rezoning would increase the Housing Choice – San Francisco Program (referred to hereinafter as "local program") height on these parcels from 85 feet to 120 feet, while the base height would remain at 65 feet. As a result of the potential height increases, these parcels would accommodate approximately 161 more housing units compared to the current proposed rezoning program.

Sansome Street Area Revisions

The area proposed along Sansome Street is centered along Sansome Street and bounded by Greenwich Street to the north, Battery Street to the east, Vallejo Street to the south, and Montgomery Street to the west, as shown in Figure 2 below. The following parcels are included (block/lots):

- 0085/ -005 and -048
- 0106/ -001, -002, -003, -004, and -042
- 0112/ -008 and -009
- 0113/ -006, -041, -040, and -063
- 0134/ -001
- 0135/ -007, -008, and -009

The potential future rezoning would add these parcels into the local program but no height changes would be proposed. However, form-based density measures from the local program would apply, which would increase housing capacity on these sites by approximately 66 more housing units compared to the current proposed rezoning program.

Revisions near Fisherman's Wharf and the Embarcadero

In addition to the two areas described above, the potential future rezoning would include height decreases on three blocks near Fisherman's Wharf and the Embarcadero, as shown in Figure 3 below:

- 0017/ -002
- 0018/ -001, -004, and -005
- 0035/ -001

The existing height limit for these blocks is 40 feet. The potential future rezoning would change from 85 feet in the proposed rezoning program to 65 feet.[1] This change would decrease growth capacity anticipated with the current proposed rezoning program on those sites by 188 units but would still increase capacity from existing conditions.

[1] For clarification, the height decreases would be a reduction compared to the proposed building heights under the current proposed rezoning program, not compared to existing heights as of August 2025.

Analysis of Environmental Effects

Approach to Analysis

As discussed in the "Approach to Analysis of Potential Environmental Effects" section of the addendum, the current proposed rezoning program is evaluated in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Statute section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines sections 15162–15163. Accordingly, the potential future rezoning areas described above are evaluated in the same manner. As shown in the analysis below, if the potential future rezoning areas are added to the current proposed rezoning program, the conclusion of the addendum would not change. That is, it would remain true that the proposed rezoning program would not result in new environmental impacts, substantially increase the severity of previously identified environmental impacts, or require new mitigation measures beyond what was evaluated in the FEIR. In addition, it would remain true that no new information has emerged that would materially change the analyses or conclusions set forth in the FEIR. Therefore, as discussed in more detail below, the proposed rezoning program, inclusive of the potential future rezoning areas described above (if added) would not change the analysis or conclusions reached in the FEIR, and no subsequent or supplemental EIR is required.

Overview of Analysis

In the context of the current proposed rezoning program, the potential future rezoning areas around Polk Street, Sansome Street, and Fisherman's Wharf and the Embarcadero would marginally increase overall growth by 39 units. This represents a small fraction of the total anticipated growth under the current proposed rezoning program (i.e., approximately 54,000 additional housing units). The potential future rezoning changes (i.e., height, form-based density measures, and inclusion into the local program) are similar in nature to other rezoning changes throughout the city and do not consist of peculiar features or unusual circumstances that would distinguish these areas from other areas of the rezoning that have been analyzed. Thus, the potential future rezoning changes would result in a minor increase in housing units and there would be similar impacts related to the following topics, as described in the FEIR and addendum:

- Aesthetics
- Agriculture and Forestry Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Energy
- Geology and Soils
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Paleontological Resources
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Tribal Cultural Resources
- Utilities and Service Systems
- Wildfire

Transportation

The potential future rezoning areas would result in a net increase of 39 units within the Northeast Planning District compared with the current proposed rezoning program. With these modifications, a portion of anticipated growth along the Embarcadero would shift to the Polk Street and Sansome Street rezoning areas. The Embarcadero blocks are approximately 1.5 miles away from the Polk Street changes and approximately 0.5 mile from the Sansome Street changes, and the transportation analysis would be similar to what was disclosed in addendum, as the trips would still occur in the same general vicinity and are all within the northeastern part of the city. The northeastern area of the city is classified as urban high density place type and has some of the lowest vehicle miles traveled per capita in the city.

Accordingly, because the potential future rezonings would only result in a marginal increase in housing growth, the number of vehicle trips would be similar and would result in similar transportation impacts. The potential increase of 161 units closer to the 19 Polk Muni route would add approximately 724 daily person trips (180 automobile, 47 TNC/taxi, 203 transit, 21 bike, and 273 walking trips) and approximately 13 peak hour vehicle trips. [2] These 13 peak hour vehicle trips would not significantly contribute to transit delay on the 19 Polk. For these reasons, the proposed rezoning program, inclusive of the potential future rezoning changes described above (if added), would not result in new significant transportation impacts that were not previously identified in the FEIR, nor would it result in more severe impacts than those previously identified.

Shadow

The potential Sansome Street changes would not increase building heights compared to what is analyzed in the addendum. Therefore, no additional shadow analysis is required for this area.

The potential Polk Street changes would increase maximum building heights under the local program by 35 feet from 85 feet to 120 feet. To evaluate the potential for shadow impacts resulting from potential future development on these parcels, the department prepared representative shadow fans in the proposed area, as shown in Figure 4 below. As shown in Figure 4, development on these parcels up to 120 feet tall would not cast new shadow on any existing or planned San Francisco Recreation and Park Department properties. For these reasons, the proposed rezoning program, inclusive of the potential future rezoning changes described above (if added), would not result in new significant shadow impacts that were not previously identified in the FEIR, nor would it result in more severe impacts than those previously identified.

[2] San Francisco County Transportation Authority. *Travel Demand Tool*. August 26, 2025. Available at: https://sftraveldemand.sfcta.org/

Wind

The potential Sansome Street changes would not increase building heights compared to existing conditions and heights are below 85 feet in height. Therefore, no additional wind analysis is required for this area.

The potential Polk Street changes would increase maximum building heights under the local program by 35 feet from 85 feet to 120 feet. The existing heights for these parcels is 65 feet. Buildings over 85 feet in height could result in accelerated wind speeds at ground level and wind hazard impacts.

The FEIR evaluated eight representative key areas throughout the city and the addendum evaluated three additional representative key areas to further assess potential wind impacts of future development consistent with the proposed rezoning program. The wind impact analysis addresses proposed height increases of generally up to 500 feet, with two limited areas up to 650 feet. The wind impact analysis in the FEIR and addendum disclosed that the nature and severity of the wind impacts under the proposed rezoning program would be similar to the wind impacts for the adopted housing element. That is, the proposed rezoning program would not result in new or substantially more severe wind impacts than identified in the FEIR. Furthermore, wind hazard exceedances could occur in some areas in the city as a result of future development under the proposed rezoning program, and FEIR Mitigation Measures M-WI-1a and M-WI-1b would apply to all buildings over 85 feet, if subject to CEQA and if a significant wind impact is identified, citywide. As previously discussed, the future potential rezoning is similar in nature to the proposed rezoning program changes throughout the city, and subsequent development characteristics would be substantially similar. For these reasons, the proposed rezoning program, inclusive of the potential future rezoning changes described above (if added), would not result in new significant wind impacts that were not previously identified in the FEIR, nor would it result in more severe impacts than those previously identified.

Conclusion

Based on the foregoing, it is concluded that the analyses conducted and the conclusions reached in the FEIR certified on November 17, 2022, remain valid and that no supplemental environmental review is required. The potential future rezoning changes, inclusive of the potential future rezoning changes described above (if added), would not cause new significant impacts not identified in the FEIR, and no new mitigation measures would be necessary to reduce significant impacts. No changes have occurred with respect to circumstances surrounding the adopted housing element that would cause significant environmental impacts to which the housing element update would contribute considerably, and no new information has become available that shows that the housing element update would cause significant environmental impacts. Therefore, no supplemental environmental review is required.



Figure 1 – *Polk Street area revisions*

Figure 2 – *Sansome Street area revisions*

Figure 3 - *Revisions near Fisherman's Wharf and the Embarcadero*

Figure 4 – *Representative Shadow Fans at 120 Feet*



26 August, 2025

San Francisco Planning

San Francisco Planning

49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400
San Francisco, CA 94103
628.652.7600
www.sfplanning.org

Executive Summary

ADOPTION OF GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENTS; PLANNING, BUSINESS, AND TAX REGULATIONS CODE AMENDMENTS; AND ZONING MAP AMENDMENTS

HEARING DATE: SEPTEMBER 11, 2025

Record No.:	2021-005878 GPA PCA MAP
Project Name:	Family Zoning Plan
Staff Contact:	Lisa Chen – (628) 652-7422 Lisa.Chen@sfgov.org
Reviewed By:	Rachael Tanner, Director of Citywide Planning

RECOMMENDATION: Adoption with Modifications

Summary

On September 11, 2025, the Planning Commission will consider a series of approval actions related to the proposed Family Zoning Plan ("Plan"). The actions before the Commission include the following:

1. Recommendation to the Board of Supervisors to **approve Planning, Business, and Tax Regulations Code Amendments** to establish the key zoning controls and other regulations that will be applicable to development projects in the proposed Family Zoning Plan, and in some cases, citywide or other geographies.

2. Recommendation to the Board of Supervisors to **approve Zoning Map Amendments** to modify the use districts and the height and bulk districts for parcels in the Housing Opportunity Areas and surrounding areas that are proposed to be rezoned through the Family Zoning Plan.

- Recommendation to the Board of Supervisors to **approve General Plan Amendments** to amend the Urban Design Element, Commerce and Industry Element, Transportation Element, the Balboa Park Station Area Plan, the Glen Park Community Plan, the Market and Octavia Area Plan, the Northeastern Waterfront Plan, the Van Ness Avenue Area Plan, the Western SoMa (South of Market) Area Plan, the

Western Shoreline Area Plan, the Downtown Area Plan, and the Land Use Index;

This Executive Summary includes content on the following topics:

1. Project Background
2. Family Zoning Plan: Proposed Zoning Map
3. Family Zoning Plan Legislation
4. Environmental Review
5. Required Commission Action
6. Recommendation
7. Basis for Recommendation
8. Issues for Consideration
9. Attachments

Background

The Family Zoning Plan (Housing Element Rezoning Program) is a state-mandated implementation action identified in the certified 2022 Housing Element Update (Housing Element). The Housing Element was unanimously adopted by the Board of Supervisors in January 2023 and subsequently certified by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). The Housing Element Update serves as San Francisco's plan for meeting our housing needs for the next 8 years (2023-2031).

Through the Housing Element and rezoning, we are creating more space for families, workers, and the next generation of San Franciscans. In the 2022 Housing Element, the City committed to rezoning to accommodate 36,200 additional **homes** above the city's current zoning to meet state requirements. Since the Housing Element was adopted, the Department has been working on the Housing Element Rezoning Program, the *Family Zoning Plan* (formerly known as Expanding Housing Choice). Starting in February 2023, the Department conducted significant public outreach and held 17 public hearings at the Planning Commission and other City commissions.[1]

In addition to the rezoning legislative package, the Board of Supervisors have **introduced complimentary ordinances intended to supplement the Family Zoning Plan**. Most notably, the Department has partnered with Mayor Lurie and with Supervisor Chyanne Chen to introduce an accompanying Tenant Protections Ordinance focused on local implementation of Senate Bill 330. The ordinance will strengthen existing

[1] The Community Engagement Summary for Spring 2023 – Spring 2024 may be accessed at: https://sfplanning.org/sites/default/files/documents/citywide/housing-choice/housingchoice_community_engagement_summary.pdf

polices and add additional measures to protect tenants in existing housing, particularly vulnerable low-income tenants. This ordinance is not described in this memorandum. It is expected to be introduced at the Board of Supervisors on September 9, 2025 and will be considered for adoption at the Planning Commission this Fall.

STATE REQUIREMENTS

The Family Zoning Plan will amend zoning policies primarily in the Housing Opportunity Areas[2] to increase capacity for multi-family housing to **satisfy the City's Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) shortfall of 36,200 housing units**. *Figure 1* illustrates the shortfall. [3]

The rezoning creates opportunities for more homes in the Housing Opportunity Areas, where the zoning has limited multifamily housing construction in recent decades. Rezoning in these areas fulfills state and federal laws that require the City to **Affirmatively Further Fair Housing (AFFH)** through actions that:

> *"…[C]ombat housing discrimination, eliminate racial bias, undo historic patterns of segregation, and life barriers that restrict access in order to foster inclusive communities and achieve racial equity, fair housing choice, and opportunity for all Californians."*[4]

One way San Francisco will advance this goal is by focusing the rezoning in the Housing Opportunity Areas. In these areas, exclusionary zoning has limited the ability for apartments, condominiums, and other lower cost forms of housing to be developed. Zoning as well as restrictive covenants and other exclusionary practices prevented low-income and persons of color from living in these areas. Significant portions of these neighborhoods have maintained primarily single-family zoning, which creates housing types that are less affordable to low-income households.

The state has found Housing Opportunity Areas to have higher incomes, better-performing public schools, more economic opportunities, and lower environmental pollution – all of which have been shown to provide positive outcomes for low- and moderate-income residents.[5] To reverse patterns of racial and economic segregation, the City can create more permissive zoning that allows multifamily homes to develop alongside single family homes.

---

[2] Areas designated as "Highest Resource" and "High Resource" on the Opportunity Area Map published by California Department of Housing and Community Development, developed by the California Tax Credit Allocation Committee (CTCAC). These areas were also called "Well-Resourced Neighborhoods" in the 2022 Housing Element.

[3] The State of California requires each region of the state to plan for a certain number of homes within a certain timeframe. San Francisco's requirement is 82,200 homes by 2031. Per state guidelines, a 15% "buffer" was added to the 86,200-units to account for uncertainty, meaning that San Francisco is planning for a capacity of 94,300 more homes. The City was able to count roughly 58,100 units that are already approved or expected to be built in this timeframe; this is commonly referred to as the "pipeline". After accounting for these expected units, the remaining number San Francisco must plan for is 36,200 homes.

[4] California Department of Housing and Community Development's goal of Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH): https://www.hcd.ca.gov/planning-and-community-development/affirmatively-furthering-fair-housing

[5] For more information regarding the data and development of the Housing Opportunity Areas, consult the information provided by the state California Tax Credit Allocation Committee (CTCAC)/ HCD Opportunity Areas Maps here: https://www.treasurer.ca.gov/ctcac/opportunity.asp

Although the proposed rezoning is concentrated in the Housing Opportunity Areas, significant housing production is still expected elsewhere in the city. This is due to development expected and permitted under existing zoning and approved plans, including from prior zoning changes such as Area Plans and Development Agreements that enabled mid-rise and high-rise housing.[6] These areas are where most new housing has been built over the past 20 years, and where most of the 58,100 units under existing zoning are expected to be produced during the 8-year Housing Element cycle (2023-31), shown in Figures 1 and 2 below.

Figure 1: Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) Gap Shortfall



Figure 2: Housing Opportunity Areas & Housing Production (2005-2019)



[6] 2022 Housing Element Appendix B: Sites Inventory and Rezoning Program: https://sfplanning.org/sites/default/files/documents/citywide/housing-choice/housingchoice_element_appendixB_sites_inventory.pdf

FAMILY ZONING PLAN: KEY OBJECTIVES

At a high level, the Family Zoning Plan is meant to address the following needs and ambitions:

- **Ambitious zoning to meet the changing needs of our City and satisfy our statutory obligations in a way that works for San Francisco:** The magnitude of San Francisco's housing shortfall (36,200 units) **requires an ambitious response to get the City closer to meeting its goals,** particularly given the current economic conditions and low rate of housing production.

- **Maintains and strengthens the City's resolve to preserve existing multi-family and rent-controlled housing.** Existing multifamily housing must be maintained as the city grows and accommodates new neighbors in new homes built on opportunity sites. Housing Element law and other state laws support the preservation of existing housing by asking cities to identify sites suitable and available for housing. **State guidance encourages cities and their zoning plans to promote development of underutilized sites while preserving existing multifamily housing.** This proposal maintains our current tenant protections in San Francisco and limits the demolition of existing multifamily and/or rent controlled housing.

- **The proposal allows the City to control our own destiny by directing and shaping growth in ways that keep San Francisco special while making space for future generations.** By satisfying state requirements, which the proposal does, San Francisco can **avoid a state takeover of our zoning powers** and can retain essential funding for transit and affordable housing. The creation of the optional Local Program (described in a later section) also creates opportunities for growth consistent with core City policy goals and design standards, while adhering to state requirements.

- **Strengthening San Francisco neighborhoods to make space for families, workers, and the next generation of San Franciscans:** The rezoning plans for future growth and vibrancy of the city's neighborhoods while remaining sensitive to existing conditions and building on what makes San Francisco neighborhoods special. The rezoning, bolstered by updates to laws that will protect existing tenants and support small businesses, supports neighborhoods welcoming more neighbors. **More housing will be concentrated on streets without existing housing, and heights have been sculpted in consideration of public vistas from signature open spaces.**

- **Inclusive growth & expanding housing opportunities and affordability:** The rezoning adds more homes broadly across the plan area so that a diversity of housing options will be available throughout the entire City. New housing generates increased property tax revenue and funding for affordable housing, and creates more diverse housing in areas that are predominantly single-family, including housing for families, seniors, essential workers, people with disabilities, and others.

- **Financial feasibility & ease of implementation:** Trends and patterns from successful area plans and Development Agreements informs the zoning. The proposal is vetted by analyses of financial feasibility and likelihood of development and will be accompanied by zoning changes that provide clear objective standards and that allow for streamlined and ministerial project review.

The Department is in the process of developing a series of factsheets describing key project goals and describe various issues (such as small businesses and tenant protections), in particular to clarify topics

where there is frequent misinformation by providing supporting data and information. Some of these resources are listed in Exhibit 2b.

INFORMATIONAL HEARINGS & COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

Since Winter 2023, the Planning Department has presented 18 informational hearings on the progress of the program to related legislative bodies, detailed in *Figure 3 (Public Hearing Timeline)*.

Figure 3: Public Hearing Timeline

Date	Legislative Body	Topic
July 27, 2023	Planning Commission	Phase 1 Zoning Concept Maps
September 11, 2023	Small Business Commission	Support for small businesses in the areas proposed for the rezoning
October 2, 2023	Youth Commission	Phase 1 Zoning Concept Maps and youth perspectives on housing challenges and needs for new housing
November 30, 2023	Planning Commission	Phase 2 Draft Zoning Proposal (Fall 2023)
February 1, 2024	Planning Commission	Proposed Zoning Map (February 2024); Local Program overview
February 21, 2024	Historic Preservation Commission	Proposed Zoning Map (February 2024), Local Program overview, and Historic Preservation policies
June 6, 2024	Planning Commission	Phase 1 & 2 Engagement Summary, Objective Design Standards, Historic and Cultural Preservation policies
February 27, 2025	Planning Commission	Tenant Protections
April 7, 2025	Youth Commission	Proposed Zoning Map (April 2025), Community engagement
April 10, 2025	Planning Commission	Proposed Zoning Map (April 2025), Local Program updates
April 17, 2025	Planning Commission	Small Business Strategies
June 16, 2025	Board of Supervisors	Land Use & Transportation Committee (Informational Hearing): Proposed Zoning Map (June 2025), Rezoning Legislation
June 26, 2025	Planning Commission	Family Zoning Plan legislation; Financial Feasibility Analysis
July 17, 2025	Planning Commission	Affordable Housing Sites Analysis & Strategy, Infrastructure Planning, and General Plan Amendments
July 28, 2025	Small Business Commission	Family Zoning Plan legislation; Small Business Strategies
August 20, 2025	Historic Preservation Commission	Family Zoning Plan legislation; Historic preservation
August 25, 2025	Small Business Commission	Small business strategies (continued)
September 3, 2025	Historic Preservation Commission	Family Zoning Plan legislation; Historic preservation

The proposed zoning map and legislative amendments have been shaped iteratively over multiple rounds of feedback dating back to February 2023. Since Summer 2024, outreach has been focused on parsing and incorporating feedback from earlier rounds of community outreach and conducting supplemental events

and meetings with individual community and advocacy groups to hear more specific feedback on the Draft Zoning Map and associated policies.

Notably, in recent months there has been a noticeable increase in requests for community meetings. **From the release of the Family Zoning Plan in April 2025 through August 2025, Department staff have had over 50 community conversations in a variety of public settings,** including town halls, webinars, panel discussions, and Q&A sessions, and our team has numerous other such events scheduled through the Fall. We've also had countless other smaller meetings with individuals and small groups from community organizations to discuss various policy topics in greater detail.

The Department continues to hear mixed reactions to the idea of adding new housing. Some community members embrace zoning changes and push for taller heights and higher densities, while other community members want to see lower heights, less change, or avoid adding new housing altogether. The Department has worked to find a balance among these disparate viewpoints and is advancing a zoning proposal that fulfills state requirements for adding housing capacity, while incorporating specific feedback we've heard on areas that are most suitable and likely to produce new housing.

Community groups are welcome to request Planning Department presentations by contacting the project team via email at sf.housing.choice@sfgov.org.

Family Zoning Plan: Proposed Zoning Map

As part of the Family Zoning Plan, Mayor Lurie released several maps starting in April 2025 illustrating the key changes to height and density proposed in the Housing Opportunity Areas. The map currently under consideration, the **July 2025 Proposed Zoning Map (Exhibit 1)**, reflects community and policy maker input received during the adoption of the 2022 Housing Element and outreach on the Family Zoning Plan. The online map includes layers with previous drafts of the map, so that community members may track how the proposal evolved on specific parcels, as well as other geographic information and data layers to provide additional context.

The heights shown on the proposed **Local Program Map** illustrate the height limits that will be permitted under the Housing Choice SF Local Program. These heights are generally equivalent to heights that would be feasible and desirable for projects using other state density bonus options. Projects will have the option to use either the Local Program or state programs to achieve the heights on the proposed map.

The heights shown on the proposed **Base Height Map** applies to development not using the Housing Choice Local Program. Housing developments that are seeking to use state bonus programs would use this height limit to establish their "base project" to apply any bonuses or code relief, which could result in projects taller than base height limits and, in some cases, above the Local Program height limits. A project could also pursue a code complying project at these base heights if desired.

KEY GUIDING PRINCIPLES OF THE UPDATED MAP

Below are the key guiding principles that have shaped the locations and heights of housing development in the Proposed Zoning Map:

- In **residential areas surrounding the major transit and commercial streets**, zoning rules will be adjusted to encourage more units (generally under existing height limits) by removing density limits and instituting "form-based" zoning. For the vast majority of residential sites, these changes are only available for projects opting into the Local Program. **In most cases, the height limit will remain at 40 feet, the same as today. Approximately 77% of the parcels in the rezoning fall into this category and are not receiving a proposed height increase under the Plan.** Around a small number of streets (such as Market Street, Church St, Divisadero St, Columbus Ave, and others), projects may build an additional 1 story (up to 50') through the Local Program.

- The map continues to **concentrate new housing and proposed height increases on major transit routes, commercial streets, and other major hubs of activity**. These areas are better served by transit, retail, and other amenities, and contain more sites that are suitable and likely to be developed into housing. Comparing the proposed Local Program height limits to today's height limits, approximately 8% of parcels would receive a height increase of 1 to 2 additional stories (10' to 20'), another 8% would receive 3 to 4 additional stories (30' to 40'), and the remaining 7% would receive 5 or more stories of additional height (50' or more).

- **Additional new housing would be distributed broadly** across the "Housing Opportunity Areas" so that no single neighborhood or set of neighborhoods would receive most of the new housing.

- Most corridors would be rezoned (with height changes and removal of density limits) 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).

- **High-rise heights** (ranging from 105' – 650', or 10-to-65 stories) are proposed in areas that:
    - Currently allow high-rise construction above 85' (for example, the greater Van Ness corridor).
    - At key intersections along major corridors (for example, sections of Geary Boulevard and 19th Avenue).
    - Wider streets that have more medium- and large-sized parcels that are well suited for housing development (for example, Market Street and Lombard Street).
    - Areas near major transit (for example, Market Street, Geary Boulevard, Glen Park).

- **Opportunity sites** throughout the well-resourced neighborhoods that meet a certain size threshold (8,000 square feet), such as public, nonprofit, and religious sites, will be permitted higher height limits. This approach leverages properties that are particularly well-suited to comfortably accommodate more housing—especially affordable housing.

- The proposal has been **mindful of the core physical patterns of San Francisco and in keeping with principles of the Urban Design Element**. The approach considers key characteristic views from major

public vantage points, such as from the tops of hills, parks known for their views, and from the waterfront. The proposal also fulfills 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, collectively the proposal does not introduce major areas of tall buildings that would block key public views or change the overall perception of the landscape of the city.

The Department worked with urban design consultant AECOM to develop visualizations that illustrate how new homes of different scales may look at various example locations, shown below. The complete list of renderings that have been developed to date are provided in Exhibit 2.c ["Rezoning Visualizations (For Illustrative Purposes Only)]. Please note that the images do not portray actual proposed developments. They are meant to provide a sense of the scale of new homes under the proposed plan, and how communities may look and feel as new buildings are added incrementally.



Visualization: Divisadero St and Bush St
140'

Visualization: Lombard St at Richardson St
65 ft (6 stories)
65'
65'
Credit: AECOM

Family Zoning Plan Legislation

On June 24, 2025, Mayor Daniel Lurie introduced legislation to enact the Family Zoning Plan and commence the Plan's adoption process, in accordance with the state-mandated deadline of January 31, 2026. The Mayor subsequently introduced substitute ordinances on July 29, 2025 that made additional amendments to address technical errors and to make slight refinements to the Plan.

This section describes the legislative information contained in the legislative packet, including key documents whose adoption or approval will constitute the legislative amendments to enact the Family Zoning Plan. Exhibits 3, 4, and 5 of packet and the various subsections are organized around items that require Commission action, as follows:

- **Exhibit 3:** Planning, Business, and Tax Regulations Ordinance (Board File 250701).
- **Exhibit 4:** Zoning Map Ordinance (Board File 250700)
- **Exhibit 5:** General Plan Amendments Ordinance

The content of each Exhibit is briefly described below. The ordinances will amend the Zoning Map, Height Map, General Plan, and the Planning, Business, and Tax Regulations Codes. The legislative package will include substantial amendments to the Planning Code and will also make amendments to relevant existing zoning districts. It will revise or establish controls in key areas, such as height, bulk, minimum densities, design standards, affordable housing, parking limits, and allowable uses, among other topics.

EXHIBIT 3: PLANNING, BUSINESS, AND TAX REGULATIONS ORDINANCE (BOARD FILE 250701).

The amendments to the Planning, Business, and Tax Regulations Codes establish the key zoning controls and other regulations that will be applicable to development projects in the proposed Family Zoning Plan. Major components of the ordinance include:

- Creating a **new zoning district:** "RTO-C," a new additional variation of Residential Transit Oriented (RTO) zoning. RTO-C allows for form-based housing development and will permit (but not require) a variety of non-residential uses on the ground floor. As part of this change, the current Residential Transit Oriented ("RTO") district will be renamed to Residential Transit Oriented – 1 ("RTO-1") to improve clarity, though most of the underlying code requirements and standards will remain the same.

- Establishing an optional **Housing Choice SF Program ("Local Program")** a flexible zoning program meant to provide sponsors with additional options to develop housing at the proposed heights and densities while meeting various City and State policy goals.

- **Establishing a new "R-4" height and bulk district** in which all properties are designated with two height designations: 1) a "local program height" that is applicable to projects using the Housing Choice SF Program, and 2) a "base height" that is applicable to projects not using the Local Program. The heights can be read as "X base height // Y Housing Choice height." For example, "40//65-R-4"

allows a 40' height in the base and a 65' height under the Housing Choice SF Local Program.

- Implementing changes to advance the **efficient use of land near transit facilities**, in fulfillment of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's Transit-Oriented Communities Policy and other city policies. This includes changing parking standards, adding minimum residential densities and office use intensities, establishing maximum unit sizes, and adjusting permitted curb cuts. This allows San Francisco to maintain priority funding for major transportation projects.

- Creating a Non-Contiguous San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Sites Special Use District to **implement the SFMTA Joint Development Policy**. The policy was adopted by the SFMTA Board and the Board of Supervisors. The Planning Commission heard an informational presentation on this item on March 6, 2025.

- Allowing certain **Legacy Businesses** to relocate without a Conditional Use Authorization and waiving development impact fees for those businesses.

- Creating a **Housing Sustainability District (HSD)** which creates a ministerial approval process for housing projects that meet specified eligibility requirements.

- Modifying **height and bulk limits** to provide additional capacity in the Housing Opportunity areas.

- Revising **wind review standards** applicable to projects taller than 85' in selected zoning districts.

- Making **conforming changes** to zoning control tables in various Districts.

- Amending the **Local Coastal Program** to be consistent with the provisions above and directing the Planning Department to forward the ordinances to the California Coastal Commission upon the Plan's adoption.

Exhibit 3 includes the proposed Planning Code ordinance (Exhibit 3.b) and draft Resolution (Exhibit 3.a) to approve the Ordinance. It also includes summary tables that describe the code ordinance (Exhibit 3.c).

EXHIBIT 4: ZONING MAP ORDINANCE (BOARD FILE 250700)

The amendments to the Zoning Map would change use districts and height and bulk districts for parcels in the Housing Opportunity Areas and surrounding areas that are proposed to be rezoned through the Family Zoning Plan. It will do this through the following provisions:

- Reclassifying certain properties to the new **Residential Transit Oriented – Commercial ("RTO-C") district.** As part of this change, the current Residential Transit Oriented ("RTO") district will be renamed as Residential Transit Oriented – 1 ("RTO-1") to improve clarity. However, most of the underlying code requirements and standards will remain the same.

- **Reclassifying properties in the rezoning area with the new "R-4" height and bulk district**. Under this new district, all properties will receive a split height designation, with: 1) a "local program height" that is applicable to projects using the Housing Choice SF Program, and 2) a "base height"

that is applicable to projects not using the Local Program.

- **Changing the height limits on certain properties** in the Family Zoning Plan, including establishing a "local program" height for all properties in the Plan area, and in a smaller number of cases, modifying the "base height."
- **Reclassifying certain properties** from Public to Mixed-Use or Neighborhood Commercial Districts to allow housing development.
- Designating various properties to be included in the **Non-contiguous San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Sites Special Use District.**
- Amending the **Local Coastal Program** to be consistent with the provisions above and directing the Planning Department to forward the ordinances to the California Coastal Commission upon the Plan's adoption.

Exhibit 4 includes the proposed Zoning Map ordinance (Exhibit 4.b) and draft Resolution (Exhibit 4.a) to approve the Ordinance. It also includes a set of illustrative Zoning Maps by Supervisor District (Exhibit 4.c). The full parcel tables that describe the Zoning Map changes at a detailed parcel level are available on the Legistar webpage for the ordinance (Board File 250700).[7]

EXHIBIT 5: GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENTS ORDINANCE

The ordinance proposes amendments to various General Plan Elements and Area Plans for consistency with the Family Zoning Plan, including: Urban Design Element, Commerce and Industry Element, Transportation Element, the Balboa Park Station Area Plan, the Glen Park Community Plan, the Market and Octavia Area Plane, the Northeastern Waterfront Plan, the Van Ness Avenue Area Plan, the Western SoMa (South of Market) Area Plan, the Western Shoreline Area Plan, the Downtown Area Plan, and the Land Use Index.

The changes consist of removing outdated zoning and height maps, as well as language about height and density limits to align with the Housing Element and the general parameters of the Family Zoning Plan. The Amendments to the Western Shoreline Area Plan constitute amendments to the Local Coastal Program.

Exhibit 5 includes the proposed General Plan Amendments ordinance (Exhibit 5.b) and Draft Resolution (Exhibit 5.b). The Draft Resolution also contains master General Plan and Planning Code Section 101.1 consistency findings for all the actions related to adopting the Family Zoning Plan.

Attached to this staff report is also a memorandum **(Exhibit 5.c), providing more background on each of the Area Plans that overlaps with the Family Zoning Plan** as well as more specific information on how each Area Plan would be amended to allow for increased housing capacity.

---

[7] https://sfgov.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=7449404&GUID=0F95C63F-86D3-433A-8B92-069CAB240942&Options=ID|Text|&Search=250700

Environmental Review

On November 17, 2022, the Commission certified the Housing Element 2022 Update EIR in motion 21206, and adopted CEQA findings, a Statement of Overriding Considerations, and a Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting program (MMRP) for the Housing Element 2022 Update on December 15, 2022 in resolution 21220.

On September 3, 2025, the Department published an addendum to the Housing Element 2022 Update FEIR, and found that the proposed Family Zoning Plan, including the General Plan, Planning Code and Zoning Map amendments, would not create any new or substantially more severe significant impacts than those described in the FEIR. The FEIR Addendum may be downloaded on the Department website at https://sfplanning.org/environmental-review-documents.

Required Commission Action

The proposed resolutions are before the Commission so that it may adopt them, reject them, or adopt them with modifications.

Recommendation and Basis for Recommendation

The Department recommends that the Commission **approve the proposed Ordinances with modifications** and adopt the attached Draft Resolutions to that effect.

The Department recommends the modifications shown in Table 4 below, which also describes the rationale recommended changes.

Table 4: Family Zoning Plan Legislation – Amendments Recommended by Department

#	Code Section	Change	Rationale
1	135	Reduce the usable open space requirement for Senior Housing (e.g. to 36 sq ft) and allow indoor community spaces to meet the requirement.	To make it easier to build senior housing and reduce requirements that may not be needed for this use type.
2	155.1	Eliminate or reduce (e.g., cut by 50%) the bike parking requirements for Senior Housing.	To make it easier to build senior housing and reduce requirements that may not be needed for this use type.
3	202.2(f)(1)(C)	Change the definition of Senior Housing so that there is no minimum number of units to qualify.	To make it easier to build senior housing at all scales.
4	202.17	Expand the waiver of the Conditional Use Authorization (for use authorization) and impact fees waivers from just Legacy Businesses to all displaced businesses.	To make it as easy as possible for a business to relocate if it is affected by new housing development.

#	Code Section	Change	Rationale
5	206.10(d)(1)	Waive ground floor height requirement (Section 145.1) for projects using the Local Program to allow a building of 9 stories in 85' height districts.	To permit more units within the 85' mid-rise construction typology, potentially creating more efficient buildings and reducing costs.
6	206.10(d)(1)(B)	Amend the unit mix requirement applicable to projects using the Local Program as follows: • 4-unit building: min one 2+BR • 5-9 units: min 25% 2+BR, including at least one 3+BR unit • 10+ units: min 25% 2+BR, including at least 5% 3+BR	To ensure a minimum number of 3BR units while creating more flexibility for very small projects.
7	206.1(d)(1)(E) and (K); various	Square Footage Bonus for additional multi-bedroom units in the Local Program: Projects of 3+ units can receive additional square footage added to their building envelope for providing: • 3BR units: 250 sq ft for each unit provided , including any the required unit(s) • 4+BR units: 400 sq ft for each unit provided including any required unit(s) In the R-districts, bonus square footage can be added horizontally through any combination of the following: • Reducing the required rear yard (from 30% down to 25% rear yard or 20 feet, whichever is greater). • Reducing the rear yard on the ground floor to 18% or 15 ft, whichever is greater. • Building into the required side yard, where applicable. • Reducing the required upper-story setback for additions to historic properties, from 15 feet down to 10 feet. (Preservation Design Standard P.5.1.1). In other districts, bonus square footage can be added horizontally as above, or vertically through the addition of additional height, generally not to exceed 1 additional story of height.	To provide incentives for new developments to include larger, family-sized units.

#	Code Section	Change	Rationale
8	206.1(d)(1)(E) and (K); 414A; various	Square Footage Bonus for family-friendly amenities in the Local Program: In R-districts, projects can get a square footage bonus for providing certain communal amenities, calculated as follows: • 2.0 sq ft bonus for each square foot provided of shared community rooms, shared kitchen, reservable room for overnight guests, extra storage for large objects, space for in-home childcare. Bonus square footage can be added horizontally through any combination of the following: • Reducing the required rear yard (from 30% down to 25% rear yard or 20 feet, whichever is greater). • Reducing the rear yard on the ground floor to 18% or 15 ft, whichever is greater. • Building into the required side yard, where applicable. • Reducing the required upper-story setback for additions to historic properties, from 15 feet down to 10 feet. (Preservation Design Standard P.5.1.1). In addition, projects that are providing an in-home childcare space may receive a waiver of their childcare fee obligation (Section 414A).	To provide incentives for new developments to include various amenities that are supportive of families and communal living arrangements.
9	206.10(d)(1)(F)	Remove usable open space requirement for projects using the Local Program. Projects are still subject to applicable rear yard requirements.	To allow more flexibility to make the Local Program more competitive with the state density bonus. Project massing is still regulated by required rear yards (which would be 25-30% for Local Program projects).
10	206.10(d)(1)(G)	Remove Planning Code exposure requirements for projects using the Local Program.	To allow more flexibility to make the Local Program more competitive with the state density bonus. Projects are still subject to California Building Code requirements for unit exposure.

#	Code Section	Change	Rationale
11	206.10(d)(1)(K)	Add an additional Height Bonus available for projects in the Local Program, comprised of additional square footage for providing tenant improvements (e.g., a "warm shell").	To bring down the costs to occupy new storefronts, particularly for cost-prohibitive buildouts like food service uses.
12	206.10(d)(1)(K)	Square Footage Bonus and Code Flexibility for Preservation of historic structures. Add a bonus and code flexibility for adaptive reuse on sites with historic structures (which could include Category A buildings, designated Article 10/11 landmarks, and listed resources in the State or National historic registers) in districts other than R districts and in the RTO-C district that do not demolish the resource and comply with the Preservation Design Standards in ways that preserve the resource and reduce the volume of the project within the otherwise permitted building envelope not accounting for the historic structure. The bonus square footage shall be equivalent to 1.5 times the square footage foregone through setback or unused volume above the footprint of the historic structure. This volume can be used to expand the allowed volume of a building horizontally or vertically, not to exceed a certain additional number of stories (to be determined) or reduce the required rear yard above the ground floor to less than 15 feet where abutting the rear yard of parcels containing residential uses.	To incentivize the retention of historic properties, particularly undesignated or unlisted Category A historic resources, particularly in commercial corridors, while not precluding their redevelopment with housing using the Local Program.
13	206.10(d)(1); 303	Allow replacement of tourist hotels/motels of 75 rooms or less for projects using the Local Program, without a Conditional Use Authorization (2/3 of the gross square footage must be residential).	To allow existing hotel uses to continue on a site (even if it is not the same operator).
14	206.10(d)(1)	State that future revisions to the Housing Choice SF program must satisfy two conditions: 1) Any proposed new or increased government constraints in the Housing Choice SF program must be offset by decreasing constraints; and, 2) Substantive changes to the applicability and/or development standards in the Local Program must be analyzed for consistency	To ensure that future amendments to the Local Program remain competitive with state programs and do not negatively affect the City's compliance with state law and the adopted Housing Element.

#	Code Section	Change	Rationale
		with Housing Element statute in Government Code 65583(a)(3).	
15	209.4	Edit the Use Size Control for the RTO-C district and delete the first clause ("P: up to 4,999 gross square feet per lot") so that it reads as follows: "P: Non-Residential use of any size that is part of a project where at least 2/3 of the floor area contains Residential uses. C: Non-residential use in new development, changes of use, or addition of more than 20% to an existing structure, in which the non-residential uses constitute more than 1/3 of the gross square footage of the proposed new, converted, or enlarged structure(s)."	Ensure new projects are at least 2/3 residential, to satisfy state requirements.
16	311	Codify early notification for commercial tenants. Upon receipt of a development application on a commercial corridor, the Planning Department will send mailed notice to the address (to notify any commercial tenants) and notify the Office of Small Business.	To provide as much advance notice to the City and commercial tenant and allow for sufficient time to make a plan if relocation is needed.
17	317(c)(12)	Edit the proposed language to read: *(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 units on the property.*	Clarification of language consistent with existing Commission policy. Removes reference to demolitions which would still be subject to Section 317.
18	Various	Clean up Planning Code Section 151 references and supersede those with 151.1 references. PC 151.1 is the only remaining off-street parking section.	Technical cleanup.

Issues for Consideration

This section describes other topics for the Commission to consider, including:

- **Consistency with Housing Element and State Laws**
- **Connection to San Francisco's Local Coastal Plan**
- **Racial and Social Equity Analysis**
- **Other Issues for Consideration**

CONSISTENCY WITH HOUSING ELEMENT AND STATE LAWS

To date, all versions of the proposed map have been developed to ensure alignment with the guiding principles listed above and consistency with the 2022 Housing Element and state laws. The current map remains broadly consistent with example maps published in the adopted Housing Element and the rezoning scenarios studied as part of the Housing Element Environmental Impact Report.

The Department has been using several analytical methods to ensure the proposed map meets the City's RHNA obligations. First, proposed heights and density adjustments are run through a unit capacity estimation calculation that was used for the Housing Element Sites Inventory of Sites Proposed for Rezoning (Housing Element Appendix B4, Table B). This method has been commonly used to estimate capacity for all of San Francisco's past rezonings and to identify sites more likely to develop based on various site characteristics, including existing uses and underdevelopment relative to proposed zoning. The results indicate that the proposed zoning map plans for housing capacity exceeding our RHNA shortfall.

Second, the proposed zoning map is also evaluated through a housing feasibility model. The Department has been working with external modelling experts and researchers to refine other analytical models that evaluate the feasibility of housing development on every parcel to estimate of how much new housing development is financially feasible with the proposed zoning changes under a range of reasonable economic conditions. In addition to the unit capacity methodology listed above, this model has guided refinements to the map that are necessary to demonstrate that rezoning could reasonably produce the RHNA shortfall.

To augment both of these analyses, the Department has been developing a review of the development activity from previous rezonings and citywide that occurred over a period of time in those areas and compared that data to the capacity estimates that the Department developed at the time of those rezonings, as well as evaluating how much housing has been entitled and produced citywide relative to overall citywide zoned capacity over recent decades. This review is intended to inform any adjustments that might need to be made to the outputs of the above modeling methods.

Finally, the Department has consulted with Century Urban, a real estate consultant, to evaluate the development feasibility of a range of building typologies in San Francisco. Among a number of common factors that affect the financial feasibility of a development, the study considered building size, location, lot size, number of units, construction hard and soft costs, and the review process that a project must undergo to be constructed. The Department also worked with Century Urban on a study of how government-imposed costs (such as fees, inclusionary housing requirements, and lengthy permitting timelines) impact project feasibility, to fulfill Housing Element Action 8.1.8, which required completion of a "pro-forma-based study of cumulative governmental constraints on housing development in relation to the socio-economic needs of the city." The results of these studies were discussed at the informational Commission hearing on June 26, 2025.

CONNECTION TO SAN FRANCISCO'S LOCAL COASTAL PLAN

The Local Coastal Program (LCP) is a policy and regulatory document required by the California Coastal Act that establishes land use, development, natural resource protection, coastal access, and public recreation policies for San Francisco's Coastal Zone. The Coastal Zone extends approximately 6 miles along the City's Pacific (western) shoreline, from the Point Lobos recreational area in the north to the Fort Funston cliff area in the south. This area is covered by the Western Shoreline Area Plan of the General Plan (WSAP).

The LCP consists of two components: (1) the Implementation Plan and (2) the Land Use Plan. The former is comprised of Planning Code provisions that relate to development within the Coastal Zone that have been certified by the California Coastal Commission (CCC). The latter consists of those portions of the WSAP that have been certified by the CCC. Because the General Plan Amendments for the Family Zoning Plan include amendments to the WSAP, an amendment to the Land Use Plan of the LCP is required. The Draft Ordinance includes instructions to the Planning Department to submit the approved General Plan Amendment to CCC for certification following City approval. Department staff completed a Consistency Analysis of the proposed Local Coastal Program Amendment associated with the adoption of the Family Zoning Plan, attached to this report as Exhibit 7, in accordance with California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Sections 13511 and 13552.

HOUSING CHOICE SF PROGRAM ("LOCAL PROGRAM")

As described in previous Commission hearings, the proposed rezoning is structured so that housing projects will have multiple pathways to achieve the heights illustrated in the Local Program map (Exhibit 1). They may use: 1) the Housing Choice SF Program ("Local Program"); or, 2) the "base heights" layered with other state or local bonus laws, such as the State Density Bonus or AB2011.

The Local Program is meant to be a parallel program to state programs (such as the State Density Bonus) and sponsors may elect either option depending on which is most advantageous for the project. **Projects using the Local Program must opt out of using state bonus programs and meet objective code requirements and design standards.** The Local Program allows us to maintain what makes San Francisco special while welcoming new homes.

How to qualify: To qualify, projects must meet the following requirements:

- Contain at least two or more units and add at least one additional unit;
- Located within the rezoned area (also referred to as the R-4 Height and Bulk District);
- Does not take advantage of State Density Bonus program or other state program that provides its own bonuses or waivers from local zoning standards;
- Does not involve the demolition of a structure designated as a landmark under Article 10, is listed as 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 Historic Resources, or is listed on the National Register

of Historic Places;

- Complies with the Citywide Design Standards and the Preservation Design Standards, except where otherwise allowed to be modified through the Local Program's Major Modification process;

Local Program projects may still use provisions in state law that provide for entitlement process streamlining (i.e., ministerial review), such as those created by AB2011 and SB423, provided they meet those program's applicable criteria.

Projects using the Local Program will receive flexibility from some Planning Code controls (e.g., development benefits), described in Figure 5 below. Projects that choose to use the Local Program would be able to choose an unlimited number of benefits from this menu of "local waivers." **The topics listed here reflect the draft ordinance as currently filed (Board File 250701, version 2) and do not reflect the recommended amendments described in the prior section.**

The menu is derived from examining the most common waivers and concessions sought by projects recently using the State Density Bonus (ex: rear yard, exposure, usable open space, among other areas). The Department conducted outreach with industry experts and community groups to review the provisions of the local program and gather additional feedback on its implementation.

Figure 5: Local Program Development Benefits in Draft Ordinance (Board File 250701, version 2)

Topic	**Applicable Planning Code or Design Standard** *(Under Current Zoning)*	**Local Program "Automatic" flexibility** *(i.e., "waivers" in Local Program; current as of July 29th ordinance – Board File 250701 v.2)*
Density	Generally, parcels off-corridor and some parcels on corridors are subject to density limits based on lot size.	Projects using the Local Program, including off-corridor sites, would not be subject to lot-based density limits but rather to Form-Based Density standards.
Height	Projects are subject to the height limit (i.e. "base" height limit). Eligible projects using State Density Bonus or other programs may exceed the height limit per the rules of those programs.	Projects may extend up to the Local Program Height Limit as provided on the Proposed Zoning Map. 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 key architectural features, such as stoops and entries.
Inclusionary Housing	Projects may meet inclusionary housing requirements through: • Affordable Housing Fee;	Projects can choose any compliance method or some combination thereof to meet Section 415. Projects that elect

Topic	**Applicable Planning Code or Design Standard** *(Under Current Zoning)*	**Local Program "Automatic" flexibility** *(i.e., "waivers" in Local Program; current as of July 29th ordinance – Board File 250701 v.2)*
	• On-site Affordable Housing; • Off-Site Affordable Housing; • Small Sites; • Land Dedication (currently available in select districts) Projects using state density and ministerial review programs must meet applicable eligibility requirements of those programs, which typically require that some or all inclusionary units be provided on-site.	off-site or land-dedication must provide the required units or land within the geography of the Housing Opportunity Areas. Projects of 24 units or less also have the option of providing a 100% rent-controlled building instead of providing inclusionary units.
Height Bonus for Community Serving Uses and Micro-Retail	None	Projects may receive a square footage bonus for providing specific uses, which may be accommodated by adding up to 10' additional height: • Up to 2 additional feet of building square footage for every square foot provided of Community Serving uses (childcare, Legacy Business, 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 100-1,000sf).
Unit Mix	Most rezoned areas (NC, C districts): 25% 2+ BRs bedrooms, including at least 10% 3+BRs (applicable starting at 10+ units). RTO and Van Ness & Market SUD: 35% 2+ BRs bedrooms, including at least 10% 3+BRs (applicable starting at 5+ units).	***As Introduced:*** Projects may instead meet 25% 2+BR or more through Local Program. Applicability is 5+ units. ***Note: Proposed for amendment by Planning Commission. See Department Recommendations for proposed amendments.***

Topic	**Applicable Planning Code or Design Standard** *(Under Current Zoning)*	**Local Program "Automatic" flexibility** *(i.e., "waivers" in Local Program; current as of July 29th ordinance – Board File 250701 v.2)*
Street-facing legislated and front setback	Required dimensions vary depending on legislated setbacks or zoning districts (RTO, RH, and RM, PUDs, etc.)	Projects on 19th Avenue may reduce legislated and front setback if sidewalk expands and is at least 15'.
Rear Yard	RH, RM-1, RM-2, RTO, RTO-M: 30% rear yard required All other Zoning Districts: 25% rear yard required	Rear yard (except in R districts) may be reduced to 18% of lot depth, or 15' whichever is greater; a corner lot's 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 (SF) per dwelling unit (DU) to 300 SF/DU	***As Introduced:*** Reduced to 36 SF/DU **Common Usable Open Space:** 10' in horizontal dimension, min 100' SF **Private residential Usable Open Space:** 3' min horizontal dimension and 27' min SF. ***Note: Proposed for amendment by Planning Commission. See Department Recommendations for proposed amendments.***
Dwelling Unit Exposure	Dwelling units citywide must face an open area meeting one of the following: (1) A public street, public alley at least 20' in width, side yard at least 25' in width, or rear yard; if an outer court whose width is less than 25', then depth is no greater than its width; or (2) An unobstructed open area (whether an inner court or a space between separate buildings on the same lot) of no less than 25' in every horizontal dimension.	***As Introduced:*** **Up to 30%** of the units may meet a lower standard, providing exposure to "yards" or "courts" as defined by California Building Code (Ch. 12, Sec. 1205.2 & 1205.3). ***Proposed for amendment by Planning Commission. See Department Recommendations in the Executive Summary for proposed amendments.***

Topic	Applicable Planning Code or Design Standard *(Under Current Zoning)*	Local Program "Automatic" flexibility *(i.e., "waivers" in Local Program; current as of July 29th ordinance – Board File 250701 v.2)*
New ground floor non-residential use size limits	Use size cap varies from 2,000sf to 25,000sf depending on the zoning 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, 85' height or less: • One element per lot; • Not to exceed 1,000 GFA • Element shall not have a plan dimension greater than 50'; • Element's height should not exceed 50% of the applicable height limit.	Allow an identical height exception for vertical non-habitable architectural elements on lots zoned for 85' or below.
Additional "catchall" flexibility	n/a	In addition to the options above, projects using the Local Program may seek an additional 15% reduction of any other quantitative Planning Code standard, with some exceptions.
Additional flexibility 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%** • **Additional 20'** of height above Local Program height. • **Curb Cuts** restrictions in Section 155(r) shall not apply. • **Ground floor ceiling height** requirements in Section 145.1(c)(4) shall not apply.
Ministerial project review	Qualifying projects may opt to use state laws that enable ministerial review (e.g., SB423, AB2011, Housing Element low-income sites provision).	In addition to existing state ministerial programs, legislation will establish a new Housing Sustainability District (HSD), which will be available to projects using the Local Program.
Major modification	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	Projects of *any size* may choose to seek a **major modification** for any additional relief requested in excess of the pre-determined list and the 15% "catchall"

Topic	Applicable Planning Code or Design Standard *(Under Current Zoning)*	Local Program "Automatic" flexibility *(i.e., "waivers" in Local Program; current as of July 29th ordinance – Board File 250701 v.2)*
	Commission approval of a Planned Unit Development.	flexibility that are embedded into the Local Program.

RACIAL AND SOCIAL EQUITY ANALYSIS

The Family Zoning is a key implementation action of the Housing Element 2022 Update, which is San Francisco's first comprehensive housing plan that is centered on equity. Consistent with Planning Commission Resolution 20738, which requires that the Planning Commission center its work and decision-making in racial and social equity, the Department developed the **Racial and Social Equity Analysis: Family Zoning Plan** (Exhibit 2.d; referred to as "RSE Analysis").

The Family Zoning Plan project team considered and applied racial and social equity-minded practices while conducting outreach for the project, addressing community concerns, and iteratively developing the final proposal. The RSE Analysis completed by staff with support from Ground Works Consulting examines the impacts of the existing zoning in San Francisco's high-resource neighborhoods, recounts the history of exclusionary zoning and existing disparities in the city, describes the intentions of the Family Zoning Plan and the evidence to support them, and discusses expected positive outcomes of rezoning and considers actions to address any potential unintended consequences, many of which have been incorporated into the proposed legislation.

Crucially, the RSE Analysis affirms the Family Zoning Plan as a critical strategy to help undo policies that have created and reinforced patterns of economic and racial segregation, due to policies dating as far back as the early 20th century. By changing zoning rules to increase housing capacity, **the Plan will increase access to affordable and diverse housing types in the Housing Opportunity Areas**, whose characteristics have been shown by research to be associated with positive economic, education, and health outcomes for low-income families – particularly better long-term outcomes for children.

A few highlights from this robust analysis are presented below.

Part 2: Historical Patterns of Exclusion and Related Disparities

This section of the RSE Analysis includes an evaluation of spatial data and historical information to describe longstanding patterns of exclusion and its impacts on various socioeconomic disparities. **The analysis finds that the neighborhoods collectively encompassed by the Housing Opportunity Areas possess the following characteristics:**

- **Low housing production, limited housing options, and expensive housing**

  - Only 9% of new housing citywide was built there over the last 25 years, despite comprising more than 50% of the city's land area and 60% of parcels.
  - Home sales prices are 29% higher and rental prices are 28% higher than the median values in other parts of the city.
  - 66% of the parcels in the High Opportunity Areas that have housing on them are used for only single-family (58,500 parcels out of 89,000)—the most expensive and exclusive housing type. Single family homes tend to be 11-40% more expensive than condos and other multifamily housing types.

- **Residents are less diverse and more affluent**
  - More residents are white—49% compared to 29% in other neighborhoods.
  - Median household incomes are approximately 23% higher than the citywide median.
  - More residents are homeowners—46% compared to 32% in other neighborhoods.

- **Better health and education outcomes**
  - More residents have a college degree—70% compared to 50% in other neighborhoods.
  - Life expectancy is 4 years longer than in other neighborhoods.

Part 3: Potential Outcomes of the Proposal

This section provides a summary of research, data, and policy strategies that address four key topics where community members have expressed concerns about the proposed rezoning, including:

- Housing Affordability
- Residential Displacement
- Small Business Impacts
- Infrastructure and Community Services

Figure 6 below ("RSE Analysis – Potential Benefits and Unintended Consequences") presents the results of this analysis, describing the potential positive outcomes that could be realized by the proposed Family Zoning Plan, as well as possible negative or unintended consequences. As noted, this analysis has been conducted iteratively and in parallel with the development of the Family Zoning Plan legislation. It has helped shape the policy proposal itself and has highlighted critical topics for consideration during Plan implementation. This section of the full RSE Analysis (Exhibit 2.b, Part 3) also describes specific policies that can address some of these concerns, including existing policies (e.g. City or state policies), actions that are currently in the proposed Family Zoning Plan legislation, and other ideas for additional actions that could be pursued either with the rezoning or through separate actions.

Figure 6: RSE Analysis – Potential Benefits and Unintended Consequences

RSE Topic	Potential Benefits of Rezoning	Potential Unintended Consequences of Rezoning
HOUSING AFFORDABILITY	• **Updating land use regulations to add more housing generally has a positive, yet moderate, impact on affordability** for housing in the general market, which is how the vast majority of households of all incomes acquire housing. Multi-family housing, enabled through the rezoning, also tends to be more affordable to more households than single family homes. • Allowing for larger building sizes through the rezoning will make 100% affordable housing developments more feasible in places they were not previously. Further, the development of **new market rate housing will generate fee revenues and build units that will grow the deed-restricted affordable housing stock**.	• It is not guaranteed that rezoning will result in more development in the short term, nor that developing more housing in the Housing Opportunity Area will significantly lower prices in the near term, particularly given extremely high demand for housing combined with **current economic conditions which make many housing types infeasible to build**.
RESIDENTIAL DISPLACEMENT	• Adding housing to the Housing Opportunity Areas, especially subsidized affordable units, has the potential to **help low-income and middle-income households and households of color move to the Housing Opportunity Areas** and help to **reduce displacement pressures** for existing residents. • The **Tenant Protections Ordinance** will work in conjunction with other tenant protection policies to **deter developers from displacing tenants and demolishing existing housing**. In practice, these policies direct developers to focus development efforts on "soft sites" without existing housing, such as parking lots.	• **If rents stay high, rather than stabilize or slightly decrease as expected, there will continue to be displacement pressures** (which are primarily due to causes like Ellis Act, owner move-ins, capital improvements, or other causes of eviction), and people could be displaced before they can benefit from increased housing supply. • Renters who are more susceptible due to age, disability status, language ability, or socio-economic status, may face **challenges navigating the existing systems** and resources designed to protect them from displacement.

RSE Topic	Potential Benefits of Rezoning	Potential Unintended Consequences of Rezoning
SMALL BUSINESS	• **More housing will support small businesses** by increasing their customer base, and by making it easier for employees and owners to live nearby. • The **proposed micro-retail spaces will create more affordable or right-sized options for small businesses**, and the inclusion of the RTO-C zoning district will expand the available area in the city where commercial uses are allowed. • **Early notification** of development applications will give OSB more time to work with the impacted business to explore options including negotiating the ability to return, seeking a different site, exploring a different business model, or otherwise planning for the next phase of the business. • **Financial resources and simplifying the requirements** for relocating a displaced business can help businesses impacted by the rezoning stay afloat.	• A small number of businesses, particularly those in buildings without residential units, **may face closure if their building is proposed for new developments** (though it is worth noting that the majority of new housing is not proposed on sites with existing storefronts). They may also experience decreased sales or other negative impacts if they are located near housing construction.
INFRASTRUCTURE & COMMUNITY SERVICES	• **More people will benefit from neighborhoods that already have access to good schools, open space, lower pollution, and essential infrastructure and community services.** For most types of infrastructure, City agencies project that there is sufficient capacity to accommodate new growth for approximately the next two decades . • **Dense, new development will be more energy and water efficient** and can reduce a household's need to drive, which can benefit the environment as well as household budgets.	• In the longer term, in cases where demand will outpace the capacity of infrastructure and services, a larger population could reduce the quality and access to services for existing residents if future investments and service expansions are unable to keep up. **This may be particularly impactful for low-income residents** who rely on specific programming, public transit, and services provided by nonprofits and community-based organizations.

RSE Topic	Potential Benefits of Rezoning	Potential Unintended Consequences of Rezoning
	• **New residents and new developments can increase City revenues** (e.g., via impact fees, property taxes, sales taxes, etc.) to reinvest in infrastructure and services, both offsetting the impacts of growth and improving service to existing residents.	

OTHER CITY COMMISSIONS

The Department has made several presentations at the **Youth Commission**, the **Small Business Commission**, and the **Historic Preservation Commission**. Relevant correspondences from these commissions are attached in Exhibit 6.a ("Responses from Other City Commissions").

The **Youth Commission** discussed the Family Zoning Plan at two informational hearings, and **adopted two resolutions in support of the Family Zoning Plan**. Generally, Commissioners acknowledged the need for more housing opportunities, particularly for young people and families, and welcomed the focus on affordable, family-sized housing. They stressed the need for strong tenant protections, including a "right to return" if redevelopment occurs, and also asked questions about historic preservation. They also asked how the City will ensure housing is actually built and how progress will be tracked.

On May 19, 2025, the Commission adopted a resolution supporting the Expanding Housing Choice Plan while urging that any zoning changes include strong tenant protections, particularly the right to return for families displaced by development. On June 16, 2025, it adopted a second resolution supporting new housing but calling for safeguards to prevent displacement of small businesses that provide jobs, culture, and community stability for youth and families. Together, the resolutions highlight the Commission's commitment to expanding affordable housing while ensuring that tenants and small businesses are not left behind.

The **Small Business Commission** discussed the legislation at three hearings, and the introduced legislation was forwarded to them for review and to make recommendations related to the Plan's potential impacts on small businesses. On August 25, 2025, the **Commission voted to support the legislation**, making the following recommendations:

- Codify a notification process to commercial tenants and the Office of Small Business when a development application on a rezoned site is submitted to the Planning Department,
- Track small business displacement under the rezoning plan,
- Codify incentives for development projects that include warm shell buildouts in new commercial

spaces,

- Explore statewide advocacy to support commercial relocation assistance; and,
- Explore incentives for development projects to make contributions to a small business mitigation fund.

The **Historic Preservation Commission** heard informational on the Plan at three calendared hearings. At the September 3, 2025 hearing, the Commission **voted to direct the HPC President to develop a letter to the Planning Commission** sharing various recommendations on how to strengthen the policies and incentives related to historic preservation in the Family Zoning Plan. This letter is expected to be sent to the Commission in advance of the Adoption hearing on September 11th.

OTHER LEGISLATIVE ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

In addition to the recommended modifications, the Department considered, but are not recommending, numerous other possible amendments to the ordinances that the Commission or Board of Supervisors could potentially consider, such as to create additional options for development, study different height and/or density proposals, or refine other aspects of the proposed Family Zoning Plan. These other issues for consideration are listed in Exhibit 2.a ("*Other Legislative Issues for Consideration*").

Public Comment

Exhibit 6.b ("Public Comment Letters") provides an overview of public comment letters that have been received on the Family Zoning Plan, primarily since the legislation introduction on June 24, 2026. The following summarizes this recent public comment:

The Planning Department has received seven organizational letters of support for the San Francisco Family Zoning Plan, from a broad array of civic, business, and affordable housing organizations, including the Chamber of Commerce, Bay Area Council, SPUR, Sierra Club, Golden Gate Restaurant Association, BOMA, Hospital Council, AdvanceSF, MidPen Housing, Mission Housing, and the SF District Benefit District Alliance. Supporters emphasized that the Plan will expand housing opportunities for families, increase density near transit and commercial corridors, and strengthen neighborhood vitality. Business and community groups also highlighted the plan's role in supporting the local workforce, small businesses, and long-term economic resilience. Collectively, the letters underscore widespread recognition that the plan advances affordability, inclusivity, and quality of life for San Francisco families.

The Planning Department also received 18 individually-written letters and 4 form letters in support of rezoning. These letters generally tended to focus on the importance of building more housing to alleviate San Francisco's housing crisis. They also noted that increasing heights and development capacity would make these neighborhoods more inclusive, thus making the rezoning important from an equity perspective.

In total, we received 25 individually-written letters and 327 form letters opposing the rezoning. These letters generally make claims that the rezoning would incentivize mass demolition, displacement of renters and small businesses, and the unchecked spread of luxury high-rises across San Francisco. These letters also make claims that the plan lacks affordability guarantees, tenant protections, or meaningful community input, framing it as a giveaway to developers and investors rather than a solution to the city's housing needs. The form opposition letters also characterize the rezoning as a blanket upzoning approach, warning it will fuel speculation, gentrification, and irreversible neighborhood change. They call on the Planning Commission to scale back or postpone the plan, prioritize tenant and small business protections, and pursue community-driven alternatives.

We received several dozen emails from other groups and individuals that voiced neither total support nor opposition to the rezoning, but included a mix of technical zoning inquiries, parcel-specific questions, and concerns and questions about a range of topics including height limits, affordability, tenant protections, and funding. Some of the letters provided feedback on specific geographies, including requests to lower heights in certain areas, shift housing growth to other areas, or to add additional height or density in certain areas. Several messages also requested meetings or clarification on hearing times, while a smaller number offered specific policy suggestions.

Attachments

Exhibit 1. Proposed Family Zoning Map (July 2025)

Exhibit 2. Issues for Consideration & Communications

a. Other Legislative Issues for Consideration
b. Factsheets (September 2025)
    i. What is the Family Zoning Plan?
    ii. Family Zoning Plan and Small Business
    iii. State and Local Tenant Protections
c. Rezoning Visualizations (for illustrative purposes only)
d. Racial and Social Equity Analysis: Family Zoning Plan (September 2025)

Exhibit 3. Planning, Business, and Tax Regulation Code Amendments

a. Planning, Business, and Tax Regulation Code Amendments Draft Resolution
b. Planning, Business, and Tax Regulation Code Amendments Draft Ordinance
c. Summary of Planning, Business, and Tax Regulation Code Amendments

Exhibit 4. Zoning Map Amendments

a. Zoning Map Amendments Draft Resolution
b. Zoning Map Amendments Draft Ordinance[8]

[8] The full Zoning Map Amendments Parcel Tables are available online on Legistar under File 250700.

c. Zoning Maps by Supervisor District (for illustrative purposes only)

Exhibit 5. General Plan Amendments

a. General Plan Amendments Draft Resolution
b. General Plan Amendments Draft Ordinance
c. Urban Design Element Map 04 – Urban Design Guidelines for the Height of Buildings
d. Overview of Area Plans that Overlap with the Family Zoning Plan

Exhibit 6. Other Commissions & Public Comment

a. Responses from Other City Commissions
b. Public Comment Letters

Exhibit 7. Local Coastal Program Consistency Findings

Exhibit 8. Addendum No. 1 to the Housing Element 2022 Update FEIR

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION OF HOUSING POLICY DEVELOPMENT
651 Banon Street, Suite 400
Sacramento, CA 95811
(916) 263-2911 / FAX (916) 263-7453
www.hcd.ca.gov

September 9, 2025

Sarah Dennis-Philips, Director
San Francisco Planning Department
City and County of San Francisco
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400
San Francisco, CA 94103

Dear Sarah Dennis-Philips:

RE: San Francisco's 6th Cycle (2023-2031) Adopted Housing Element and Draft Rezoning Package

Thank you for submitting the City and County of San Francisco's (City) draft rezoning package (Package) related to implementation of the housing element. The Package includes various memos, draft ordinances, maps, spreadsheets and other documents intended to implement the housing element, particularly Programs 7.1.1 (Rezoning for the RHNA) and 8.4.4 (Sites Identified in Prior Planning Periods). The purpose of this correspondence is to communicate a preliminary review by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) and to assist the City in its decision-making process. The preliminary review is limited to Programs 7.1.1, 8.4.4 and related Programs.

On February 1, 2023, HCD found the City's adopted housing element in substantial compliance with State Housing Element Law (Gov. Code, § 65580 et seq). This finding was based on, among many other things, commitments to accommodate the City's regional housing need allocation (RHNA) and actions to address identified constraints and affirmatively further fair housing (AFFH). As of this date, the City continues to substantially comply with State Housing Element Law.

Among other requirements, Program 7.1.1 committed to accommodate the RHNA shortfall with a buffer (approximately 36,282 new units, including 20,327 for lower-income households) primarily in Well-Resourced Neighborhoods, in proximity to transit and commercial corridors. Further, Program 8.4.4 committed to make prior sites available and establish a nondiscretionary approval for housing developments with 20 percent affordability for lower-income households.

HCD is pleased to preliminarily find that the Package is consistent with statutory requirements and meets the objectives and commitments of Programs 7.1.1 and 8.4.4.

FZP Letters and Email

Received from 8/24/2025 – 9/04/2025

Organization	Signed by	Contact
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce	Rodney Fong, President & CEO	(O) 415-352-8803 (C) 202-262-5860
Bay Area Council	Matt Regan	
SPUR	Sujata Srivastava	ssrivastava@spur.org
Advance SF	Wade Rose, President	415-956-9966
Golden Gate Restaurant Association	Laurie Thomas	laurie@niceventures.com
Building Owners & Managers Association San Francisco	John Bryant	Jbryant@boma.com, 571-338-542
Hospital Council of Northern and Central California	(No name provided)	
San Francisco Benefit District Alliance	Kate Robinson, Board President	San Francisco Benefit District Alliance
MidPen Housing	Nevada V. Merriman, VP of Policy and Advocacy	650-477-6195, nmerriman@midpen-housing.org
Mission Housing	Sam Moss, Executive Director	(415) 350-2024, **smoss@missionhousing.org**
Sierra Club (San Francisco Group)	Charles Whitfield, Chair	
AIA San Francisco	Stacy Williams, Executive Director and Anton Foss, 2025 AIAS Board President	
Small Business Commission	Katy Tang	
Youth Commission	Commissioner Valencia-Tow	

Note: This encompasses the Broad Business Community Support Letter signed by Rodney Fong for San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, Matt Regan for Bay Area Council, Sujata Srivastava for SPUR, Wade Rose for Advance SF, Laurie Thomas for Golden Gate Restaurant Association, John Bryant for Building Owners & Managers Association San Francisco, and Hospital Council of Northern and Central California (no name).

EXHIBIT 6b

September 3rd, 2025

San Francisco Planning Commission
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400
San Francisco, California, 94103

RE: Business Community Support for San Francisco's Family Zoning Plan

Dear Members of the Planning Commission,

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 Supervisor Myrna 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

Golden Gate Restaurant Association
Laurie Thomas, Executive Director

Building Owners & Managers Association San Francisco
John Bryant, CEO

September 3, 2025

San Francisco Planning Commission
Commission Chambers, Room 400
San Francisco City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Support for Family Zoning Plan

Dear Commissioners,

On behalf of Advance SF, I write to express our strong support for the Family Zoning Plan. As an organization dedicated to transforming San Francisco into an affordable, thriving city with a good quality of life for all, we recognize that housing and the economy are deeply intertwined. The Family Zoning Plan will allow for more homes that are essential to building a stronger, more vibrant city.

New housing helps address San Francisco's affordability crisis, including for low- and middle-income workers who are employed by our local businesses but cannot afford to live in the city where they work. Today, a worker must earn four times the minimum wage to afford the average San Francisco apartment. By expanding the supply of homes, we can ensure that more of our workforce can live in the City, strengthening both our neighborhoods and our economy.

Equally important, more homes directly support small businesses and the local economy. Families living near commercial corridors mean more foot traffic, more sales, and stronger neighborhood vitality. Studies show that meeting San Francisco's housing needs could generate nearly $5.6 billion in local spending, while also creating construction jobs and long-term employment opportunities. By focusing on new developments on underutilized sites, such as parking lots, gas stations, and vacant commercial buildings, we avoid displacing existing storefronts while preserving crucial retail corridors.

We also understand that there is still potential for business displacement as a result of new homes. With that in mind, we support Supervisor Melgar's Small Business Rezoning Construction Relief Program, which provides grants to businesses disrupted or requiring relocation due to new housing construction. We also support creative ideas such as increased technical assistance, leasing support, and access to grants and loans through the stabilization fund. These strategies, combined with higher city revenues from new housing to fund public safety and neighborhood improvements, will help ensure San Francisco's commercial districts remain vibrant and resilient.

The Family Zoning Plan will create the conditions for San Francisco to thrive: more homes, stronger small businesses, increased city revenues, and a more inclusive and resilient economy. As an organization comprised of San Francisco's leading employers, we respectfully urge the Planning Commission to approve the plan and move our city forward.

Thank you for your leadership on this critical issue.

Sincerely,



Wade Rose
President
Advance SF

SAN FRANCISCO BENEFIT DISTRICT ALLIANCE
www.sfbda.org

8.28.25

Mayor Daniel Lurie
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
San Francisco Planning Commission

Re: Support for the San Francisco Family Zoning Plan

Dear Mayor Lurie, Members of the Board of Supervisors, and Planning Commissioners,

On behalf of the San Francisco Benefit District Alliance (SFBDA)—the coalition of directors from all of San Francisco's Community Benefit Districts (CBDs) and Business Improvement Districts (BIDs)—we write to express our strong support for the Family Zoning Plan. Together, our districts encompass more than 150,000 residents and hundreds of neighborhood-serving small businesses across the city.

San Francisco's neighborhoods thrive when they are both vibrant places to live and to do business. The Family Zoning Plan is a critical step toward ensuring this balance by modernizing outdated land-use laws, unlocking housing opportunity in historically exclusionary areas, and supporting the small businesses that are the backbone of our districts.

Housing Growth Strengthens Small Businesses

The data is clear: new homes drive more customers to our commercial corridors. Adding enough housing to meet the City's needs is projected to generate nearly $5.6 billion in new spending at local businesses while creating both construction and permanent jobs. More residents mean more foot traffic for our merchants, restaurants, and service providers—vital for sustaining neighborhood economies.

Affordability for Workers and Families

Housing affordability is not only a human challenge but a business one. Today, a worker must earn four times the minimum wage to afford the average San Francisco rent. By expanding the supply of apartments—including mid-rise and family-sized homes near transit and shops—the Family Zoning Plan will help retain the workforce our small businesses rely upon, shorten commutes, and stabilize communities.

SAN FRANCISCO BENEFIT DISTRICT ALLIANCE
www.sfbda.org

Protecting and Supporting Small Businesses

Equally important, the Family Zoning Plan includes thoughtful safeguards for local businesses. Past rezonings have shown that the vast majority of new housing replaces underutilized lots—such as gas stations, vacant banks, and parking lots—rather than active storefronts. For the small number of businesses impacted, the Plan provides early notification, relocation assistance, permit fee waivers, and incentives for new developments to include legacy businesses, micro-retail, childcare, grocery, and other community-serving spaces. These measures ensure that growth does not come at the expense of neighborhood vitality.

Revenue for Services and Infrastructure

Beyond business activity, new homes also expand the property tax base, generating the revenues necessary to fund vital services such as public safety, infrastructure, and neighborhood beautification—all priorities shared by our districts.

For decades, too much of the responsibility for housing growth has fallen on a handful of neighborhoods, while others remained effectively off-limits. The Family Zoning Plan takes a more balanced, citywide approach that shares opportunity fairly across San Francisco and avoids the risks of state takeover of our planning process.

The San Francisco Benefit District Alliance urges swift adoption of the Family Zoning Plan. Our neighborhoods, businesses, and residents need the affordability, stability, and vibrancy this plan will bring.

Sincerely,
Kate Robinson
Board President
San Francisco Benefit District Alliance
www.sfbda.org

SAN FRANCISCO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

August 25th, 2025

Small Business Commission
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

RE: Letter of Support for Mayor Lurie's Family Zoning Plan

Dear Members of the Small Business Commission,

On behalf of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, I write to express our strong support for Mayor Lurie's Family Zoning Plan, an initiative that will help meet the City's Regional Housing Needs Assessment goals while maintaining local control and strengthening the foundation of our small business community.

The San Francisco Chamber of Commerce represents nearly 900 member organizations across the city, 60 percent of which are small businesses. From restaurants and retailers to neighborhood service providers, these businesses are the backbone of our economy and the heart of what makes our City special. Policies that support their success are central to the Chamber's mission.

First and foremost, more homes mean more customers for small businesses. Building enough housing to meet our city's needs could generate nearly $5.6 billion in new spending at local businesses. This would be a transformative boost for neighborhood-serving small businesses. Importantly, these homes will be concentrated near commercial corridors, increasing local foot traffic and creating opportunities for new ground-floor retail spaces that enrich neighborhoods.

The Chamber of Commerce also recognizes the challenges small businesses face during times of change. However, we feel confident that these are solvable challenges that will be addressed in the Family Zoning Plan and related legislation. We recognize that the overwhelming majority of small businesses will not be impacted by this plan. Most new homes will be built on underutilized sites such as parking lots, gas stations, or vacant buildings, which helps preserve existing storefronts while revitalizing blighted parcels

For the rare cases where relocation is necessary, the plan includes protections such as early notification, relocation assistance, waived permit fees, and incentives for developments to relocate existing or legacy businesses in new projects. We also supported creative ideas such

as increased technical assistance, leasing support, and access to grants and loans through a stabilization fund. These strategies, combined with higher city revenues from new housing to fund public safety and neighborhood improvements, will help ensure San Francisco's commercial districts remain vibrant and resilient.

The Family Zoning Plan represents a balanced approach that expands housing for families, provides safeguards for small businesses, and keeps San Francisco eligible for critical state housing and infrastructure funds. On behalf of our nearly 900 members, 60 percent of them small businesses, we respectfully urge the Small Business Commission to support this legislation as a vital step toward making San Francisco a place where small businesses and families alike can thrive.

Sincerely,



Rodney Fong
President & CEO
The San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

MidPen HOUSING

Building Communities. Changing Lives.

July 15, 2025

San Francisco Planning Commission
49 South Van Ness Ave, 14th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94103

Subject: Letter of Support for Family Zoning Plan

Dear President So and Commissioners,

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

MISSION HOUSING DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

474 Valencia Street, Suite 280
San Francisco, CA. 94010
(415) 864-6432

June 16, 2025

San Francisco Planning Commission
49 South Van Ness, 14th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94103

RE: Family Zoning Plan & Affordable Housing Development

Dear Planning Commissioners,

As organizations that develop, finance, and operate affordable housing in San Francisco, we write to express our **support for the Family Zoning Plan**. We also commend the Planning Department's ongoing development of the **Affordable Housing Sites Analysis & Strategy,** which will be discussed at your upcoming hearing.

Our work is fundamentally guided by the "3 P's" of the CASA Compact: producing housing at all levels of affordability, preserving existing affordable housing, and protecting vulnerable households from housing instability and displacement.

Mayor Lurie's Family Zoning Plan will allow more homes – including affordable homes – to be built throughout San Francisco. Notably, the Plan offers affordable housing projects additional height and relief from code standards, which means that new affordable housing construction is possible on more sites and can be built more efficiently to make best use of public funds.

Furthermore, adding more capacity for mixed-income projects will also benefit affordable housing projects. Following the last major rezoning efforts focusing on the city's east side, San Francisco has built thousands of new homes. Since 2005, San Francisco's eastern neighborhoods have added 6,888 100% affordable homes and 3,667 affordable homes through the inclusionary housing program. Creating more space for more homes means more affordable homes, too.

Research shows that when families move to neighborhoods with better outcomes and opportunities, kids thrive and families enjoy better quality of life. The Family Zoning Plan makes space for more San Franciscans to reside in such high opportunity neighborhoods, meaning that more kids will be able to enjoy access to parks, high-quality schools, and improved economic opportunity.

We applaud the ongoing development of the Affordable Housing Sites Analysis and Strategies. The portions shared in the staff report indicate that there is suitable land available for affordable housing in every district throughout San Francisco. The report also points out one of the greatest

MISSION HOUSING DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION
474 Valencia Street, Suite 280
San Francisco, CA. 94010
(415) 864-6432

barriers to affordable housing: lack of funding. Creating additional funding streams and changing zoning means we can be more creative and successful in meeting our city's needs.

As organizations deeply invested in creating more affordable housing in San Francisco, we ask that you support Mayor Lurie's Family Housing Plan when it comes to you for a vote later this fall.

Sincerely,

Sam Moss
Executive Director
Mission Housing Development Corp.

CC:
Board of Supervisors
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
Sarah Dennis-Philips, Director, San Francisco Planning Department

SIERRA CLUB
SAN FRANCISCO BAY
San Francisco Group of the San Francisco Bay Chapter

June 2, 2025

To: Mayor Daniel Lurie
Cc: San Francisco Board of Supervisors
San Francisco Planning Commission

Re: Support for the Family Zoning Plan

I am writing on behalf of the nearly 6,000 members of the San Francisco Group of the SF Bay Chapter of the Sierra Club to express support for the Family Zoning Plan. Consistent with the Sierra Club Urban Infill Policy, we support development that is dense, inclusive, and walkable, thereby mitigating climate change and increasing resilience. We know that increasing economic opportunity, housing, services, and amenities in existing communities protects and mitigates against sprawl, reduces pollution and greenhouse gas emissions, and at the same time creates more livable communities.

The Family Zoning Plan proposed by Mayor Lurie marks a significant advancement in San Francisco's housing policy. As the City strives to meet state-mandated housing targets, this plan offers a transformative approach to zoning regulations, enabling the construction of much-needed infill housing across diverse neighborhoods. By removing barriers to dense multifamily housing and creating opportunities near key amenities, the plan not only addresses San Francisco's immediate housing needs but also promotes fair housing for all residents & workers – and reduces their carbon footprint. With provisions for denser housing in historically underdeveloped areas and supportive measures for small businesses and tenants, the Family Zoning Plan is poised to foster inclusive growth and address past inequities.

The Family Zoning Plan aims to enable the development of denser housing options in San Francisco's northern and western areas, which have seen minimal new construction due to restrictive zoning laws established in the 1970s. By prioritizing zoning modifications on sites with high development potential, the plan significantly boosts San Francisco's ability to address its housing shortage. Key elements of the plan include:

- Designating zones for multifamily buildings ranging from six to eight stories above commercial venues like shops and restaurants on bustling neighborhood streets and vital transit corridors, alongside taller high-rise structures in major transportation corridors.
- Introducing "density decontrol," which permits property owners to increase housing units while adhering to existing height and setback regulations on numerous residential streets

in well-resourced neighborhoods. This will allow the construction of small apartment or condominium buildings up to four or six stories.

Adding more homes in San Francisco through infill projects offers numerous advantages. It encourages residents to embrace eco-friendly modes of transportation like walking, biking, and public transit. It enables more new residents to choose to live in San Francisco, where lifestyles are relatively car-light, rather than being forced to live in car-centric outer suburbs. Increased housing supply can also help alleviate the city's affordability crisis by easing the housing shortage that drives up costs. Furthermore, denser communities foster a more vibrant atmosphere with amenities within close proximity, enhancing the overall quality of life for residents. By embracing urban infill, San Francisco can progress towards a more sustainable, accessible, and livable future for all its citizens.

Sincerely,

Charles Whitfield
Chair, San Francisco Group
Sierra Club

AIA San Francisco

San Francisco Planning Commission
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400
San Francisco, CA 94103

September 2, 2025

RE: San Francisco Family Zoning Plan (Housing Element Rezoning Program)

The San Francisco chapter of the American Institute of Architects (AIASF) is endorsing the Family Zoning Plan. We believe this historic upzoning will improve housing access and diversity in San Francisco, enabling more families to live and raise children in the city. Additionally, over time, the higher residential densities enabled by this Plan will support independently owned neighborhood retail, a vital aspect of any vibrant urban environment.

Staff from the San Francisco Planning Department held multiple meetings with our members, including a forum in July, to update the architecture community on the plan's progress and collect feedback. Our members valued the opportunity to engage with planning professionals, get answers to their questions, and have their input considered. We are pleased that Planning's proposed policy will actively promote an increased supply and diversity of housing options and hope the Commission agrees.

While AIASF supports the plan, its Public Policy Committee also wants to emphasize support for additional and future upzoning. Increasing housing opportunities across the city, especially on lots within a few blocks of transit and not only along major transit corridors, will foster prosperity. It is good urban planning to align building heights with street widths; currently, San Francisco has many wide streets with very short buildings. Overall, this plan and similar future initiatives promote effective zoning policies.

AIASF encourages the commission to approve the Family Zoning Plan.

Sincerely,

Stacy Williams
Executive Director

Anton Foss, AIA
2025 AIASF Board President

AIA San Francisco
Hallidie Building
140 Sutter Street
San Francisco, CA 94104

(415) 874-2620
info@aiasf.org

www.aiasf.org

[Supporting Housing Choice Plan]

Resolution in Support of SF Planning's 2025 Expanding Housing Choice Plan.

WHEREAS, San Francisco is currently facing a housing crisis with the city only having achieved building 5% in moderate-income housing, 7% in low-income housing, and 7% in very low-income housing to reach the Housing Element mandated building of 46,000 affordable units; and

WHEREAS, Addressing our housing shortage through the building of affordable housing will help ensure that living in San Francisco can be accessible to all; and

WHEREAS, The San Francisco Youth Commission's 2025-2026/2026-2027 Budget Policy and Priorities (BPP) report acknowledged the importance of affordable housing in allowing families to live in San Francisco without a financial burden; and

WHEREAS, Urgent action is needed to meet the state-mandated 82,000 new units of housing with 46,000 of those units being affordable; and

WHEREAS, The San Francisco Youth Commission's 2025-2026/2026-2027 BPP report acknowledged that amending the planning code to raise height limits is an important step to increase new units of housing in the city; and

WHEREAS, The San Francisco Youth Commission's 2025-2026/2026-2027 BPP report also acknowledged that an increase in housing production should ensure that new development is not exclusively market rate but also affordable; and

WHEREAS, Many working class families with children and youth have struggled with rising costs of rent and face threats of displacement; and

WHEREAS, The San Francisco Planning Department's 2025 Expanding Housing Choice Plan promotes housing production, notably in the lower density west side of the city; and

WHEREAS, The 2025 Expanding Housing Choice Plan aligns with the Youth Commission's 2025-2026/2026-2027 BPP report regarding raising height limits; and

WHEREAS, The 2025 Expanding Housing Choice Plan as of now does not directly address the feasibility of tenants returning to their homes after construction of new units finishes; and

WHEREAS, While San Francisco's right-to-return policy intends to protect displaced tenants, a length building process often prevents tenants from returning to their previous unit; and

WHEREAS, Families that rent in San Francisco deserve strong protections against displacement and a transparent and comprehensive plan from the Planning Department ensuring tenant rights are respected; and, now, therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the San Francisco Youth Commission urges the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to support a zoning plan only if it includes a comprehensive strategy that protects tenants from displacement; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the San Francisco Youth Commission recognizes the importance of building more affordable housing to address San Francisco's housing crisis; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the San Francisco Youth Commission recognizes that tenant rights and issues regarding rent affect youth and families; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the San Francisco Youth Commission also recognizes the importance of ensuring that new housing construction should not come at the expense of displacing long time existing tenants and residents of the city, particularly those that are families or have children; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the San Francisco Youth Commission urges the Board of Supervisors and Mayor to consider the effects of new development on tenants in low income communities; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the San Francisco Youth Commission staff shall transmit copies of this resolution to the Mayor, Board of Supervisors, the Office of Supervisor Melgar, San Francisco Tenants Union, and the Chinese Progressive Association.

[2025 Expanding Housing Choice Plan: Small Business Protections]

Resolution in support of the 2025 Expanding Housing Choice Plan and urging San Francisco Mayor and Board of Supervisors to protect Small Businesses from displacement.

WHEREAS, The 2025 Expanding Housing Choice plan aims to increase housing production, particularly increasing the density of northern and western neighborhoods and rezoning for development for underutilized sites[1]; and

WHEREAS, The 2025 Expanding Housing Choice Plan aligns with the Youth Commission's Budget and Policy Priorities (BPPs) about height limits[2]; and

WHEREAS, Commercial corridors are vital in supporting small businesses – generating significant revenue through tourism, retail, dining, and showcasing San Francisco's niche neighborhood cultural diversity and community; and

WHEREAS, In California, 27.44% of small businesses are family owned, with 92% of those businesses being first-generation owned[3]; and

WHEREAS, On April 17, 2025 the SF Planning Commission held a hearing on Expanding Housing Choice: Small Business Strategies, and identified that the proposed rezoning will affect 37 commercial corridors, home to 5,680 registered businesses – 1052 of which are on parcels suitable for development, and 47 are legacy businesses. The most affected businesses are bars and restaurants, retail, and medical-related[4]; and

---

[1] "Expanding Housing Choice (Proposed Zoning Map)," San Francisco Planning, n.d., https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/6e0e399f9c82456dbda233eacebc433d/.
[2] San Francisco Youth Commission, "Budget and Policy Priorities: FY 2025 - 2026 | 2026 - 2027," *Sfgov.Org*, March 2025, https://www.sfgov.org/youthcommission/sites/default/files/24-25%20Budget%20and%20Policy%20Priorities%20-%20B%26A%20Presentation.pdf.
[3] Gabriel Dillard, "Study: Fresno No. 2 in U.S. for Proportion of Family Businesses," The Business Journal, April 17, 2024, https://thebusinessjournal.com/study-fresno-no-2-in-u-s-for-proportion-of-family-businesses/.
[4] San Francisco Planning Commission, "Expanding Housing Choice: Small Business Strategies," Slide show, sfgov.org, April 17, 2025, https://citypln-m-extnl.sfgov.org/Commissions/CPC/4_17_2025/Presentation/2021-005878CWP-R1_Expanding%20Housing%20Choice%20Small%20Business%20Strategies.pdf.

WHEREAS, The SF Planning staff estimated an average of 53 small businesses face the risk of displacement due to new development – roughly 1-2 businesses per corridor per year[5]; and

WHEREAS, Over 80% of San Francisco small businesses are commercial tenants, meaning they lease and do not own their space, and have less protections when facing termination and sudden rent increases, thus burdening tenant's ADA compliance, insurance, and taxes. Alongside these burdens, long term investment for small businesses is not viable; and

WHEREAS, Pandemic debt still hinders small businesses' profits on top of inflation, rising costs of wages, employee retainment, insurance, and utility costs; and

WHEREAS, In San Francisco, Mom & Pop landlords are increasingly being replaced by large corporate real estate interests, shifting an increased burden to commercial tenants by imposing lengthy leases, often with over 40 pages of difficult language and sometimes necessitating tenants to contribute towards property taxes; and

WHEREAS, Small Business workers make $30,000 to $80,000 annually, and the displacement of small businesses will significantly increase rent burdens, crowding, long commute for these workers; and

WHEREAS, The 2025 Expanding Housing does not directly address the protections of small businesses after construction of new units finishes, thus posing the risk of displacement; and

[5] Sarah Richardson and Lisa Chen, "Memo to the Planning Commission," San Francisco Planning, April 17, 2025, https://citypln-m-extnl.sfgov.org/Commissions/CPC/4_17_2025/Commission%20Packet/2021-005878CWP.pdf.

WHEREAS, The San Francisco Planning Department recommends early notifications and referrals to OSB, implementing a construction mitigation fund, and upholding AB 2011 and SB 1103[6]; and

WHEREAS, Small business forward worked with community members and identified that potential relocation assistance including scalable lengths in the tenancy, right to return, payments for relocation, grants and loans and Small Business corridor vibrancy supports including good neighbor construction policies and discouraging long term storefront vacancies are the most important recommendations to support small businesses, and therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the San Francisco Youth Commission recognizes that both small businesses and housing are integral to supporting youth livelihoods and families, serving as key places of culture and community; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, the San Francisco Youth Commission recognizes that the importance of building affordable housing should not come at the expense of displacing small businesses; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, the Youth Commission recognizes the importance of building more affordable housing units to address San Francisco's housing crisis and that building more units will enable small business workers to have more housing to support their livelihoods, which can increase businesses supports; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the San Francisco Youth Commission urges the Mayor, Board of Supervisors, and Planning Department to include comprehensive strategies to protect small businesses from displacement in the 2025 Expanding

[6] Richardson and Chen, "Memo to the Planning Commission."

Housing Choice Plan with consideration of the recommendations by the San Francisco Planning Department, Small Business Forward, and San Francisco youth and families.

SAN FRANCISCO
OFFICE OF SMALL BUSINESS

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
DANIEL L. LURIE, MAYOR

OFFICE OF SMALL BUSINESS
DIRECTOR KATY TANG

August 27, 2025

Ms. Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
City Hall Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

RE: BOS File 250700 Zoning Map – Family Zoning Plan and BOS File 250701 Family Zoning Plan - Support with Recommendations

Dear Ms. Calvillo,

On August 25, 2025, the Small Business Commission (the Commission) heard BOS File 250700 Zoning Map – Family Zoning Plan and BOS File 250701 Family Zoning Plan. Sarah Dennis-Phillips, Planning Director, discussed the legislation and spoke to goals of expanding housing affordability and availability by allowing increased density throughout the city, especially along transit and commercial corridors to meet state law requirements for San Francisco to adopt a compliant rezoning plan by January 31, 2026. The Commission spoke at length about the strategies to prevent small business displacement that may occur as a result of the Family Zoning Plan.

The Commission voted to support the legislation with a 4-0 vote, with three Commissioners absent. The Commission made the following recommendations:

- Codify a notification process to commercial tenants and the Office of Small Business when a development application on a rezoned site is submitted to the Planning Department,
- Track small business displacement under the rezoning plan,
- Codify incentives for development projects that include warm shell buildouts in new commercial spaces,
- Explore statewide advocacy to support commercial relocation assistance, and
- Explore incentives for development projects to make contributions to a small business mitigation fund.

Thank you for considering the Commission's recommendations. Please feel free to contact me should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Katy Tang
Director, Office of Small Business

For example, the Package addresses the shortfall of capacity to accommodate the RHNA for lower-income and permits multifamily development with 20 percent affordability to lower-income households without discretionary action, requires minimum densities, meets residential performance standards, and primarily identifies sites in Well-Resourced Neighborhoods, in proximity to transit and commercial corridors. HCD encourages the City to continue expeditious implementation of these Programs in a similar manner to meet statutory requirements, including meeting rezoning deadlines.

However, HCD cautions the City to continue decision-making, implementation and making adjustments that meet programmatic commitments and statutory requirements, as follows:

- *Sites Identified in Prior Planning Period*: Currently, Section 207.9 (Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities and Minimum Office Intensities) allows housing developments with 20 percent affordability to be permitted without discretionary action. This section should also reference the sites identified in prior planning periods on a publicly available and accessible website. HCD further encourages the City to proactively promote the availability of these sites to housing developers.
- *Section 207.9 (Minimum Dwelling Unit Densities and Minimum Office Intensities)*: The Section should provide additional clarity in the purpose and applicability subdivisions to apply to identified sites to accommodate the lower-income RHNA and sites identified in prior planning periods as well as complying with all statutory requirements pursuant to Government Code section 65583, subdivision (c)(1) and section 65583.2, subdivisions (c), (h) and (i), including residential performance standards.
- *Program 7.1.1 (Rezoning for the RHNA) Components*: The City must continue to meet all Program 7.1.1 commitments generally including but not limited to: (1) identifying sites in Well-Resourced Neighborhoods, (2) accounting for site's likelihood of development during the planning period using an analytical model, (3) not adding constraints that reduce financial feasibility as determined by an analysis prior to rezoning enactment, (4) implementing a rezone program that exceeds the RHNA and reducing the need and size of any subsequent rezoning triggered by Action 8.1.5 and (5) making any conforming amendments to relevant area plans in the City's General Plan. Taking action inconsistent with these components or altering these components or the spirit of Program 7.1.1 could trigger an amendment to the housing element or a review of impacts on the City's compliance status. Please see below for additional discussion.
- *Analytical Models*: As part of Program 7.1.1 and using analytical models to account for site's likelihood of development in the planning period, the City should continue to explore additional and multiple methods and make adjustments as appropriate.
- *Exceeding the RHNA*: As part of Program 7.1.1 and reducing the need and size of any subsequent rezoning and as noted in HCD's prior reviews, the City should adopt the most aggressive rezoning strategies to ensure that adequate sites are

available throughout the planning period, especially for lower- and moderate-income households. Also, where appropriate, HCD urges the City to continue using conservative assumptions (e.g., unit size, economic factors) that facilitate the highest housing outcomes.

- *Not Adding Governmental Constraints*: If changes are proposed to any additional rules, regulations, restrictions, land use controls, procedures or other related matters, HCD cautions the City to carefully consider whether to make any changes and ensure that governmental constraints do not reduce financial feasibility or unduly impact housing supply, cost or approval certainty.
- *Development and Design Standards and the Local Program*: As part of the remaining process, HCD encourages the City to continue evaluating development and design standards as potential constraints and, in particular, engage the housing development community and make adjustments to remove or mitigate governmental constraints. As part of this engagement, the City should also engage the housing development community to evaluate the potential effectiveness of the Local Program and make adjustments, as appropriate.
- *Housing Sustainability Districts (HSD)*: HCD understands that HSD's are optional and are not required on identified sites to accommodate the RHNA or sites identified in prior planning periods. As noted in HCD's prior review, please note that HSDs or other similar ordinances do not substitute the City's obligation to complete its rezone program and should not be required on sites in the Package that are intended to accommodate the RHNA.
- *Rezoning Deadlines*: The City must complete rezoning to accommodate the RHNA and make prior identified sites available by January 31, 2026. HCD encourages the City to continue diligent efforts to meet this deadline. Missing the deadline will result in HCD review of the City's compliance status. Upon completion of all necessary rezoning, a copy of the resolution, ordinances and all related documents should be transmitted to HCD. HCD will review the documentation for compliance with statutory requirements, including program objectives and commitments.

For your information, implementation of the housing element, including public participation and the local decision-making process, is integral to achieving the goals and objectives of the housing element and addressing the housing need of all segments of the population. Maintaining the spirit, integrity, or specifics of the housing element that was found in substantial compliance by HCD is also of the upmost importance. Any changes to the way in which housing element programs are implemented should be carefully evaluated for potential impacts on HCD's finding of substantial compliance. For example, changes could negatively impact HCD's finding of substantial compliance and therefore could require a compliance review or an amendment to the housing element that is subject to HCD review.

Changes to program implementation that may impact HCD's finding of substantial compliance or trigger an amendment to the housing element include but are not limited to introducing potential constraints on development, omitting or altering the specifics in

the housing element program, or switching provisions with new provisions that are inconsistent with the integrity or specifics of the housing element program. Examples include adding labor provisions, removing and replacing sites, reducing capacity, affordability requirements, removing sites from Well Resourced Neighborhoods, introducing constraining development standards and adding permit procedures, such that the changes have the effect of, among other issues, reducing housing supply, increasing housing costs, failing to AFFH, or decreasing the ability to promote approval certainty or achieving maximum densities.

Additionally, the City must continue timely and effective implementation of all programs, including but not limited to Programs related to (1) addressing and removing constraints to housing development, (2) expanding housing choices, rezoning and making available adequate sites to accommodate the RHNA, (3) fostering equitable communities and AFFH, (4) preventing and eliminating homelessness, (5) serving special needs groups and (6) stabilizing tenants and rental housing. For example, Program 8.1.5 (Evaluation of RHNA Progress) requires additional rezoning and constraints reductions among several other actions if a specified number of building permits are not issued by January 31, 2027. HCD encourages the City to implement programs in a manner that considers this trigger and the critical nature of California's housing needs. HCD will be closely monitoring the City's housing element implementation efforts throughout the planning period including key milestones, deadlines, and annually for compliance with State Housing Element Law.

The City must monitor and report on the results of all programs through the annual progress report, required pursuant to Government Code section 65400. Please be aware, Government Code section 65585, subdivision (i), grants HCD authority to review any action or failure to act by a local government that it determines is inconsistent with an adopted housing element or Housing Element Law. This includes failure to implement program actions included in the housing element. HCD may revoke housing element compliance if the local government's actions do not comply with state law.

Several federal, state, and regional funding programs consider housing element compliance as an eligibility or ranking criterion. For example, the CalTrans Senate Bill (SB) 1 Sustainable Communities grant, the Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities program, and HCD's Permanent Local Housing Allocation consider housing element compliance and/or annual reporting requirements pursuant to Government Code section 65400. With a compliant housing element and timely implementation, the City continues to meet housing element requirements for these and other funding sources.

HCD recognizes the challenges and opportunities to implement the housing element and applauds the efforts of the City in addressing the housing needs of all segments of the community. HCD looks forward to following the City's progress in implementation and appreciates the opportunity to assist the City in its decision-making. If you have any questions or need additional assistance, please contact me at paul.mcdougall@hcd.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Paul McDougall
Senior Program Manager

San Francisco Planning

49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400
San Francisco, CA 94103
628.652.7600
www.sfplanning.org

September 9, 2025

Ms. Lydia So
President
SF Planning Commission
City and County of San Francisco
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Family Zoning Plan

Dear President So and the SF Planning Commissioners:

During the public hearings of the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) on August 20, 2025 and September 3, 2025, San Francisco Planning Department staff provided an informational presentation on the Family Zoning Plan, including the updated zoning map proposal and upcoming zoning amendments to implement the Housing Element.

As you are aware, the HPC is charged with providing advice and guidance on historic preservation goals, policies, and programs to preserve, highlight, document, and formally acknowledge resources of historic and cultural significance.

While we make this a priority in our discussion and approval measures, we are also aware and supportive of the City and County of San Francisco's efforts to meet the state mandated goals to create new housing. As a Commission, we clearly understand the most pressing needs that are placed upon the City to fulfill this obligation, and feel that continuing to promote and preserve our most important historic and cultural assets will not impede any of these efforts.

Toward this end, we have summarized the discussion that took place at the most recent HPC Hearing on September 3, 2025, and would like to respectfully request the consideration of proactive measures under Requested Recommendations.

Discussion Summary

Commissioners and staff reviewed the following areas based on Commission comments and information received from members of the public:

1. The impacts of removing Category "A – Historic Resource Present" parcels from the proposed Family Zoning Plan or the Housing Choice SF Program (the "Local

Program").[1] Commissioners understand that exempting these properties would decrease zoned housing capacity significantly and would very likely risk sending the City towards outcomes like the decertification of our approved Housing Element and ultimately the Builder's Remedy, which would be catastrophic for historic resources. Similarly, Commissioners understand the plan is necessary and the best way to guard ourselves against Builder's Remedy.

2. Commissioners also acknowledged the need for more housing, not only to meet state requirements, but also to address our housing affordability crisis. They identified the proposed Local Program as a promising strategy to create the required capacity while maintaining more local control over future development by requiring projects to meet the Preservation Design Standards and other objective requirements.

3. Commissioners reviewed incentives to result in the creation of new housing units while also preserving Category A properties (and possibly Category B, those properties whose historic status is unknown at this time) in the Family Zoning Plan. Incentive ideas included a program similar to the Article 11 Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) program and adaptive reuse of non-residential properties. Commissioners also highlighted the need for design standards for infill within all identified historic districts. Conversely, a Commissioner cited the need to track the loss of historic resources and determine criteria to monitor this tracking.

4. In addition to the existing "demolish" language for projects involving historic resources in the Family Zoning Plan, Commissioners explored a clear definition and the inclusion of "substantially alter" as an amendment to the Family Zoning Plan. This was raised after staff explained that the Planning Code as it stands today does not contain a definition to substantially alter a property and noted that it may not be possible to develop such a definition as an enforceable objective standard. However, the Planning Code does contain a definition for demolish in Article 10, which is objective in its implementation.

5. Staff also clarified that the flat policy requires a Conditional Use Authorization requirement for the removal or subdivision of residential flats unless the proposal results in a net increase in residential density.

6. The Commissioners reiterated the need to work with the State of California Office of Historic Preservation to expedite a procedure where all designated landmarks (individuals and historic districts) in the City and County of San Francisco are listed in

[1] Parcels (or properties) labeled Category "A" contain a historic resource. Because of this status, it is listed or determined eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places and/or California Register of Historical Resources; locally designated via Article 10 (city landmarks) or Article 11; or because it has been identified as a historic resource under the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"), a survey, or other work. This includes individual properties and historic district contributors as well as non-contributors.

the California Register of Historical Resources as a group of historic resources rather than requesting individual nominations, a request to the state that has been repeated from HPC hearings over the past few years.

7. Commissioners stressed the need to expedite the San Francisco Citywide Cultural Resources Survey (SF Survey) and Family Zoning Plan Landmark Designations Program in the rezoning area, including streamlining the landmarking process for individual properties and historic districts.

Requested Recommendations

The Historic Preservation Commission would like to respectfully request the following recommendations to the Family Zoning Plan:

1. **Identification: Completion of SF Survey**

   Make it a priority for the Planning Department to expedite the completion of SF Survey in the Family Zoning Plan Area. This can be achieved by ensuring that staff have sufficient resources and funding to move SF Survey forward at an accelerated pace so that historic resources can be immediately identified.

2. **Designation: Family Zoning Plan Landmark Designations Program**

   The Planning Department should also prioritize and expedite the Family Zoning Plan Landmark Designations Program and investigate ways to further streamline the landmarking process, which could include identifying additional resources or potentially developing trailing legislation to amend the designation process. The HPC would like to initiate this discussion as soon as possible.

3. **Protection: Preservation Design Standards**

   The Planning Department should prioritize the completion of Preservation Design Standards for infill and new construction in historic districts.

4. **Reuse: Adaptive Reuse Incentives**

   The Planning Department should develop new adaptive reuse incentives in the Family Zoning Plan and add adaptive reuse of historic properties as an incentive in the Local Program.

I have met with the Planning Director and staff to discuss the feasibility of incorporating these recommendations into the Department's work plan and into the proposed rezoning. They have shared actionable next steps for increasing the Department's commitments to accelerating recommendations 1-3 on this list. They also shared a recommended amendment to the rezoning to address recommendation 4, by creating an adaptive reuse incentive

through the Local Program. These are positive developments that can support the swift identification and protection of historic resources while still abiding by state housing requirements.

Thank you for your serious attention to this matter. I am happy to meet with the Planning Commission and Planning Department staff to begin to discuss and implement these measures in a timely manner.

Sincerely,

Diane Matsuda
President
Historic Preservation Commission
cc: San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Attachments

I am including all of the written correspondence that was provided at the HPC Hearings on this matter for your further information.

- SF Heritage Letter
- Courtney Damkroger
- Bridget Maley
- Telegraph Hill
- Georgia Shuttish

From: Woody LaBounty <wlabounty@sfheritage.org>
Sent: Tuesday, September 2, 2025 10:16 AM
To: Matsuda, Diane (CPC) <diane.matsuda@sfgov.org>
Cc: Foley, Chris (CPC) <chris.foley@sfgov.org>; Baldauf, Hans (CPC) <hans.baldauf@sfgov.org>; Vergara, Robert (CPC) <robert.vergara1@sfgov.org>; Baroni, Dan (CPC) <Dan.Baroni@sfgov.org>; Sucre, Richard (CPC) <richard.sucre@sfgov.org>; Chen, Lisa (CPC) <lisa.chen@sfgov.org>; Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC) <sarah.dennis-phillips@sfgov.org>; CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>; Ionin, Jonas (CPC) <jonas.ionin@sfgov.org>; Tsern Strang, Gayle (CPC) <gayle.tsernstrang@sfgov.org>; eleanor.cox@sfgov.org <eleanor.cox@sfgov.org>
Subject: Family Zoning Plan Resolution

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

Dear President Matsuda,

I understand that the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) plans to draft a resolution in response to the current version of Mayor Lurie's Family Zoning Plan at tomorrow's September 3, 2025 meeting. San Francisco Heritage would like to offer a few suggestions to consider:

1. While the ongoing city survey and recent Planning Department effort to batch and accelerate city landmark designations is welcome, the process is still lengthy. There is uncertainty as to whether all city supervisors will participate in the plan, jeopardizing our shared goal to have historic designations justly represent the diversity of San Francisco and its people. Upzoning will immediately change values and put thousands of potential historic buildings in a highly vulnerable position from development. The city survey and accelerated landmarking program aren't enough to protect potential landmarks and districts in the face of this sweeping change.

2. San Francisco Heritage suggests excluding from the zoning plan the "Category A" parcels that the Planning Department has already identified as potentially historic. Planning reports that these Category A's are about 14% of the properties in the proposed zoning map. This would leave 85% of the land, more than 79,000 parcels, available to meet the Family Zoning Plan's unit targets. Exclusion would give the city survey team time to finish assessing the Category A's for possible designation.

3. The Planning Department has suggested that 79,000 parcels may not offer enough capacity to meet the Housing Element's targeted number of units, I presume because of factors inhibiting increased density on other parcels, such as special zoning or rent-controlled buildings. While San Francisco Heritage does not concede this point and asks the HPC to request a true and detailed analysis from Planning, exclusion of the Category

A sites on commercial corridors, where upzoning is projected to produce most new units, must be a priority.

4. Lastly, changes in state laws and new proposed legislation make local, state, and national designation the most significant factors in protecting historic properties. The city's Planning Department has a skilled preservation team to make evaluations, but there is no mandate, requirement, or trigger for the city to designate individual landmarks or historic districts. It is usually left to city supervisors to initiate the process or brought to the city by community groups spearheading and paying for nominations.

   As the city survey team continues its effort and identifies even more historic resources, the City of San Francisco has to have a plan to finish the job and make official designations, including of historic districts.

   The Planning Department's Historic Preservation program needs a revised over-arching framework and strategy for preservation in the city to address this issue and adequately respond to a changed landscape. San Francisco Heritage would welcome joining the Historic Preservation Commission, the Planning Department, and the mayor's office in crafting a new path forward aligned with Mayor Lurie's priorities and our shared desire to protect San Francisco's special places.

Thank you for your consideration of these points and suggestions.

Woody

SF HERITAGE

Woody LaBounty
President & CEO
he/him/his

SAN FRANCISCO HERITAGE
On Unceded Ramaytush Ohlone Land
HAAS-LILIENTHAL HOUSE
2007 FRANKLIN STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94109
P: 415.441.3000 x 104

www.sfheritage.org
wlabounty@sfheritage.org

Join Heritage Now

SFH
Letter-Family-Zoning

SF HERITAGE
www.sfheritage.org
2007 FRANKLIN STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94109
415 441 3000

September 2, 2025

Diane Matsuda, president
Historic Preservation Commission
City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94103

Re: Family Zoning Plan Resolution at September 3, 2025 Meeting

Dear President Matsuda,

I understand that the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) plans to draft a resolution in response to the current version of Mayor Lurie's Family Zoning Plan at its September 3, 2025 meeting. San Francisco Heritage would like to offer a few suggestions to consider:

1) While the ongoing city survey and recent Planning Department effort to batch and accelerate city landmark designations is welcome, the process is still lengthy. There is uncertainty as to whether all city supervisors will participate in the plan, jeopardizing our shared goal to have historic designations justly represent the diversity of San Francisco and its people. Upzoning will immediately change values and put thousands of potential historic buildings in a highly vulnerable position from development. The city survey and accelerated landmarking program aren't enough to protect potential landmarks and districts in the face of this sweeping change.

2) San Francisco Heritage suggests excluding from the zoning plan the "Category A" parcels that the Planning Department has already identified as potentially historic. Planning reports that these Category A's are about 14% of the properties in the proposed zoning map. This would leave 85% of the land, more than 79,000 parcels, available to meet the Family Zoning Plan's unit targets. Exclusion would give the city survey team time to finish assessing the Category A's for possible designation.

3) The Planning Department has suggested that 79,000 parcels may not offer enough capacity to meet the Housing Element's targeted number of units, I presume because of factors inhibiting increased density on other parcels, such as special zoning or rent-controlled buildings. While San Francisco Heritage does not concede this point and asks the HPC to request a true and detailed analysis from Planning, exclusion of the Category A sites on commercial corridors, where upzoning is projected to produce most new units, must be a priority.

4) Lastly, changes in state laws and new proposed legislation make local, state, and national designation the most significant factors in protecting historic properties. The city's Planning Department has a skilled preservation team to make evaluations, but there is no mandate, requirement, or trigger for the city to designate individual landmarks or historic districts. It is usually left to city supervisors to initiate the process or brought to the city by community groups spearheading and paying for nominations.

   As the city survey team continues its effort and identifies more historic resources, the City of San Francisco has to have a plan to finish the job and make official designations, including of historic districts.

   The Planning Department's Historic Preservation program needs a revised over-arching framework and strategy for preservation in the city to address this issue and adequately respond to a changed landscape. San Francisco Heritage would welcome joining the Historic Preservation Commission, the Planning Department, and the mayor's office in crafting a new path forward aligned with Mayor Lurie's priorities and our shared desire to protect San Francisco's special places.

Thank you for your consideration of these points and suggestions.

Sincerely,

Woody LaBounty
President & CEO
San Francisco Heritage
wlabounty@sfheritage.org
415-441-3000 x104

From: Courtney Damkroger <cdamkroger@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 2, 2025 7:33 PM
To: Matsuda, Diane (CPC) <diane.matsuda@sfgov.org>; Tsern Strang, Gayle (CPC) <gayle.tsernstrang@sfgov.org>; Baldauf, Hans (CPC) <hans.baldauf@sfgov.org>; Baroni, Dan (CPC) <Dan.Baroni@sfgov.org>; Foley, Chris (CPC) <chris.foley@sfgov.org>; Vergara, Robert (CPC) <robert.vergara1@sfgov.org>; eleanor.cox@sfgov.org <eleanor.cox@sfgov.org>
Cc: Sucre, Richard (CPC) <richard.sucre@sfgov.org>; Ionin, Jonas (CPC) <jonas.ionin@sfgov.org>; Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC) <sarah.dennis-phillips@sfgov.org>; Woody LaBounty <wlabounty@sfheritage.org>
Subject: Item 4. Family Zoning 9/3/25 HPC

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

Please find my letter attached and below:

Dear President Matsuda and Members of the Commission:

There are two key points I wish to convey. The first is to reiterate that all Category A buildings should be exempt from the proposed upzoning and second, under Article 10, the HPC has the responsibility to review any ordinances concerning historic preservation and to submit reports regarding those resources to the Planning Commission or Board of Supervisors, whichever is applicable.

<u>Category A Buildings should be exempt:</u>

- The department's program to survey and designate historic resources on an accelerated schedule is an excellent effort, but it is not enough given the timing, breadth and intensity of the proposed upzoning.

- While not a new request from the preservation community, exempting Category A buildings is the most effective measure to deal with potential threats to historic resources at this time.

- Action 4.5.5. (Appendix D - General Plan Consistency 2014 Housing Element, page 16 of the Housing Element adopted in 2023) stated that the City should:

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.

The quality and skill of the Planning Department's preservation staff is impressive.

However, lacking a true and ready commitment from city leadership and the Planning Department to preserve our historic and cultural resources, they will not be prioritized. Clear, firm, direction from the HPC is critical.

HPC responsibility to review ordinances and resolutions (SEC. 1002. POWERS AND DUTIES OF PLANNING DEPARTMENT AND HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION):

Given the direction of Article 10, the HPC has the responsibility to review the language of the proposed rezoning ordinances where designated and eligible historic and cultural resources are affected. For example, on Page 12, Lines 8-11 Housing Choice-SF Program and Page 25 lines 1-4, Housing Sustainability District (FILE NO. 250701 ORDINANCE NO. [Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan])[1] the proposed language should be improved to include "substantial alteration" as well as protections for buildings and sites identified in adopted surveys, buildings listed or potentially eligible for individual listing in the California Register of Historical Resources or on the National Register of Historic Places, or buildings located within listed or potentially eligible National Register or California Register historic districts as well as all buildings identified as "Category A" buildings.

Highlighted here are just two of several sections in the proposed ordinances that deal with historic resources and Legacy Businesses and where HPC review and comment is warranted.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Courtney Damkroger

[1] (https://sfgov.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=14558815&GUID=4D6988AD-9941-422E-8CCA-67AAD8523F82)

cc: Woody LaBounty, SF Heritage

2025 9 3 HPC ltr Upzoning.docx

[1] (https://sfgov.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=14558815&GUID=4D6988AD-9941-422E-8CCA-67AAD8523F82)

September 2, 2025

Diane Matsuda, President
Historic Preservation Commission
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94103

Re: Item 4--Family Zoning Plan

Dear President Matsuda and Members of the Commission:

There are two key points I wish to convey. The first is to reiterate that all Category A buildings should be exempt from the proposed upzoning and second, under Article 10, the HPC has the responsibility to review any ordinances concerning historic preservation and to submit reports regarding those resources to the Planning Commission or Board of Supervisors, whichever is applicable.

<u>Category A Buildings should be exempt:</u>

- The department's program to survey and designate historic resources on an accelerated schedule is an excellent effort, but it is not enough given the timing, breadth and intensity of the proposed upzoning.

- While not a new request from the preservation community, exempting Category A buildings is the most effective measure to deal with potential threats to historic resources at this time.

- Action 4.5.5. (Appendix D - General Plan Consistency 2014 Housing Element, page 16 of the Housing Element adopted in 2023) stated that the City should:

    > 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.

The quality and skill of the Planning Department's preservation staff is impressive. However, lacking a true and ready commitment from city leadership and the Planning Department to preserve our historic and cultural resources, they will not be prioritized. Clear, firm, direction from the HPC is critical.

HPC responsibility to review ordinances and resolutions (SEC. 1002. POWERS AND DUTIES OF PLANNING DEPARTMENT AND HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION):

Given the direction of Article 10, the HPC has the responsibility to review the language of the proposed rezoning ordinances where designated and eligible historic and cultural resources are affected. For example, on Page 12, Lines 8-11 Housing Choice-SF Program and Page 25 lines 1-4, Housing Sustainability District (FILE NO. 250701 ORDINANCE NO. [Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan])[1] the proposed language should be improved to include "substantial alteration" as well as protections for buildings and sites identified in adopted surveys, buildings listed or potentially eligible for individual listing in the California Register of Historical Resources or on the National Register of Historic Places, or buildings located within listed or potentially eligible National Register or California Register historic districts as well as all buildings identified as "Category A" buildings.

Highlighted here are just two of several sections in the proposed ordinances that deal with historic resources and Legacy Businesses and where HPC review and comment is warranted.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Courtney Damkroger

cc: Woody LaBounty, SF Heritage

[1] (https://sfgov.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=14558815&GUID=4D6988AD-9941-422E-8CCA-67AAD8523F82)

From: Bridget Maley <bridget@architecture-history.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 2, 2025 10:35 PM
To: Matsuda, Diane (CPC) <diane.matsuda@sfgov.org>; Tsern Strang, Gayle (CPC) <gayle.tsernstrang@sfgov.org>; Baldauf, Hans (CPC) <hans.baldauf@sfgov.org>; Baroni, Dan (CPC) <Dan.Baroni@sfgov.org>; Foley, Chris (CPC) <chris.foley@sfgov.org>; Vergara, Robert (CPC) <robert.vergara1@sfgov.org>; eleanor.cox@sfgov.org <eleanor.cox@sfgov.org>
Cc: Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS) <Stephen.Sherrill@sfgov.org>; Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC) <sarah.dennis-phillips@sfgov.org>; Segal, Ned (MYR) <ned.segal@sfgov.org>; Sucre, Richard (CPC) <richard.sucre@sfgov.org>; CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>; Ionin, Jonas (CPC) <jonas.ionin@sfgov.org>; Woody LaBounty <wlabounty@sfheritage.org>; Courtney Damkroger <cdamkroger@hotmail.com>; Katherine Petrin <petrin.katherine@gmail.com>; Lori Brooke <neighborhoodsunitedsf@gmail.com>; Dennis Richards <drichards20@outlook.com>
Subject: Item 4: "Family Zoning" HPC Calendar Sept 3 2025

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

Dear President Matsuda and Historic Preservation Commissioners:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the "Family Zoning" Item 4 on your agenda for September 3, 2025. The mayor's proposal is a drastic Upzoning Plan that will fuel speculative development, encourage demolition of historic buildings, and result in displacement of residential tenants and small businesses. It will have the opposite effect and will push working class families out of our city.

Unfortunately, I cannot attend the meeting in person. I would like to point out several serious issues with the Upzoning Plan that other preservation professionals, including Courtney Damkroger, a former Commissioner, have highlighted in comments to the Commission.

First, all Category A Historic Buildings should be exempt from the proposed Upzoning Plan. The Final 2022 Housing Element EIR noted on page 4.2-82 that:

"Specifically, the department's projection assumes that Category A resource status would act as a development constraint for future development. The Housing Element 2022 Update Modeling and Projections Memorandum included in Appendix C of this EIR presents additional information about the modeling and growth assumptions used in the department's housing growth projection."

"The department's housing growth projection factored in the locations of known historic districts in San Francisco and assumed that future development would primarily occur outside those districts."

The proposed Upzoning Plan and accompanying legislation does not exempt Category A buildings, conflicting with what the Housing Element indicated would be protected.

Second, under Article 10, the HPC has the responsibility to review any ordinances concerning historic preservation and to submit reports regarding those resources to the Planning Commission or Board of Supervisors, whichever is applicable. As such, the Commission should push for exemptions of Category A Buildings and other policies and provisions that will protect our city's treasured historic and cultural resources, historic districts and historic neighborhoods that contribute to our tourist economy, drawing visitors from around the world. The Commission should be designating historically and culturally significant buildings, landscapes, and districts for preservation using the Citywide Cultural Resource Survey, Planning Code Articles 10 and 11, and on state and national historic resource registries to ensure appropriate treatment of historic properties that are important to the community. Designation will unlock historic preservation incentives that could be used to enhance and preserve historic buildings for housing. Clear, firm, direction from the Historic Preservation Commission is critical.

Lastly, why is the item not a regular calendar item on your agenda? This issue deserves more input and review than as a "Commission Matters" item. One of you should suggest it be moved from this portion of the agenda to a regular item at the beginning of the hearing.

San Francisco is unlike any other city in the United States. If we erode our city's historic and cultural character through drastic upzoning, we will regret these actions just as we now regret the demolition and displacement that occurred in the historic Fillmore and Western Addition neighborhoods and other redevelopment areas of the 1960s and 1970s.

The Historic Preservation Commission is a City Charter Commission. The citizens of San Francisco are looking to you for leadership at this critical moment.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,
Bridget Maley
Former Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board President (appointed by Mayor Gavin Newsom)
LBE Certified Small and Woman-Owned Business Owner
Member Neighborhoods United SF (NUSF)

--
bridget maley
architecture + history, llc
415 . 760 . 4318
san francisco, ca

www.architecture-history.com

From: Nancy Shanahan <nshan@mindspring.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 19, 2025 1:51 PM
To: Matsuda, Diane (CPC) <diane.matsuda@sfgov.org>; Foley, Chris (CPC) <chris.foley@sfgov.org>; Baldauf, Hans (CPC) <hans.baldauf@sfgov.org>; Baroni, Dan (CPC) <Dan.Baroni@sfgov.org>; Vergara, Robert (CPC) <robert.vergara1@sfgov.org>; Tsern Strang, Gayle (CPC) <gayle.tsernstrang@sfgov.org>; Wright, Jason (CPC) <jason.wright@sfgov.org>; eleanorruth802@gmail.com <eleanorruth802@gmail.com>
Cc: Woody LaBounty <woody@outsidelands.org>; Katherine Petrin <petrin.katherine@gmail.com>; Chen, Lisa (CPC) <lisa.chen@sfgov.org>
Subject: Comments on Family Zoning Plan (Housing Element Rezoning Program) 2021-005878CWP

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

Dear President Matsuda and Commissioners,
Please see the attached letter from the Telegraph Hill Dwellers sharing our concerns with Mayor Lurie's proposed rezoning ordinance and the potentially significant impacts it will have on the historic resources of San Francisco.
We hope that the Commission will recommend the changes set forth in our letter to safeguard our City's important historic resources by (1) removing from the upzoning plan the recently added areas of District 3 that include designated and eligible historic districts; (2) broadening the definition of historic buildings that would be ineligible for demolition under the upzoning ordinance; and (3) recommending that the Preservation Design Standards be amended to apply to all properties in historic districts.
Thank you for your consideration of our concerns and recommendations.
Sincerely,
Sincerely,
Stan Hayes and Nancy Shanahan, Co-Chairs
Telegraph Hill Dwellers
Planning and Zoning Committee

THD letter to HPC 8.19.25.pdf

August 19, 2025

Diane Matsuda, President
San Francisco Historic Preservation Commission
49 S. Van Ness, Suite 1400
San Francisco, CA 94103
Via email: diane.matsuda@sfgov.org

RE: Comments on Family Zoning Plan (Housing Element Rezoning Program) 2021-005878CWP

Dear President Matsuda and Commissioners,

On behalf of the Telegraph Hill Dwellers (THD), a neighborhood organization representing over 500 members in North Beach and Telegraph Hill, we are writing to share our concerns with Mayor Lurie's proposed rezoning ordinance and the potentially significant impacts it will have on the historic resources of San Francisco. Although we support the Planning Department's two preservation initiatives, they will do little to counter the impending threats to our recognized historic buildings and districts from the massive upzoning plan, density decontrol, and ministerial approvals contained in the proposed rezoning ordinance.

To lessen the threats to historic resources, we have the following observations and recommendations for your consideration.

First, we are seriously concerned by the late inclusion within the rezoning plan of the Telegraph Hill Historic District and significant portions of the proposed North Beach National Register Historic District whose nomination is pending. The Washington Square Historic District and the Powell Street Shops Historic District, both recognized as eligible for the California Register, are also now included within the upzoning area. None of these historic areas were included in the 2022 Updated Housing Element or considered in the Housing Element EIR. Nor were they included in any of the previously proposed upzoning maps until after Mayor Lurie introduced his rezoning map in April. [Please see Attachment] We respectfully ask the Commission to recommend the removal of these historic areas from the upzoning Plan.

Second, we urge that the Commission recommend proposed changes to two sections of the proposed rezoning legislation to broaden the definitions of the historic buildings that would be ineligible for demolition under the Housing Choice -San Francisco Program (HC-SF) and Housing Sustainability District (HSD). Please consider recommending the following additions:

> Page 12, Lines 8-11 and on Page 25, Lines 1-4:
>
> (4) *The project 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*, buildings and districts identified in adopted surveys, buildings listed or potentially eligible for individual listing in the California Register of Historical Resources or on the National Register of Historic Places, or buildings located within listed or potentially eligible National Register or California Register historic districts.

Finally, we urge the Commission to please recommend that the Preservation Design Standards (PDS) be amended to apply to all properties in historic districts. In direct conflict with Articles 10 and 11, which apply to all new construction and alteration of properties in historic districts, the PDS apply solely to contributors to historic districts or to Category A properties that have been determined individually

significant. Historic districts are a mosaic, greater than the sum of their parts, not merely a loose collection of separate individually listed or contributing buildings. Applying standards to a small subset of buildings in a historic district, while allowing the remaining others to be demolished, altered, and developed without PDS controls, risks a steady erosion of the historic character of the districts. Extension of the PDS to all properties within historic districts would better protect the historic character of districts, which together comprise just a small percentage of San Francisco's land area (e.g., Article 10 historic districts together are estimated to be approximately 3-5 percent of the City's total land area).

* * * * * * * *

In conclusion, we hope that you will recommend changes that will safeguard important historic resources by (1) removing designated and eligible historic districts from the upzoning plan as stated above; (2) broadening the definition of historic buildings that would be ineligible for demolition under the upzoning ordinance as suggested above; and (3) recommending that the Preservation Design Standards be amended to apply to all properties in historic districts.

Sincerely,

Stan Hayes and Nancy Shanahan, Co-Chairs
Planning and Zoning Committee

cc: Chris Foley, Vice President chris.foley@sfgov.org
Hans Baldauf, Commissioner hans.baldauf@sfgov.org
Dan Baroni, Commissioner dan.baroni@sfgov.org
Robert Vergara, Commissioner robert.vergara1@sfgov.org
Gayle Tsern Strang, Commissioner gayle.tsernstrang@sfgov.org
Jason Wright, Commissioner jason.wright@sfgov.org
Eleanor Cox, Commissioner eleanorruth802@gmail.com
Woody LaBounty Wlabounty@sfheritage.org
Katherine Petrin petrin.katherine@gmail.com
Lisa Chen Lisa.Chen@sfgov.org

Enc: Attachment

Mayor Breed's Upzoning Map 2024



Mayor Lurie's Upzoning Map June 2025



From: Thomas Schuttish <schuttishtr@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 9:17 AM
To: Matsuda, Diane (CPC) <diane.matsuda@sfgov.org>; Foley, Chris (CPC) <chris.foley@sfgov.org>; Baldauf, Hans (CPC) <hans.baldauf@sfgov.org>; Baroni, Dan (CPC) <Dan.Baroni@sfgov.org>; Tsern Strang, Gayle (CPC) <gayle.tsernstrang@sfgov.org>; Vergara, Robert (CPC) <robert.vergara1@sfgov.org>
Cc: CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>; Sucre, Richard (CPC) <richard.sucre@sfgov.org>; Chen, Lisa (CPC) <lisa.chen@sfgov.org>; Tanner, Rachael (CPC) <rachael.tanner@sfgov.org>; Switzky, Joshua (CPC) <joshua.switzky@sfgov.org>; Bishop, Melanie (CPC) <melanie.bishop@sfgov.org>; CPC - Survey Team <CPC.Survey@sfgov.org>; peter.miljanich@sfgov.org <peter.miljanich@sfgov.org>; YANG, AUSTIN (CAT) <Austin.Yang@sfcityatty.org>; JENSEN, KRISTEN (CAT) <Kristen.Jensen@sfcityatty.org>; Ionin, Jonas (CPC) <jonas.ionin@sfgov.org>
Subject: Follow up to HPC Meeting on August 20th

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

Dear Commissioners:

This email is a follow up on the issue of codifying the Residential Flat Policy (Resolution 20024).

Under the Rezoning the reason for this is to: *"Codify Planning Commission's Flats Policy to help preserve this family-friendly housing type"*. It is a noble goal.

At the August 20th HPC hearing, Commissioners were concerned about how to protect and preserve sites if they have not yet been analyzed by the Survey, particularly due to the large number of properties currently ranked as "B" and the importance of those currently ranked as "A".

There is no doubt that San Francisco needs to increase the amount of housing.

However, the City doesn't want to lose existing multi-unit housing and existing historic resources.

The Staff has repeatedly stated that existing multi-unit buildings, particularly if they are tenant occupied will have protection.

It is important to preserve Residential Flats, especially if they are determined to have historic and cultural value.

Flats can be found all over the City, in every neighborhood. They provide housing if currently occupied and housing for future occupants.

The HPC has adopted one Context Statement on Flats, and another is in the works.

It makes sense to have really stringent Code language to protect and preserve this existing typology of San Francisco housing.

One way to do that, in addition to a review preserving facades, would be to limit the amount of interior demolition allowed during an Alteration to between 10% to 15%. This would allow for reasonable remodeling/upgrading and not the total relocation and reconfiguration of each Flat.

During my comments at the August 20th hearing I said I would follow up with other examples.

Attached right below is a pdf about 64-66 Beaver Street. Next to this pdf, is a very brief video that shows the sliding door connecting the two units. The video was made at the open house in April and sent to me.

The property, two legal Flats per the Assessor's Info, was marketed and sold as a single family home for $5.6 million in April 2025.

Right below is another pdf showing the pairs of Flats adjacent to 64-66 Beaver Street prior to the "Alteration", along with two pages from the Context Statement for "Flats and Small Apartments (1915-1978)".

This group of six Flats, three with barrel-front bays and three with an angled bays, should have been analyzed by the Survey.

According to the SFPIM all are "A" rated because they are located in the "Eligible Duboce Triangle Historic District Extension".

However, despite what it says on the SFPIM, 64-66 Beaver Street was listed as a "B" on the 2019 HRA and then lowered to a "C" during the review of the Alteration.

And in terms of providing multi-unit housing, it is fair to say that it can no longer be considered a pair Flats given they are internally connected via the sliding door in the video.

(The Beaver Street project *got around* the Flat Policy which went into affect on October 12, 2017).

This project at 64-66 Beaver Street had a **68%** interior demolition.

And as you can see in the first pdf above the exterior no longer resembles the original pair of Flats (or the adjacent Flats) and doesn't even look like a typical pair of Flats due to the totally redone front facade.

Here in the next pdf right below is another example of another "Alteration" that was in another group of Flats.

This pdf shows a photo of 112 Mallorca Way and it is pretty obvious which structure had the "Alteration" within this group of A-rated Flats in the "Eligible Marina Corporation Residential Historic District". (The legal address is 112-114 Mallorca Way.)

This was an Alteration of a pair of Flats into a SFH that was approved over 20 years ago which is why there is no "before" photo from Google Earth.

But it is fair to assume it looked like the other pairs of Flats in the large group designated in the Sanborn Map. (This Alteration was also prior to the implementation of Planning Code Section 317 and there is no historic review analysis uploaded to the SFPIM as with the Beaver Street project).

This group of Flats was built in 1924. According to the SFPIM, the altered structure retained its A-rating after the facade change and the vertical expansion and the merging of the Flats.

It is important to preserve the exterior of Flats that the Survey may deem worthy as a cultural and historic resource.....but it is also important to preserve the housing that Flats provide.

This is housing that the City has determined provides homes for middle income, moderate income families and is *"family-friendly"*.

And the interior and the exterior are equally important. Buildings that are clearly a pair of Flats in the PROW should also be a pair of Flats inside with the typical floor plan that reflects the original interior as built.

Attached below is an array of the six pairs of adjacent Flats on Beaver Street from Google Earth photos in 2019, *prior* to the Alteration and sale of 64-66 Beaver Street to compare with the photo of the Flats on Mallorca Way in the pdf above and with the examples in the Survey in the other pdf above.

I hope that the HPC in their letter to the Planning Commission will encourage a more stringent definition of Demolition to preserve the interior configuration of Flats by limiting the amount of interior Demolition allowed when granting an Alteration permit for Flats. This could best preserve this *"family friendly housing"*. And of course preserve the facades of Flats that the Survey may find to be eligible as a historic and cultural resource.

Sincerely,
Georgia Schuttish

FLAT LOOPHOLE EXAMPLE copy.pdf

IMG_6994.mov

Comparison Survey w Beaver.pdf

CURRENT

(Note placement of front doors from street on opposite sides of garage)

Asking Price: $5.995 Million (See Page 5 for sales history)

Original Asking Price Prior to Permit Issuance: $2.455 Million (Owned by "LP" using just one street address, even though property legally two addresses).

Main Site Permit Value: $572 Thousand

2019

2021

Rear Facade Before

Rear Facade After

10/25/2024	$5,995,000	PriceChange
06/17/2024	$6,795,000	Listed For Sale
10/11/2018	$2,455,000	Sold

5 bed **6.5** bath **4,057** sqft **2,875** sqft lot

Est.$39,029/mo Get pre-approved

Single family
Property type

10 days
On Realtor.com

$1,478
Price per sqft

1 Car
Garage

2024
Year built

wonderful five bedroom, six and a half bath modern property with a truly rare combination of ar A+ location, unobstructed San Francisco views and a deep level yard with exquisite architectural design by EAG Studio and Design 1618. This spacious 3 level 2 unit home was designed to allow natural light to flow through every corner. The second level consists of four bedrooms (three ensuite) shared between the two residences and four bathrooms as well as a comfortable lounge. The upper level of the residence features a large primary suite with walk in closet and well-appointed primary as well a great room with an expansive chef's kitchen, with large pantry, dining room and full width living room with immediate access to a view terrace with commanding views of downtown San Francisco. The home features European oak stairway and floors and well-lit living spaces including a grand 11+/- foot entertainment room witl floor to ceiling windows and doors opening to a custom patio and large yard with lush plantings as a backdrop as well as a mature tree canopy for shade and privacy. 3 car parking with interior access, package delivery closet, air conditioning (upper level) and outdoor kitchens on roof terrace and the rear yard complete this unique & special offering **Show less**

SEE “PROPERTY TYPE” ABOVE.

THIS IS LISTED ON THE INTERNET AS “SINGLE FAMILY”. NOT A “MULTI-UNIT” PROPERTY TYPE OR AS A “FLATS” AS LISTED ON SFPIM.

ADDITIONALLY IT HAS BEEN ON (AND OFF) THE MARKET FOR MANY MONTHS.

NO DATE LISTED WHEN CFC WAS ISSUED PER SFPIM.

Assessed Values		**Construction Type**	Wood or steel frame
Land	$1,879,428.00	**Use Type**	Flats & Duplex
Structure	$1,005,468.00	**Units**	2
Fixtures	-	**Stories**	2
Personal Property	-	**Rooms**	10
Last Sale	10/11/2018	**Bedrooms**	6
Last Sale Price	$2,455,000.00	**Bathrooms**	2
Year Built	1916	**Basement**	650 sq ft
Building Area	3,250 sq ft		
Parcel Area	2,874 sq ft	**Parcel Shape**	-
Parcel Frontage	-	**Parcel Depth**	-



FROM SF PIM. ASSESSOR'S INFO HAS USE TYPE AS "FLATS & DUPLEX"

SANBORN MAP SHOWS ROW OF FLATS INCLUDING SUBJECT OF THIS PDF (Second from Left).

Six pairs of "2 Flats" or "2-F"

ORIGINAL FRONT DOORS

AND

DESCRIPTION FROM WEB AD FROM 2018 SALE.

PURCHASED BY A LIMITED PARTNERSHIP

About this home

Attractive Edwardian duplex on a quiet, residential street in the Castro sector of the Duboce Triangle. This home is only a few blocks from MUNI, a wide variety of shops and restaurants, famous Castro Theater, and lovely, local area parks. Excellent opportunity with this charming two-family home. Each unit features a large living room with fireplace, formal dining room with original wainscot paneling, kitchen with adjacent pantry, two bedrooms with sizable closets, and split baths. Also featured are original, solid oak floors and charming crown and baseboard molding. Additionally, panoramic views, large backyard, tandem garage parking (2 to 3 cars) with automatic overhead door, and two sizable storerooms. Walk Score = 94; Transit Score = 97. This sale is subject to Confirmation by the Superior Court pursuant to the California Probate Code. No offers will be considered without signed disclosures available from listing broker. Offers are due no later than June 27, 2018 at 5pm.

This example is located in the Family and Senior Housing SUD.

And the CNLR SUD.

The original Flats comply with these SUDs.

The current project for sale does not comply.


Jan 2018
See latest date


P.C.
2 Flats
2 Flats
2 Flats
2-F
2-F
2-F
2B
H.B

EXAMPLE: ELIGIBLE DISTRICT CONTRIBUTOR

- 3321-3323 Scott Street (c.1923)
  - Example of Barrel-Front flat building unique to San Francisco and common in neighborhoods like the Marina
  - Relatively unaltered/high level of integrity
  - Potentially eligible under Criterion A/1 (Events) and C/3 (Architecture) as part of an intact row of 6 Barrel-Front flats



FLATS AND SMALL APARTMENT BUILDINGS (1915-1978) HISTORIC CONTEXT STATEMENT

Goals:

- Identify essential historic features to protect
- Provide property owners, tenants, and planners information about historic designs, materials, and finishes to facilitate appropriate rehabilitation
- Provide greater transparency and consistency of property evaluations through SF Survey