File No. 250966 **Committee Item No.** 5
Board Item No. 36

COMMITTEE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

Committee: Land Use and Transportation **Date:** Dec. 1, 2025
Board of Supervisors Meeting: **Date:** Dec. 2, 2025

Cmte Board

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

OTHER

☒	☐	LUT Committee Meeting Minutes – October 20, November 3 and November 17, 2025
☒	☐	Planning Presentation – November 17, 2025
☒	☐	Planning Presentation – October 20, 2025
☒	☐	CEQA Analysis of Amended Ordinances – Nov. 3 and 17, 2025
☒	☐	PLN Affordable Housing Sites Analysis – October 16, 2025
☒	☐	PC Transmittal Package – September 22, 2025
☒	☐	PC Reso No. 21784 – July 17, 2025
☒	☐	FEIR Transmittal – October 16, 2025
☒	☐	CEQA Determination – October 16, 2025
☒	☐	D1 Supervisor's Memos – October 20 and November 17, 2025
☒	☐	Hearing Notice – October 3, 2025
☒	☐	Notice of Availability – LCPA – September 3, 2025
☒	☐	Committee Report Request Memo – November 24, 2025

Prepared by: John Carroll **Date:** Nov. 26, 2025
Prepared by: **Date:**
Prepared by: **Date:**

[General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan]

Ordinance amending the General Plan to revise the Urban Design Element, Commerce and Industry Element, Transportation Element, Balboa Park Station Area Plan, Glen Park Community Plan, Market and Octavia Area Plan, Northeastern Waterfront Plan, Van Ness Avenue Area Plan, Western SoMa (South of Market) Area Plan, Western Shoreline Area Plan, Downtown Area Plan, and Land Use Index, to implement the Family Housing Zoning Program, including the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program, by adjusting guidelines regarding building heights, density, design, and other matters; amending the City's Local Coastal Program to implement the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program and other associated changes in the City's Coastal Zone, and directing the Planning Director to transmit the Ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and adopting findings of public necessity, convenience, and welfare under Planning Code, Section 340.

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 Housing Element 2022 Update (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 No. 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, mitigation measures, and project alternatives, as well as a statement of overriding considerations (CEQA Findings), and adopted a mitigation monitoring and 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 010-23, the Board of Supervisors adopted the 2022 Housing Element. That ordinance confirmed the certification of the Housing Element EIR and made certain environmental findings, including adoption of the MMRP and a Statement of Overriding Considerations.

(e) On September 3, 2025, the Planning Department published an addendum to the Housing Element EIR, which concluded that no supplemental or subsequent environmental review is required for the Family Housing Rezoning Program, which includes Planning Code and Zoning Map amendments, as well as these General Plan Amendments, 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. The Addendum is on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. 250966.

(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.

(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) Under Charter Section 4.105 and Planning Code Section 340, any amendments to the General Plan shall first be considered by the Planning Commission and thereafter recommended for approval or rejection by the Board of Supervisors.

(i) After a duly noticed public hearing on July 17, 2025, in Resolution No. 21784, the Planning Commission initiated amendments to the General Plan. A copy of Planning Commission Resolution No. 21784 is on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. 250966 and is incorporated herein by reference.

(j) On September 11, 2025, the Planning Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing on the General Plan Amendments pursuant to Planning Code Section 340, and, by Resolution No. 21808, found both that the actions contemplated in this ordinance are consistent, on balance, with the City's General Plan and the eight priority policies of Planning Code Section 101.1, and that the public necessity, convenience, and general welfare require the proposed General Plan Amendments. The Planning Commission adopted the General Plan Amendments and recommended them for approval to the Board of Supervisors. The Board adopts the findings in Planning Commission Resolution No. 21808 as its own. A copy of Planning Commission Resolution No. 21808 is on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. 250966 and is incorporated herein by reference.

(k) The Board of Supervisors finds that the General Plan amendments in this ordinance (specifically, the amendments to the Western Shoreline Area Plan) constitute amendments to the certified Land Use Plan of the City’s Local Coastal Program (LCP). The Board of Supervisors finds that the LCP amendments meet the requirements of, and are in conformity with, the policies of Chapter 3 of the Coastal Act (California Public Resources

Code Section 30200 et seq.). The Board further finds that the LCP amendments will be implemented in full conformance with the Coastal Act's provisions, and acknowledges that the amendments to the Western Shoreline Area Plan are consistent with San Francisco's Housing Element's housing goals.

(l) 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 Section 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.

Section 2. Additional Findings.

(a) Under State law, every city and county must have a general plan, and each general plan must include a housing element. State law requires that a housing element identify and analyze the jurisdiction's existing and projected housing needs, include a statement of goals, policies and objectives for the preservation, improvement, and development of housing, and identify adequate sites for housing for all economic segments of the community. (California Government Code Section 65583.) The City adopted the 2022 Housing Element on January 31, 2023.

(b) A jurisdiction's existing and projected housing needs is known as its Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA). If a jurisdiction does not have sufficient sites to accommodate its RHNA, it must adopt zoning changes, generally within three years of housing element adoption. San Francisco's RHNA is approximately 82,000 units, and because the City does not have sufficient capacity to accommodate its RHNA, it must rezone sufficient sites to allow for additional units by January 31, 2026. State Housing Element law

also mandates that jurisdictions affirmatively further fair housing, in part by providing housing opportunities in “well-resourced areas,” a state law designation that takes into consideration access to amenities such as good schools, jobs, transportation, and open space, and lower rates of poverty.

(c) This ordinance amends various elements and area plans in the San Francisco General Plan, consistent with the 2022 Housing Element. This ordinance is part of a package of ordinances that will implement the Family Zoning Plan. The Family Zoning Plan includes this ordinance amending the General Plan, as well as a Planning Code and Business and Tax Regulations Code amendment (found in Board File 250701) and a Zoning Map amendment (found in Board File 250700). Together, the three ordinances implement goals found in the 2022 Housing Element to accommodate the City’s RHNA. The ordinances satisfy the City’s obligation to rezone and address the RHNA shortfall of 36,200 housing units.

(d) Among other aspects, the ordinances: (1) create the Housing Choice-San Francisco program, which includes a local residential bonus program and a Housing Sustainability District; (2) amends to San Francisco’s height and bulk requirements in well-resourced areas, primarily by increasing heights along certain corridors to allow for mid-rise development (65 feet, or six to eight stories); (3) removes density limits and institutes form-based density in residential areas surrounding major transit and commercial streets; and (4) makes various other changes to the Planning Code to concentrate new housing on major transit routes, commercial streets, and other hubs of activity in the City’s well-resourced neighborhoods.

Section 3. The General Plan is hereby amended by revising the Urban Design Element, to read as follows:

(a) Map 4, “Urban Design Guidelines for Height of Buildings” is hereby removed and replaced with the map entitled “Urban Design Guidelines for Height of Buildings” on file with the Clerk of the Board in File No. 250966.

(b) Map 5, “Urban Design Guidelines for Bulk of Buildings” is hereby removed from the Urban Design Element.

(c) The Urban Design Element is further revised, to read as follows:

Urban Design Element

* * * *

City Pattern

* * * *

OBJECTIVE 1

EMPHASIS OF THE CHARACTERISTIC PATTERN WHICH GIVES TO THE CITY AND ITS NEIGHBORHOODS AN IMAGE, A SENSE OF PURPOSE, AND A MEANS OF ORIENTATION.

* * * *

Principles for City Pattern

These fundamental principles and their illustrations reflect the needs and characteristics with which this plan is concerned, and describe measurable and critical urban design relationships in the city pattern.

* * * *		
2.	Street layouts and building forms which do not emphasize topography reduce the clarity of the city form and image.	* * * *

	A: Tall, slender buildings at the tops of hills and low*er* buildings on the slopes and in valleys accentuate the form of the hills. B: Contour streets on hills align buildings to create a pattern of strong horizontal bands that conflict with the hill form.	
* * * *		

Image and Character

POLICY 1.1

Recognize and protect major views in the city, with particular attention to those of open space and water.

Views contribute immeasurably to the quality of the city and to the lives of its residents. ~~*Protection*~~ *Special consideration* should be given to major views whenever it is feasible, with special attention to the characteristic views of open space and water that reflect the natural setting of the city and give a colorful and refreshing contrast to man's development.

Overlooks and other viewpoints for appreciation of the city and its environs should be protected and supplemented, by limitation of buildings and other obstructions where necessary and by establishment of new viewpoints at key locations.

Visibility of open spaces, especially those on hilltops, should be maintained and improved, in order to enhance the overall form of the city, contribute to the distinctiveness of districts and permit easy identification of recreational resources. The landscaping at such locations also provides a pleasant focus for views along streets.

* * * *

Conservation

* * * *

OBJECTIVE 2

CONSERVATION OF RESOURCES WHICH PROVIDE A SENSE OF NATURE, CONTINUITY WITH THE PAST, AND FREEDOM FROM OVERCROWDING.

If San Francisco is to retain its charm and human proportion, certain irreplaceable resources must not be lost or diminished. Natural areas must be kept undeveloped for the enjoyment of future generations. ~~*Past development, as represented both by distinctive buildings and by areas of established character, must be preserved.*~~ *Special care should be taken to recognize, express and, in some cases, maintain, the distinctive character of individual neighborhoods, as well as notable buildings, recognizing that accommodating new buildings that are taller or denser than adjacent existing buildings is necessary to meet the evolving needs of the city and its population.* Street space must be retained as valuable public open space in the tight-knit fabric of the city.

* * * *

Richness of Past Development

* * * *

POLICY 2.7

Recognize and protect outstanding and unique areas that contribute in an extraordinary degree to San Francisco's visual form and character.

* * * *

These areas do not have buildings of uniform age and distinction, or individual features that can be readily singled out for preservation. It is the combination and eloquent interplay of buildings, landscaping, topography and other attributes that makes them outstanding. ~~*For that reason, special review of building proposals may be required to assure consistency with the basic character and scale of the area.*~~ Furthermore, the participation of neighborhood associations in these areas in a cooperative effort to maintain the established character, beyond the scope of public regulation, is essential to the long-term image of the areas and the city.

* * * *

Major New Development

* * * *

OBJECTIVE 3

MODERATION OF MAJOR NEW DEVELOPMENT TO COMPLEMENT THE CITY PATTERN, THE RESOURCES TO BE CONSERVED, AND THE NEIGHBORHOOD ENVIRONMENT.

* * * *

Visual Harmony

POLICY 3.1

Promote harmony in the visual relationships and transitions between new and older buildings.

New buildings should be made sympathetic to the scale, form and proportion of older development. This can often be done by repeating existing building lines and surface treatment. Where new buildings reach exceptional height and bulk, large surfaces should be articulated and textured to reduce their apparent size and to reflect the pattern of older buildings.

Although contrasts and juxtapositions at the edges of districts of different scale are sometimes pleasing, the transitions between such districts should generally be gradual in order to make the city's larger pattern visible and avoid overwhelming of the district of smaller scale. In transitions between districts and between properties, especially in areas of high intensity, the lower portions of buildings should be designed to promote easy circulation, good access to transit, good relationships among open spaces and maximum penetration of sunlight to the ground level.

In new, high-density residential areas ~~*near*~~*outside of the* downtown *core* where towers are being contemplated as part of comprehensive neighborhood planning efforts, ~~*such as Transbay and Rincon Hill,*~~ such towers should be slender and widely spaced among buildings of lesser height to allow ample sunlight, sky exposure and views to streets and public spaces. It is thus to be expected that some tall buildings will be located adjacent to buildings of significantly lower height. This, does not in itself, create disharmony or poor transitions, but is in fact necessary in order to achieve important neighborhood-wide livability goals. Because these areas are ~~*on the edges*~~ *outside* of the downtown *core*, stricter standards than exist in the downtown core for tower bulk and spacing should be established to minimize the bulk of towers and set minimum tower spacing. It is especially important that towers have active ground floors and that lower stories are highly articulated *at and below the podium height* and engage the pedestrian realm, with multiple building entrances, townhouses, retail, and neighborhood services. (See Map 4.)

* * * *

Height and Bulk

* * * *

POLICY 3.5

Relate the height of buildings to important attributes of the city pattern and to the height and expression of existing development.

The height of new buildings should take into account the guidelines expressed in this Plan. These guidelines are intended to promote the objectives, principles and policies of the Plan, and especially to complement the established city pattern. They weigh and apply many factors affecting building height, recognizing the special nature of each topographic and development situation.

MAP 4 - Urban Design Guidelines for Height of Buildings

Tall, slender buildings should occur on many of the city's hilltops to emphasize the hill form and safeguard views, while buildings of smaller scale should occur at the base of hills and in the valleys between hills. In other cases, especially where the hills are capped by open spaces and where existing hilltop development is low and small-scaled, new buildings should remain low in order to conserve the natural shape of the hill and maintain views to and from the open space. Views along streets and from major roadways should be protected. The heights of buildings should taper down to the shoreline of the Bay and Ocean, following the characteristic pattern and preserving topography and views.

Tall buildings should be clustered downtown and at other centers of activity to promote the efficiency of commerce, to mark important transit facilities and access points and to avoid unnecessary encroachment upon other areas of the city. Such buildings should also occur at points of high accessibility, such as rapid transit stations in larger commercial areas and in areas that are within walking distance of the downtown's major centers of employment. In these areas, building height should taper down toward the edges to provide gradual transitions to other areas.

In areas of growth where tall buildings are considered through comprehensive planning efforts, such tall buildings should be grouped and sculpted to form discrete skyline forms that do not muddle the clarity and identity of the city's characteristic hills and skyline. Where multiple tall buildings are contemplated in areas of flat topography near other strong skyline forms, such as on the southern edge of the downtown "mound," they should be adequately spaced and slender to ensure that they are set apart from the overall physical form of the downtown and allow some views of the city, hills, the Bay Bridge, and other elements to permeate through the district.

The city's downtown skyline should be crafted to resemble a distinct and elegant hill form with the tallest and most prominent building rising as it's "crown." As the geographic

epicenter of downtown, as well as the front door of the Transbay Transit Center, the "Transit Tower" should be the tallest building in the city's skyline. The Transit Tower represents the City's commitment to focusing growth around a sustainable transportation hub, as well as the apex of the downtown skyline. The Transit Center District Sub-Area Plan contains specific details related to urban form and design for this area.

The prevailing height limits for the "fabric" of most residential neighborhoods in the City should generally range from four to six stories dependent on location. Parcels lining commercial and transit corridors and in denser mixed-use areas should generally be permitted at a minimum of six to eight stories. Parcels with certain conditions may warrant buildings at the higher ends of these ranges, such as wider streets, proximity to more significant transit infrastructure, being located on a corner, being larger than standard sized parcels, or other conditions. Buildings taller than eight stories should be considered ~~*In residential and smaller commercial areas, tall buildings should occur*~~ along *segments of certain major* transit corridors*, the intersection of major corridors,* and closest to major centers of employment and community services which themselves produce significant building height, and at locations where more height will encourage social and commercial activity and achieve visual interest consistent with other neighborhood considerations. At outlying and other prominent locations, the point tower form (slender in shape with a high ratio of height to width) should be used in order to avoid interruption of views, casting of extensive shadows or other negative effects. In all cases, the height and expression of existing development should be considered.

The guidelines in this Plan express ranges of height that are to be used as an urban design evaluation for the future establishment of specific height limits affecting both public and private buildings. For any given location, urban design considerations indicate the appropriateness of a height coming within the range indicated. The guidelines are not height limits, and do not have the direct effect of regulating construction in the city.

POLICY 3.6

Relate the bulk of buildings to the prevailing scale of development to avoid an overwhelming or dominating appearance in new construction.

* * * *

~~***MAP 5 - Urban Design Guidelines for Bulk of Buildings***~~

* * * *

Section 4. The General Plan is hereby amended by revising the Commerce and Industry Element, to read as follows:

* * * *

Neighborhood Commerce

OBJECTIVE 6

MAINTAIN AND STRENGTHEN VIABLE NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL AREAS EASILY ACCESSIBLE TO CITY RESIDENTS.

* * * *

POLICY 6.7

Promote high quality urban design on commercial streets.

Most of San Francisco's neighborhood commercial districts were developed concurrently with residential development and have physical forms which relate to the needs and tastes prevalent during the first half of this century. During this period, commercial units were built along streetcar lines and at major street intersections, often with residential flats on the upper floors, thus creating the familiar "linear" or "strip" commercial districts.

The small lot pattern prevalent at that time also encouraged the development of small buildings and stores. The resulting scale has come to characterize San Francisco's attractive

and active neighborhood commercial districts. The ~~*small-scale*~~ *intricate* character should be maintained through the regulation of the size of new buildings and commercial uses.

Continuous commercial frontage at the street level is especially important in all but the lowest intensity commercial districts with limited market areas. It prevents the fragmentation and isolation of fringe areas, improves pedestrian accessibility, and enhances the physical and aesthetic cohesiveness of the district. The design of new buildings should harmonize with the scale and orientation of existing buildings. Additionally, a correspondence of building setbacks, proportions, and texture helps establish visual coherence between new development and existing structures on a commercial street.

The appeal and vitality of a neighborhood commercial district depends largely on the character, amenities, and visual quality of its streets. The main function of neighborhood commercial streets is to provide retail goods and services in a safe, comfortable, and attractive pedestrian environment.

* * * *

Urban Design Guidelines

* * * *

Scale, Height and Bulk

- In most cases, small lots with narrow building fronts should be maintained in districts with this traditional pattern.
- When new buildings are constructed on large lots, the facades should be designed in a series of elements which are compatible with the existing scale of the district.
- The height of a proposed development should ~~*relate*~~ *be considered relative* to the ~~*individual neighborhood character and the height and*~~ scale of ~~*adjacent buildings*~~ *the neighborhood. Design strategies should be employed to break down*

the scale of new larger structures, including building massing and articulation strategies, to avoid an overwhelming or dominating appearance of new structures. ~~*On a street of varied building heights, transitions between high and low buildings should be provided. While three-and four-story buildings are appropriate in many locations, two-story buildings are more appropriate in some areas with lower-scale development.*~~

- The height and bulk of new development should be designed to maximize sun access to nearby residential open space, parks, plazas, and major pedestrian corridors.

* * * *

Section 5. The General Plan is hereby amended by revising the Transportation Element, to read as follows:

Transportation Element

* * * *

OBJECTIVES & POLICIES

* * * *

Citywide Parking

* * * *

OBJECTIVE 36

RELATE THE AMOUNT OF PARKING IN RESIDENTIAL AREAS AND NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICTS TO THE CAPACITY OF THE CITY'S STREET SYSTEM AND LAND USE PATTERNS.

* * * *

POLICY 36.3

~~***Permit minimal or reduced off-street parking supply for new buildings in residential and commercial areas adjacent to transit centers and along transit preferential streets.***~~

~~*Where there is a high concentration of transit service, as in the northeastern portions of the city, census tract figures indicate that residents are less likely to own automobiles and more likely to use public transit. High-density housing and housing for the elderly are already eligible for reductions in the standard provisions for off-street parking, enabling the building sponsors to build more economically. These buildings should be encouraged where transit service is plentiful and comprehensive.*~~

Set maximum parking limits for off-street parking in new buildings commensurate with the level of public transit access and in consideration of the land use density and mix of uses.

In order to facilitate an appropriate density of housing, commercial activity, and other uses, to encourage travel by modes other than single-occupant automobiles, and to reduce the cost of building new housing and other uses, San Francisco does not have minimum off-street automobile parking requirements for any uses citywide, and sets maximum limits for new development, generally expressed as a maximum ratio of parking spaces per unit or square footage of non-residential use. Lower maximum limits should be set for areas in close proximity to high frequency and high capacity transit, such as local (e.g. Muni Metro) and regional (e.g. BART, Caltrain) rail stations and high quality rapid bus services, such as bus rapid transit. Higher density and mixed use areas with better transit service, such as areas crossed by multiple bus lines, should also be considered for lower parking limits. Maintaining these parking maximums is critical to reducing the cost of housing, controlling traffic congestion, limiting environmental impacts of vehicular travel (e.g. greenhouse gas emissions), and improving street safety for pedestrians and other vulnerable road users, and maximizing efficient use of major public investment in transit infrastructure and services by encouraging transit ridership.

* * * *

Section 6. The General Plan is hereby amended by revising the Balboa Park Station Area Plan, to read as follows:

(a) The map, "Height Districts" is hereby removed from the Balboa Park Station Area Plan.

(b) The Balboa Park Station Area Plan is further revised, to read as follows:

Balboa Park Station Area Plan

* * * *

4. HOUSING

* * * *

OBJECTIVE 4.2

STRENGTHEN THE OCEAN AVENUE NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT BY PROVIDING AN APPROPRIATE MIX OF HOUSING.

* * * *

POLICY 4.2.1

Encourage mixed-use commercial and residential infill within the commercial district while maintaining the district's existing fine-grained character.

Over time there will be opportunities to replace some existing structures in the commercial district. Infill on these parcels with mixed-use developments ~~*containing up to three floors of housing,*~~ and retail space on the ground floor should be encouraged. ~~*To retain the district's fine-grained character, consolidation or mergers of more than one parcel should be prohibited. An exception to this rule should be made for mergers where a corner parcel would be consolidated with one adjacent parcel. These mergers would allow slightly larger structures to be developed on corners, which would allow more housing units to be developed with access to parking from the side street.*~~ *The size, scale, and design of new developments should consider and incorporate the district's fine-grained character.*

* * * *

6. BUILT FORM

* * * *

Balboa Park Station Area Plan

Urban Design Principles

* * * *

(1) **Massing and Articulation**

* * * *

- ~~*Significant parcel consolidation is prohibited on Ocean Avenue to preserve the fine-grained scale of the neighborhood. No parcel consolidation will be permitted that increases the frontage width on Ocean Avenue between Manor and Delano. The neighborhood is built on a traditional fabric of lots that are narrow and deep, which provides for an enriching block face, diversity of buildings, and stimulating pedestrian experience. Exceptions may be allowed where such merger would create corner parcels, such that off street parking can be accessed from a side street.*~~
- ~~*All buildings of 85 feet in height or lower must have a maximum horizontal plan dimension of 110 feet, with a maximum diagonal of 125 feet.*~~ The form of new buildings must consider the proportions and massing of other residential and street-front commercial buildings found throughout San Francisco, which are typically based on 25-foot wide building increments for row houses and neighborhood retail frontages, and that generally do not exceed 75 feet in width for larger apartment or office buildings. Efforts should be made to integrate the building into the overall scale of the streetwall. Many of the development parcels in the plan area are wider than the traditional 25-foot lot pattern, and care must be taken to create a fine-grained human scale. Individual buildings should maintain an expression of

architectural unity, even for larger buildings~~*, within the 110 foot maximum dimension*~~. There must be a qualitatively different expression of buildings between adjacent structures.

These modulation and articulation increments are based on the walking speed of the average person and the need to experience diversity in the street front every ten to twenty paces.

* * * *

~~***MAP - Height Districts***~~

* * * *

Section 7. The General Plan is hereby amended by revising the Glen Park Community Plan, to read as follows:

(a) Map 3, "Existing and Proposed Heights" is hereby removed from the Glen Park Community Plan.

(b) The Glen Park Community Plan is further revised, to read as follows:

Glen Park Community Plan

* * * *

Land Use & Urban Design

* * * *

OBJECTIVE 1

PROTECT AND STRENGTHEN THE QUALITIES THAT MAKE DOWNTOWN GLEN PARK SPECIAL

* * * *

POLICY 1.5

In the ~~*more sensitive*~~ interior of Glen Park village, building*s* ~~*heights*~~ should ~~*be reduced to respond to the prevailing pattern found there*~~ *reinforce the existing character of the neighborhood*.

The interior of Glen Park village is characterized by ~~*two and three-story*~~ *smaller* buildings. This fine-grained pattern helps create an intimacy and a comfortable pedestrian environment. ~~*A revision to the area's height district that reduces the maximum height of new construction on certain blocks should be carried out to reflect the established pattern.*~~

* * * *

Heights



~~*MAP 3 - Existing and Proposed Heights*~~

~~*EXISTING HEIGHTS*~~

~~*Currently, all of Glen Park and its surrounding area are located within a 40' height district. This typically allows up to four stories of development.*~~

~~*PROPOSED HEIGHTS*~~

~~*The fine-grained interior of Glen Park village is characterized by two and three-story buildings. These help create a comfortable pedestrian environment and define the street.*~~

~~*The Plan proposes reducing the maximum height of new development within the interior of the "village" from 40' to 30' in acknowledgement of the existing pattern.*~~

~~*Taller storefronts are also encouraged. A five foot height bonus is allowed for active ground floor uses within the Glen Park NCT District. This would permit maximum building heights of 35' and 45' depending on location (see Map above).*~~

OBJECTIVE 2

ENSURE THE COMPATIBILITY OF NEW DEVELOPMENT WITH THE FORM AND CHARACTER OF GLEN PARK

* * * *

POLICY 2.4

Design of new buildings should be consistent with the neighborhood's existing pattern.

New buildings or major renovations should reinforce the character of Glen Park by creating attractive, pedestrian-friendly places to live, visit and shop. Infill development should follow existing design guidelines and be consistent with the intent and policies of the Plan particularly in relation to scale, height, bulk, materials and details.

~~*The height of p*~~Proposed development should relate to neighborhood character. Setbacks of facades may be appropriate to avoid an overwhelming appearance of new structures. Human-scaled buildings should be designed to be built close to the sidewalk, have active ground floors, use high-quality materials, and contain interesting features. Long blank monotonous walls or highly visible parking entrances should be avoided.

* * * *

Implementation Program

* * * *

Project	Action	Key Agency	Timeframe	Potential Funding Source
LAND USE & URBAN DESIGN				
Revised Neighborhood Commercial Zoning	Update Planning Code to reflect zoning change of existing neighborhood commercial district (NC-2) to Glen Park Neighborhood Commercial Transit (NCT) district	Planning	Upon Plan adoption	Planning Department
~~*Height District Revisions*~~	~~*Reduce maximum building heights for new construction on portions of Diamond, Wilder and Chenery Streets from 40-X to 35-X. Allow additional 5' height (45-X) on portions of Bosworth, Diamond, Joost Ave and Monterey Blvd for taller ground floor storefronts*~~	~~*Planning*~~	~~*Upon Plan adoption*~~	~~*Planning Department*~~
Streetscape Improvements	Develop streetscape strategy for core village area to include some or all of the following benches, new bus shelters, newsrack consolidation, bulbouts, possible sidewalk widening, utility undergrounding and street tree planting.	Planning, BART, SFMTA, DPW	Ongoing	Grants
* * * *				

* * * *

Section 8. The General Plan is hereby amended by revising the NorthEastern Waterfront Area Plan, to read as follows:

(a) Map 2, "Height and Bulk Plan" is hereby removed from the Northeast Waterfront Area Plan.

(b) The NorthEastern Waterfront Area Plan is further revised, to read as follows:

NorthEastern Waterfront Area Plan

* * * *

Urban Design

OBJECTIVE 10

TO DEVELOP THE FULL POTENTIAL OF THE NORTHEASTERN WATERFRONT IN ACCORD WITH THE UNIQUE OPPORTUNITIES PRESENTED BY ITS RELATION TO THE BAY, TO THE OPERATING PORT, FISHING INDUSTRY, AND DOWNTOWN; AND TO ENHANCE ITS UNIQUE AESTHETIC QUALITIES OFFERED BY WATER, TOPOGRAPHY, VIEWS OF THE CITY AND BAY, AND ITS HISTORIC MARITIME CHARACTER.

~~MAP 2 - Height and Bulk Plan~~

POLICY 10.1

Preserve the physical form of the waterfront and reinforce San Francisco's distinctive hill form by maintaining low*er* structures near the water, with an increase in vertical development near hills or the downtown core area. Promote preservation and historic rehabilitation of finger piers, bulkhead buildings, and structures in the Embarcadero National Register Historic District. Larger buildings and structures with civic importance may be appropriate at important locations.

* * * *

Specific Policies for Buildings

POLICY 10.25

~~Restrict development south of Broadway to the Height and Bulk Districts shown on Map 2.~~*[Reserved]*

* * * *

Ferry Building Subarea

* * * *

OBJECTIVE 26

TO FURTHER DEVELOP THE FERRY BUILDING AND DOWNTOWN FERRY TERMINAL AREA AS A MAJOR TRANSIT CENTER, IMPROVING AND EXPANDING TRANSIT ACCESS BY, AND TRANSFERS AMONG, LANDSIDE AND WATERSIDE TRANSIT SYSTEMS.

* * * *

POLICY 26.23

~~***Change the Height and Bulk District on Block 3743 from 84-E to 40-X. Change the Height and Bulk District on the rest of the Rincon Park Site to open space.***~~ *[Reserved]*

* * * *

Section 9. The General Plan is hereby amended by revising the Van Ness Avenue Area Plan, to read as follows:

(a) For Map 1, "Generalized Land Use and Density Plan":

(1) At the bottom of Map 1 under the map title, revise the language in parentheses, to read as follows: "(FAR applies to ~~*residential and*~~ nonresidential uses)";

(2) For the area north of Broadway and South of Bay Street in Map 1, revise the language below "Residential Ground Floor Retail", to read as follows: "1 Non Residential FAR ~~*1 Unit/400 Sq. Ft.*~~";

(3) For the area south of Broadway and north of California Street in Map 1, revise the language below "Mixed Use", to read as follows: "~~*Residential,*~~ Nonresidential 4.5:1 FAR"; and

(4) For the area south of California Street and north of Redwood Street in Map 1, revise the language below "Mixed Use", to read as follows: "~~*Residential,*~~ Nonresidential 7.1:1 FAR".

(b) Map 2, “Height and Bulk Districts” is hereby removed from the Van Ness Avenue Area Plan.

(c) The Van Ness Avenue Area Plan is further revised, to read as follows:

Van Ness Avenue Area Plan

* * * *

Land Use

* * * *

OBJECTIVE 1

~~***CONTINUE EXISTING OF THE AVENUE AND***~~ **ADD A SIGNIFICANT INCREMENT OF NEW HOUSING.**

~~*Although there are 18 buildings containing 980 dwelling units in this subarea most of the buildings are in non-residential use.*~~

This section of Van Ness Avenue is one of the few areas in the city where new housing can be accommodated with minimal impacts on existing residential neighborhoods and public services.

Some of the features that make the area attractive for medium density mixed use development with high density housing are as follows:

This 16 block strip along Van Ness Avenue maintains a "central place" location and identity. The area is close to the city’s major employment center, is well-served by transit, has well developed infrastructure (roadway, water, sewer and other public services), wide roadway (93+ feet) and sidewalks (16+ feet), has continuous commercial frontage and numerous attractive, architecturally outstanding buildings.

There are a number of large parcels which are substantially under-developed.

~~*A height limitation of between 80 and 130 ft. would allow sufficient development to make feasible over time the construction of housing on under used parcels.*~~

The minor streets which bisect most of the blocks within this subarea facilitate access to and from new developments with minimal ~~*affects*~~ *effects* on major east-west thoroughfares or on Van Ness Avenue.

Development of a number of medium density, mixed-use projects with continued non-residential use of non-residential buildings would facilitate the transformation of Van Ness Avenue into an attractive mixed use boulevard.

A high-density medical center at the transit nexus of Van Ness Avenue and Geary would support Van Ness Avenue's redevelopment as a mixed use boulevard as set forth in Policy 1.6 below.

* * * *

POLICY 1.4

Maximize the number of housing units.

An overall mix of unit sizes on Van Ness Avenue is desirable to encourage a diverse and mixed range of occupants. ~~*However, the emphasis should be on a larger number of medium sized units (1 and 2 bedroom) rather than a smaller number of large size units because Van Ness Avenue is not anticipated to be a preferred area for family housing.*~~ It is ~~*therefore*~~ more desirable to achieve greater affordability for ~~*the*~~ smaller units by building at a high density. Construction of rental housing is encouraged.

* * * *

Urban Design

OBJECTIVE 5

ENCOURAGE DEVELOPMENT WHICH REINFORCES TOPOGRAPHY AND URBAN PATTERN, AND DEFINES AND GIVES VARIETY TO THE AVENUE.

* * * *

POLICY 5.1

Establish height controls to: emphasize topography *and key transit nodes,* ~~and~~ adequately frame the great width of the Avenue, and support the redevelopment of the Avenue as a diverse, mixed use boulevard and transit corridor.

~~*Existing height limits on the Avenue generally range from 40 feet at the northern end to 130 feet in the central portion. This h*~~*H*eight differentiation responds to topographic conditions as well as land use *and transportation* patterns, maintaining distinctions between areas of different character. For example, height districts are gradually tapered from ~~*130 feet*~~ *the tallest allowable height* around ~~*the hilltop at Washington Street*~~*Geary Boulevard* to ~~*80 feet at Pacific Avenue and further to 65 and 40 feet*~~ *the lowest allowable height* towards the Bay shoreline.

~~*Although the majority of existing height controls are adequate to define both the overall topography as well as the great width of the Avenue, the height limit between California and Pacific Streets should be lowered from the existing 130/105-ft. level to 80 ft. in order to facilitate the transition between the greater building heights along the southern part of the Avenue and the mostly low-rise residential development north of Broadway.*~~ Development to maximum height should be closely monitored to avoid blocking views between the high slopes on both sides of the Avenue. Good proportion between the size of a street and that of its buildings is important for streets to be interesting and pleasant places. ~~*The proposed height limits, combined with the Van Ness Plan's proposed bulk controls, encourage definition of the 93-foot wide Avenue.*~~

~~*The height limit for the block bounded by Geary Boulevard, Franklin Street, Post Street and Van Ness Avenue is established at 230 feet as indicated on Map 2 to accommodate development of a medical center that will maximize use of the major transit nexus at this location and give variety to the avenue by diversifying the mix of non-residential uses and enhancing the streetscape.*~~

POLICY 5.2

Encourage a regular street wall and harmonious building forms along the Avenue.

New development should create a coherent street wall along the Avenue through property line development at approximately the same height. Since block face widths are constant, a regularized street wall encourages buildings of similar scale and massing. Nevertheless, some variety of height is inevitable and desirable due to the need to highlight buildings of historical and architectural significance and meet other Objectives of the Plan.

~~*The following controls are proposed for the various bulk districts as shown on the accompanying map:*~~

~~***MAP 2 - Height and Bulk Districts***~~

~~***Setbacks***~~***Streetwall***

POLICY 5.3

Continue the street wall heights as defined by existing significant buildings and promote an adequate enclosure of the Avenue.

New construction on Van Ness Avenue can occur in two basic situations. In some cases, the development will take place between or adjacent to architecturally significant buildings. In this instance, ~~*continuity of design and scale between the old and the new*~~ *respect for the existing context* is of major importance. In other cases, new development will take place in a more isolated design context; for example, between two existing two-story, non-descript commercial structures. In this instance, the overall continuity of scale along the Avenue is of greater importance than the design character of adjacent buildings. ~~*Setbacks of up to 20 feet in depth should be considered for all new development above 40 feet in height and should be required whenever necessary to continue existing significant street wall heights and to define an adequate enclosure of the Avenue. Setbacks can also serve to buffer the upper-level residential units from street-level noise.*~~

POLICY 5.4

~~***Preserve existing view corridors.***~~

~~*In addition to the setback along the Van Ness Avenue frontage, a setback approximately fifteen feet deep should be provided at an appropriate height along California, Pine, Sacramento, Clay and Washington Streets when necessary to preserve view corridors. The recommended setbacks on the east-west streets could be varied on a case-by-case basis, through the Conditional Use review process, as individual buildings undertake massing studies to determine an appropriate building form and setback which would preserve these significant view corridors.*~~ *[Reserved]*

* * * *

Section 10. The General Plan is hereby amended by revising the Market and Octavia Area Plan, to read as follows:

(a) Map 3, "Generalized Height Districts" is hereby removed from the Market and Octavia Area Plan.

(b) The Market and Octavia Area Plan is further revised, to read as follows:

Market and Octavia Area Plan

* * * *

1. Land Use and Urban Form

* * * *

OBJECTIVE 1.1

CREATE A LAND USE PLAN THAT EMBRACES THE MARKET AND OCTAVIA NEIGHBORHOOD'S POTENTIAL AS A SUSTAINABLE MIXED-USE URBAN NEIGHBORHOOD.

The new land use and special use districts, along with revisions to several existing districts, implement this concept. These land use districts provide a flexible framework that encourages new housing and neighborhood services that build on and enhance the area's

urban character. Several planning controls are introduced, including carefully prescribed building envelopes and the elimination of housing density limits, as well as the replacement of parking requirements with parking maximums, based on accessibility to transit.

- *The Van Ness and Market Residential Special Use District* (VNMR-SUD) will encourage the development of a walkable, transit-oriented, high-density, mixed-use neighborhood around the intersection of Van Ness Avenue and Market Street, adjacent to downtown. This district will still have the area's most intensive residential uses, some office uses and neighborhood serving retail. Residential towers will be permitted along the Market / Mission Street corridor, provided they meet urban design standards. Residential towers, if built, would be clustered around the intersection of Market Street and Van Ness Avenue~~,~~ ~~*with heights ranging from 140 – 650 feet*~~.
- ~~*A*~~ *Transit-Oriented Neighborhood Commercial Districts* (NCT) will encourage transit-oriented, mixed-use development of a moderate scale ~~*to a height of 85 feet*~~ concentrated near transit services in the Hub, areas immediately adjacent to the downtown and along the Market Street corridor. Retail use is actively encouraged on the ground floor with housing above to enliven commercial streets. Along Market Street and in the Hub, a limited amount of office will be permitted. Complimenting a rich mix of neighborhood-serving retail and services with a dense residential populations in these districts, walking and transit will be the primary means of transportation and car-free housing will be common and encouraged.

  In named NCT and NC*T*-1 ~~*(T)*~~ districts, revised parking requirements and housing density controls will encourage housing above ground-floor retail uses. These districts otherwise remain unchanged. They include current

Neighborhood Commercial Districts (Hayes-Gough, portions of the Upper Market, Valencia) and several parcels ~~currently~~*previously* zoned NC-1.

- ~~A~~ *Residential* *Transit-Oriented* ~~*Residential*~~ *Districts* (RTO) will encourage moderate-density, multi-family, residential infill, in scale with existing development. The high availability of transit service, proximity of retail and services within walking distance, and limitation on permitted parking will encourage construction of housing without accessory parking. Small-scale retail activities serving the immediate area will be permitted at intersections *in RTO-1 districts and on all lots in RTO-C districts*.

* * * *

OBJECTIVE 1.2

ENCOURAGE URBAN FORM THAT REINFORCES THE PLAN AREA'S UNIQUE PLACE IN THE CITY'S LARGER URBAN FORM AND STRENGTHENS ITS PHYSICAL FABRIC AND CHARACTER.

The plan's urban form ~~*and height proposal*~~ is based on enhancing the existing variety of scale and character throughout the plan area. The plan ~~*adjusts heights in various locations*~~ *aims* to achieve urban design goals and to maximize efficient building forms for housing, given building code, fire, and other safety requirements. The ~~*heights*~~ *plan* ensures that new development contributes positively to the urban form of the neighborhood and allows flexibility in the overall design and architecture of individual buildings.

~~*The height map on the following page implements the following policies:*~~

~~***MAP 3 - Generalized Height Districts***~~

POLICY 1.2.1

Relate the prevailing height of buildings to street widths throughout the plan area.

It is the height and mass of individual buildings that define the public space of streets. Building heights have historically been strongly related to the width of streets in the Market and Octavia neighborhood and elsewhere in the city. Where building heights are related to the width of the facing streets, they enclose the street and define it as a comfortable, human-scaled space with ample light and air.

The permitted heights should strengthen the relationship between the height of buildings and the width of streets~~*, as shown in Map 3 Height Districts*~~.

POLICY 1.2.2

Maximize housing opportunities and encourage high-quality commercial spaces on the ground floor.

~~*Proposed heights*~~ *Height limits* in neighborhood commercial districts ~~*are adjusted*~~ *should be set* to maximize housing potential within specific construction types. Where ground floor commercial is most desirable, ~~*existing 40- and 50-foot height districts*~~ *building height limits* ~~*are adjusted to*~~ *should* permit ~~*an additional five feet of height provided that it is used to create more*~~ generous ceiling heights on the ground floor *of up to 15 feet*.

It is also common in the Market and Octavia neighborhood, as with the rest of San Francisco, to provide housing above ground floor commercial spaces along neighborhood commercial streets. This not only provides much-needed housing close to services and, in most cases, transit, but also provides a residential presence to these streets, increasing their vitality and the sense of safety for all users.

POLICY 1.2.3

~~***Limit***~~ ***Appropriately sculpt building*** **heights along the alleys in order to provide ample sunlight and air in accordance with the plan principles that relate building heights to street widths.**

- ~~*In order to maximize light in alleys given their narrow scale, heights in alleys are generally limited to 40 feet, however:*~~
- ~~*Heights in alleys are lowered on the southern side of east/west residential alleys to preserve a 50 degree sun angle from the north sidewalk to the building corner in order to provide adequate sunlight to the public right-of-way. For a 35-foot wide alley, this gives a maximum streetwall height of 35 feet.*~~

Given their narrow scale, building heights along alleys should be sculpted to maximize light and create a positive pedestrian experience.

* * * *

POLICY 1.2.6

Mark the block of Market Street from Buchanan Street to Church Street as a gateway to the Castro.

The block of Market Street from Buchanan Street to Church Street marks the entrance to the Castro. At Buchanan Street, heights and form respond to Mint Hill and preserve views to the Mint from Dolores Street. At Church Street, building forms should accent this point, with architectural treatments that express the significance of the intersection. ~~*The height map allows for buildings up to 85-feet in height at the intersection of Church and Market Streets.*~~ Special architectural features should be used at the corners of new buildings to express the visual importance of this intersection.

POLICY 1.2.7

Encourage new mixed-use infill on Market Street with a scale and stature appropriate for the varying conditions along its length.

Market Street is a uniquely monumental street, with buildings along its length that have a distinctive scale and stature, especially east of its intersection with Van Ness Avenue. West of Van Ness Avenue, new buildings should have a height and scale that strengthens the

street's role as a monumental public space. ~~*A podium height limit of 120-feet along Market Street is established east of Van Ness Avenue, consistent with its width. Buildings heights step down to 85 – 65-feet along Market Street west of Van Ness Avenue, providing a transition to surrounding areas.*~~

* * * *

POLICY 1.2.10

Preserve midblock open spaces in residential districts.

Residential districts in the plan area have a well-established pattern of interior-block open spaces that contribute to the livability of the neighborhood. ~~*Along some of the area's primary streets, 65-feet and higher height districts directly abut smaller scale residential districts of 40-feet or lower height districts.*~~ Care must be taken to sculpt new development so that light and air are preserved to midblock spaces. Upper Market NCT lots that abut residential midblock open spaces will be required to provide rear-yards at all levels.

* * * *

2. Housing

* * * *

The fundamental principles are:

- *Provide ample and diverse housing opportunities to add to the vitality of the place.* Maximize the amount and types of housing in the neighborhood to serve a wide variety of people, including a range of incomes, ages, and household and family compositions. The Plan does so by looking to the prevailing built form of the area and carefully prescribing controls for building envelopes to emulate that form. Controls that limit building area by restricting housing are ~~*eliminated*~~ *reduced* in favor of well-defined height and bulk controls and urban design guidelines, encouraging building types more in keeping with the area's established development pattern, and allowing greater flexibility in the type and

configuration of new housing. In addition, residential buildings are also encouraged to include a mix of amenities that support the needs of families with children and sustainable transportation choices, such as social and play spaces and easily accessible storage for strollers, car seats, grocery carts, and bicycles.

* * * *

OBJECTIVE 2.2

ENCOURAGE CONSTRUCTION OF RESIDENTIAL INFILL THROUGHOUT THE PLAN AREA.

* * * *

POLICY 2.2.2

Ensure a mix of unit sizes is built in new development and is maintained in existing housing stock.

Greater unit density does not necessarily correlate to housing for more people. For new construction, the new policies are meant to allow flexibility to accommodate a variety of housing and household types, such as student, extended family, or artist housing, as well as development on small and irregular lots. For instance, the Octavia Boulevard parcels are narrow and irregular, and economically and architecturally reasonable projects will likely require more units and flexibility than earlier zoning would allow. Therefore, these controls balance the need for a flexible process that allows innovative and dense designs on irregular parcels, while also providing sufficient control so that existing housing stock and family-sized units are preserved. One goal of The Plan is to ensure the market does not produce only projects with small units. A unit mix requirement will apply to ~~*any project larger than 4 units*~~*larger projects*. Subdivisions will be permitted only when the resulting units retain some larger units.

* * * *

OBJECTIVE 2.3

PRESERVE THE AFFORDABILITY OF EXISTING HOUSING STOCK AND STRENGTHEN TENANT PROTECTION PROGRAMS.

* * * *

POLICY 2.3.2

Prohibit residential demolitions unless they would result in sufficient replacement of existing housing units. Even when replacement housing is provided, demolitions should further be restricted to ensure affordable housing and historic resources are maintained.

The City's General Plan discourages residential demolitions, except where it would result in replacement housing equal to or exceeding that which is to be demolished. This policy will be applied in the Market & Octavia area in such a way that new housing would at least offset the loss of existing units, and the City's affordable housing, and historic resources would be protected. The plan maintains a strong prejudice against the demolition of sound housing, particularly affordable housing.

Even when replacement housing is provided, demolitions would be permitted only through conditional use in the event the project serves the public interest by giving consideration to each of the following: (1) affordability, (2) soundness, (3) maintenance history, (4) historic resource assessment, (5) number of units, (6) superb architectural and urban design, (7) rental housing opportunities, (8) number of family-sized units, (9) supportive housing or serves a special or underserved population, and (10) a public interest or public use that cannot be met without the proposed demolition. *Certain local and state laws may offer or require an additional layer of approvals criteria, processes, and requirements, including the requirement in certain circumstances for replacement units, rent-restrictions and other provisions to limit or mitigate displacement of existing tenants.*

* * * *

3. Building With a Sense of Place and Sustainability

* * * *

OBJECTIVE 3.1

ENCOURAGE NEW BUILDINGS THAT CONTRIBUTE TO THE BEAUTY OF THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT AND THE QUALITY OF STREETS AS PUBLIC SPACE.

*** * * ***

Policy 3.1.1

Ensure that new development adheres to principles of good urban design.

New development will take place over time. Modest structures will fill in small gaps in the urban fabric, some owners will upgrade building facades, and large underutilized land areas, such as the former Central Freeway parcels, will see dramatic revitalization in the years ahead.

The following Fundamental Design Principles apply to all new development in the Market and Octavia area. They are intended to supplement existing design guidelines, Fundamental Principles in the Urban Design Element of the General Plan and the Planning Department's Residential Design Guidelines, which apply to residential districts, and the Urban Design Guidelines, which apply to commercial, downtown, and mixed-use districts. They address the following areas: (1) Building Massing and Articulation; (2) Tower Design Elements; (3) Ground Floor Treatment, further distinguished by street typology, including (a) Neighborhood Commercial Streets, (b) Special Streets - Market Street, and (c) Alleys, and (4) Open Space. *Projects shall also conform to Citywide Design Standards and other adopted objective standards.*

* * * *

Fundamental Design Principles for Building Massing and Articulation

The way we experience a building is determined largely by its massing and articulation. Buildings in most San Francisco neighborhoods are no more than five stories tall, built on narrow lots, and have bay windows or other kinds of projections. This gives them a distinct rhythm and verticality, and breaks down the scale to that of the human activity taking place inside and around them. This further relates buildings to the human activities in the street. *Projects shall also conform to Citywide Design Standards and other adopted objective standards.*

* * * *

Fundamental Design Principles for Towers

Towers may be permitted above a base height of 85 - ~~*120*~~*140*-feet in selected locations in the *general vicinity of the intersections of Market and Van Ness and Mission and South* Van Ness. ~~*and Market Downtown Residential Special Use District (VNMDR-SUD).*~~ Special urban design considerations are required for towers because of their potential visual impacts on the city skyline and on the quality and comfort of the street. *Projects shall also conform to Citywide Design Standards and other adopted objective standards.*

* * * *

Fundamental Design Principles The Ground Floor

The design and use of a building's ground floor has a direct influence on the pedestrian experience. Ground floor uses in the area are devoted to retail, service, and public uses in mixed-use buildings and to residential units and lobbies in apartment buildings. These uses provide an active and visually interesting edge to the public life of the street, which is especially important on neighborhood commercial streets. Parking, which has become a common street-facing use in more recent buildings, dilutes the visual interest and vitality of the street. This plan maintains a strong presumption against permitting surface-level parking as a street-facing use; rather, it encourages retail, residential, and other active uses facing the

street. *Projects shall also conform to Citywide Design Standards and other adopted objective standards.*

* * * *

Fundamental Design Principles for Streets

NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL STREETS

Like most parts of San Francisco, neighborhood commercial streets in the Market and Octavia neighborhood provide a center for the life of the area. These streets are typically lined with individual retail storefronts that provide visual interest and have a scale that feels especially lively and organic. While not all new development on these streets need be mixed-use in character, it should contain active ground-floor uses and provide a façade that adds visual interest and a human scale to the street. *Projects shall also conform to Citywide Design Standards and other adopted objective standards.*

* * * *

Section 11. The General Plan is hereby amended by revising the Western SoMa (South of Market) Area Plan, to read as follows:

Western SoMa (South of Market) Area Plan

* * * *

Housing

* * * *

OBJECTIVE 3.2

ENCOURAGE NEW NEIGHBORHOOD RESIDENTIAL USES IN LOCATIONS THAT PROVIDE THE GREATEST OPPORTUNITIES TO BUILD ON THE EXISTING NEIGHBORHOOD PATTERNS

* * * *

POLICY 3.2.2

Encourage in-fill housing production that *utilizes design strategies that consider* ~~*continues*~~ the existing built housing qualities in terms of heights, prevailing density, yards and unit sizes.

* * * *

Urban Design and Built Form

* * * *

OBJECTIVE 5.4

ENCOURAGE APPROPRIATE NEW DEVELOPMENT THAT IS RESPONSIVE TO THE EXISTING AND BUILT ENVIRONMENT.

POLICY 5.4.1

~~*Increase prevailing 50-foot heights in the Western SoMa SUD to 55 feet*~~ ***Establish height limits and design standards that*** ~~*to*~~ **encourage gracious floor to ceiling heights for ground floor uses.**

POLICY 5.4.2

~~*Reduce*~~ ***Establish building massing and design standards that respect the lower scale of*** **Residential Enclave*s along alleys.*** ~~*heights to 40 feet.*~~

Section 12. The General Plan is hereby amended by revising the Western Shoreline Area Plan, to read as follows:

Western Shoreline Area Plan

* * * *

Richmond and Sunset Residential Neighborhoods

OBJECTIVE 11

~~PRESERVE THE SCALE OF RESIDENTIAL AND COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT ALONG THE COASTAL ZONE AREA.~~ ENSURE DEVELOPMENT IN THE COASTAL ZONE ADVANCES HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GOALS APPROPRIATE FOR THE LOCATION OF EACH PARCEL.

POLICY 11.1

~~Preserve the scale and character of existing residential neighborhoods by setting allowable densities at the density generally prevailing in the area and regulating new development so its appearance is compatible with adjacent buildings.~~ 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.

* * * *

Section 13. The General Plan is hereby amended by revising Map 5, "Proposed Height and Bulk Districts," of the Downtown Area Plan, to read as follows:

Add to the map notes: "The buildings on parcels between 11th Street and 12th Street, and Van Ness Avenue and Franklin Street that are north of Mission Street and south of Fell Street may be considered for additional height above that indicated on this map to emphasize the skyline node at the intersection of Market Street and Van Ness Avenue in keeping with the principles of the Urban Design Element and this Plan."

Section 14. The Land Use Index shall be updated as necessary to reflect the amendments set forth above in Sections 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 13.

Section 15. Local Coastal Program. The Local Coastal Program is hereby amended to revise the Land Use Plan (the Western Shoreline Area Plan) of the Local Coastal Program, as described in Section 12 of this ordinance.

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 10 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 10 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. 250966. 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/
GIULIA GUALCO-NELSON
Deputy City Attorney

n:\legana\as2025\2500203\01853821.docx

FILE NO. 250966

LEGISLATIVE DIGEST

[General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan]

Ordinance amending the General Plan to revise the Urban Design Element, Commerce and Industry Element, Transportation Element, Balboa Park Station Area Plan, Glen Park Community Plan, Market and Octavia Area Plan, Northeastern Waterfront Plan, Van Ness Avenue Area Plan, Western SoMa (South of Market) Area Plan, Western Shoreline Area Plan, Downtown Area Plan, and Land Use Index, to implement the Family Housing Zoning Program, including the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program, by adjusting guidelines regarding building heights, density, design, and other matters; amending the City's Local Coastal Program to implement the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program and other associated changes in the City's Coastal Zone, and directing the Planning Director to transmit the Ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and adopting findings of public necessity, convenience, and welfare under Planning Code, Section 340.

Existing Law

Under Charter Section 4.105 and Planning Code Section 340, any amendments to the General Plan shall first be considered by the Planning Commission and recommended for approval or rejection by the Board of Supervisors.

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, as set forth in the ordinances in Board Files 250700 and 250701, as introduced on June 24, 2025.

Amendments to Current Law

This ordinance would amend the General Plan to facilitate the Housing Element rezoning (the "Family Zoning Plan") in Board Files 250700 and 250701. This ordinance amends the General Plan as follows:

Urban Design Element

- delete Map 5, “Urban Design Guidelines for Bulk of Buildings”
- revise policies concerning neighborhood character and new development height and bulk

Commerce and Industry Element
- revise policies regarding scale, height, and bulk of new development

Transportation Element
- revise off-street parking policies

Balboa Park Station Area Plan
- delete “Height Districts” map
- revise policies concerning size, scale, design, massing, and articulation of new development

Glen Park Community Plan
- delete Map 3, “Existing and Proposed Heights”
- revise policies concerning neighborhood character and building height

Market and Octavia Area Plan
- delete Map 3, “Generalized Height Districts”
- revise policies concerning new development height and bulk, building sculpting along alleys, unit mix, residential demolition, and design principles
- revise policy to include reference to newly created Residential Transit Oriented-Commercial (RTO-C) district

Northeastern Waterfront Plan
- delete Map 2, “Height and Bulk Plan”
- delete policy restricting new development in certain areas of the Plan
- revise policies concerning height and bulk of new development

Van Ness Avenue Area Plan
- revise Map 1, “Generalized Land Use and Density Plan” to remove residential FAR references
- revise policies concerning height of new development, size of new residential units, street walls, and view corridors

Western SoMa (South of Market) Area Plan
- revise policies concerning building heights, design principles, and heights along alleys

Western Shoreline Area Plan

- amend policies that comprise the Land Use Plan of the City's certified Local Coastal Program
- amend policies concerning neighborhood character and design compatibility with new development

Downtown Area Plan

- revise Map 5, "Proposed Height and Bulk Districts," to add additional height for parcels between 11th Street and 12th Street, and Van Ness Avenue and Franklin Street that are north of Mission Street and south of Fell Street

Land Use Index

- make conforming revisions to the Land Use Index

Background Information

On September 11, 2025 the Planning Commission considered the proposed amendments to the General Plan and recommended initiation in Planning Commission Resolution 21808.

n:\legana\as2025\2500203\01870386.docx

San Francisco Planning

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

NOTICE OF ELECTRONIC TRANSMITTAL

DATE: November 17, 2025

TO: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

FROM: Debra Dwyer, Principal Environmental Planner, 628.652.7576 or Debra.Dwyer@sfgov.org

RE: Environmental Review for the Family Zoning Program
Board Files 250700, 250701, and 250966

In compliance with San Francisco's Administrative Code Section 8.12.5 "Electronic Distribution of Multi-Page Documents," the Planning Department is submitting a memorandum addressing analysis of proposed zoning map amendments to the family zoning program sponsored by Supervisor Sherrill, District 2.

The Land Use and Transportation Committee of the Board of Supervisors will hold a hearing on the Family Zoning Program on November 17, 2025. These environmental documents are associated with Board Files 250700, 250701, and 250966. For questions regarding the environmental review for this project, please contact Ryan Shum, 628.652.7542 or ryan.shum@sfgov.org.

Enclosure

San Francisco Planning

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

MEMORANDUM 3

Date: November 17, 2025
To: San Francisco Board of Supervisors
From: Lisa Gibson, Environmental Review Officer – lisa.gibson@sfgov.org , (628) 652-7571
Debra Dwyer, Principal Planner – debra.dwyer@sfgov.org, (628) 652-7576
Ryan Shum, Senior Planner – ryan.shum@sfgov.org, (628) 652-7542

RE: CEQA Analysis for Family Zoning Plan – Proposed Amendments
Planning Case Nos. 2019-016230ENV, 2021-005878CWP, and 2021-005878GPA
Board file nos. 250700, 250701, and 250966

Introduction

The purpose of this memorandum is to document why proposed amendments to the Family Zoning Plan proposed Zoning Map amendments do not require further analysis pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) beyond the previously prepared environmental impact report, addendum, and supplemental memo.

Following the publication of the Housing Element 2022 Update Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) and adoption of the Housing Element, the San Francisco Planning Department (department) undertook an iterative process to develop a proposed rezoning program. The Mayor introduced the Family Zoning Plan (rezoning program) on June 24 and July 28, 2025. The department reviewed the legislation in compliance with CEQA, determined that there would be no new environmental impacts from the legislation, and prepared an addendum to the FEIR to confirm the findings of the FEIR analysis. The department published Addendum No. 1 to the Housing Element 2022 Update FEIR (addendum) on September 3, 2025, pursuant to CEQA.[1] The Planning Commission (commission) heard the rezoning program on September 11, 2025 and recommended its approval with modifications to the Board of Supervisors (board).

After the September 11 hearing at the Planning Commission, the Mayor submitted substitute legislation on September 30, 2025 that included minor changes to the zoning map and the planning code.[2] An October 16, 2025 memorandum to the file provided analysis for the modifications in the substitute legislation (Version 3 – September 30, 2025) pursuant to CEQA Statute section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines section 15162-15164, and incorporated by reference analysis in the FEIR and addendum.

1 San Francisco Planning Department. *Addendum No. 1 to the Environmental Impact Report*. September 3, 2025. Available at: https://sfplanning.org/environmental-review-documents?title=housing+element&field_environmental_review_categ_target_id=All&items_per_page=10

2 San Francisco Planning Department. *Family Zoning Plan: September 30, 2025, Substitute Legislation (version 3).* Available at: https://sfgov.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=14834613&GUID=01515652-61EE-41BB-B353-CFB0C61A2C95

On October 20, 2025 the Land Use and Transportation Committee (land use committee) of the Board of Supervisors (board) held a hearing on the family zoning program. Proposed amendments to both the proposed zoning ordinance and zoning map were introduced (See attachment A). The land use committee will hold a second hearing on the family zoning program as well as the proposed amendments on November 3, 2025. This memorandum 2 provides analysis for the proposed amendments to the substitute legislation (Version 3 – September 30, 2025) pursuant to CEQA Statute section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines section 15162-15164, and incorporates by reference analysis in the FEIR, addendum, and supplemental memorandum.

On November 3, 2025 the Land Use and Transportation Committee (land use committee) of the Board of Supervisors (board) held a hearing on the family zoning program. Proposed amendments to both the proposed zoning ordinance and zoning map were introduced (See attachment A to 11/3/2025 memorandum 2).

The land use committee will hold a third hearing on the family zoning program and further proposed map amendments on November 17, 2025. This memorandum 3 provides analysis for the proposed map amendments to the substitute legislation (Version 3 – September 30, 2025) pursuant to CEQA Statute section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines section 15162-15164, and incorporates by reference analysis in the FEIR, addendum, and supplemental memoranda.

Description and Analysis of Proposed Amendments

The full text of the proposed ordinances and map changes are available online at on the board's Legislative Research Center (https://sfbos.org/legislative-research-center-lrc) under board file nos. 250700, 250701, and 250966.

The proposed amendments shown in Table 1 (attached) as well as in Board File 250700. The environmental analysis of proposed map changes with the potential to result in physical environmental effects are discussed below according to the Summary, a description of the general location for the change and whether the amendment is decreasing or increasing heights.

Summary Nos. 1, 2, 3 and 6 would result in decreased heights compared to the heights proposed in the Family Zoning Program as analyzed in the FEIR and addendum. Therefore, these amendments would not increase height or number of units allowed compared to the rezoning program analyzed in the addendum. These decreases are anticipated to result in an estimated decrease of 330 units. No further analysis is required.

Summary No. 4 would result in increased heights along the western portion of Van Ness Avenue between Ellis and Turk streets. In particular, the amendment would increase the base height from 130 feet to 140 feet and an increase in the local program height from 300 feet to 350 feet. The amendment would result in an increase of approximately 250 units within this area of western portion of Van Ness Avenue.

Summary No. 5 would result in increased heights along Pine Street between Leavenworth and Larkin streets. In particular, the amendment would change parcels proposed for 65//120-R-4 to 80//140-R-4. For these parcels the base height would change from 65 feet to 80 feet and the local program would increase from 120 feet to 140 feet. Other parcels would change from 80//120-R-4 to 80//140-R-4 where the base height would not change but the local program height would increase from 120 feet to 140 feet. The amendment would result in an increase of approximately 256 units.

The proposed modifications in item Nos. 4 and 5 may result in an incremental increases in height of between 15 to 50 feet and a marginal increase in the number of units allowed within two areas by about 250 units.

Wind and Shadow. The increases in heights in these two limited areas are within the range of heights studied in the programmatic and representative analysis in the FEIR and addendum. Therefore, these modifications would not result in new or more significant shadow or wind impacts and would be subject to project-level environmental review, as applicable. FEIR shadow and wind mitigation measures to reduce the impacts would apply, as applicable; the planning department would determine whether shadow or wind mitigation measures are required during project-level environmental review, as applicable.

Transportation. The net increase of about 250 units in two areas would result in a marginal increase in housing growth along Van Ness Avenue and closer to the 19-Polk Muni route, but the number of vehicle trips would be similar and would result in similar transportation impacts. The proposed modifications on Van Ness Avenue would not contribute to transit delay as transit operations on Van Ness Avenue are within protected transit only lanes for bus rapid transit. In each area, the increases could add approximately 1,730 daily person trips (289 automobile, 69 TNC/taxi, 485 transit, 50 bike, and 653 walking trips) to the area. Of the 358 automobile trips, only 13 vehicle trips would occur during the PM peak hour. These 13 peak hour vehicle trips would not significantly contribute to transit delay on the 19-Polk. The proposed modifications would not result in a new significant transportation impact that was not previously identified in the FEIR and addendum, nor would it result in substantially more severe impacts than those previously identified. Furthermore, the potential additional units in these two limited areas would be offset by the decreases in areas in item Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 6.

Other Topics. The potential additional units in these two limited areas are offset by the decreases in areas Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 6. The proposed modifications 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, while the proposed modification would result in a minor increase in housing units in these areas, the impacts of the following topics would be similar as to what is 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, and wildfire. No further analysis is required.

Conclusion

The proposed amendments to the family zoning program zoning map could result in minor increases in height, density, and housing unit growth in certain parts of the city, primarily in well-resourced areas. Limited growth could occur in areas adjacent to well-resourced areas, but the Housing Element FEIR and addendum acknowledged that the height and growth distribution depicted in the FEIR was hypothetical and not intended to be a precise depiction of future zoning changes. In addition, the FEIR indicated that future growth would likely be concentrated in, but is not limited to, the well-resourced areas of the city. The incremental growth would not result in new or substantially more severe significant impacts that were not already disclosed in the EIR. The mitigation measures that were identified in the FEIR would continue to apply to future development projects as determined applicable, and the department will determine which mitigation measures would apply during the project-specific environmental review phase. For these reasons, additional environmental review is not required for the proposed amendments to the legislation as described above.

TABLE 1: Proposed Rezoning Map Amendments

No.	Summary	Location	Block/Lot	Proposed Local Program Zoning Designation	Amendment
1	Decreasing heights along one block of Geary Blvd between Wood and Emerson	2700 Geary Blvd	1070003	70//140-R-4	50//85-R-4
		2750 Geary Blvd	1070001A	70//140-R-4	50//85-R-4 from Geary Boulevard to 100 feet from Geary Boulevard; 40//65-R-4 rest of lot
		75 Wood Street	1070002	40//65-R-4	40//65-R-4

No.	Summary	Location	Block/Lot	Proposed Local Program Zoning Designation	Amendment
2	Decreasing heights at the Marina Safeway parcel	15 Marina Blvd	0446002	40//65-R-4	40//40-R-4
		11 Marina Blvd	0446003	40//65-R-4	40//40-R-4
3	Decreasing heights at Ghirardelli Square Block	Ghirardelli Square Block	0452NA	40//65-R-4	40//40-R-4
4	Increasing heights along the western portion of Van Ness Avenue between Ellis and Turk streets	851 Van Ness Ave C1, San Francisco, CA 94109	0738045	130//300-R-4	140//350-R-4
		939 Ellis St, San Francisco, CA 94109	0738019	130//300-R-4	140//350-R-4
		815 Van Ness Ave, San Francisco, CA 94109	0738022	130//300-R-4	140//350-R-4

No.	Summary	Location	Block/Lot	Proposed Local Program Zoning Designation	Amendment
		801 Van Ness Ave, San Francisco, CA 94109	0738005	130//300-R-4	140//350-R-4
		830 Eddy St, San Francisco, CA 94109	0738018	130//300-R-4	140//350-R-4
		860 Eddy St, San Francisco, CA 94109	0738007	130//300-R-4	140//350-R-4
		815 Eddy Street, San Francisco, CA 94109	0743001	130//300-R-4	140//350-R-4
		799 Van Ness Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94109	0743204	130//300-R-4	140//350-R-4
		821 Eddy Street, San Francisco, CA 94109	0743015	130//300-R-4	140//350-R-4
		725 Van Ness Ave, San Francisco, CA 94102	0743002	130//300-R-4	140//350-R-4
		701 Van Ness Ave, San Francisco, CA 94102	0743203	130//300-R-4	140//350-R-4
5	Increasing heights along Pine Street between Leavenworth and Larkin	1390 Pine Street, San Francisco, CA 94109	0250009	65//120-R-4	80//140-R-4
		1372 Pine Street, San Francisco, CA 94109	0250008	65//120-R-4	80//140-R-4

No.	Summary	Location	Block/Lot	Proposed Local Program Zoning Designation	Amendment
		1370 Pine Street, San Francisco, CA 94109	0250007	65//120-R-4	80//140-R-4
		1350 Pine Street, San Francisco, CA 94109	0250006	65//120-R-4	80//140-R-4
		1346 Pine Street, San Francisco, CA 94109	0250005	65//120-R-4	80//140-R-4
		1330 Pine Street, San Francisco, CA 94109	0250004	65//120-R-4	80//140-R-4
		1324 Pine Street, San Francisco, CA 94109	0250003E	65//120-R-4	80//140-R-4
		1005 Hyde Street, San Francisco, CA 94109	0250003D	65//120-R-4	80//140-R-4
		1000 Hyde St, San Francisco, CA 94109	0251015	65//120-R-4	80//140-R-4
		1280 Pine Street, San Francisco, CA 94109	0251014	65//120-R-4	80//140-R-4
		1270 Pine Street, San Francisco, CA 94109	0251013	65//120-R-4	80//140-R-4
		1262 Pine Street, San	0251012	65//120-R-4	80//140-R-4

No.	Summary	Location	Block/Lot	Proposed Local Program Zoning Designation	Amendment
		Francisco, CA 94109			
		1254 Pine Street, San Francisco, CA 94109	0251011	65//120-R-4	80//140-R-4
		1250 Pine Street, San Francisco, CA 94109	0251010	65//120-R-4	80//140-R-4
		1234 Pine St, San Francisco, CA 94109	0251009	65//120-R-4	80//140-R-4
		1220 Pine Street, San Francisco, CA 94109	0251008	65//120-R-4	80//140-R-4
		1200 Pine Street, San Francisco, CA 94109	0251007	65//120-R-4	80//140-R-4
		1385 Pine St, San Francisco, CA 94109	0278012	80//120-R-4	80//140-R-4
		1359 Pine St, San Francisco, CA 94109	0278019	80//120-R-4	80//140-R-4
		1355 Pine St., San Francisco, CA 94109	0278016	80//120-R-4	80//140-R-4
		1331 Pine St., San Francisco, CA 94109	0278020	80//120-R-4	80//140-R-4
		969 Hyde Street, San Francisco, CA 94109	0278001	80//120-R-4	80//140-R-4

No.	Summary	Location	Block/Lot	Proposed Local Program Zoning Designation	Amendment
		972 Hyde Street, San Francisco, CA 94109	0277025	80//120-R-4	80//140-R-4
		1243 Pine Street, San Francisco, CA 94109	0277021	80//120-R-4	80//140-R-4
		1235 Pine Street, San Francisco, CA 94109	0277022	80//120-R-4	80//140-R-4
		1225 Pine Street, San Francisco, CA 94109	0277023	80//120-R-4	80//140-R-4
		1201 Pine Street, San Francisco, CA 94109	0277001	80//120-R-4	80//140-R-4
6	Decreasing heights on North Point Street between Larkin and Hyde	ENTIRE Block of North Point Street bound by Larkin Street (west) and Hyde Street (east)	0025004A	40//65-R-4	40//40-R-4
		ENTIRE Block of North Point Street bound by Larkin Street (west) and Hyde Street (east)	0025004B	40//65-R-4	40//40-R-4
		ENTIRE Block of North Point Street bound by Larkin Street (west) and Hyde Street (east)	0025004C	40//65-R-4	40//40-R-4

No.	Summary	Location	Block/Lot	Proposed Local Program Zoning Designation	Amendment
		ENTIRE Block of North Point Street bound by Larkin Street (west) and Hyde Street (east)	0025004D	40//65-R-4	40//40-R-4
		ENTIRE Block of North Point Street bound by Larkin Street (west) and Hyde Street (east)	0025004E	40//65-R-4	40//40-R-4
		ENTIRE Block of North Point Street bound by Larkin Street (west) and Hyde Street (east)	0025004F	40//65-R-4	40//40-R-4
		ENTIRE Block of North Point Street bound by Larkin Street (west) and Hyde Street (east)	0025008	40//65-R-4	40//40-R-4
			0025023	40//65-R-4	40//40-R-4
		ENTIRE Block of North Point Street bound by Larkin Street (west) and Hyde Street (east)	0025024	40//65-R-4	40//40-R-4
		ENTIRE Block of North Point Street bound by Larkin Street	0025028	40//65-R-4	40//40-R-4

No.	Summary	Location	Block/Lot	Proposed Local Program Zoning Designation	Amendment
		(west) and Hyde Street (east)			
		ENTIRE Block of North Point Street bound by Larkin Street (west) and Hyde Street (east)	0025029	40//65-R-4	40//40-R-4
		ENTIRE Block of North Point Street bound by Larkin Street (west) and Hyde Street (east)	0025032	40//65-R-4	40//40-R-4
		ENTIRE Block of North Point Street bound by Larkin Street (west) and Hyde Street (east)	0025039	40//65-R-4	40//40-R-4
		ENTIRE Block of North Point Street bound by Larkin Street (west) and Hyde Street (east)	0025042	40//65-R-4	40//40-R-4
		ENTIRE Block of North Point Street bound by Larkin Street (west) and Hyde Street (east)	0025045	40//65-R-4	40//40-R-4

LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

MEETING MINUTES - DRAFT

Monday, October 20, 2025 - 1:30 PM

City Hall, Legislative Chamber, Room 250

Regular Meeting

Members: Myrna Melgar, Chyanne Chen, Bilal Mahmood

Clerk: John Carroll

(415) 554-4445 ~ john.carroll@sfgov.org

Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board

BOARD COMMITTEES

Committee Membership	Meeting Days
Budget and Appropriations Committee Supervisors Chan, Dorsey, Walton, Mandelman	Wednesday 1:30 PM
Budget and Finance Committee Supervisors Chan, Dorsey	Wednesday 10:00 AM
Government Audit and Oversight Committee Supervisors Fielder, Sauter, Sherrill	1st and 3rd Thursday 10:00 AM
Land Use and Transportation Committee Supervisors Melgar, Chen, Mahmood	Monday 1:30 PM
Public Safety and Neighborhood Services Committee Supervisors Dorsey, Mahmood, Sauter	2nd and 4th Thursday 10:00 AM
Rules Committee Supervisors Walton, Sherrill, Mandelman	Monday 10:00 AM

First-named Supervisor is Chair, Second-named Supervisor is Vice-Chair of the Committee.

Members Present: Myrna Melgar, Chyanne Chen, and Bilal Mahmood

The Land Use and Transportation Committee met in regular session on Monday, October 20, 2025, with Chair Myrna Melgar presiding. Chair Melgar called the meeting to order at 1:33 p.m.

ROLL CALL AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

On the call of the roll, Chair Melgar, Vice Chair Chen, and Member Mahmood were noted present. A quorum was present.

COMMUNICATIONS

John Carroll, Land Use and Transportation Committee Clerk, instructed members of the public that public comment is taken on each item on the agenda. Alternatively, written comments may be submitted through email (john.carroll@sfgov.org) or the U.S. Postal Service at City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA 94102.

AGENDA CHANGES

There were no agenda changes.

REGULAR AGENDA

SPECIAL MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Supervisors Chan, Sauter, and Fielder were noted present at 1:33 p.m., thereby constituting a quorum of the Board of Supervisors. A special meeting of the Board of Supervisors was convened at 1:33 p.m., although the meeting was conducted in all respects as a committee meeting for items on the agenda and any substantive decisions constitute a recommendation of the committee and not action taken by the board.

Present: Supervisors Melgar, Chen, Mahmood, Chan, Sauter, and Fielder.

Supervisors Mandelman, Walton, and Sherrill were noted present at 1:42 p.m.

Supervisor Walton was noted not present at 2:05 p.m.

Supervisor Mandelman was noted not present at 2:51 p.m.

Supervisor Sherrill was noted not present at 3:01 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

At the hour of 3:48 p.m., Supervisor Fielder was noted not present, thereby adjouring the Special Meeting of the Board of Supervisors.

Chair Melgar requested that File Nos. 250966, 250700, 250701, and 250985 be heard together.

Chair Melgar recessed the meeting at 8:33 p.m., and reconvened at 8:35 p.m.

250966 **[General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan]**

Ordinance amending the General Plan to revise the Urban Design Element, Commerce and Industry Element, Transportation Element, Balboa Park Station Area Plan, Glen Park Community Plan, Market and Octavia Area Plan, Northeastern Waterfront Plan, Van Ness Avenue Area Plan, Western SoMa (South of Market) Area Plan, Western Shoreline Area Plan, Downtown Area Plan, and Land Use Index, to implement the Family Housing Zoning Program, including the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program, by adjusting guidelines regarding building heights, density, design, and other matters; amending the City's Local Coastal Program to implement the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program and other associated changes in the City's Coastal Zone, and directing the Planning Director to transmit the Ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and adopting findings of public necessity, convenience, and welfare under Planning Code, Section 340. (Planning Commission)
(Pursuant to Charter, Section 4.105, the Planning Commission recommends General Plan amendments to the Board of Supervisors for approval or rejection. If the Board fails to act within 90 days of receipt, the proposed General Plan amendment shall be deemed approved. Transmittal Date: September 22, 2025)

Heard in Committee. Speakers: Brad Russi (Office of the City Attorney); Rachel Tanner, Lisa Chen, James Pappas, Josh Switzky, Lisa Gibson (Planning Department); Supervisors Rafael Mandelman, Jackie Fielder, Stephen Sherrill, Danny Sauter, and Connie Chan (Board of Supervisors); presented information and answered questions raised throughout the discussion. George Wooding; Speaker; Speaker; Speaker; Speaker; Speaker; Speaker; Speaker; Speaker; Speaker; Speaker; Speaker; Kent; Georgia Schuttish; Lisa Lugi; Gary; Jennifer Belson; Christopher Peterson; Speaker; Alex Landsberg; Julie Fischer; Speaker; Speaker; Sam; Speaker; Carmen Lee; Rosa Shields: Alexandra Zang; Katherine Howard; Speaker; Tyson; Bernie Green; David Woo; Richard Frankel; Sam Hayes; Eileen Purcell; Leslie Simon; Paul; Jessica; Speaker; Justin; Quentin Mecke (Council of Community Housing Organizations); Rahama; John Espinoza; Steven Torres; Carolyn; Dan Rosenfeld; Eileen Hearst; Catherine; Madison; Gwen McLaughlin; Speaker; Sarah Cruz; Romalyn Schmaltz; Apollo; Aldo Weisman; Lori Leiderman; Lance; Speaker; Steph; Jess; Emily Mock; Michelle; Speaker; Jeff; Joanna; Wes; Jacinda; Jacob Talbot; Asia Duncan; Speaker; Christian Tersios; Speaker; Peggy; Patrick; Christin Evans; Speaker; Ellen; Jordan; Mikah; Speaker; Speaker; Speaker; Eileen Boken; Speaker; Jason Wright; Richard; Speaker; Theresa; Miranda Erlicht; Nina Block; Phillip; Speaker; Tadd Buckner; Katt Well; Charlie; Speaker; Speaker; Speaker; Kate; Speaker; Speaker; Patrice; Mike Casey; Speaker; Will Jackson; Speaker; Speaker; Sarah Rogers; Speaker; Bobak Esfandiari; Bernie Powell; Taylor; Juliana; Mark; Nicholas; Mike; Lucas Wang; John Crabtree; Lisa Arges; Tyler; Frank; Leanne; Speaker; Speaker; Speaker; Peter; David Kim; Thomas Rogers; Monica Morse; Speaker; Mikela; Speaker; Paula Katz (See addendum on page 12); Honest Charlie Bodkin; Brianna Morales (Housing Action Coalition); Alec Bash; Jane Natoli; Edward; shared various concerns regarding the ordinance matter.

Chair Melgar moved that this Ordinance be CONTINUED to the Land Use and Transportation Committee meeting of November 3, 2025. The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 3 - Melgar, Chen, Mahmood

250700 **[Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan]**

Sponsors: Mayor; Sauter, Mahmood and Dorsey

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.
(Economic Impact; No Economic Impact Analysis Report)

Heard in Committee. Speakers: Brad Russi (Office of the City Attorney); Rachel Tanner, Lisa Chen, James Pappas, Josh Switzky, Lisa Gibson (Planning Department); Supervisors Rafael Mandelman, Jackie Fielder, Stephen Sherrill, Danny Sauter, and Connie Chan (Board of Supervisors); presented information and answered questions raised throughout the discussion. George Wooding; Speaker; Speaker; Speaker; Speaker; Speaker; Speaker; Speaker; Speaker; Speaker; Speaker; Speaker; Kent; Georgia Schuttish; Lisa Lugi; Gary; Jennifer Belson; Christopher Peterson; Speaker; Alex Landsberg; Julie Fischer; Speaker; Speaker; Sam; Speaker; Carmen Lee; Rosa Shields: Alexandra Zang; Katherine Howard; Speaker; Tyson; Bernie Green; David Woo; Richard Frankel; Sam Hayes; Eileen Purcell; Leslie Simon; Paul; Jessica; Speaker; Justin; Quentin Mecke (Council of Community Housing Organizations); Rahama; John Espinoza; Steven Torres; Carolyn; Dan Rosenfeld; Eileen Hearst; Catherine; Madison; Gwen McLaughlin; Speaker; Sarah Cruz; Romalyn Schmaltz; Apollo; Aldo Weisman; Lori Leiderman; Lance; Speaker; Steph; Jess; Emily Mock; Michelle; Speaker; Jeff; Joanna; Wes; Jacinda; Jacob Talbot; Asia Duncan; Speaker; Christian Tersios; Speaker; Peggy; Patrick; Christin Evans; Speaker; Ellen; Jordan; Mikah; Speaker; Speaker; Speaker; Eileen Boken; Speaker; Jason Wright; Richard; Speaker; Theresa; Miranda Erlicht; Nina Block; Phillip; Speaker; Tadd Buckner; Katt Well; Charlie; Speaker; Speaker; Speaker; Kate; Speaker; Speaker; Patrice; Mike Casey; Speaker; Will Jackson; Speaker; Speaker; Sarah Rogers; Speaker; Bobak Esfandiari; Bernie Powell; Taylor; Juliana; Mark; Nicholas; Mike; Lucas Wang; John Crabtree; Lisa Arges; Tyler; Frank; Leanne; Speaker; Speaker; Speaker; Peter; David Kim; Thomas Rogers; Monica Morse; Speaker; Mikela; Speaker; Paula Katz (See addendum on page 12); Honest Charlie Bodkin; Brianna Morales (Housing Action Coalition); Alec Bash; Jane Natoli; Edward; shared various concerns regarding the ordinance matter.

Chair Melgar requested that this Ordinance be DUPLICATED

See duplicate File No. 251071.

Chair Melgar moved that this Ordinance be CONTINUED to the Land Use and Transportation Committee meeting of November 3, 2025. The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 3 - Melgar, Chen, Mahmood

251071 [Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan]

Sponsors: Mayor; Sauter, Mahmood and Dorsey

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.
(Economic Impact; No Economic Impact Analysis Report)

Duplicated from File No. 250700.

Chair Melgar moved that this Ordinance be AMENDED, AN AMENDMENT OF THE WHOLE BEARING NEW TITLE, to remove the base zoning and height and bulk changes to parcels in the Priority Equity Geographies Special Use District ("PEG SUD", Planning Code, Section 249.97), except that any parcels with RTO zoning in the PEG shall be reclassified to RTO-1; remove the base zoning and height and bulk changes to parcels located in the Coastal Zone north of Fulton Street; remove two parcels in the Coastal Zone from the SFMTA SUD; to adjust the base height for the R-4 Height and Bulk Districts for the following areas and street segments: Inner Clement NCD: 40//40-R-4, Outer Clement NCD: 40//40-R-4, Outer Balboa NCD: 40//40-R-4, Geary Boulevard between 32nd and 43rd Avenue: 50//65-R-4, Portions of Block 1070 on Geary Boulevard: 50//85-R-4, Block 0446 on Marina Boulevard: 40//40-R-4, Block 0452 on North Point Street: 40//40-R-4, Portions of Block 0025 along Hyde, Beach, and North Point Streets: 40//40-R-4; eliminate the proposed change from RH-2 to Geary Boulevard NCD for Assessor's Parcel Block No. 1070/002; and made conforming amendments throughout the ordinance text. The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 3 - Melgar, Chen, Mahmood

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), except for properties located in the Priority Equity Geographies Special Use District ("PEG SUD"); 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, except for properties located in the PEG SUD; 4) reclassify certain properties currently zoned Neighborhood Commercial (NC) or Public (P) to Community Business (C-2) , except for properties located in the PEG SUD; and 5) reclassify certain properties from Public to Mixed-Use or Neighborhood Commercial Districts, except for properties located in the PEG SUD; amending the Height and Bulk Map to: 1) reclassify properties in the Family Zoning Plan to R-4 Height and Bulk District, except for properties located in the PEG SUD; 2) change the height limits on certain lots in the R-4 Height and Bulk District, except for properties located in the PEG SUD; 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 south of Lincoln Way to R-4 Height and Bulk District; 2) reclassify certain properties south of Lincoln Way to RTO-C and Neighborhood Commercial District; and 3) 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.
(Economic Impact; No Economic Impact Analysis Report)

Chair Melgar moved that this Ordinance be CONTINUED AS AMENDED to the Land Use and Transportation Committee meeting of November 3, 2025. The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 3 - Melgar, Chen, Mahmood

250701 **[Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan]**

Sponsor: Mayor

Ordinance amending the Planning Code to: 1) create the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program to incent housing development through a local bonus program and by adopting a Housing Sustainability District, 2) modify height and bulk limits to provide for additional capacity in well-resourced neighborhoods, and to allow additional height and bulk for projects using the local bonus program, 3) require only buildings taller than 85 feet in certain Districts to reduce ground level wind currents, 4) make conforming changes to the RH (Residential, House), RM (Residential, Mixed), and RC (Residential-Commercial) District zoning tables to reflect the changes to density controls, and parking requirements made in this Ordinance, 5) create the RTO-C (Residential Transit Oriented-Commercial) District, 6) implement the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's Transit-Oriented Communities Policy by making changes to parking requirements, minimum residential densities, and minimum office intensities, and requiring maximum dwelling unit sizes, 7) revise off-street parking and curb cut obligations citywide, 8) create the Non-contiguous San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Sites Special Use District, 9) permit businesses displaced by new construction to relocate without a conditional use authorization and waive development impact fees for those businesses, 10) make technical amendments to the Code to implement the above changes, 11) make conforming changes to zoning tables in various Districts, including the Neighborhood Commercial District and Mixed Use Districts, and 12) reduce usable open space and bicycle parking requirements for senior housing; amending the Business and Tax Regulations Code regarding the Board of Appeals' review of permits in the Housing Choice Program Housing Sustainability District; also, amending the Local Coastal Program to implement the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program and other associated changes in the City's Coastal Zone, and directing the Planning Director to transmit the Ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and making public necessity, convenience, and welfare findings under Planning Code, Section 302.
(Economic Impact; No Economic Impact Analysis Report)

Heard in Committee. Speakers: Brad Russi (Office of the City Attorney); Rachel Tanner, Lisa Chen, James Pappas, Josh Switzky, Lisa Gibson (Planning Department); Supervisors Rafael Mandelman, Jackie Fielder, Stephen Sherrill, Danny Sauter, and Connie Chan (Board of Supervisors); presented information and answered questions raised throughout the discussion. George Wooding; Speaker; Speaker; Speaker; Speaker; Speaker; Speaker; Speaker; Speaker; Speaker; Speaker; Speaker; Speaker; Kent; Georgia Schuttish; Lisa Lugi; Gary; Jennifer Belson; Christopher Peterson; Speaker; Alex Landsberg; Julie Fischer; Speaker; Speaker; Sam; Speaker; Carmen Lee; Rosa Shields: Alexandra Zang; Katherine Howard; Speaker; Tyson; Bernie Green; David Woo; Richard Frankel; Sam Hayes; Eileen Purcell; Leslie Simon; Paul; Jessica; Speaker; Justin; Quentin Mecke (Council of Community Housing Organizations); Rahama; John Espinoza; Steven Torres; Carolyn; Dan Rosenfeld; Eileen Hearst; Catherine; Madison; Gwen McLaughlin; Speaker; Sarah Cruz; Romalyn Schmaltz; Apollo; Aldo Weisman; Lori Leiderman; Lance; Speaker; Steph; Jess; Emily Mock; Michelle; Speaker; Jeff; Joanna; Wes; Jacinda; Jacob Talbot; Asia Duncan; Speaker; Christian Tersios; Speaker; Peggy; Patrick; Christin Evans; Speaker; Ellen; Jordan; Mikah; Speaker; Speaker; Speaker; Eileen Boken; Speaker; Jason Wright; Richard; Speaker; Theresa; Miranda Erlicht; Nina Block; Phillip; Speaker; Tadd Buckner; Katt Well; Charlie; Speaker; Speaker; Speaker; Kate; Speaker; Speaker; Patrice; Mike Casey; Speaker; Will Jackson; Speaker; Speaker; Sarah Rogers; Speaker; Bobak Esfandiari; Bernie Powell; Taylor; Juliana; Mark; Nicholas; Mike; Lucas Wang; John Crabtree; Lisa Arges; Tyler; Frank; Leanne; Speaker; Speaker; Speaker; Peter; David Kim; Thomas Rogers; Monica Morse; Speaker; Mikela; Speaker; Paula Katz (See addendum on page 12); Honest Charlie Bodkin; Brianna Morales (Housing Action Coalition); Alec Bash; Jane Natoli; Edward; shared various concerns regarding the ordinance matter.

Chair Melgar moved that this Ordinance be AMENDED, AN AMENDMENT OF THE WHOLE BEARING SAME

TITLE, to prohibit projects using the Local Program if the project requires demolition of housing where there are 3 or more rent controlled units; amend the bonus for "warm shell" commercial spaces by limiting the proposed 3 square foot bonus to food service-ready "warm shells" and creating a 2.5 square foot bonus for "general warm shells"; amend the local program bonus to offer an additional bonus where the Local Program project replaces existing commercial space; and made conforming changes throughout the ordinance text. The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 3 - Melgar, Chen, Mahmood

(Economic Impact; No Economic Impact Analysis Report)

Chair Melgar requested that this Ordinance be DUPLICATED AS AMENDED

See dulplicated File No. 251072.

Chair Melgar requested that this Ordinance be DUPLICATED AS AMENDED

See dulplicated File No. 251073.

Chair Melgar moved that this Ordinance be CONTINUED AS AMENDED to the Land Use and Transportation Committee meeting of November 3, 2025. The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 3 - Melgar, Chen, Mahmood

251072 [Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan]

Sponsor: Mayor

Ordinance amending the Planning Code to: 1) create the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program to incent housing development through a local bonus program and by adopting a Housing Sustainability District, 2) modify height and bulk limits to provide for additional capacity in well-resourced neighborhoods, and to allow additional height and bulk for projects using the local bonus program, 3) require only buildings taller than 85 feet in certain Districts to reduce ground level wind currents, 4) make conforming changes to the RH (Residential, House), RM (Residential, Mixed), and RC (Residential-Commercial) District zoning tables to reflect the changes to density controls, and parking requirements made in this Ordinance, 5) create the RTO-C (Residential Transit Oriented-Commercial) District, 6) implement the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's Transit-Oriented Communities Policy by making changes to parking requirements, minimum residential densities, and minimum office intensities, and requiring maximum dwelling unit sizes, 7) revise off-street parking and curb cut obligations citywide, 8) create the Non-contiguous San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Sites Special Use District, 9) permit businesses displaced by new construction to relocate without a conditional use authorization and waive development impact fees for those businesses, 10) make technical amendments to the Code to implement the above changes, 11) make conforming changes to zoning tables in various Districts, including the Neighborhood Commercial District and Mixed Use Districts, and 12) reduce usable open space and bicycle parking requirements for senior housing; amending the Business and Tax Regulations Code regarding the Board of Appeals' review of permits in the Housing Choice Program Housing Sustainability District; also, amending the Local Coastal Program to implement the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program and other associated changes in the City's Coastal Zone, and directing the Planning Director to transmit the Ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and making public necessity, convenience, and welfare findings under Planning Code, Section 302.

(Economic Impact; No Economic Impact Analysis Report)

Duplicated from File No. 250701.

Chair Melgar moved that this Ordinance be AMENDED, AN AMENDMENT OF THE WHOLE BEARING NEW TITLE, to prohibit Lot Mergers on properties with certain types of historic resources; and making conforming amendments throughout the ordinance text. The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 3 - Melgar, Chen, Mahmood

Ordinance amending the Planning Code to: 1) create the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program to incent housing development through a local bonus program and by adopting a Housing Sustainability District, 2) modify height and bulk limits to provide for additional capacity in well-resourced neighborhoods, and to allow additional height and bulk for projects using the local bonus program, 3) require only buildings taller than 85 feet in certain Districts to reduce ground level wind currents, 4) make conforming changes to the RH (Residential, House), RM (Residential, Mixed), and RC (Residential-Commercial) District zoning tables to reflect the changes to density controls, and parking requirements made in this ordinance, 5) create the RTO-C (Residential Transit Oriented-Commercial) District, 6) implement the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's Transit-Oriented Communities Policy by making changes to parking requirements, minimum residential densities, and minimum office intensities, and requiring maximum dwelling unit sizes, 7) revise off-street parking and curb cut obligations citywide, 8) create the Non-contiguous San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Sites Special Use District, 9) permit businesses displaced by new construction to relocate without a conditional use authorization and waive development impact fees for those businesses, 10) make technical amendments to the Code to implement the above changes, 11) make conforming changes to zoning tables in various Districts, including the Neighborhood Commercial District and Mixed Use Districts, prohibit Lot mergers on Lots with Category A historic resources, subject to certain preservation obligations, and 13) reduce usable open space and bicycle parking requirements for senior housing; amending the Business and Tax Regulations Code regarding the Board of Appeals' review of permits in the Housing Choice Program Housing Sustainability District; also, amending the Local Coastal Program to implement the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program and other associated changes in the City's Coastal Zone, and directing the Planning Director to transmit the ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and making public necessity, convenience, and welfare findings under Planning Code, Section 302.
(Economic Impact; No Economic Impact Analysis Report)

Chair Melgar moved that this Ordinance be CONTINUED AS AMENDED to the Land Use and Transportation Committee meeting of December 1, 2025. The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 3 - Melgar, Chen, Mahmood

251073 **[Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan]**

Sponsor: Mayor

Ordinance amending the Planning Code to: 1) create the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program to incent housing development through a local bonus program and by adopting a Housing Sustainability District, 2) modify height and bulk limits to provide for additional capacity in well-resourced neighborhoods, and to allow additional height and bulk for projects using the local bonus program, 3) require only buildings taller than 85 feet in certain Districts to reduce ground level wind currents, 4) make conforming changes to the RH (Residential, House), RM (Residential, Mixed), and RC (Residential-Commercial) District zoning tables to reflect the changes to density controls, and parking requirements made in this Ordinance, 5) create the RTO-C (Residential Transit Oriented-Commercial) District, 6) implement the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's Transit-Oriented Communities Policy by making changes to parking requirements, minimum residential densities, and minimum office intensities, and requiring maximum dwelling unit sizes, 7) revise off-street parking and curb cut obligations citywide, 8) create the Non-contiguous San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Sites Special Use District, 9) permit businesses displaced by new construction to relocate without a conditional use authorization and waive development impact fees for those businesses, 10) make technical amendments to the Code to implement the above changes, 11) make conforming changes to zoning tables in various Districts, including the Neighborhood Commercial District and Mixed Use Districts, and 12) reduce usable open space and bicycle parking requirements for senior housing; amending the Business and Tax Regulations Code regarding the Board of Appeals' review of permits in the Housing Choice Program Housing Sustainability District; also, amending the Local Coastal Program to implement the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program and other associated changes in the City's Coastal Zone, and directing the Planning Director to transmit the Ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and making public necessity, convenience, and welfare findings under Planning Code, Section 302.
(Economic Impact; No Economic Impact Analysis Report)

Duplicated from File No. 250701.

Chair Melgar moved that this Ordinance be AMENDED, AN AMENDMENT OF THE WHOLE BEARING SAME TITLE, to amend the Local Program to exclude projects that: demolish or substantially alter Category A historic resources, demolish, remove, or convert dwelling units or residential flats, or demolish or convert any portion of a Tourist Hotel; to amend the Local Program to state that other City's laws would apply to Local Program projects, such as Dwelling Unit Mix requirements in Section 207.7, Article 4 development impact fees and requirements, displaced business requirements in new Section 202.17, tenant protections in the Planning Code or SF Rent Ordinance, or other permitting or licensing requirements outside of the Planning Code; to require projects that comply with the Inclusionary ordinance through off-site units or land dedication to provide those units within 1/2 mile of the project; to amend the Local Program approvals to expire if the project sponsor fails to obtain a building permit within 30 days, subject to six-month extension; to amend the Local Program to provide additional bonus square footage of 250 additional square feet for every two-bedroom unit in excess of the dwelling unit requirements for the Local Program; to amend the Housing Sustainability District to prohibit any projects using the Housing Sustainability District streamlining from demolishing or substantially altering Category A historic resources, or demolishing or converting any portion of a Tourist Hotel; to amend the SFMTA SUD by adding findings regarding the purpose of the SUD, adding pre-application requirements, and excluding properties in the Coastal Zone; to remove the exception included in the ordinance in Board File No. 250701 that did not require a Conditional Use Authorization to merge, reconfigure or reduce a residential flats, if the project adds at least one unit; and making conforming changes throughout the ordinance text. The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 3 - Melgar, Chen, Mahmood

(Economic Impact; No Economic Impact Analysis Report)

Chair Melgar moved that this Ordinance be CONTINUED AS AMENDED to the Land Use and Transportation Committee meeting of November 3, 2025. The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 3 - Melgar, Chen, Mahmood

250985 **[Local Coastal Program Amendment - Family Zoning Plan]**

Sponsor: Mayor

Resolution transmitting to the California Coastal Commission for review and certification an amendment to the Implementation Program and Land Use Plan of the City's certified Local Coastal Program to implement the Family Zoning Plan; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act.

Heard in Committee. Speakers: Brad Russi (Office of the City Attorney); Rachel Tanner, Lisa Chen, James Pappas, Josh Switzky, Lisa Gibson (Planning Department); Supervisors Rafael Mandelman, Jackie Fielder, Stephen Sherrill, Danny Sauter, and Connie Chan (Board of Supervisors); presented information and answered questions raised throughout the discussion. George Wooding; Speaker; Speaker; Speaker; Speaker; Speaker; Speaker; Speaker; Speaker; Speaker; Speaker; Speaker; Kent; Georgia Schuttish; Lisa Lugi; Gary; Jennifer Belson; Christopher Peterson; Speaker; Alex Landsberg; Julie Fischer; Speaker; Speaker; Sam; Speaker; Carmen Lee; Rosa Shields: Alexandra Zang; Katherine Howard; Speaker; Tyson; Bernie Green; David Woo; Richard Frankel; Sam Hayes; Eileen Purcell; Leslie Simon; Paul; Jessica; Speaker; Justin; Quentin Mecke (Council of Community Housing Organizations); Rahama; John Espinoza; Steven Torres; Carolyn; Dan Rosenfeld; Eileen Hearst; Catherine; Madison; Gwen McLaughlin; Speaker; Sarah Cruz; Romalyn Schmaltz; Apollo; Aldo Weisman; Lori Leiderman; Lance; Speaker; Steph; Jess; Emily Mock; Michelle; Speaker; Jeff; Joanna; Wes; Jacinda; Jacob Talbot; Asia Duncan; Speaker; Christian Tersios; Speaker; Peggy; Patrick; Christin Evans; Speaker; Ellen; Jordan; Mikah; Speaker; Speaker; Speaker; Eileen Boken; Speaker; Jason Wright; Richard; Speaker; Theresa; Miranda Erlicht; Nina Block; Phillip; Speaker; Tadd Buckner; Katt Well; Charlie; Speaker; Speaker; Speaker; Kate; Speaker; Speaker; Patrice; Mike Casey; Speaker; Will Jackson; Speaker; Speaker; Sarah Rogers; Speaker; Bobak Esfandiari; Bernie Powell; Taylor; Juliana; Mark; Nicholas; Mike; Lucas Wang; John Crabtree; Lisa Arges; Tyler; Frank; Leanne; Speaker; Speaker; Speaker; Peter; David Kim; Thomas Rogers; Monica Morse; Speaker; Mikela; Speaker; Paula Katz (See addendum on page 12); Honest Charlie Bodkin; Brianna Morales (Housing Action Coalition); Alec Bash; Jane Natoli; Edward; shared various concerns regarding the resolution matter.

Chair Melgar moved that this Resolution be CONTINUED to the Land Use and Transportation Committee meeting of November 3, 2025. The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 3 - Melgar, Chen, Mahmood

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the Land Use and Transportation Committee adjourned at the hour of 8:37 p.m.

N.B. The Minutes of this meeting set forth all actions taken by the Land Use and Transportation Committee on the matters stated, but not necessarily in the chronological sequence in which the matters were taken up.

ADDENDUM

Pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 67.16, the following statement was provided by a speaker during the public comment period who supplied a brief written summary of their comments, which shall be included in the meeting minutes and are incorporated by individual reference as fully set forth herein. The content is neither generated by, nor subject to approval or verification of accuracy by, the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors.

Paula Katz submitted the following statement during Public Comment, as follows: "I urge you not to accept the upzoning plan without significant amendments: 1. Require any plan to include 20-25% of on-site affordable housing, along with more two and three bedroom family units. And 100% affordable housing should be required on publicly owned lands. 2. All rent controlled buildings must be excluded from the plan. 3. Require sufficient parking for all upzoned buildings so their new residents will not have to compete with current residents already struggling to find limited street parking. 4. Remove overlapping base and density maps and excessive height bonuses that allow state density bonus incentives, including very high buildings. 5. Support small businesses affected by upzoning, and don't allow locations with legacy businesses to be upzoned."

LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

MEETING MINUTES - DRAFT

Monday, November 3, 2025 - 1:30 PM

City Hall, Legislative Chamber, Room 250

Regular Meeting

Members: Myrna Melgar, Chyanne Chen, Bilal Mahmood

Clerk: John Carroll

(415) 554-4445 ~ john.carroll@sfgov.org

Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board

BOARD COMMITTEES

Committee Membership	Meeting Days
Budget and Appropriations Committee Supervisors Chan, Dorsey, Walton, Mandelman	Wednesday 1:30 PM
Budget and Finance Committee Supervisors Chan, Dorsey	Wednesday 10:00 AM
Government Audit and Oversight Committee Supervisors Fielder, Sauter, Sherrill	1st and 3rd Thursday 10:00 AM
Land Use and Transportation Committee Supervisors Melgar, Chen, Mahmood	Monday 1:30 PM
Public Safety and Neighborhood Services Committee Supervisors Dorsey, Mahmood, Sauter	2nd and 4th Thursday 10:00 AM
Rules Committee Supervisors Walton, Sherrill, Mandelman	Monday 10:00 AM

First-named Supervisor is Chair, Second-named Supervisor is Vice-Chair of the Committee.

Members Present: Myrna Melgar, Chyanne Chen, and Bilal Mahmood

The Land Use and Transportation Committee met in regular session on Monday, November 3, 2025, with Chair Myrna Melgar presiding. Chair Melgar called the meeting to order at 1:32 p.m.

ROLL CALL AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

On the call of the roll, Chair Melgar, Vice Chair Chen, and Member Mahmood were noted present. A quorum was present.

COMMUNICATIONS

John Carroll, Land Use and Transportation Committee Clerk, instructed members of the public that public comment is taken on each item on the agenda. Alternatively, written comments may be submitted through email (john.carroll@sfgov.org) or the U.S. Postal Service at City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA 94102.

AGENDA CHANGES

There were no agenda changes.

REGULAR AGENDA

Chair Melgar requested that File Nos. 250426 and 250427 be heard together.

250426 [Planning Code, Zoning Map - San Francisco Gateway Special Use District]
Sponsors: Walton; Fielder, Chen, Melgar and Dorsey

Ordinance amending the Planning Code and the Zoning Map to establish the San Francisco Gateway Special Use District generally bounded by Kirkwood Avenue to the northeast, Rankin Street to the southeast, McKinnon Avenue to the southwest, and Toland Street to the northwest; making findings 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 findings of public necessity, convenience, and welfare under Planning Code, Section 302.
(Economic Impact; No Economic Impact Analysis Report)

Heard in Committee. Speaker(s): Supervisor Shamann Walton (Board of Supervisors); Susan Ma (Office of Economic and Workforce Development); presented information and answered questions raised throughout the discussion. Rev. Dr. Carolyn Ransom-Scott; Lindsay Palmer; Michael; Speaker; Vanessa; Kristin Hardy; Dan Torres; Rudy Gonzalez (San Francisco Building & Construction Trades Council); Raymond Tan; spoke in support of the ordinance matter. Steve Zeltzer; spoke in opposition to the ordinance matter. Francisco Da Costa; shared various concerns regarding the ordinance matter.

Chair Melgar moved that this Ordinance be RECOMMENDED. The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 3 - Melgar, Chen, Mahmood

250427 [Development Agreement - Prologis, L.P. - San Francisco Gateway Project - Toland Street at Kirkwood Avenue]

Sponsors: Walton; Fielder, Chen, Melgar and Dorsey

Ordinance approving a Development Agreement between the City and County of San Francisco and Prologis, L.P., a Delaware limited partnership, for the development of an approximately 17.1-acre site located at Toland Street at Kirkwood Avenue with two multi-story production, distribution, and repair buildings in a core industrial area, including 1,646,000 square feet of production, distribution, and repair, space for non-retail sales and service, automotive, and retail uses, a rooftop solar array, ground-floor maker space, and streets built to City standard; making findings under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of conformity with the General Plan, and with the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1(b); making findings of public convenience, necessity, and welfare under Planning Code, Section 302; approving certain development impact fees for the Project and waiving certain Planning Code fees and requirements; confirming compliance with or waiving certain provisions of Labor and Employment Code, Articles 131, 132, 103, 104, and 106, and Administrative Code, Chapters 56, 14B, 82, 83, and 23; and ratifying certain actions taken in connection therewith, as defined herein.
(Economic Impact; No Economic Impact Analysis Report)

Heard in Committee. Speaker(s): Supervisor Shamann Walton (Board of Supervisors); Susan Ma (Office of Economic and Workforce Development); presented information and answered questions raised throughout the discussion. Rev. Dr. Carolyn Ransom-Scott; Lindsay Palmer; Michael; Speaker; Vanessa; Kristin Hardy; Dan Torres; Rudy Gonzalez (San Francisco Building & Construction Trades Council); Raymond Tan; spoke in support of the ordinance matter. Steve Zeltzer; spoke in opposition to the ordinance matter. Francisco Da Costa; shared various concerns regarding the ordinance matter.

Chair Melgar moved that this Ordinance be RECOMMENDED. The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 3 - Melgar, Chen, Mahmood

250886 [Planning Code - Adaptive Reuse of Historic Buildings]

Sponsor: Mayor

Ordinance amending the Planning Code to allow additional uses as principally or conditionally permitted in Historic Buildings citywide, exempt Historic Buildings in certain Eastern Neighborhood Plan Areas from Conditional Use authorization otherwise required to remove Production, Distribution, and Repair (PDR), Institutional Community, and Arts Activities uses, and from providing replacement space for such uses, make conforming amendments to provisions affected by the foregoing, including zoning control tables; 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 findings of public necessity, convenience, and general welfare under Planning Code, Section 302.

Heard in Committee. Speaker(s): Lisa Gluckstein (Planning Department); presented information and answered questions raised throughout the discussion. Speaker; Speaker; Romalyn Schmaltz; Apollo; Pat Huey; Heather Davies; Raymond Tan; Speaker; Speaker; Speaker; Speaker; shared various concerns regarding the ordinance matter.

Chair Melgar moved that this Ordinance be CONTINUED TO CALL OF THE CHAIR. The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 3 - Melgar, Chen, Mahmood

250888 [Planning Code - Planning Fees]

Sponsors: Mayor; Dorsey

Ordinance amending the Planning Code to require certain Planning Department fees to be paid to the Department at the time the Development Application is submitted, modify the environmental review fees for large projects, and remove the separate fee schedule for “Class 32” categorical exemptions under the California Environmental Quality Act; 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 findings of public necessity, convenience, and welfare pursuant to Planning Code, Section 302.

Heard in Committee. Speaker(s): Veronica Flores (Planning Department); presented information and answered questions raised throughout the discussion. Speaker; Romalyn Schmaltz; Speaker; spoke in opposition to the ordinance matter. Raymond Tan; shared various concerns regarding the ordinance matter.

Chair Melgar moved that this Ordinance be RECOMMENDED AS COMMITTEE REPORT. The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 3 - Melgar, Chen, Mahmood

Supervisor Mandelman was noted present at 2:06 p.m.

Supervisor Sauter was noted present at 2:23 p.m.

SPECIAL MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Supervisor Chan was noted present at 2:25 p.m., thereby constituting a quorum of the Board of Supervisors. A special meeting of the Board of Supervisors was convened at 2:25 p.m., and maintained sporadically throughout the meeting through 4:24 p.m., although the meeting was conducted in all respects as a committee meeting for items on the agenda and any substantive decisions constitute a recommendation of the committee and not action taken by the board.

Present: Supervisors Melgar, Chen, Mahmood, Mandelman, Sauter, and Chan.

Supervisor Dorsey was noted present at 2:50 p.m.

Supervisor Sherrill was noted present at 3:46 p.m.

250808 [Planning Code; Administrative Code - Legacy Businesses in Neighborhood Commercial Districts]

Sponsor: Chan

Ordinance amending the Planning Code to define Legacy Business and to require conditional use authorization prior to replacing a Legacy Business with a new non-residential use in certain Neighborhood Commercial, Named Neighborhood Commercial, and Neighborhood Commercial Transit Districts, and in the Chinatown Mixed Use Districts; amending the Administrative Code to allow a business that has been operating for 15 years to qualify as a Legacy Business; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of consistency with the General Plan and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and adopting findings of public necessity, convenience, and welfare under Planning Code, Section 302.
(Supervisor Mahmood dissented in committee.)

Heard in Committee. Speaker(s): Supervisor Connie Chan (Board of Supervisors); Lisa Gluckstein (Planning Department); presented information and answered questions raised throughout the discussion. George Wooding; Marc Bruno; Romalyn Schmaltz; Speaker; Yolanda; Gwen McLaughlin (Small Business Forward); Justin; Pat Huey; Speaker; Steven Torres; Andy Katz; Katherine Howard; Raymond Tan; Bridget Maley; Howard Wong; Speaker; spoke in support of the ordinance matter.

Vice Chair Chen moved that this Ordinance be RECOMMENDED. The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 2 - Melgar, Chen
Noes: 1 - Mahmood

Chair Melgar requested that File Nos. 250966, 250700, 251071, 250701, 251073, and 250985 be heard together.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

At the hour of 4:25 p.m., Supervisors Mandelman, Sauter, Chan, Dorsey and Sherrill were noted not present, thereby adjouring the Special Meeting of the Board of Supervisors.

250966 [General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan]

Ordinance amending the General Plan to revise the Urban Design Element, Commerce and Industry Element, Transportation Element, Balboa Park Station Area Plan, Glen Park Community Plan, Market and Octavia Area Plan, Northeastern Waterfront Plan, Van Ness Avenue Area Plan, Western SoMa (South of Market) Area Plan, Western Shoreline Area Plan, Downtown Area Plan, and Land Use Index, to implement the Family Housing Zoning Program, including the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program, by adjusting guidelines regarding building heights, density, design, and other matters; amending the City's Local Coastal Program to implement the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program and other associated changes in the City's Coastal Zone, and directing the Planning Director to transmit the Ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and adopting findings of public necessity, convenience, and welfare under Planning Code, Section 340. (Planning Commission)
(Pursuant to Charter, Section 4.105, the Planning Commission recommends General Plan amendments to the Board of Supervisors for approval or rejection. If the Board fails to act within 90 days of receipt, the proposed General Plan amendment shall be deemed approved. Transmittal Date: September 22, 2025)

Heard in Committee. Speaker(s): Ted Egan (Office of the Controller); Supervisors Connie Chan, Danny Sauter, Rafael Mandelman, and Matt Dorsey (Board of Supervisors); Joshua Switzky, Lisa Chen (Planning Department); presented information and answered questions raised throughout the discussion. George Wooding; Herbert Mintz; Ray Borraca; Speaker; Naj Daniels; Kristen Hardy; Marc Bruno; Julie Fisher; Jessica Visness; Tony Hallier; Romalyn Schmaltz; Apollo; John Huliman; Mike Casey; Randy Tan; Alden Weissman; Pat Huey; Speaker; Andy Katz; Carol Brewer; Lori Brooke; Bridget Manley; Donna Hurliss; Katherine Howard; Nick Ferriss, President (Telegraph Hill Dwellers); Niels Pierson; Kathleen Courtney; Eileen Hirst; George; Fred; Lisa Arges; Lila Holtzman; Speaker; Theresa; Speaker; Dan Wollette; Speaker; Speaker; Howard Wong; Gwen McLaughlin (Small Business Forward); Paul Conwright; P. Segal; Ruth Fergusson; Charlie Natoli; Mo Zu; Speaker; Annie Fryman (SPUR); Deborah Solomon; Speaker; Marie Joyce; Speaker; Brianna Morales (Housing Action Coalition); Witt Turner; Speaker; Speaker; Stan Hayes (Telegraph Hill Dwellers); Honest Charley Bodkin; Mike Chan; Speaker; Jane Natoli (YIMBY Action); Monica Morse (West of Twin Peaks Neighborhood Council); Speaker; Eric Brooks; Greg Jacino; Eileen Boken; shared various concerns regarding the ordinance matter.

Chair Melgar moved that this Ordinance be CONTINUED to the Land Use and Transportation Committee meeting of November 17, 2025. The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 3 - Melgar, Chen, Mahmood

250700 [Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan]

Sponsors: Mayor; Sauter, Mahmood and Dorsey

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.
(Economic Impact)

Heard in Committee. Speaker(s): Ted Egan (Office of the Controller); Supervisors Connie Chan, Danny Sauter, Rafael Mandelman, and Matt Dorsey (Board of Supervisors); Joshua Switzky, Lisa Chen (Planning Department); presented information and answered questions raised throughout the discussion. George Wooding; Herbert Mintz; Ray Borraca; Speaker; Naj Daniels; Kristen Hardy; Marc Bruno; Julie Fisher; Jessica Visness; Tony Hallier; Romalyn Schmaltz; Apollo; John Huliman; Mike Casey; Randy Tan; Alden Weissman; Pat Huey; Speaker; Andy Katz; Carol Brewer; Lori Brooke; Bridget Manley; Donna Hurliss; Katherine Howard; Nick Ferriss, President (Telegraph Hill Dwellers); Niels Pierson; Kathleen Courtney; Eileen Hirst; George; Fred; Lisa Arges; Lila Holtzman; Speaker; Theresa; Speaker; Dan Wollette; Speaker; Speaker; Howard Wong; Gwen McLaughlin (Small Business Forward); Paul Conwright; P. Segal; Ruth Fergusson; Charlie Natoli; Mo Zu; Speaker; Annie Fryman (SPUR); Deborah Solomon; Speaker; Marie Joyce; Speaker; Brianna Morales (Housing Action Coalition); Witt Turner; Speaker; Speaker; Stan Hayes (Telegraph Hill Dwellers); Honest Charley Bodkin; Mike Chan; Speaker; Jane Natoli (YIMBY Action); Monica Morse (West of Twin Peaks Neighborhood Council); Speaker; Eric Brooks; Greg Jacino; Eileen Boken; shared various concerns regarding the ordinance matter.

Chair Melgar moved that this Ordinance be CONTINUED to the Land Use and Transportation Committee meeting of November 17, 2025. The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 3 - Melgar, Chen, Mahmood

251071 [Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan]

Sponsors: Mayor; Sauter, Mahmood and Dorsey

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), except for properties located in the Priority Equity Geographies Special Use District ("PEG SUD"); 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, except for properties located in the PEG SUD; 4) reclassify certain properties currently zoned Neighborhood Commercial (NC) or Public (P) to Community Business (C-2) , except for properties located in the PEG SUD; and 5) reclassify certain properties from Public to Mixed-Use or Neighborhood Commercial Districts, except for properties located in the PEG SUD; amending the Height and Bulk Map to: 1) reclassify properties in the Family Zoning Plan to R-4 Height and Bulk District, except for properties located in the PEG SUD; 2) change the height limits on certain lots in the R-4 Height and Bulk District, except for properties located in the PEG SUD; 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 south of Lincoln Way to R-4 Height and Bulk District; 2) reclassify certain properties south of Lincoln Way to RTO-C and Neighborhood Commercial District; and 3) 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.
(Economic Impact)

Heard in Committee. Speaker(s): Ted Egan (Office of the Controller); Supervisors Connie Chan, Danny Sauter, Rafael Mandelman, and Matt Dorsey (Board of Supervisors); Joshua Switzky, Lisa Chen (Planning Department); presented information and answered questions raised throughout the discussion. George Wooding; Herbert Mintz; Ray Borraca; Speaker; Naj Daniels; Kristen Hardy; Marc Bruno; Julie Fisher; Jessica Visness; Tony Hallier; Romalyn Schmaltz; Apollo; John Huliman; Mike Casey; Randy Tan; Alden Weissman; Pat Huey; Speaker; Andy Katz; Carol Brewer; Lori Brooke; Bridget Manley; Donna Hurliss; Katherine Howard; Nick Ferriss, President (Telegraph Hill Dwellers); Niels Pierson; Kathleen Courtney; Eileen Hirst; George; Fred; Lisa Arges; Lila Holtzman; Speaker; Theresa; Speaker; Dan Wollette; Speaker; Speaker; Howard Wong; Gwen McLaughlin (Small Business Forward); Paul Conwright; P. Segal; Ruth Fergusson; Charlie Natoli; Mo Zu; Speaker; Annie Fryman (SPUR); Deborah Solomon; Speaker; Marie Joyce; Speaker; Brianna Morales (Housing Action Coalition); Witt Turner; Speaker; Speaker; Stan Hayes (Telegraph Hill Dwellers); Honest Charley Bodkin; Mike Chan; Speaker; Jane Natoli (YIMBY Action); Monica Morse (West of Twin Peaks Neighborhood Council); Speaker; Eric Brooks; Greg Jacino; Eileen Boken; shared various concerns regarding the ordinance matter.

Vice Chair Chen moved that this Ordinance be AMENDED, AN AMENDMENT OF THE WHOLE BEARING SAME TITLE, on Pages 13-16, to delete certain parcels along Ocean Avenue from the changes in the ordinance. The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 3 - Melgar, Chen, Mahmood
(Economic Impact)

Chair Melgar moved that this Ordinance be CONTINUED AS AMENDED to the Land Use and Transportation Committee meeting of November 17, 2025. The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 3 - Melgar, Chen, Mahmood

250701 [Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan]
Sponsor: Mayor

Ordinance amending the Planning Code to: 1) create the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program to incent housing development through a local bonus program and by adopting a Housing Sustainability District, 2) modify height and bulk limits to provide for additional capacity in well-resourced neighborhoods, and to allow additional height and bulk for projects using the local bonus program, 3) require only buildings taller than 85 feet in certain Districts to reduce ground level wind currents, 4) make conforming changes to the RH (Residential, House), RM (Residential, Mixed), and RC (Residential-Commercial) District zoning tables to reflect the changes to density controls, and parking requirements made in this Ordinance, 5) create the RTO-C (Residential Transit Oriented-Commercial) District, 6) implement the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's Transit-Oriented Communities Policy by making changes to parking requirements, minimum residential densities, and minimum office intensities, and requiring maximum dwelling unit sizes, 7) revise off-street parking and curb cut obligations citywide, 8) create the Non-contiguous San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Sites Special Use District, 9) permit businesses displaced by new construction to relocate without a conditional use authorization and waive development impact fees for those businesses, 10) make technical amendments to the Code to implement the above changes, 11) make conforming changes to zoning tables in various Districts, including the Neighborhood Commercial District and Mixed Use Districts, and 12) reduce usable open space and bicycle parking requirements for senior housing; amending the Business and Tax Regulations Code regarding the Board of Appeals' review of permits in the Housing Choice Program Housing Sustainability District; also, amending the Local Coastal Program to implement the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program and other associated changes in the City's Coastal Zone, and directing the Planning Director to transmit the Ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and making public necessity, convenience, and welfare findings under Planning Code, Section 302.
(Economic Impact)

Heard in Committee. Speaker(s): Ted Egan (Office of the Controller); Supervisors Connie Chan, Danny Sauter, Rafael Mandelman, and Matt Dorsey (Board of Supervisors); Joshua Switzky, Lisa Chen (Planning Department); presented information and answered questions raised throughout the discussion. George Wooding; Herbert Mintz; Ray Borraca; Speaker; Naj Daniels; Kristen Hardy; Marc Bruno; Julie Fisher; Jessica Visness; Tony Hallier; Romalyn Schmaltz; Apollo; John Huliman; Mike Casey; Randy Tan; Alden Weissman; Pat Huey; Speaker; Andy Katz; Carol Brewer; Lori Brooke; Bridget Manley; Donna Hurliss; Katherine Howard; Nick Ferriss, President (Telegraph Hill Dwellers); Niels Pierson; Kathleen Courtney; Eileen Hirst; George; Fred; Lisa Arges; Lila Holtzman; Speaker; Theresa; Speaker; Dan Wollette; Speaker; Speaker; Howard Wong; Gwen McLaughlin (Small Business Forward); Paul Conwright; P. Segal; Ruth Fergusson; Charlie Natoli; Mo Zu; Speaker; Annie Fryman (SPUR); Deborah Solomon; Speaker; Marie Joyce; Speaker; Brianna Morales (Housing Action Coalition); Witt Turner; Speaker; Speaker; Stan Hayes (Telegraph Hill Dwellers); Honest Charley Bodkin; Mike Chan; Speaker; Jane Natoli (YIMBY Action); Monica Morse (West of Twin Peaks Neighborhood Council); Speaker; Eric Brooks; Greg Jacino; Eileen Boken; shared various concerns regarding the ordinance matter.

Chair Melgar moved that this Ordinance be AMENDED, AN AMENDMENT OF THE WHOLE BEARING SAME TITLE, on Page 11, Lines 23-24, by inserting 'Except as provided in this Section 206.10, all HC-SF projects shall comply with Article 4 of the Planning Code.' The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 3 - Melgar, Chen, Mahmood

(Economic Impact)

Chair Melgar moved that this Ordinance be AMENDED, AN AMENDMENT OF THE WHOLE BEARING SAME TITLE, on Page 17, Lines 15-18, by inserting '(4) Exclusions. In no event shall this Section 206.10 be interpreted as relieving a HC-SF project from complying with: Article 4 of the Planning Code other than as specified in this subsection (d); Section 202.17; any tenant protections contained elsewhere in the Planning Code, including Section 317 et seq.; or Chapter 37 of the Administrative Code.' The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 3 - Melgar, Chen, Mahmood

(Economic Impact)

Chair Melgar moved that this Ordinance be AMENDED, AN AMENDMENT OF THE WHOLE BEARING SAME TITLE, on Page 21, Lines 5-8 to read '(4) Units With Two or More Bedrooms. Projects that contain units with two or more bedrooms shall be permitted to include additional square footage, as set forth below: (A) 250 square feet for every two-bedroom unit provided in excess of the number of two-bedroom units required by subsection (d)(1)(B);' and making a conforming change on Line 25. The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 3 - Melgar, Chen, Mahmood

(Economic Impact)

Chair Melgar moved that this Ordinance be AMENDED, AN AMENDMENT OF THE WHOLE BEARING SAME TITLE, on Page 27, Lines 5-9, to read '(c) Administrative Review. The Planning Department shall administratively review an HC-SF Project, unless the Project seeks a Major Modification pursuant to subsection (d), or any HC-SF Project that is a 100% Affordable HC-SF Project. The Planning Department's determination regarding an HC-SF Project under this subsection (c) shall not be appealable. Nothing in this Section 334 abrogates permit, license, or other requirements codified outside the Planning Code.' The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 3 - Melgar, Chen, Mahmood

(Economic Impact)

Chair Melgar moved that this Ordinance be AMENDED, AN AMENDMENT OF THE WHOLE BEARING SAME TITLE, on Page 29, Line 23 through Page 30, Line 9, to read '(4) The project does not demolish or substantially alter a historic resource that is: designated as a landmark or listed as a contributor to or located within a historic district under Article 10; listed as a Significant or Contributory Building under Article 11; listed in the California Register of Historical Resources or the National Register of Historic Places; identified in an adopted survey or historic context statement as potentially eligible for individual listing in the California Register of Historical Resources or the National Register of Historic Places; or, located within an historic district that is listed in, or identified in an adopted survey or historic context statement as potentially eligible for listing in, the California Register of Historical Resources or the National Register of Historic Places.' The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 3 - Melgar, Chen, Mahmood

(Economic Impact)

Chair Melgar moved that this Ordinance be AMENDED, AN AMENDMENT OF THE WHOLE BEARING SAME TITLE, on Page 31, Line 4, by inserting '(13) The project does not demolish or convert any portion of a Hotel.' The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 3 - Melgar, Chen, Mahmood

(Economic Impact)

Chair Melgar moved that this Ordinance be AMENDED, AN AMENDMENT OF THE WHOLE BEARING SAME TITLE, on Page 189, Lines 22-25, by striking '(12) Residential Flats. Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in this Section 317, projects that propose the Merger, reconfiguration, or reduction in size of Residential Flats shall not require a Conditional Use authorization if the project would increase the number of Dwelling Units on the property.' The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 2 - Melgar, Chen

Noes: 1 - Mahmood

(Economic Impact)

Chair Melgar moved that this Ordinance be AMENDED, AN AMENDMENT OF THE WHOLE BEARING SAME TITLE, on Page 190, Lines 8-10, by striking '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'. The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 2 - Melgar, Chen

Noes: 1 - Mahmood

(Economic Impact)

Chair Melgar moved that this Ordinance be CONTINUED AS AMENDED to the Land Use and Transportation Committee meeting of November 17, 2025. The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 3 - Melgar, Chen, Mahmood

251073 [Planning, Business and Tax Regulations, Administrative Codes - Family Zoning Plan]

Sponsor: Mayor

Ordinance amending the Planning Code to: 1) create the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program to incent housing development through a local bonus program and by adopting a Housing Sustainability District, 2) modify height and bulk limits to provide for additional capacity in well-resourced neighborhoods, and to allow additional height and bulk for projects using the local bonus program, 3) require only buildings taller than 85 feet in certain Districts to reduce ground level wind currents, 4) make conforming changes to the RH (Residential, House), RM (Residential, Mixed), and RC (Residential-Commercial) District zoning tables to reflect the changes to density controls, and parking requirements made in this Ordinance, 5) create the RTO-C (Residential Transit Oriented-Commercial) District, 6) implement the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's Transit-Oriented Communities Policy by making changes to parking requirements, minimum residential densities, and minimum office intensities, and requiring maximum dwelling unit sizes, 7) revise off-street parking and curb cut obligations citywide, 8) create the Non-contiguous San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Sites Special Use District, 9) permit businesses displaced by new construction to relocate without a conditional use authorization and waive development impact fees for those businesses, 10) make technical amendments to the Code to implement the above changes, 11) make conforming changes to zoning tables in various Districts, including the Neighborhood Commercial District and Mixed Use Districts, and 12) reduce usable open space and bicycle parking requirements for senior housing; amending the Business and Tax Regulations Code regarding the Board of Appeals' review of permits in the Housing Choice Program Housing Sustainability District; also, amending the Local Coastal Program to implement the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program and other associated changes in the City's Coastal Zone, and directing the Planning Director to transmit the Ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and making public necessity, convenience, and welfare findings under Planning Code, Section 302.
(Economic Impact)

Heard in Committee. Speaker(s): Ted Egan (Office of the Controller); Supervisors Connie Chan, Danny Sauter, Rafael Mandelman, and Matt Dorsey (Board of Supervisors); Joshua Switzky, Lisa Chen (Planning Department); presented information and answered questions raised throughout the discussion. George Wooding; Herbert Mintz; Ray Borraca; Speaker; Naj Daniels; Kristen Hardy; Marc Bruno; Julie Fisher; Jessica Visness; Tony Hallier; Romalyn Schmaltz; Apollo; John Huliman; Mike Casey; Randy Tan; Alden Weissman; Pat Huey; Speaker; Andy Katz; Carol Brewer; Lori Brooke; Bridget Manley; Donna Hurliss; Katherine Howard; Nick Ferriss, President (Telegraph Hill Dwellers); Niels Pierson; Kathleen Courtney; Eileen Hirst; George; Fred; Lisa Arges; Lila Holtzman; Speaker; Theresa; Speaker; Dan Wollette; Speaker; Speaker; Howard Wong; Gwen McLaughlin (Small Business Forward); Paul Conwright; P. Segal; Ruth Fergusson; Charlie Natoli; Mo Zu; Speaker; Annie Fryman (SPUR); Deborah Solomon; Speaker; Marie Joyce; Speaker; Brianna Morales (Housing Action Coalition); Witt Turner; Speaker; Speaker; Stan Hayes (Telegraph Hill Dwellers); Honest Charley Bodkin; Mike Chan; Speaker; Jane Natoli (YIMBY Action); Monica Morse (West of Twin Peaks Neighborhood Council); Speaker; Eric Brooks; Greg Jacino; Eileen Boken; shared various concerns regarding the ordinance matter.

Vice Chair Chen moved that this Ordinance be AMENDED, AN AMENDMENT OF THE WHOLE BEARING SAME TITLE, on Page 14, Line 21, through Page 15, Line 14, to read '(B) Dwelling Unit Mix. Section 207.6 and Section 207.7 shall apply, except that projects between four and nine units shall comply with the following: (i) a project with four dwelling units shall contain at least one unit with two or more bedrooms; and (ii) for projects between five and nine dwelling units, at least 25 percent of units shall contain two or more bedrooms, including at least one unit with three or more bedrooms, unless Section 207.6(c) requires a higher percentage of two- and three-bedroom units.' The motion carried by

the following vote:

Ayes: 3 - Melgar, Chen, Mahmood

(Economic Impact)

Vice Chair Chen moved that this Ordinance be AMENDED, AN AMENDMENT OF THE WHOLE BEARING NEW TITLE, on Page 2, Lines 1-2, by inserting 'amending the Administrative Code to set Board policy regarding the sale or lease of properties within the SFMTA SUD'; on Page 10, Lines 23-25, by inserting '(y) This ordinance, in Section 16 amends the Administrative Code to set Board of Supervisors policy regarding the approval of the sale or lease of properties within the Non-Contiguous San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Special Use District.'; and on Page 471-472, by inserting 'Section 16. Article I of Chapter 2 of the Administrative Code is hereby amended by adding Section 2.6-4 to read as follows: SEC. 2.6-4. POLICY FOR APPROVAL OF LEASES OR SALE OF PROPERTY WITHIN THE NON-CONTIGUOUS SAN FRANCISCO MUNICIPAL TRANSPORTATION AGENCY SITES SPECIAL USE DISTRICT. (a) Whenever, in accordance with the provisions of the Charter, the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency ("SFMTA") submits a Non-Transit Lease or Sale Agreement to the Board of Supervisors for its approval or disapproval, it shall be the policy of the Board of Supervisors to only approve the Non-Transit Lease or Sale Agreement if: (i) it is for the development and operation of a 100% Affordable Housing Project; (ii) the SFMTA has provided each then-existing Qualified Nonprofit with a right of first refusal to lease or buy, as applicable, the affected property on the same terms in the Non-Transit Lease or Sale Agreement (which may include, but is not limited to, a rent or purchase price based on the highest and best use of the property), except the permitted use shall be modified to only permit the development and operation of a 100% Affordable Housing Project, and either (A) the SFMTA does not receive a bona fide acceptance of that offer from a Qualified Nonprofit within 14 calendar days, or (B) the SFMTA receives a bona fide acceptance within 14 calendar days from a Qualified Nonprofit, but that Qualified Nonprofit fails to sign the Non-Transit Lease or Sale Agreement within 30 days of submitting the bona fide acceptance; or (iii) the SFMTA Board of Directors has determined the Non-Transit Lease or Sale Agreement is needed to further the SFMTA's transit purposes and the Board of Supervisors affirms such determination. (b) A "100% Affordable Housing Project" shall be a residential project where all Residential Uses, except a manager's unit, are comprised solely of Dwelling Units or Group Housing bedrooms that are restricted for the Life of the Project as Affordable Units and meets the requirements in Planning Code Section 406(b)(1)(A) and (C). For purposes of this subsection (b), the terms "Affordable Unit" and "Life of the Project" are as defined in Planning Code Section 401, and the terms Residential Use, Dwelling Unit, and Group Housing are as defined in Planning Code Section 102. (c) A "Non-Transit Lease or Sale Agreement" means an agreement to lease or buy property located within the Non-Contiguous San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Sites Special Use District, established in Planning Code Section 249.11, to develop and operate a residential or commercial project. (d) "Qualified Nonprofit" shall be a nonprofit organization that meets the requirements set forth in Administrative Code Section 41B.4 and is listed on the Mayor's Office of Housing and Economic Development's website pursuant to Section 41B.4.' The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 3 - Melgar, Chen, Mahmood

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 (SFMTA SUD), 9) permit businesses displaced by new construction to relocate without a conditional use authorization and waive development impact fees for those businesses, 10) make technical amendments to the Code to implement the above changes, 11) make conforming changes to zoning tables in various Districts, including the Neighborhood Commercial District and Mixed Use Districts, and 12) reduce usable open space and bicycle parking requirements for senior housing; amending the Business and Tax Regulations Code regarding the Board of Appeals' review of permits in the Housing Choice Program Housing Sustainability District; amending the Administrative Code to set Board policy regarding the sale or lease of properties within the SFMTA SUD; also, amending the Local Coastal Program to implement the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program and other associated changes in the City's Coastal Zone, and directing the Planning Director to transmit the ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and making public necessity, convenience, and welfare findings under Planning Code, Section 302.
(Economic Impact)

Vice Chair Chen moved that this Ordinance be AMENDED, AN AMENDMENT OF THE WHOLE BEARING SAME TITLE, on Pages 170-171, by inserting '(d) Pre-Application Requirements. When a Development Application is submitted pursuant to this Section 249.11 for a site that meets the minimum specifications for 100% affordable housing sites as determined by the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development, the project sponsor, in conjunction with SFMTA, shall provide: (1) A feasibility study that models the development of the project site as 100% affordable housing, as that term is defined in Section 406(b)(1)(A) and (C); (2) Documentation that the project sponsor, in conjunction with SFMTA, has conducted at least one pre-application meeting. Mailed notice of the meeting shall be provided to the individuals and neighborhood organizations specified in Planning Code Section 333(e)(2)(A) and (C), as well as posted notice as set forth in Planning Code Section 333(e)(1). The Planning Department may establish procedures and requirements to administer this subsection; and (3) Documentation of how the project advances the City's goals for affordable housing on public lands, as identified in Housing Element Policy Actions 1.2.6 and 1.2.7.' The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 3 - Melgar, Chen, Mahmood
(Economic Impact)

Chair Melgar moved that this Ordinance be CONTINUED AS AMENDED to the Land Use and Transportation Committee meeting of November 17, 2025. The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 3 - Melgar, Chen, Mahmood

250985 [Local Coastal Program Amendment - Family Zoning Plan]
Sponsor: Mayor

Resolution transmitting to the California Coastal Commission for review and certification an amendment to the Implementation Program and Land Use Plan of the City's certified Local Coastal Program to implement the Family Zoning Plan; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act.

Heard in Committee. Speaker(s): Ted Egan (Office of the Controller); Supervisors Connie Chan, Danny Sauter, Rafael Mandelman, and Matt Dorsey (Board of Supervisors); Joshua Switzky, Lisa Chen (Planning Department); presented information and answered questions raised throughout the discussion. George Wooding; Herbert Mintz; Ray Borraca; Speaker; Naj Daniels; Kristen Hardy; Marc Bruno; Julie Fisher; Jessica Visness; Tony Hallier; Romalyn Schmaltz; Apollo; John Huliman; Mike Casey; Randy Tan; Alden Weissman; Pat Huey; Speaker; Andy Katz; Carol Brewer; Lori Brooke; Bridget Manley; Donna Hurliss; Katherine Howard; Nick Ferriss, President (Telegraph Hill Dwellers); Niels Pierson; Kathleen Courtney; Eileen Hirst; George; Fred; Lisa Arges; Lila Holtzman; Speaker; Theresa; Speaker; Dan Wollette; Speaker; Speaker; Howard Wong; Gwen McLaughlin (Small Business Forward); Paul Conwright; P. Segal; Ruth Fergusson; Charlie Natoli; Mo Zu; Speaker; Annie Fryman (SPUR); Deborah Solomon; Speaker; Marie Joyce; Speaker; Brianna Morales (Housing Action Coalition); Witt Turner; Speaker; Speaker; Stan Hayes (Telegraph Hill Dwellers); Honest Charley Bodkin; Mike Chan; Speaker; Jane Natoli (YIMBY Action); Monica Morse (West of Twin Peaks Neighborhood Council); Speaker; Eric Brooks; Greg Jacino; Eileen Boken; shared various concerns regarding the resolution matter.

Chair Melgar moved that this Resolution be CONTINUED to the Land Use and Transportation Committee meeting of November 17, 2025. The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 3 - Melgar, Chen, Mahmood

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the Land Use and Transportation Committee adjourned at the hour of 6:48 p.m.

N.B. The Minutes of this meeting set forth all actions taken by the Land Use and Transportation Committee on the matters stated, but not necessarily in the chronological sequence in which the matters were taken up.

LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

MEETING MINUTES - DRAFT

Monday, November 17, 2025 - 1:30 PM

City Hall, Legislative Chamber, Room 250

Regular Meeting

Members: Myrna Melgar, Chyanne Chen, Bilal Mahmood

Clerk: John Carroll

(415) 554-4445 ~ john.carroll@sfgov.org

Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board

BOARD COMMITTEES

Committee Membership	Meeting Days
Budget and Appropriations Committee Supervisors Chan, Dorsey, Walton, Mandelman	Wednesday 1:30 PM
Budget and Finance Committee Supervisors Chan, Dorsey	Wednesday 10:00 AM
Government Audit and Oversight Committee Supervisors Fielder, Sauter, Sherrill	1st and 3rd Thursday 10:00 AM
Land Use and Transportation Committee Supervisors Melgar, Chen, Mahmood	Monday 1:30 PM
Public Safety and Neighborhood Services Committee Supervisors Dorsey, Mahmood, Sauter	2nd and 4th Thursday 10:00 AM
Rules Committee Supervisors Walton, Sherrill, Mandelman	Monday 10:00 AM

First-named Supervisor is Chair, Second-named Supervisor is Vice-Chair of the Committee.

Members Present: Myrna Melgar, Chyanne Chen, and Bilal Mahmood

The Land Use and Transportation Committee met in regular session on Monday, November 17, 2025, with Chair Myrna Melgar presiding. Chair Melgar called the meeting to order at 1:35 p.m.

ROLL CALL AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

On the call of the roll, Chair Melgar, Vice Chair Chen, and Member Mahmood were noted present. A quorum was present.

COMMUNICATIONS

John Carroll, Land Use and Transportation Committee Clerk, instructed members of the public that public comment is taken on each item on the agenda. Alternatively, written comments may be submitted through email (john.carroll@sfgov.org) or the U.S. Postal Service at City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA 94102.

AGENDA CHANGES

There were no agenda changes.

REGULAR AGENDA

250811 [Building Code - Building Permit Expiration Timelines]

Sponsors: Mahmood; Dorsey

Ordinance amending the Building Code to revise the timing of expiration of certain building permits and building permit applications; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act.

Heard in Committee. Speaker(s): Tate Hanna (Department of Building Inspection); presented information and answered questions raised throughout the discussion. Joseph Smooke; shared various concerns regarding the ordinance matter.

Member Mahmood moved that this Ordinance be AMENDED, AN AMENDMENT OF THE WHOLE BEARING SAME TITLE, on Page 1, Line 22, through Page 2, Line 7, to read '(c) No local findings are required under California Health and Safety Code Section 17958.7 because the amendments to the Building Code contained in this ordinance do not regulate materials or manner of construction or repair and therefore do not modify building standards. Even if the amendments are considered modifications to building standards, the amendments to building permit expiration timelines are not new, local building standards because they largely revert to or conform with the underlying provisions of the California Building Code. All amendments are consistent with the intent of recently enacted Assembly Bill 130, which is intended to prohibit local building standards applicable to residential units that are more restrictive than the California Building Code, and are also permissible because they would result in reductions in operating costs for the Department of Building Inspection. (Health & Safety Code § 17958.5(c)(6)(D)).'; on Page 3, Line 8, through Page 4, Line 16, to read '106A.3.7 Application expiration. The Building Official may hold in abeyance or reject any application, plans, or specifications filed which in the Building Official's opinion, do not provide the necessary information in a clear and concise manner as required in Section 106A.3.3. An application for a permit for any proposed work shall be deemed to have been abandoned, and shall expire, 730 days after the date of filing if no permit has been issued, except that the Building Official may grant one or more extensions of time for additional periods not exceeding 180 days each. Such extension shall be requested in writing and shall demonstrate justifiable cause for the extension. See Section 110A, Table 1A-J – Miscellaneous Fees – for applicable fee for such extensions. In the event the application has not been approved and issued within 60 days before the end of the time periods set forth in this Section 106A.3.7, the Department shall notify the applicant that the application will be canceled in 60 days unless the application is extended. An application which exceeds the stated or extended time period after such notice shall be deemed canceled without further action by the Department.'; on Page 4, Lines 18-25, by striking exceptions 1 and 2, '1. For applications resulting from enforcement actions initiated by the Building Official to abate code violations, the above time limits shall be reduced to 30 days and 10 days, respectively. The Building Official may grant an extension for hardship or procedural error. Upon cancellation, such cases shall be referred to the City Attorney for legal action. 2.The above time limits shall not apply to applications which are subject to the work without permit investigation fee per Section 110A, Table 1A-K – Penalties, Hearings, Code Enforcement Assessments. Such applications shall be canceled only through specific action by the Building Official.'; and making clerical and conforming amendments throughout the ordinance text. The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 3 - Melgar, Chen, Mahmood

Member Mahmood moved that this Ordinance be CONTINUED AS AMENDED to the Land Use and Transportation Committee meeting of December 1, 2025. The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 3 - Melgar, Chen, Mahmood

240637 [Planning Code, Zoning Map - Central Neighborhoods Large Residence SUD, Corona Heights Large Residence SUD]

Sponsor: Mandelman

Ordinance amending the Planning Code to expand the boundaries of the Central Neighborhoods Large Residence Special Use District (SUD), and to apply its controls to all lots within the SUD, with some exceptions; to delete the Corona Heights Large Residence SUD, and as a result to merge it into the Central Neighborhoods Large Residence SUD; amending the Zoning Map to reflect the deletion and boundary expansion; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; and making public necessity, convenience, and welfare findings under Planning Code, Section 302, and findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1.

Heard in Committee. Speaker(s): Supervisor Rafael Mandelman (Board of Supervisors); Aaron Starr (Planning Department); presented information and answered questions raised throughout the discussion. Georgia Schuttish; Paul Wormer; Raymond Tan; shared various concerns regarding the ordinance matter.

Chair Melgar moved that this Ordinance be AMENDED, AN AMENDMENT OF THE WHOLE BEARING SAME TITLE, on Page 6, Line 16, through Page 7, Line 18, by striking '(e) Conditional Use Authorizations. For all lots zoned RH wWithin the Central Neighborhoods Large Residence Special Use District, a Conditional Use authorization shall be required for any residential development or expansion of a Residential Building that would result in any Dwelling Unit with a Gross Floor Area exceeding the equivalent of a 1.2:1 Floor Area Ratio, or would result in any Dwelling Unit exceeding 3,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area, except where the total increase of gross floor area of any existing Dwelling Unit is less than 15%. (f) Conditional Use Findings. In addition to the criteria outlined in Planning Code Section 303(c)(1), in acting upon an application for Conditional Use authorization within the Central Neighborhoods Large Residence Special Use District the Planning Commission shall also consider whether facts are presented to establish, based on the record before the Commission, that the following criteria are met: (1) the proposed project is contextual with the neighborhood, meets applicable Residential Design Guidelines, and seeks to retain any existing design elements; (2) the proposed project does not remove Rental Units subject to the Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance; (3) the proposed project increases the number of Dwelling Units on the lot; (4) no Dwelling Unit is less than one-third the gross floor area of the largest Dwelling Unit in a Residential Building; (5) the proposed project does not negatively impact the historic integrity of the property or any existing structure on a lot that is listed in or formally eligible for listing in the California Register of Historic Resources, or has been determined to appear eligible for listing in the California Register of Historic Resources or to qualify as a "historical resource" under CEQA; and (6) the project does not negatively impact the historic integrity of any existing structure on a lot that has been adopted as a local landmark or a contributor to a local historic district under Articles 10 or 11 of this Code, or would render the property ineligible for historic designation as an individual or contributing resource.'; on Page 7, Lines 23-25, to read '(2) In multi-unit buildings, shared spaces such as stairwells, atriums, and other communal spaces accessible to all building occupants shall not be included in the Gross Floor Area thresholds'; on Page 8, Lines 6-12, by striking '(h) The Conditional Use requirement established by subsections (e)-(f) of this Section 249.92 shall sunset on December 31, 2024. After that date, for all lots zoned RH within the Central Neighborhoods Large Residence Special Use District, no residential development or expansion of an existing Residential Building shall be permitted within the Central Neighborhoods Large Residence Special Use District that would result in any Dwelling Unit exceeding 3,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area, except where the total increase of gross floor area of any existing Dwelling Unit is less than 15%.'; and making conforming and clerical amendments throughout the ordinance text. The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 3 - Melgar, Chen, Mahmood

Chair Melgar moved that this Ordinance be CONTINUED AS AMENDED to the Land Use and Transportation Committee meeting of December 1, 2025. The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 3 - Melgar, Chen, Mahmood

250926 [Planning, Administrative Codes - Tenant Protections Related to Residential Demolitions and Renovations]

Sponsors: Chen; Fielder, Walton, Chan, Dorsey, Sauter, Sherrill, Melgar and Mahmood

Ordinance amending the Planning Code to 1) require property owners seeking to demolish residential units to replace all units that are being demolished; 2) require relocation assistance to affected occupants of those units, with additional assistance and protections for lower-income tenants; 3) modify the conditional use criteria that apply to projects to demolish residential units; amending the Administrative Code to 4) require landlords to provide additional relocation assistance to lower-income tenants who are being required to vacate temporarily due to capital improvements or rehabilitation work; 5) update the standards and procedures for hearings related to tenant harassment; 6) require additional disclosures in buyout agreements; 7) making various non-substantive changes and clarifications; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making public necessity, convenience, and welfare findings under Planning Code, Section 302; and making findings of consistency with the General Plan and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1.

Heard in Committee. Speaker(s): Malena Leon-Farrera and Rachel Tanner (Planning Department); presented information and answered questions raised throughout the discussion. Marc Bruno; Mark Solomon; Sarah "Fred" Sherburn-Zimmer (Housing Rights Committee); David Harlan; Speaker; Speaker; Teresa Dulalas (SOMCAN); Julie Fischer; Kay Walker; Avdi; Zach Weisenberger (Young Community Developers); Aristos Kemiji (Mission Economic Development Agency); Susan Marsh; Georgia Schuttish; Gwen; Joseph Smooke; Peter Stevens; Pauline Worshell; Gen Fujioka; Howard Willies; Speaker; Ocean Blue Coast; Zach Frial (SOMCAN); Asia Nicole Duncan; Christin Evans (Small Business Forward); Speaker; Mitchell Omerberg; Brianna Morales (Housing Action Coalition); Romalyn Schmaltz; Speaker; Alice Mosely; Raymond Tan; shared various concerns regarding the ordinance matter.

Supervisor Mahmood requested to be added as a co-sponsor.

Vice Chair Chen moved that this Ordinance be AMENDED, AN AMENDMENT OF THE WHOLE BEARING NEW TITLE, on Page 1, Lines 4-7, to read '2) require relocation assistance to affected occupants of those units and to former occupants who vacated due to harassment, improper buyout agreements, owner move-ins, or pursuant to the Ellis Act'; on Page 1, Lines 13-14, by inserting '7) require an additional disclosure in notice of intent to withdraw units under the Ellis Act'; on Page 3, Lines 21-25, by inserting '(c) This Ordinance also includes a requirement that a landlord withdrawing a unit under the Ellis Act must state whether they intend to demolish the unit within the next five years. This statement would be for informational purposes only: it is not intended to create a substantive defense to an eviction, but it will be helpful for the City to understand the impacts of SB 330 and to manage tenant displacements.'; on Page 8, Line 11, through Page 9, Line 5, to read '(2) Outside the Priority Equity Geographies Special Use District, any Development Application that seeks authorization for Removal of one or more Residential or Unauthorized Units is required to obtain Conditional Use authorization unless it meets all the following criteria: (A) The project sponsor certifies under penalty of perjury that any units to be demolished are not tenant occupied and are without a history of evictions under Administrative Code Sections 37.9(a)(8)-(12), (14), or (17) within the last ten years, and have not been vacated within the past ten years pursuant to a Buyout Agreement, as defined in Administrative Code Section 37.9E, as it may be amended from time to time, regardless of whether the Buyout Agreement was filed with the Rent Board pursuant to Administrative Code Section 37.9E(h); (B) No units would be removed or demolished that are: (i) subject to a recorded covenant, ordinance, or law that restricts rents to levels affordable to persons and families of lower- or very low-income within the past ten years; or (ii) subject to limits on rent increases under the Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance (Chapter 37 of the Administrative Code) within the past ten years; or (iii) rented by lower- or very low-income households within the past ten years'; on Page 14, Lines 8-22, to read '(B) The project does not propose changes to more than 20% of the character defining features of 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. (C) The project increases

the number of Residential Units subject to the rent increase limitations of the Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance (Chapter 37 of the Administrative Code) compared to the number of existing Residential Units and Unauthorized Units subject to the rent increase limitations of the Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance. (D) The project does not require the Residential Demolition of existing, deed-restricted, affordable and/or below market rate housing, or increases the number of permanently Affordable Units located on the site.'; on Page 17, Lines 15-22, to read 'The Planning Commission shall approve, and the Planning Department shall publish on its website, a Replacement Unit Implementation Document (hereafter, the "Implementation Document") containing procedures, regulations, guidelines, notice formats, and application forms, as deemed necessary to assist the Department in ensuring that the relocation assistance and services in this Section 317.2 are available to displaced tenants, as required, and with implementation, monitoring, and enforcement of the policies and procedures of this Section 317.2. The Department may update the Implementation Document from time to time and shall seek Planning Commission approval for any significant changes.'; on Page 18, Line 12, though Page 19, Line 13, to read '"Demolition" is defined as "Residential Demolition" in Section 317(b)(2). "Existing Occupant" shall mean a Tenant of a unit at the time the owner of a unit applied to demolish the unit or recovered possession of the unit in order for the unit to be demolished. A Tenant occupying a unit on the date the project sponsor submitted a Development Application or preliminary application to demolish that unit shall be an Existing Occupant. If there is no Tenant occupying the unit on such date, the prior Tenant shall still qualify as an Existing Occupant for purposes of this Section 317.2 if any of the following circumstances are true as of the date the project sponsor submitted the Development Application or preliminary application: 1) the Tenant vacated the unit within the previous five years following a wrongful endeavor to recover possession of the unit through harassment under Administrative Section 37.9(l), where the Rent Board found the Tenant had vacated the unit because of the harassment or where the Rent Board made a finding of ongoing harassment and the tenant vacated within 12 months after said finding; the Tenant vacated the unit within the previous five years pursuant to a Buyout Agreement that did not substantially comply with the disclosure requirements set forth in Administrative Code Section 37.9E, subdivisions (d)(12) and (f)(5); 3) the Tenant vacated the unit within the previous three years pursuant to a notice to vacate under Administrative Code Section 37.9(a)(8); or 4) the Tenant vacated the unit within the previous five years pursuant to a notice to vacate under Administrative Code Section 37.9(a)(13).'; on Page 20, Lines 4-6, by inserting '"Tenant" is defined in Administrative Code Section 37.2(t) and shall include any lawful occupants of the unit, as well as any persons who have vacated the unit temporarily while the landlord is carrying out capital improvements or rehabilitation work.'; on Page 23, Lines 7-9, by inserting 'To ensure that Existing Occupants are provided the relocation assistance and services required by this Section 317.2'; on Page 24, Lines 2-3, by striking 'sent by certified mail and'; on Page 24, Line 6, by striking 'following receipt of the notice required by subsection (A)'; on Page 24, Lines 11-12, to read '(C) Right to Relocation Assistance. The Department shall ensure that Project sponsors provide relocation assistance to Existing Occupants as follows:'; on Page 30, Lines 6-12, to read '(f) Private Right of Action; Civil Penalties. (1) An aggrieved tenant, or any organization with tax exempt status under United States Code Section 501(c)(3) or 501(c)(4) that has a primary mission of protecting tenants in San Francisco may file a civil action for monetary damages and/or injunctive relief against any project sponsor, including any person(s) acting on their behalf and any successors-in-interest, to enforce violations of this Section 317.2.'; on Page 42, Lines 4-5, by inserting 'Information related to a tenant's source of income shall be treated as confidential information.'; on Page 46, Lines 11-12, by striking '(C) The alleged harassment is so severe that it has materially impacted a tenant's enjoyment of the unit'; on Page 46, Line 19, through Page 47, Line 2, to read '(3) The Executive Director shall schedule any such hearing within 45 days after receipt of the report of alleged harassment, or as soon as practicable thereafter. Both the tenant and the landlord may appear at the hearing and make oral and/or written presentations, including presentation of other witnesses. Following such hearing, the Administrative Law Judge shall issue findings and conclusions in regard to whether harassment occurred that was severe enough that it materially impacted the tenant's enjoyment of the unit, and in the case of a prior tenant whether the prior tenant vacated the unit due to the harassment for purposes of Planning Code Section 317.2. The findings and conclusions may be appealed by either party to provide the Board under Section 37.8.'; on Page 49, Lines 8-9, by inserting 'The notice shall also disclose for informational purposes only whether the landlord intends to demolish the accommodations within the next five years.'; on Page 50, Lines 19-23, by inserting '(F) With respect to notices of intent dated on or after the effective date of the ordinance in Board File No. 250926, whether the landlords intends to demolish within the next five years after the date of the notice

and a statement that the tenant may be entitled to additional protections in the event the unit is demolished pursuant to Planning Code Section 317.2, and that the tenant may keep their contact information on file with the Rent Board.'; and making clerical and conforming amendments throughout the ordinance text. The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 3 - Melgar, Chen, Mahmood

Ordinance amending the Planning Code to 1) require property owners seeking to demolish residential units to replace all units that are being demolished; 2) require relocation assistance to affected occupants of those units and to former occupants who vacated due to harassment, improper buyout agreements, owner move-ins, or pursuant to the Ellis Act, with additional assistance and protections for lower-income tenants; 3) modify the conditional use criteria that apply to projects to demolish residential units; amending the Administrative Code to 4) require landlords to provide additional relocation assistance to lower-income tenants who are being required to vacate temporarily due to capital improvements or rehabilitation work; 5) update the standards and procedures for hearings related to tenant harassment; 6) require additional disclosures in buyout agreements; 7) require an additional disclosure in notice of intent to withdraw units under the Ellis Act; 8) making various non-substantive changes and clarifications; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making public necessity, convenience, and welfare findings under Planning Code, Section 302; and making findings of consistency with the General Plan and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1.

Vice Chair Chen moved that this Ordinance be CONTINUED AS AMENDED to the Land Use and Transportation Committee meeting of December 1, 2025. The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 3 - Melgar, Chen, Mahmood

Chair Melgar requested that File Nos. 250966, 250700, 251071, 250701, 251073, and 250985 be heard together.

SPECIAL MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Supervisors Chan, Mandelman, and Sherrill were noted present at 3:45 p.m., thereby constituting a quorum of the Board of Supervisors. A special meeting of the Board of Supervisors was convened at 3:45 p.m., although the meeting was conducted in all respects as a committee meeting for items on the agenda and any substantive decisions constitute a recommendation of the committee and not action taken by the board.

Present: Supervisors Melgar, Chen, Mahmood, Chan, Mandelman, and Sherrill.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

At the hour of 4:15 p.m., Supervisor Mandelman was noted not present, thereby adjouring the Special Meeting of the Board of Supervisors.

Supervisor Chan was noted not present at 4:18 p.m.

Supervisor Sherrill was noted not present at 4:22 p.m.

Chair Melgar recessed the meeting beginning at 6:04 p.m., and reconvened the meeting at 6:10 p.m.

250966 [General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan]

Ordinance amending the General Plan to revise the Urban Design Element, Commerce and Industry Element, Transportation Element, Balboa Park Station Area Plan, Glen Park Community Plan, Market and Octavia Area Plan, Northeastern Waterfront Plan, Van Ness Avenue Area Plan, Western SoMa (South of Market) Area Plan, Western Shoreline Area Plan, Downtown Area Plan, and Land Use Index, to implement the Family Housing Zoning Program, including the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program, by adjusting guidelines regarding building heights, density, design, and other matters; amending the City's Local Coastal Program to implement the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program and other associated changes in the City's Coastal Zone, and directing the Planning Director to transmit the Ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and adopting findings of public necessity, convenience, and welfare under Planning Code, Section 340. (Planning Commission)
(Pursuant to Charter, Section 4.105, the Planning Commission recommends General Plan amendments to the Board of Supervisors for approval or rejection. If the Board fails to act within 90 days of receipt, the proposed General Plan amendment shall be deemed approved. Transmittal Date: September 22, 2025)

Heard in Committee. Speaker(s): Aly Bonde (Office of the Mayor); Joshua Switzky, Lisa Chen, Rachel Tanner, and Richard Sucre (Planning Department); Supervisors Rafael Mandelman, Connie Chan, and Stephen Sherrill (Board of Supervisors); Maia Small (San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency); Brad Russi (Office of the City Attorney); presented information and answered questions raised throughout the discussion. Eileen Boken; Georgia Schuttish; Raymond Tan; Paul Wormer; Sarah "Fred" Sherburn-Zimmer (Housing Rights Committee); Jacinda McCann; Speaker; Marie Romero; Zachary Frial (SOMCAN); Theresa Dulales (SOMCAN); Jose Descansera; Christen Evans; Mark Solomon; Jessica Vistnes; Peter Stevens; Marc Bruno; Mary; Robert Ho (Ingleside Terrace Association); Speaker; Speaker; Romalyn Schmaltz; Brian Malnik; Speaker; Andy Katz; David Kim (SF YIMBY); Jenny Gephart; Stan Hayes; Stephen Torres; Kay Walker; Ocean; Speaker; John Gutterman; Nick Ferris, President (Telegraph Hill Dwellers); Speaker; Glendida Farley; Kate Bloomberg; Gwen; Speaker; Paul Michael; Gino Fortunado; Gabe; Erica; Tina Lombardi (San Francisco Heritage); Speaker; Sarah Rogers; Tina; Udya Singh; Corey Smith (Housing Action Coalition); Speaker; Jane Natoli (YIMBY Action); Speaker; Speaker; Phillip; Paula Katz; Mike Chen; Bobak Esfandiari (San Francisco Democratic Party Central Committee); Speaker; Speaker; Brianna Morales (Housing Action Coalition); Speaker; Brian Han; Jeantelle Labarinto; Speaker; Asia Nicole Duncan; Harris; Rosa Shields (San Francisco Labor Council); shared various concerns regarding the ordinance matter.

Chair Melgar moved that this Ordinance be CONTINUED to the Land Use and Transportation Committee meeting of December 1, 2025. The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 3 - Melgar, Chen, Mahmood

250700 [Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan]

Sponsors: Mayor; Sauter, Mahmood and Dorsey

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.
(Economic Impact)

Heard in Committee. Speaker(s): Aly Bonde (Office of the Mayor); Joshua Switzky, Lisa Chen, Rachel Tanner, and Richard Sucre (Planning Department); Supervisors Rafael Mandelman, Connie Chan, and Stephen Sherrill (Board of Supervisors); Maia Small (San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency); Brad Russi (Office of the City Attorney); presented information and answered questions raised throughout the discussion. Eileen Boken; Georgia Schuttish; Raymond Tan; Paul Wormer; Sarah "Fred" Sherburn-Zimmer (Housing Rights Committee); Jacinda McCann; Speaker; Marie Romero; Zachary Frial (SOMCAN); Theresa Dulales (SOMCAN); Jose Descansera; Christen Evans; Mark Solomon; Jessica Vistnes; Peter Stevens; Marc Bruno; Mary; Robert Ho (Ingleside Terrace Association); Speaker; Speaker; Romalyn Schmaltz; Brian Malnik; Speaker; Andy Katz; David Kim (SF YIMBY); Jenny Gephart; Stan Hayes; Stephen Torres; Kay Walker; Ocean; Speaker; John Gutterman; Nick Ferris, President (Telegraph Hill Dwellers); Speaker; Glendida Farley; Kate Bloomberg; Gwen; Speaker; Paul Michael; Gino Fortunado; Gabe; Erica; Tina Lombardi (San Francisco Heritage); Speaker; Sarah Rogers; Tina; Udya Singh; Corey Smith (Housing Action Coalition); Speaker; Jane Natoli (YIMBY Action); Speaker; Speaker; Phillip; Paula Katz; Mike Chen; Bobak Esfandiari (San Francisco Democratic Party Central Committee); Speaker; Speaker; Brianna Morales (Housing Action Coalition); Speaker; Brian Han; Jeantelle Labarinto; Speaker; Asia Nicole Duncan; Harris; Rosa Shields (San Francisco Labor Council); shared various concerns regarding the ordinance matter.

Vice Chair Chen moved that this Ordinance be AMENDED, AN AMENDMENT OF THE WHOLE BEARING NEW TITLE, to exclude all currently designated historic landmarks and contributors to historic districts, pursuant to Article 10, from the rezoning plan. The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 2 - Melgar, Chen
Noes: 1 - Mahmood

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 , except for properties with structures designated as landmarks or contributors to historic districts pursuant to Article 10; 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. (Economic Impact)

Member Mahmood moved that this Ordinance be AMENDED, AN AMENDMENT OF THE WHOLE BEARING SAME TITLE, to decrease heights along one block of Geary Blvd between Wood and Emerson; decrease heights at the Marina Safeway parcel; decrease heights at Ghirardelli Square; increase heights along the western portion of Van Ness between Ellis and Turk; increase heights along Pine Street between Leavenworth and Larkin Streets; and decrease heights on North Point Street between Larkin and Hyde streets. The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 3 - Melgar, Chen, Mahmood

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, except for properties with structures designated as landmarks or contributors to historic districts pursuant to Article 10; 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. (Economic Impact)

Vice Chair Chen moved that this Ordinance be AMENDED, to incorporate text from the duplicate file in Board File No. 251071, which would remove all Priority Equity Geographies from the rezoning plan. The motion FAILED by the following vote:

Ayes: 1 - Chen

Noes: 2 - Melgar, Mahmood

Chair Melgar moved that this Ordinance be CONTINUED AS AMENDED to the Land Use and Transportation Committee meeting of December 1, 2025. The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 3 - Melgar, Chen, Mahmood

251071 [Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan]

Sponsors: Mayor; Sauter, Mahmood and Dorsey

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), except for properties located in the Priority Equity Geographies Special Use District ("PEG SUD"); 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, except for properties located in the PEG SUD; 4) reclassify certain properties currently zoned Neighborhood Commercial (NC) or Public (P) to Community Business (C-2) , except for properties located in the PEG SUD; and 5) reclassify certain properties from Public to Mixed-Use or Neighborhood Commercial Districts, except for properties located in the PEG SUD; amending the Height and Bulk Map to: 1) reclassify properties in the Family Zoning Plan to R-4 Height and Bulk District, except for properties located in the PEG SUD; 2) change the height limits on certain lots in the R-4 Height and Bulk District, except for properties located in the PEG SUD; 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 south of Lincoln Way to R-4 Height and Bulk District; 2) reclassify certain properties south of Lincoln Way to RTO-C and Neighborhood Commercial District; and 3) 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.
(Economic Impact)

Heard in Committee. Speaker(s): Aly Bonde (Office of the Mayor); Joshua Switzky, Lisa Chen, Rachel Tanner, and Richard Sucre (Planning Department); Supervisors Rafael Mandelman, Connie Chan, and Stephen Sherrill (Board of Supervisors); Maia Small (San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency); Brad Russi (Office of the City Attorney); presented information and answered questions raised throughout the discussion. Eileen Boken; Georgia Schuttish; Raymond Tan; Paul Wormer; Sarah "Fred" Sherburn-Zimmer (Housing Rights Committee); Jacinda McCann; Speaker; Marie Romero; Zachary Frial (SOMCAN); Theresa Dulales (SOMCAN); Jose Descansera; Christen Evans; Mark Solomon; Jessica Vistnes; Peter Stevens; Marc Bruno; Mary; Robert Ho (Ingleside Terrace Association); Speaker; Speaker; Romalyn Schmaltz; Brian Malnik; Speaker; Andy Katz; David Kim (SF YIMBY); Jenny Gephart; Stan Hayes; Stephen Torres; Kay Walker; Ocean; Speaker; John Gutterman; Nick Ferris, President (Telegraph Hill Dwellers); Speaker; Glendida Farley; Kate Bloomberg; Gwen; Speaker; Paul Michael; Gino Fortunado; Gabe; Erica; Tina Lombardi (San Francisco Heritage); Speaker; Sarah Rogers; Tina; Udya Singh; Corey Smith (Housing Action Coalition); Speaker; Jane Natoli (YIMBY Action); Speaker; Speaker; Phillip; Paula Katz; Mike Chen; Bobak Esfandiari (San Francisco Democratic Party Central Committee); Speaker; Speaker; Brianna Morales (Housing Action Coalition); Speaker; Brian Han; Jeantelle Labarinto; Speaker; Asia Nicole Duncan; Harris; Rosa Shields (San Francisco Labor Council); shared various concerns regarding the ordinance matter.

Member Mahmood moved that this Ordinance be TABLED. The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 2 - Melgar, Mahmood
Noes: 1 - Chen

250701 [Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan]
Sponsor: Mayor

Ordinance amending the Planning Code to: 1) create the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program to incent housing development through a local bonus program and by adopting a Housing Sustainability District, 2) modify height and bulk limits to provide for additional capacity in well-resourced neighborhoods, and to allow additional height and bulk for projects using the local bonus program, 3) require only buildings taller than 85 feet in certain Districts to reduce ground level wind currents, 4) make conforming changes to the RH (Residential, House), RM (Residential, Mixed), and RC (Residential-Commercial) District zoning tables to reflect the changes to density controls, and parking requirements made in this Ordinance, 5) create the RTO-C (Residential Transit Oriented-Commercial) District, 6) implement the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's Transit-Oriented Communities Policy by making changes to parking requirements, minimum residential densities, and minimum office intensities, and requiring maximum dwelling unit sizes, 7) revise off-street parking and curb cut obligations citywide, 8) create the Non-contiguous San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Sites Special Use District, 9) permit businesses displaced by new construction to relocate without a conditional use authorization and waive development impact fees for those businesses, 10) make technical amendments to the Code to implement the above changes, 11) make conforming changes to zoning tables in various Districts, including the Neighborhood Commercial District and Mixed Use Districts, and 12) reduce usable open space and bicycle parking requirements for senior housing; amending the Business and Tax Regulations Code regarding the Board of Appeals' review of permits in the Housing Choice Program Housing Sustainability District; also, amending the Local Coastal Program to implement the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program and other associated changes in the City's Coastal Zone, and directing the Planning Director to transmit the Ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and making public necessity, convenience, and welfare findings under Planning Code, Section 302.
(Economic Impact)

Heard in Committee. Speaker(s): Aly Bonde (Office of the Mayor); Joshua Switzky, Lisa Chen, Rachel Tanner, and Richard Sucre (Planning Department); Supervisors Rafael Mandelman, Connie Chan, and Stephen Sherrill (Board of Supervisors); Maia Small (San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency); Brad Russi (Office of the City Attorney); presented information and answered questions raised throughout the discussion. Eileen Boken; Georgia Schuttish; Raymond Tan; Paul Wormer; Sarah "Fred" Sherburn-Zimmer (Housing Rights Committee); Jacinda McCann; Speaker; Marie Romero; Zachary Frial (SOMCAN); Theresa Dulales (SOMCAN); Jose Descansera; Christen Evans; Mark Solomon; Jessica Vistnes; Peter Stevens; Marc Bruno; Mary; Robert Ho (Ingleside Terrace Association); Speaker; Speaker; Romalyn Schmaltz; Brian Malnik; Speaker; Andy Katz; David Kim (SF YIMBY); Jenny Gephart; Stan Hayes; Stephen Torres; Kay Walker; Ocean; Speaker; John Gutterman; Nick Ferris, President (Telegraph Hill Dwellers); Speaker; Glendida Farley; Kate Bloomberg; Gwen; Speaker; Paul Michael; Gino Fortunado; Gabe; Erica; Tina Lombardi (San Francisco Heritage); Speaker; Sarah Rogers; Tina; Udya Singh; Corey Smith (Housing Action Coalition); Speaker; Jane Natoli (YIMBY Action); Speaker; Speaker; Phillip; Paula Katz; Mike Chen; Bobak Esfandiari (San Francisco Democratic Party Central Committee); Speaker; Speaker; Brianna Morales (Housing Action Coalition); Speaker; Brian Han; Jeantelle Labarinto; Speaker; Asia Nicole Duncan; Harris; Rosa Shields (San Francisco Labor Council); shared various concerns regarding the ordinance matter.

Vice Chair Chen moved that this Ordinance be AMENDED, AN AMENDMENT OF THE WHOLE BEARING SAME TITLE, to make conforming changes to exclude all currently designated historic landmarks and contributors to historic districts, pursuant to Article 10, from the rezoning plan. The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 2 - Melgar, Chen

Noes: 1 - Mahmood

(Economic Impact)

Vice Chair Chen moved that this Ordinance be AMENDED, AN AMENDMENT OF THE WHOLE BEARING SAME TITLE, to incorporate text from the duplicate file in Board File No. 251073 to remove reduced unit mix requirements in the local program and defer to existing unit mix requirements in Planning Code, Sections 207.6 and 207.7. The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 2 - Melgar, Chen

Noes: 1 - Mahmood

(Economic Impact)

Vice Chair Chen moved that this Ordinance be AMENDED, to incorporate text from the duplicate file in Board File No. 251073 related to the SFMTA Special Use District (SUD) which would add findings establishing the objective of prioritizing the Priority Equity Geographies sites in the SFMTA SUD for 100% affordable housing; add a pre-application process with a feasibility study to model those sites which satisfy minimum specifications as 100% affordable housing; require at least one publicly-noticed pre-application meeting; add findings of consistency with Housing Element Actions 1.2.6 and 1.2.7; and provide for a Right of First Refusal for qualified organizations. The motion FAILED by the following vote:

Ayes: 1 - Chen

Noes: 2 - Melgar, Mahmood

Chair Melgar moved that this Ordinance be CONTINUED AS AMENDED to the Land Use and Transportation Committee meeting of December 1, 2025. The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 3 - Melgar, Chen, Mahmood

251073 [Planning, Business and Tax Regulations, Administrative Codes - Family Zoning Plan]

Sponsor: Mayor

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 (SFMTA SUD), 9) permit businesses displaced by new construction to relocate without a conditional use authorization and waive development impact fees for those businesses, 10) make technical amendments to the Code to implement the above changes, 11) make conforming changes to zoning tables in various Districts, including the Neighborhood Commercial District and Mixed Use Districts, and 12) reduce usable open space and bicycle parking requirements for senior housing; amending the Business and Tax Regulations Code regarding the Board of Appeals' review of permits in the Housing Choice Program Housing Sustainability District; amending the Administrative Code to set Board policy regarding the sale or lease of properties within the SFMTA SUD; also, amending the Local Coastal Program to implement the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program and other associated changes in the City's Coastal Zone, and directing the Planning Director to transmit the ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and making public necessity, convenience, and welfare findings under Planning Code, Section 302.
(Economic Impact)

Heard in Committee. Speaker(s): Aly Bonde (Office of the Mayor); Joshua Switzky, Lisa Chen, Rachel Tanner, and Richard Sucre (Planning Department); Supervisors Rafael Mandelman, Connie Chan, and Stephen Sherrill (Board of Supervisors); Maia Small (San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency); Brad Russi (Office of the City Attorney); presented information and answered questions raised throughout the discussion. Eileen Boken; Georgia Schuttish; Raymond Tan; Paul Wormer; Sarah "Fred" Sherburn-Zimmer (Housing Rights Committee); Jacinda McCann; Speaker; Marie Romero; Zachary Frial (SOMCAN); Theresa Dulales (SOMCAN); Jose Descansera; Christen Evans; Mark Solomon; Jessica Vistnes; Peter Stevens; Marc Bruno; Mary; Robert Ho (Ingleside Terrace Association); Speaker; Speaker; Romalyn Schmaltz; Brian Malnik; Speaker; Andy Katz; David Kim (SF YIMBY); Jenny Gephart; Stan Hayes; Stephen Torres; Kay Walker; Ocean; Speaker; John Gutterman; Nick Ferris, President (Telegraph Hill Dwellers); Speaker; Glendida Farley; Kate Bloomberg; Gwen; Speaker; Paul Michael; Gino Fortunado; Gabe; Erica; Tina Lombardi (San Francisco Heritage); Speaker; Sarah Rogers; Tina; Udya Singh; Corey Smith (Housing Action Coalition); Speaker; Jane Natoli (YIMBY Action); Speaker; Speaker; Phillip; Paula Katz; Mike Chen; Bobak Esfandiari (San Francisco Democratic Party Central Committee); Speaker; Speaker; Brianna Morales (Housing Action Coalition); Speaker; Brian Han; Jeantelle Labarinto; Speaker; Asia Nicole Duncan; Harris; Rosa Shields (San Francisco Labor Council); shared various concerns regarding the ordinance matter.

.
.

Member Mahmood moved that this Ordinance be TABLED. The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 2 - Melgar, Mahmood
Noes: 1 - Chen

250985 [Local Coastal Program Amendment - Family Zoning Plan]
Sponsor: Mayor

Resolution transmitting to the California Coastal Commission for review and certification an amendment to the Implementation Program and Land Use Plan of the City's certified Local Coastal Program to implement the Family Zoning Plan; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act.

Heard in Committee. Speaker(s): Aly Bonde (Office of the Mayor); Joshua Switzky, Lisa Chen, Rachel Tanner, and Richard Sucre (Planning Department); Supervisors Rafael Mandelman, Connie Chan, and Stephen Sherrill (Board of Supervisors); Maia Small (San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency); Brad Russi (Office of the City Attorney); presented information and answered questions raised throughout the discussion. Eileen Boken; Georgia Schuttish; Raymond Tan; Paul Wormer; Sarah "Fred" Sherburn-Zimmer (Housing Rights Committee); Jacinda McCann; Speaker; Marie Romero; Zachary Frial (SOMCAN); Theresa Dulales (SOMCAN); Jose Descansera; Christen Evans; Mark Solomon; Jessica Vistnes; Peter Stevens; Marc Bruno; Mary; Robert Ho (Ingleside Terrace Association); Speaker; Speaker; Romalyn Schmaltz; Brian Malnik; Speaker; Andy Katz; David Kim (SF YIMBY); Jenny Gephart; Stan Hayes; Stephen Torres; Kay Walker; Ocean; Speaker; John Gutterman; Nick Ferris, President (Telegraph Hill Dwellers); Speaker; Glendida Farley; Kate Bloomberg; Gwen; Speaker; Paul Michael; Gino Fortunado; Gabe; Erica; Tina Lombardi (San Francisco Heritage); Speaker; Sarah Rogers; Tina; Udya Singh; Corey Smith (Housing Action Coalition); Speaker; Jane Natoli (YIMBY Action); Speaker; Speaker; Phillip; Paula Katz; Mike Chen; Bobak Esfandiari (San Francisco Democratic Party Central Committee); Speaker; Speaker; Brianna Morales (Housing Action Coalition); Speaker; Brian Han; Jeantelle Labarinto; Speaker; Asia Nicole Duncan; Harris; Rosa Shields (San Francisco Labor Council); shared various concerns regarding the resolution matter.

Chair Melgar moved that this Resolution be CONTINUED to the Land Use and Transportation Committee meeting of December 1, 2025. The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 3 - Melgar, Chen, Mahmood

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the Land Use and Transportation Committee adjourned at the hour of 7:11 p.m.

N.B. The Minutes of this meeting set forth all actions taken by the Land Use and Transportation Committee on the matters stated, but not necessarily in the chronological sequence in which the matters were taken up.

San Francisco Planning

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

NOTICE OF ELECTRONIC TRANSMITTAL

DATE: November 3, 2025

TO: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

FROM: Debra Dwyer, Principal Environmental Planner, 628.652.7576 or Debra.Dwyer@sfgov.org

RE: Environmental Review for the Family Zoning Program
Board Files 250700, 250701, and 250966

In compliance with San Francisco's Administrative Code Section 8.12.5 "Electronic Distribution of Multi-Page Documents," the Planning Department is submitting a memorandum addressing analysis of proposed amendments to the family zoning program as heard at the Land Use and Transportation Committee hearing on October 20, 2025.

The Land Use and Transportation Committee of the Board of Supervisors will hold a hearing on the Family Zoning Program on November 3, 2025. These environmental documents are associated with Board Files 250700, 250701, and 250966. For questions regarding the environmental review for this project, please contact Ryan Shum, 628.652.7542 or ryan.shum@sfgov.org.

Enclosure

San Francisco Planning

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

MEMORANDUM 2

Date: November 3, 2025
To: San Francisco Board of Supervisors
From: Lisa Gibson, Environmental Review Officer – lisa.gibson@sfgov.org , (628) 652-7571
Debra Dwyer, Principal Planner – debra.dwyer@sfgov.org, (628) 652-7576
Ryan Shum, Senior Planner – ryan.shum@sfgov.org, (628) 652-7542

RE: CEQA Analysis for Family Zoning Plan – Proposed Amendments
Planning Case Nos. 2019-016230ENV, 2021-005878CWP, and 2021-005878GPA
Board file nos. 250700, 250701, and 250966
Attachments: Attachment A – Summary Table for October 20th Land Use & Transportation Committee Amendments

Introduction

The purpose of this memorandum is to document why proposed amendments to the Family Zoning Plan legislation do not require further analysis pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) beyond the previously prepared environmental impact report, addendum, and supplemental memo.

Following the publication of the Housing Element 2022 Update Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) and adoption of the Housing Element, the San Francisco Planning Department (department) undertook an iterative process to develop a proposed rezoning program. The Mayor introduced the Family Zoning Plan (rezoning program) on June 24 and July 28, 2025. The department reviewed the legislation in compliance with CEQA, determined that there would be no new environmental impacts from the legislation, and prepared an addendum to the FEIR to confirm the findings of the FEIR analysis. The department published Addendum No. 1 to the Housing Element 2022 Update FEIR (addendum) on September 3, 2025, pursuant to CEQA.[1] The Planning Commission (commission) heard the rezoning program on September 11, 2025 and recommended its approval with modifications to the Board of Supervisors (board).

After the September 11 hearing at the Planning Commission, the Mayor submitted substitute legislation on September 30, 2025 that included minor changes to the zoning map and the planning code.[2] An October 16, 2025 memorandum to the file provided analysis for the modifications in the substitute legislation (Version 3

1 San Francisco Planning Department. *Addendum No. 1 to the Environmental Impact Report*. September 3, 2025. Available at: https://sfplanning.org/environmental-review-documents?title=housing+element&field_environmental_review_categ_target_id=All&items_per_page=10

2 San Francisco Planning Department. *Family Zoning Plan: September 30, 2025, Substitute Legislation (version 3).* Available at: https://sfgov.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=14834613&GUID=01515652-61EE-41BB-B353-CFB0C61A2C95

– September 30, 2025) pursuant to CEQA Statute section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines section 15162-15164, and incorporated by reference analysis in the FEIR and addendum.

On October 20, 2025 the Land Use and Transportation Committee (land use committee) of the Board of Supervisors (board) held a hearing on the family zoning program. Proposed amendments to both the proposed zoning ordinance and zoning map were introduced (See attachment A). The land use committee will hold a second hearing on the family zoning program as well as the proposed amendments on November 3, 2025. This memorandum 2 provides analysis for the proposed amendments to the substitute legislation (Version 3 – September 30, 2025) pursuant to CEQA Statute section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines section 15162-15164, and incorporates by reference analysis in the FEIR, addendum, and supplemental memorandum.

Description and Analysis of Proposed Amendments

The full text of the proposed ordinances and map changes are available online at on the board's Legislative Research Center (https://sfbos.org/legislative-research-center-lrc) under board file nos. 250700, 250701, and 250966.

The proposed amendments include modifications to the Zoning map as well as the Planning Code. The proposed modifications with the potential to result in physical environmental effects are discussed further below. Table 1 below presents the environmental analysis of proposed map changes. Table 2 presents the potential environmental analysis of proposed planning code changes.

TABLE 1: CEQA Analysis of Map Changes

#	Block/Lot(s)	Amendment	Sponsor	CEQA Analysis
1	0446/002,003; 0452/002 [Safe way site, and Ghiradelli Square]	Reclassify height limit and bulk district from 65' to 40//40-R-4.	Sherill	Proposed modification would not increase height or number of units allowed compared to the rezoning program analyzed in the addendum. No further analysis required.
2	0025/east of and including 008 [Northpoint, north side between Hyde and Larkin]	Reclassify zoning from 40//65-R-4 to 40//40-R-4	Sherill	Proposed modification would not alter the maximum height or density or number of units allowed compared to the rezoning program analyzed in the addendum. No further analysis required.
3	1070/ 001A, 003 [Geary, between Wood and Emmerson, northside]	Reclassify 140' to 50//85-R-4	Sherill	Proposed modification would not alter the maximum height or density or number of units allowed compared to the rezoning program analyzed in the addendum. No further analysis required.
4	Various	Various – Remove all priority equity geographies	Chen	Would not change height or density compared to existing conditions. No further analysis required.

#	Block/Lot(s)	Amendment	Sponsor	CEQA Analysis
5	Various	Removes Article 10 structures (Local Landmarks). (pending proposal)	Mandelman	Would not change height or density compared to existing conditions. No further analysis required.
6	All NCs Various LOWER HEIGHTS IN NEIGHBORHOOD and COMMERCIAL DISTRICTS (OTHER THAN GEARY)	Remove from parcel table and maps completely all parcels in District 1. Lowers height to 40' (Inner Clement, Outer Clement, Outer Balboa, and some other non-named NCs), Decreases heights in many other locations: All RTO-C will be decreased from 85' to 65' (from 50//85 RTO-C to 40//65 or 50//65.)	Chan	Remove proposed changes to areas in District 1 from proposed zoning program. No further analysis is required.
7	Coastal Zone District 1	Blocks: 1591, 1593, 1596, 1598, 1689, 1690, 1691, 1481, 1483 [approx. 122 parcels]	Chan	Remove parcels on these blocks from the proposed zoning program; no analysis required.

Table 2: CEQA Analysis of Planning Code Changes

#	Planning Code Sec.	Sponsor	Amendment	CEQA Analysis
1	206.10(b)(9)	Melgar	EXEMPT RENT-CONTROLLED BUILDINGS OVER 2 UNITS FROM LOCAL PROGRAM: Such buildings would not be eligible for the local program but could still use State programs, if applicable.	The proposed modification would not alter the maximum height or density or number of units allowed compared to the assumptions in the FEIR or the indirect effects of the proposed zoning program analyzed in the addendum. No further analysis required.
2	206.10(b)(9)	Melgar	NO DEMOLITION OR CONVERSION OF TOURIST Hotels**:** Remove tourist hotels from Local Program eligibility.	The proposed modification would not alter the maximum height or density or number of units allowed compared to the assumptions in the FEIR or the indirect effects of the rezoning

#	Planning Code Sec.	Sponsor	Amendment	CEQA Analysis
				program analyzed in the addendum. No further analysis required.
3	344 (d)(13)	Melgar	NO DEMOLITION OR CONVERSION OF TOURIST HOTELS IN HOUSING SUSTAINABILITY DISTRICT. Adds eligibility criteria in HSD that project may not demolish or convert any portion of a Tourist Hotel.	The proposed modification would not alter the maximum height or density or number of units allowed compared to the assumptions in the FEIR or the indirect effects of the rezoning program analyzed in the addendum. No further analysis required.
4	334 (c)	Melgar	TECHNICAL CLARIFICATION: Affirms that nothing in Section 334 (Housing Sustainability District) abrogates permit, license, or other requirements codified outside the planning code.	The proposed modification would not result in physical impacts. No further analysis required.
5	206.10(d)(1)(B)	Chen	REINSTATES LOCAL PROGRAM UNIT MIX REQUIREMENT: Removes reduced unit mix requirement in the local program and defers to existing unit mix requirements in Planning Code 207.6 and 207.7.	The proposed modification would not alter the maximum height or density or number of units allowed compared to the assumptions in the FEIR or the indirect effects of the rezoning program analyzed in the addendum. No further analysis required.
6	334(d)(3)	Chen	NO LOCAL PROGRAM MODIFICATIONS OF UNIT MIX: includes unit mix as an exclusion that cannot be modified through a Major Modification.	The proposed modification would not alter the maximum height or density or number of units allowed compared to the assumptions in the FEIR or the indirect effects of the rezoning program analyzed in the addendum. No further analysis required.
7	249.11 (a)(2), (d) (1-3)	Chen	100% AFFORDABLE ON SFMTA SITES: For the SFMTA Special Use District (SUD), -Add findings establishing the objective of prioritizing the SFMTA sites for 100% affordable housing -Add pre-application process with a feasibility study modeling the site as 100% affordable housing, at least one pre-application meeting (publicly noticed), and documentation of consistency with Housing	The proposed modification would not result in physical impacts. No further analysis required.

#	Planning Code Sec.	Sponsor	Amendment	CEQA Analysis
			Element Actions 1.2.6 and 1.2.7.	
8	270(i)(2)	Mandelman	EXEMPT HISTORIC LANDMARKS FROM REZONING: establishes that Article 10 buildings are excluded from the R-4 Height and Bulk District, specifically: "Lots that contain a structure that has been designated as a historic landmark or a contributor to a historic district, pursuant to Article 10."	The proposed modification would not alter the maximum height or density or number of units allowed compared to the assumptions in the FEIR or the indirect effects of the rezoning program analyzed in the addendum. No further analysis required.
9	121.7(e)	Mandelman	RESTRICT LOT MERGERS WITH HISTORIC PROPERTIES: restricts all A-rated sites (Article 10, Article 11, National Register listed or eligible; Cal register listed or eligible) from lot mergers unless project maintains historic resource, compliant with Preservation Design Standards. Applicable historic resources: Any Lot with a historic resource that is - * designated as a landmark or listed as a contributor to or located within a historic district under Article 10; listed as a Significant or Contributory Building under Article 11; listed in the California Register of Historical Resources or the National Register of Historic Places; * identified in an adopted survey or historic context statement as potentially eligible for individual listing in the California Register of Historical Resources or the National Register of Historic	The proposed modification would not alter the maximum height or density or number of units allowed compared to the assumptions in the FEIR or the indirect effects of the rezoning program analyzed in the addendum. No further analysis required.

#	Planning Code Sec.	Sponsor	Amendment	CEQA Analysis
			Places" * or, located within an historic district that is listed in, or identified in an adopted survey or historic context statement as potentially eligible for listing in, the California Register of Historical Resources or the National Register of Historic Places."	
10	206.10(e)(2)	Sauter	ADDS "WARM SHELL" RETAIL INCENTIVE: provides edits to Warm Shell definition to delineate Food Service Warm Shell and General Warm Shell. Up to 3.0 square-foot bonus for Food Service and up to 2.5 square-foot bonus for General Warm Shell. Also clarifies how square footage bonuses may or may not be combined to result in additional height.	The proposed modification may result in an incremental increase in height of up to one to three additional story(ies)[3] and a marginal increase in the number of units allowed on a project site. **Preservation.** Future development projects that utilize this proposed bonus would be required to preserve the historic resource on-site and comply with the Preservation Design Standards so that the project would not result in a significant and unavoidable impact on the historic resource. Therefore, the proposed modification would not result in a new or substantially more severe significant impact on built-environment historic resources. **Wind & Shadow.** The incremental increase in height would not result in new or more significant shadow or wind impacts and would be subject to project-level environmental review, as applicable. FEIR shadow and wind mitigation measures to reduce shadow and wind impacts, respectively, would apply, as applicable; the planning department would determine whether shadow or wind mitigation measures are required during project-level environmental review.

3 The various square footage bonuses cannot cumulatively add more than one story onto a building, except on projects involving historic preservation on the parcel (see proposed code change #12 "Square Footage Bonus and Code Flexibility for Preservation of Historic Structures". Projects that utilize the square footage bonus and code flexibility for preservation of historic structures may be allowed up to two additional stories for the preservation bonus, plus one additional story cumulatively for the non-preservation incentives. In total, a project may be allowed to add up to three stories if they achieve the maximum allowable square footage bonus for both the preservation and non-preservation incentives. However, note that the square footage bonuses would not automatically grant additional height as horizontal bonuses would be considered and the total amount of square footage bonus would need to add up to one additional story. Furthermore, parcels in residential districts would not be allowed to use the additional square footage bonus as height at all and would be required to use the bonus space in other horizontal ways (e.g., reduced rear yard, etc.).

#	Planning Code Sec.	Sponsor	Amendment	CEQA Analysis
				Other Topics. The potential additional units on-site would be similar in nature to other housing units in the rezoning and on the project site, and would represent a marginal increase over the number of units allowed without the square footage bonus. Thus, the marginal increase in units would not result in new or substantially more severe impacts that were not previously identified in the FEIR and addendum.
11	206.10(e)(5)	Sauter	ADDS STOREFRONT REPLACEMENT INCENTIVE: Adds 1.5 square-foot bonus incentive for Replacement of Commercial Space, defined as a space that has 90-100% the space of the original space, and the same linear storefront dimensions (with allowance for a small lobby).	The proposed modification may result in an incremental increase in height of up to one to three additional story(ies)[4] and a marginal increase in the number of units allowed on a project site. **Preservation.** Future development projects that utilize this proposed bonus would be required to preserve the historic resource on-site and comply with the Preservation Design Standards so that the project would not result in a significant and unavoidable impact on the historic resource. Therefore, the proposed modification would not result in a new or substantially more severe significant impact on built-environment historic resources. **Wind & Shadow.** The incremental increase in height would not result in new or more significant shadow or wind impacts and would be subject to project-level environmental review, as applicable. FEIR shadow and wind mitigation measures to reduce shadow and wind impacts, respectively, would apply, as applicable; the planning department would determine whether shadow or wind mitigation measures are required during project-level environmental review. **Other Topics.** The potential additional units on-site would be similar in nature to other housing units in the rezoning and on the project site, and would represent a marginal increase over the number of units allowed without the square footage bonus. Thus, the marginal increase in units would not result in

4 See footnote 3.

#	Planning Code Sec.	Sponsor	Amendment	CEQA Analysis
				new or substantially more severe impacts that were not previously identified in the FEIR and addendum.
12	206(e)(6)(B)	Sauter	ADDS HISTORIC STOREFRONT PRESERVATION INCENTIVE: Adds incentive to retain historic storefronts per Preservation Design Standards (additional 0.25 gross-square-feet per square foot of storefront, added to other Adaptive Reuse incentive).	The proposed modification may result in an incremental increase in height that may be combined with other Adaptive Reuse incentives. See discussion in item 11. This modification would not result in new or substantially more severe impacts that were not previously identified in the FEIR and addendum.
13	206(e)(4)(A)	Sherrill, Sauter	ADDS 2-BEDROOM UNIT INCENTIVE: Adds incentive for additional 2 BD units above what is required (add 250 sf for each 2 BD unit)	The proposed modification would offer additional bulk for providing larger units. It would not alter the maximum height or number of units allowed compared to the assumptions in the FEIR or the indirect effects of the rezoning program analyzed in the addendum. No further analysis required.
14	Various	Chan	REMOVES FORM-BASED DENSITY IN THE BASE ZONING in all districts, and reverts density to existing density limits (applicable to Dwelling Units, Group Housing, Senior Housing)	The proposed modification would not alter the maximum height or density or number of units allowed compared to the assumptions in the FEIR or the indirect effects of the rezoning program analyzed in the addendum. No further analysis required.
15	209.4	Chan	NO FORM-BASED ZONING FOR NEW RTO-C DISTRICT: Updates the RTO District Zoning Control Table RTO-C column changing form-based density to density allowed in the nearest NC district.	The proposed modification would not alter the maximum height or density or number of units allowed compared to the assumptions in the FEIR or the indirect effects of the rezoning program analyzed in the addendum. No further analysis required.
16	206.10 (b)(4)	Chan	EXPANDS CATEGORIES OF HISTORIC RESOURCES FOR PROHIBITION OF DEMOLITION AND ADDS NO ALTERATIONS OF HISTORIC RESOURCES IN LOCAL PROGRAM: Expands universe of historic resources ineligible for Local Program from listed resources to those eligible	The proposed modification would not alter the maximum height or density or number of units allowed compared to the assumptions in the FEIR or the indirect effects of the rezoning program analyzed in the addendum. No further analysis required.

#	Planning Code Sec.	Sponsor	Amendment	CEQA Analysis
			and "potentially eligible", including non-contributing sites that are within districts. Expands the historic resource protection by clarifying that in addition to not demolishing, it does not "substantially alter a historic resource".	
17	206.10 (b)(10)	Chan	NO RESIDENTIAL DEMOLITIONS IN LOCAL PROGRAM: Adds "(9) does not demolish, remove, or convert to another use any existing Dwelling Unit(s), or Residential Flat" under HC-SF applicability.	The proposed modification would not alter the maximum height or density or number of units allowed compared to the assumptions in the FEIR or the indirect effects of the rezoning program analyzed in the addendum. No further analysis required.
18	334 (g)	Chan	30-MONTH "SHOT CLOCK": Adds a "Progress Requirement" through expiration if a project sponsor has not procured a building or site permit for construction within 30 months of project approval, with the ability to extend by 6 months (or longer in the case of appeal or lawsuit).	The proposed modification would not result in a physical environmental effect. No further analysis required.
19	206.10 (c)	Chan	RESTRICTS LOCATION OF OFF-SITE BMR UNITS: Removes "shall provide the required units within the R-4 Height and Bulk District or" under Inclusionary Housing Ordinance Alternatives. (Instead, revert to earlier requirement that they be provided within ½ mile of project site).	The proposed modification would not alter the maximum height or density or number of units allowed compared to the assumptions in the FEIR or the indirect effects of the rezoning program analyzed in the addendum. No further analysis required.
20	317 (c)(12)	Chan	STRENGTHEN REVIEW OF RESIDENTIAL FLAT DEMOLITION: Removes the CUA exemption for projects with residential flats that increase the number of units on a property; under this amendment, these projects	The proposed modification is a process change would not result in a physical environmental effect. No further analysis required.

#	Planning Code Sec.	Sponsor	Amendment	CEQA Analysis
			would require a CUA hearing.	
21	317 (g)(6)(L)	Chan	STRENGTHEN REVIEW OF RESIDENTIAL FLAT DEMOLITION: Removes CUA criteria language regarding whether residential flats maintain or increase the number of units on the lot that contain 2BD+ or that are at least equivalent in size to residential flats demolished.	The proposed modification is a process change would not result in a physical environmental effect. No further analysis required.
22	344 (d)(4)	Chan	NO ALTERATIONS OF HISTORIC RESOURCES IN HOUSING SUSTAINABILITY DISTRICT (HSD): Expands the historic resource protection by clarifying that in addition to not demolishing, it does not "substantially alter a historic resource"	The proposed modification would not alter the maximum height or density or number of units allowed compared to the assumptions in the FEIR or the indirect effects of the rezoning program analyzed in the addendum. No further analysis required.
23	249.11	Chan	REMOVE SPECIFIC SFMTA PARCELS FROM SUD: Removes Block/lot 1596/044 and 045 from the Non-contiguous SFMTA SUD (La Playa bus turnaround).	The proposed modification would not alter the maximum height or density or number of units allowed compared to the assumptions in the FEIR or the indirect effects of the rezoning program analyzed in the addendum. No further analysis required.
24	Section 8 (g)	Chan	REMOVES REFERENCE TO SFMTA SUD IN THE LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM: In the description of deletes section (g) which references planning code section 249.11 SFMTA SUD	The proposed modification would not result in a physical environmental effect. No further analysis required.
25	206.10 (a)	Chan	AFFIRM LOCAL PROGRAM COMPLIANCE WITH ARTICLE 4 (FEES, AFFORDABILITY): Adds "Except as provided in this Section 206.10, all HC-SF shall comply with Article 4 of the Planning Code"	The proposed modification would not result in a physical environmental effect. No further analysis required.
26	206.10 (d)(4)	Chan	AFFIRM LOCAL PROGRAM COMPLIANCE WITH ARTICLE 4 (FEES, AFFORDABILITY) AND TENANT PROTECTIONS: Adds an exclusions clause to	The proposed modification would not result in a physical environmental effect. No further analysis required.

#	Planning Code Sec.	Sponsor	Amendment	CEQA Analysis
			current requirements clarifying FZP is not relieving a HC-SF project from complying with : Article 4 of the Planning Code other than as specified in this subsection (d); Section 202.17; or any tenant protections contained elsewhere in the Planning Code, including Section 317 et seq ., and Chapter 37 of the Administrative Code.	

Conclusion

The proposed amendments to the family zoning program zoning map and planning code could result in minor increases in height, density, and housing unit growth in certain parts of the city, primarily in well-resourced areas. Limited growth could occur in areas adjacent to well-resourced areas, but the Housing Element FEIR and addendum acknowledged that the height and growth distribution depicted in the FEIR was hypothetical and not intended to be a precise depiction of future zoning changes. In addition, the FEIR indicated that future growth would likely be concentrated in, but is not limited to, the well-resourced areas of the city. The incremental growth would not result in new or substantially more severe significant impacts that were not already disclosed in the EIR. The mitigation measures that were identified in the FEIR would continue to apply to future development projects as determined applicable, and the department will determine which mitigation measures would apply during the project-specific environmental review phase. For these reasons, additional environmental review is not required for the proposed amendments to the legislation as described above.

Attachment A

SF FAMILY ZONING PLAN
October 20th Land Use & Transportation Committee Amendments

NOTE: The amendments in the attached summary were added to the Family Zoning Plan ordinances at the October 20, 2025 Board of Supervisors Land Use & Transportation Committee hearing. The ordinances are continuing to be reviewed by the Board of Supervisors and are subject to change.

SF FAMILY ZONING PLAN

October 20th Land Use & Transportation Committee Amendments

NOTE: The amendments listed below were added to the Family Zoning Plan ordinances at the October 20, 2025 Board of Supervisors Land Use & Transportation Committee hearing. The ordinances are continuing to be reviewed by the Board of Supervisors and are subject to change.

ZONING MAP AMENDMENTS

#	Board File	Location	Block	Lot	Sponsoring Supervisor	Amendment
1	251071	Safeway site @ Marina Boulevard & Laguna St	0446	002, 003	**Sherill**	**LOWER HEIGHT OF SAFEWAY SITE:** Lower height from 65' to 40//40-R-4.
2	251071	Ghirardelli Square	452	002	**Sherill**	**LOWER HEIGHT OF GHIRADELLI SQUARE (A HISTORIC LANDMARK):** Lower height from 65' to 40//40-R-4
3	251071	North Point, north side btwn. Hyde and Larkin	0025	all parcels east of and including 008	**Sherill**	**LOWER HEIGHT OF PARCELS ON NORTH SIDE OF NORTH POINT STREET BETWEEN HYDE AND LARKIN:** Lower height from 40//65-R-4 to 40//40-R-4
4	251071	Geary, btwn. Wood & Emerson, North side	1070	001A, 003	**Sherill**	**LOWER HEIGHT OF TWO GEARY BLVD PARCELS:** Lower height from 140' to 50//85-R-4

#	Board File	Location	Block	Lot	Sponsoring Supervisor	Amendment
5	251071	Priority Equity Geographies	Various	Various	**Chen**	**REMOVE ALL PRIORITY EQUITY GEOGRAPHIES (PEGs) FROM REZONING:** Remove all PEGs from Zoning Tables (Table 1) Remove all PEGs from reclassifying residential to RTO-C Remove all PEGs from reclassifying residential districts other than RTO to RTO-1 Remove all PEGs from reclassifying from NC or P to C-2 Remove all PEGs from P to Mixed-Use or NCs Remove all PEGs from changing the height limits in the R-4 Remove all PEGs from rezoning to R-4. Remove Block 0019 (MTA Kirkland Yard) at Stockton Street and North Point Street Remove all PEGs from increasing heights to 40' if in height districts that are less than 40' Remove all PEGs from being reclassified to 40'//50' Remove all PEGs from being reclassified to 40'//65' Remove all PEGs from being reclassified to 50'//85' Remove all PEGs from being reclassified to 85' Remove all PEGs from being reclassified to base heights of 50'-80' and to HC-SF heights of 120'-180' Remove all PEGs from being reclassified to base heights of 100'-140' and HC-SF heights of 240'-350' Remove Van Ness Market bounded by Polk and Ellis from base heights of 195'-260' and HC-SF heights of 490'-650'. Instead, bound it by Van Ness, O'Farrell, etc.
6	Pending - may be proposed at 11/3 Land Use & Transportation Committee	Article 10 structures throughout the rezoning.	Various	Various	**Mandelman**	**REMOVE ALL ARTICLE 10 HISTORIC BUILDINGS (LOCAL LANDMARKS).** Maintains the properties in the ordinance only where they are changing from RTO to RTO-1, to clarify the name change.

#	Board File	Location	Block	Lot	Sponsoring Supervisor	Amendment
7	251071	District 1	All NCs and RTO-Cs in District 1	Various	**Chan**	**LOWER HEIGHTS IN NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICTS (OTHER THAN GEARY) AND ON PROPOSED RTO-C DISTRICT THROUGHOUT ALL OF DISTRICT 1.** *** On most NC corridors, rolls back heights to current heights:** Lowers height to 40' (Inner Clement, Outer Clement, Outer Balboa, and some other non-named NCs), *** Decreases heights in many other locations:** All RTO-C will be decreased from 85' to 65' (from 50//85 RTO-C to 40//65 or 50//65.)
8	251071	Coastal Zone portion of District 1	1591, 1593, 1596, 1598, 1689, 1690, 1691, 1481, 1483	Various	**Chan**	**REMOVE MANY PARCELS IN DISTRICT 1 IN THE COASTAL ZONE** (122 parcels). Removes all parcels proposed for zoning with form-based density -- everything zoned NC, RTO-C -- removing all parcels that face Fulton, Balboa and La Playa. Removes Safeway site, SFMTA bus lot site. Also removes parcels along El Camino del Mar and Seal Rock Dr.

PLANNING, BUSINESS & TAX REGULATIONS CODE AMENDMENTS

#	Board File	Page	Line	Planning Code Sec.	Sponsoring Supervisor	Amendment
1	251072 and 251073	13	13-15	206.10(b)(9)	**Melgar**	**EXEMPT RENT-CONTROLLED BUILDINGS OVER 2 UNITS FROM LOCAL PROGRAM:** Such buildings would not be eligible for the Local Program (but could still use State programs, if applicable).
2	251073	13	18	206.10(b)(9)	**Melgar**	**NO DEMOLITION OR CONVERSION OF TOURIST HOTELS IN LOCAL PROGRAM:** Remove tourist hotels from Local Program eligibility. (They may still use State programs.)
3	251073	31	24	344 (d)(13)	**Melgar**	**NO DEMOLITION OR CONVERSION OF TOURIST HOTELS IN HOUSING SUSTAINABILITY DISTRICT (HSD):** Adds eligibility criteria in HSD that project may not demolish or convert any portion of a Tourist Hotel.
4	251073	27	18-19	334 (c)	**Melgar**	**TECHNICAL CLARIFICATION:** Affirms that nothing in Section 334 (Housing Sustainability District) cancels or repeals permit, license, or other requirements codified outside of the Planning Code.
5	251073	14-15	17-25; 1-4	206.10(d)(1)(B)	**Chen**	**REINSTATES LOCAL PROGRAM UNIT MIX REQUIREMENT:** Removes reduced unit mix requirement in the Local Program and defers to existing unit mix requirements in PC 207.6 and 207.7
6	251073	28	9	334(d)(3)	**Chen**	**NO LOCAL PROGRAM MODIFICATIONS OF UNIT MIX:** Includes unit mix as an exclusion that cannot be modified through a Major Modification
7	251073	166-167; 170	12-25; 1-6; 8-20	249.11 (a)(2), (d) (1-3)	**Chen**	**100% AFFORDABLE ON SFMTA SITES:** For the MTA Special Use District: - Add findings establishing the objective of prioritizing the MTA sites for 100% affordable housing - Add pre-application process with a feasibility study modeling the site as 100% affordable housing, at least one pre-application meeting (publicly noticed), and documentation of consistency with Housing Element Actions 1.2.6 and 1.2.7.

#	Board File	Page	Line	Planning Code Sec.	Sponsoring Supervisor	Amendment
8	Pending - may be proposed at 11/3 Land Use & Transportation Committee			270(i)(2)	**Mandelman**	**EXEMPT HISTORIC LANDMARKS FROM REZONING:** establishes that Article 10 buildings are excluded from the R-4 Height and Bulk District, specifically: "Lots that contain a structure that has been designated as a historic landmark or a contributor to a historic district, pursuant to Article 10"
9	251072	171-172	21-25; 1-8	121.7(e)	**Mandelman**	**RESTRICT LOT MERGERS WITH HISTORIC PROPERTIES:** restricts all A-rated sites (Article 10, A11, National Register listed or eligible; California Register listed or eligible) from lot mergers unless project maintains historic resource, compliant with Preservation Design Standards. <u>Applicable historic resources</u>: Any Lot with a historic resource that is: * designated as a landmark or listed as a contributor to or located within a historic district under Article 10; listed as a Significant or Contributory Building under Article 11; listed in the California Register of Historical Resources or the National Register of Historic Places; * identified in an adopted survey or historic context statement as potentially eligible for individual listing in the California Register of Historical Resources or the National Register of Historic Places; * or, located within an historic district that is listed in, or identified in an adopted survey or historic context statement as potentially eligible for listing in, the California Register of Historical Resources or the National Register of Historic Places.
10	251072 and 251073	18-19; 19-20	13-25 and 1-15; 2-25 and 1-4	206.10(e)(2)	**Sauter**	**ADDS "WARM SHELL" RETAIL INCENTIVE:** provides edits to Warm Shell definition to delineate Food Service Warm Shell and General Warm Shell. Up to 3.0 square footage bonus for Food Service and up to 2.5 square footage bonus for General Warm Shell. Also clarifies how square footage bonuses may or may not be combined to result in additional height.

#	Board File	Page	Line	Planning Code Sec.	Sponsoring Supervisor	Amendment
11	251072 and 251073	21-22; 22-23	21-25 and 1-18; 12-25 and 1-9	206.10(e)(5)	**Sauter**	**ADDS STOREFRONT REPLACEMENT INCENTIVE:** Adds 1.5 square footage bonus incentive for Replacement of Commercial Space, defined as a space that has 90-100% the space of the original space, and the same linear storefront dimensions (with allowance for a small lobby).
12	251072 and 251073	23; 23-24	7-10; 23-25 and 1	206(e)(6)(B)	**Sauter**	**ADDS HISTORIC STOREFRONT PRESERVATION INCENTIVE:** Adds incentive to retain historic storefronts per Preservation Design Standards (additional 0.25 gross square footage per square foot of storefront, added to other Adaptive Reuse incentive).
13	251073	21	14-17	206(e)(4)(A)	**Sherrill, Sauter**	**ADDS 2-BEDROOM UNIT INCENTIVE:** Adds incentive for additional 2-bedroom units above what is required (at 250+ square feet / 2-bedroom unit)
14	251073	Various	Various	Various	**Chan**	**REMOVES FORM-BASED DENSITY IN THE BASE ZONING** in all districts, and reverts density to existing density limits (applicable to Dwelling Units, Group Housing, Senior Housing)
15	251073	107	1-9	209.4	**Chan**	**NO FORM-BASED ZONING FOR NEW RTO-C DISTRICT:** Updates the RTO District Zoning Control Table RTO-C column changing form-based density to density allowed in the nearest NC district.
16	251073	12	20-Sep	206.10 (b)(4)	**Chan**	**EXPANDS CATEGORIES OF HISTORIC RESOURCES FOR PROHIBITION OF DEMOLITION AND ADDS NO ALTERATIONS OF HISTORIC RESOURCES IN LOCAL PROGRAM:** Expands universe of historic resources ineligible for Local Program from listed resources to those eligible and "potentially eligible", including non-contributing sites that are within districts. Expands the historic resource protection by clarifying that in addition to not demolishing, it does not "substantially alter a historic resource".
17	251073	13	16-17	206.10 (b)(10)	**Chan**	**NO RESIDENTIAL DEMOLITIONS IN LOCAL PROGRAM:** Adds “(9) does not demolish, remove, or convert to another use any existing Dwelling Unit(s), or Residential Flat” under Local Program applicability.
18	251073	29	8-16	334 (g)	**Chan**	**30-MONTH "SHOT CLOCK":** Adds a "Progress Requirement" through expiration if a project sponsor has not procured a building or site permit for construction within 30 months of project approval, with the ability to extend by 6 months (or longer in the case of appeal or lawsuit).

#	Board File	Page	Line	Planning Code Sec.	Sponsoring Supervisor	Amendment
19	251073	13	23	206.10 (c)	**Chan**	**RESTRICTS LOCATION OF OFF-SITE BMR UNITS:** Removes "shall provide the required units within the R-4 Height and Bulk District or" under Inclusionary Housing Ordinance Alternatives. (Instead, units revert to earlier requirement that they be provided within ½ mile of project)
20	251073	191	21-24	317 (c)(12)	**Chan**	**STRENGTHEN REVIEW OF RESIDENTIAL FLAT DEMOLITION:** Removes the Conditional Use Authorization exemption for projects with residential flats that increase the number of units on a property; under this amendment, these projects would require a Conditional Use Authorization hearing.
21	251073	192	6-9	317 (g)(6)(L)	**Chan**	**STRENGTHEN REVIEW OF RESIDENTIAL FLAT DEMOLITION:** Removes Conditional Use Authorization criteria language referencing whether residential flats maintain or increase the number of units on the lot that contain 2+ bedrooms or are at least equivalent in size to residential flats demolished.
22	251073	30-31	17-25 and 1-4	344 (d)(4)	**Chan**	**NO ALTERATIONS OF HISTORIC RESOURCES IN HOUSING SUSTAINABILITY DISTRICT (HSD):** Expands the historic resource protection by clarifying that in addition to not demolishing, it does not "substantially alter a historic resource"
23	251073	167	9	249.11	**Chan**	**REMOVE SPECIFIC SFMTA PARCELS FROM SPECIAL USE DISTRICT (SUD):** Removes 1596/044 and 045 from the Non-contiguous SFMTA SUD (La Playa bus turnaround).
24	251073	471	22-23	Section 8 (g)	**Chan**	**REMOVES REFERENCE TO SFMTA SPECIAL USE DISTRICT (SUD) IN THE LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM:** In the description of deletes section (g) which references PC 249.11 SFMTA SUD
25	251073	11	23-24	206.10 (a)	**Chan**	**AFFIRM LOCAL PROGRAM COMPLIANCE WITH ARTICLE 4 (FEES, AFFORDABILITY):** Adds "Except as provided in this Section 206.10, all HC-SF projects shall comply with Article 4 of the Planning Code"

#	Board File	Page	Line	Planning Code Sec.	Sponsoring Supervisor	Amendment
26	251073	17-18	24-25; 1-2	206.10 (d)(4)	**Chan**	**AFFIRM LOCAL PROGRAM COMPLIANCE WITH ARTICLE 4 (FEES, AFFORDABILITY) AND TENANT PROTECTIONS:** Adds an exclusions clause clarifying Family Zoning Plan is not relieving a Local Program project from complying with: Article 4 of the Planning Code other than as specified in this subsection (d); Section 202.17; or any tenant protections contained elsewhere in the Planning Code, including Section 317 et seq., and Chapter 37 of the Administrative Code.

San Francisco Family Zoning Program

HOUSING ELEMENT REZONING

Josh Switzky
Deputy Director, Citywide Planning

Lisa Chen
Principal Planner, Plan Manager

LAND USE & TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

NOVEMBER 17, 2025

TODAY'S PRESENTATION

- Housing Capacity Calculations
- SB 79 Overview
- Summary

San Francisco's obligations under state law

To maintain Housing Element certification, by January 2026 we must:

- Rezone for **realistic capacity** to meet our RHNA shortfall (36,200 units).
- Affirmatively Further Fair Housing by **zoning in high opportunity areas**.
- **Identify low-income housing sites** that will be eligible for ministerial approval.

NOTE:

Housing Element certification will not be revoked if planned units are not ultimately built.

Target: We have suitable & available sites for 36,200 homes



State Law: Calculating Realistic Capacity

To meet state law and Housing Element Action 7.1.1: SF must demonstrate that rezoning adds at least 36,200 units of capacity on **sites that are suitable and available**, using **methods that reasonably account for development likelihood.**

HCD issued a preliminary approval of the Plan on September 9th, noting that SF must continue use **all of these methods in combination** to demonstrate realistic capacity and meet various obligations:

Method	Analysis	Capacity
Citywide	Uses an annual pace of development relative to total zoned capacity.	**39,000 units** *(meets target of 36,200 units)*
Soft Sites	Excludes or discounts parcels based on current uses and other characteristics.	**40,000 – 64,000 units** *(meets target of 36,200 units)*
Feasibility	Computational model testing financial feasibility and economic conditions on each parcel.	**19,000 units** *(meets target of 16,000 moderate & above-moderate units)*

Method: Citywide Method

- Need this method to comply with HE 7.1.1 to supplement the "Soft Sites Analysis (method 2).
- Inspired by methodologies used in cases by the **State of CO, Terner Center, UCLA Lewis Center – concept of "zoning buffer"** of overall zoned capacity to housing targets
- Examines the **rate at which homes were approved** in the city from 2005 – 2023.
- Considers **how much zoned capacity was available** during that period and, of that zoned capacity, **how much (%) was entitled**.
- Annualizes that buildout to get a rate (%) of zoned capacity that we can say is likely to be built during the remainder of Housing Element cycle (5 years)
- Includes **RHNA shortfall across income groups**
- Assumes that we will do at least as well in our future as in our past

Citywide Housing Production Method	
Housing entitlements citywide 2005-2023	90,000
Current Remaining Total Zoned Capacity (2025)	313,000
Total	403,000
% capacity entitled	22%
Number of years	19
Annual	1%
% entitled in remaining RHNA period (5 yrs)	5%
Rezoning Net Increase to Total Zoned Capacity (Local Program)	780,000
Expected Net Approvals from Rezoning	**39,000**

Target: 36,200 homes likely within RHNA period

Method: Soft Sites Analysis

- Uses **similar assumptions submitted for rezoning in the adopted Housing Element** for consistency (requested by HCD)
- Necessary to **identify and filter specific sites** as required by HCD to meet test of **"suitable and available"**
- This method assumes:
  - 70% of capacity on "soft sites" (ie no existing units, built <30% of zoned capacity)
  - 2% of capacity on sites with existing units (min 5:1 allowed:existing)
- Excludes: Rent controlled buildings, sites w/pipeline projects, condo parcels, public properties, unusual parcels, listed historic resources

40k in Base

- Includes average use of SDB
- 26K VLI/LI, 14K Mod/Above

64k under Local Program

- 34K VLI/LI, 30K Mod/Above

Method: Financially Feasible

Urban Sim – online simulation tool to determine how many units are financially feasible.

- Urban Sim runs a **proforma analysis on every parcel** using (1) economic assumptions, (2) allowed building envelope, (3) existing lot conditions, to determine for each lot the largest feasible project, if any.
- Helps us **understand how economic conditions impact the construction of moderate and above moderate homes** relative to our RHNA targets.
- Since most affordable housing relies on public subsidy instead of financial feasibility, this method provides limited information for how the city will meet its affordable targets.
- **Not all Financially Feasible Projects will be pursued during the RHNA period.** Discount factors must be applied. In "improved" financial conditions, as many as 221K units are feasible, but many are on sites with homes or other conditions that must be accounted for.

19,000 – 47,000 likely units

Target: 16,000 Mod/Above Mod on sites suitable and available during the RHNA period

Senate Bill 79 (SB 79): Applies after July 1, 2026

- **SETS MINIMUM HEIGHT & DENSITY: 5 to 9 stories,** ½-mile around BART, Caltrain, Muni Metro, and Major Bus Stops
- **VARIOUS EXEMPTIONS UNTIL 2032:** For lots with >50% SB79 density, low-resource census tracts, other conditions. ***Most SF parcels are exempt under these rules***.
- **ALLOWS LOCAL "ALTERNATIVE PLAN" IN-LIEU OF SB79:** provided that Alternative Plan has at least same cumulative housing capacity as SB79.

Senate Bill 79 (SB 79): Applies after July 1, 2026

- **SETS MINIMUM HEIGHT & DENSITY: 5 to 9 stories,** ½-mile around BART, Caltrain, Muni Metro, and Major Bus Stops
- **VARIOUS EXEMPTIONS UNTIL 2032:** For lots with >50% SB79 density, low-resource census tracts, other conditions. ***Most SF parcels are exempt under these rules***.
- **ALLOWS LOCAL "ALTERNATIVE PLAN" IN-LIEU OF SB79:** provided that Alternative Plan has at least same cumulative housing capacity as SB79.



If the Family Zoning Plan is NOT adopted



If the Family Zoning Plan IS adopted



SB 79: Family Zoning Plan is Adequate as "Alternative Plan"

Preliminary analysis shows that **if the proposed rezoning is adopted, SF will likely have an adequate Alternative Plan**, though further analysis is needed.

SB79 Net Capacity: 763,000

SF Zoning Net Capacity in SB79 Area (with FZP): >800,000



SB 79: Family Zoning Plan is Adequate as "Alternative Plan"

MTC needs to publish final map of stations and station areas

SF is collaborating with other cities on implementation (eg SD, SJ, LA, Sac, Oak)

HCD needs to review and approve Alt Plan ordinance, may take up to 120 days



Summary: Realistic Capacity & SB 79

- **MULTIPLE CAPACITY METHODS NEED TO BE CONSIDERED** and all must meet our requirement for **realistic capacity for 36,200 units** (16,000 units moderate & above-moderate).

- **AMENDMENTS NEED TO BE "NET NEUTRAL":** Per HCD preliminary approval letter in September, **changes that negatively affect housing capacity and/or constraints should be offset with changes elsewhere.**

Summary: Realistic Capacity & SB 79

- **SIGNIFICANT STEP TOWARD SB 79 ALTERNATIVE PLAN:** If the Family Zoning Plan is adopted, **it will satisfy the primary criteria for the "Alternative Plan" under SB 79, which would allow us to use local height limits.**
  - A small number of parcels outside of the Family Zoning Plan will need **minor adjustments to increase density** before July 2026 to meet the Alternative Plan criteria.
  - We will have the opportunity to **recertify our Alternative Plan in 2032** so that local zoning controls will continue to apply, instead of SB 79.

Possible amendment: Commercial Replacement Incentive

- **Commercial Replacement Incentive** was adopted into the original file on 10/20/25 and provides a square footage bonus in the Local Program for projects that:
  - **Replace existing commercial uses** with a space of equivalent size and street-facing dimensions.
  - **Preserve a historic storefront**, which are granted an additional bonus.
- Supervisor Sauter is working with City Attorney and Planning Department **on a non-substantive amendment to refine the proposal and make it easier to use.**
  - Would allow projects to **replace an existing space(s) with multiple spaces** so long as the cumulative commercial square footage on the site and the street-facing dimensions are preserved.
  - Will clarify requirements for replacing existing spaces with a “warm shell” for food service use.

Thank you!

http://sfplanning.org/sf-family-zoning-plan

sf.housing.choice@sfgov.org

San Francisco Family Zoning Program

HOUSING ELEMENT REZONING

Lisa Chen
Principal Planner, Plan Manager

James Pappas
Principal Planner

LAND USE & TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

OCTOBER 20, 2025

TODAY'S PRESENTATION

- Background
- Legislation under Consideration
- Affordable Housing Sites Analysis & Strategy
- Informational Resources & Visuals

Image from Wikipedia

San Francisco's Pervasive Housing Crisis

- SF is 2nd most expensive rental market and 2025 rents grew fastest of any US city.
- Rental vacancies are down to 3.8% — on par with pre-pandemic levels.
- It takes more than 4 minimum wage jobs to afford average SF rent.
- In 2024, 81,200 people applied in the lottery for 512 affordable housing units.
- Evictions nearly doubled in 2024 and are at their highest rate since 2018.
- 1/3 of households are cost-burdened, both renters and owners.
- SF has more than 8,300 unsheltered individuals.

California needs 2.5 million housing units. San Francisco's fair share is 82,000 units.



The Family Zoning Plan fulfills state laws by planning for affordable and mixed-income housing to overcome historic patterns of exclusion.



Housing Opportunity Areas*



Housing Production (2005-2019)

90% of housing was built outside "housing opportunity areas," even though they cover over 50% of the city.

*Areas designated "Highest Resource" and "High Resource" on the Opportunity Area Map (CA Dept of Housing & Community Development)

What's at stake if we don't rezone

BUILDERS REMEDY: Menlo Park 446' proposal; zoned for 70'

If San Francisco does not adopt compliant rezoning, we risk:

- **State seizure of local permitting power,** a.k.a. "builders remedy"
- **Loss of state funding,** including transportation & affordable housing
- **Fines and lawsuits**

Source: Menlo Park

Communities facing Builders Remedy

See factsheet:
What happens if we don't rezone?

PALO ALTO

MENLO PARK

MOUNTAIN VIEW

BEVERLY HILLS

SANTA MONICA



SANTA CRUZ COUNTY

REDONDO BEACH

LOS GATOS

The Kelsey: $30million AHSC award

SF received $110 million/year in funds requiring Housing Element compliance:

CalTrans Sustainable Communities Grant

One Bay Area Grant

Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities

Permanent Local Housing Allocation

Community Development Block Grant Program

Infill Infrastructure Grant Program

Local Housing Trust Fund Program

HOME Program

Local Partnership Program

Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program

Active Transportation Program

Solutions for Congested Corridors Program

… and more

San Francisco's obligations under state law

To maintain Housing Element certification, by January 2026 we must:

- Rezone for **realistic capacity** to meet our RHNA shortfall (36,200 units).
- Affirmatively Further Fair Housing by **zoning in high opportunity areas**.
- **Identify low-income housing sites** that will be eligible for ministerial approval.

NOTE:

Housing Element certification will not be revoked if planned units are not ultimately built.

Community Engagement 2023-2025

18 Public Hearings

70 Education Workshops
1200+ attendees

8 Focus Groups
85 attendees

Survey
2,382 respondents

90+ Community Conversations
2000+ attendees

4 Open Houses, 2 Housing Summits
800+ attendees

Photos: SF Planning, Wah Mei School

Proposed
Local Program Map (Sept 2025)

- **MEETS STATE REQUIREMENTS** and allows for at least 36,200 new homes.
- **KEEPS LOCAL CONTROL** by setting base heights lower and incentivizing projects to use a Local Program.
- **PUTS TALLER BUILDINGS NEAR TRANSIT AND SERVICES:** 6+ stories on main streets and near transit.
- **ALLOWS SMALL APARTMENTS ELSEWHERE:** keeps existing 40’ height (4 stories) while welcoming more homes.



Proposed
Base Height Map (Sept 2025)

- **ON CORRIDORS, PROJECTS CHOOSE LOCAL OR STATE PROGRAMS:** Projects can get to similar heights under either option.
- **IN RESIDENTIAL AREAS, PROJECTS MUST USE LOCAL PROGRAM.** Projects in program get form-based zoning and **may not use State Density bonus.**



40’ Gentle Density (4 stories)

77% of sites in the rezoning receive no height changes but will get to build more units within their 40’ height limit.

These projects **<u>cannot</u> use State Density Bonus** to increase heights further.

2-unit (left) and a 4-unit building (right) on Hermann Street.



50’ Commercial Transition (5 stories)

Commercial transition areas get an additional **1 story (10’)** through the Local Program.

These projects **cannot use State Density Bonus** to increase heights further.

5-story building on West Portal Avenue



65’ & 85’ Mid-Rise Corridors (6 and 8 stories)

Generally 2 to 4 stories above today’s height limit.

<u>Projects can choose</u> either Local Program or State Density Bonus to get to similar heights.

6- and 8-story building on Polk St



Select High Rise Area (Height varies)

<u>Projects can choose</u> either Local Program or State Density Bonus to get to similar heights.

16-story building in Mission Bay



State Law & Capacity Calculations

To meet state law and Housing Element Action 7.1.1: SF must demonstrate that rezoning adds at least 36,200 units of capacity on **sites that are suitable and available**, using **methods that reasonably account for development likelihood.**

HCD issued a preliminary approval of the Plan on September 9th, noting that SF must use **all three of these methods** in combination to demonstrate realistic capacity:

Method	Analysis	Capacity *(June & Sept ordinances)*
Citywide	Uses an annual pace of development relative to zoned capacity.	**39,000 units** *(meets target of 36,200 units)*
Soft Sites	Excludes or discounts parcels based on current uses and other characteristics.	**45,000 units** *(meets target of 36,200 units)*
Feasibility	Computational model testing financial feasibility and economic conditions on each parcel.	**19,000 units** *(meets target of 16,000 moderate & above-moderate units)*

Senate Bill 79 (SB 79): Applies after July 1, 2026

- **SETS MINIMUM HEIGHT & DENSITY: 5 to 9 stories,** ½-mile around BART, Caltrain, Muni Metro, and Major Bus Stops
- **VARIOUS EXEMPTIONS UNTIL 2032:** For lots with >50% SB79 density, low-resource census tracts, other conditions. ***Most SF parcels are exempt under these rules.***
- **ALLOWS LOCAL "ALTERNATIVE PLAN" IN-LIEU OF SB79:** provided that Alternative Plan has at least same cumulative housing capacity as SB79.



SB 79: Family Zoning Plan is Adequate as "Alternative Plan"

Preliminary analysis shows that **if the proposed rezoning is adopted, SF will likely have an adequate Alternative Plan**, though further analysis is needed.

HCD and MTC will issue additional guidance on SB79 implementation.



ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

ACTIONS UNDER CONSIDERATION

1. Adoption of General Plan Amendments Ordinance (File 250966)
2. Adoption of Map Ordinance (File 250700)
3. Adoption of Planning, Business, & Tax Regulations Code Ordinance (File 250701)
4. Adoption of Local Costal Plan Amendment Resolution (File 250985)

General Plan Amendments Ordinance (File 250966)

- **Goal:** Modernize the General Plan and bring it into **alignment with the Family Zoning Plan**.

- **Proposed Amendments:**
  - Remove **outdated height maps**
  - **Update language** about height limits, density limits, and building scale and character.



PROPOSED AREA PLAN AND ELEMENT UPDATES

Urban Design Element
Commerce and Industry Element
Transportation Element
Balboa Park Station Area Plan
Glen Park Community Plan
Market and Octavia Area Plan
Northeastern Waterfront Plan
Van Ness Avenue Area Plan
Western SoMa (South of Market) Area Plan
Western Shoreline Area Plan.
Land Use Index

Source: Glen Park Community Plan, Urban Design Element

Zoning Map Ordinance (File 250700)

- **ZONING DISTRICT CHANGES:** Reclassifies various parcels to other districts to **allow more housing**, including Mixed Use, NC, and new RTO-C zoning.
- **HEIGHT CHANGES:** Changes **height limits** on certain parcels,and sets a “Base” height and “Local Program” height.
- **NEW BULK DISTRICT:** Creates new **R-4 Height and Bulk District**, which establishes eligibility for optional Local Program (“Housing Choice SF Program”)
- **SFMTA SPECIAL USE DISTRICT (SUD):** Adds various properties to a SFMTA SUD to enable housing production. **Future development projects will need Board approval.**
- **LOCAL COASTAL PLAN:** Amends parcels in Local Coastal Plan to be **consistent with the changes above**.

Planning, Business & Tax Regulation Code Ordinance (File 250701)

Topic	Amendment	Sections
Local Program (Housing Choice SF Program)	**Offers Incentives and streamlined process** via Local Program (Housing Choice SF Program), a flexible alternative to the State Density Bonus that **ensures local control over height and design standards**	206.10; 344
New Residential Zoning District (RTO-C)	Sets rules for newly created Residential Transit Oriented – Commercial (RTO-C) district, a **form-based district which allows ground floor commercial**	209.4
SFMTA Special Use District	Sets rules for SFMTA Special Use District to **allow for future housing on sites** (future developments projects will still require Board approval)	249.11

Planning, Business & Tax Regulation Code Ordinance (File 250701)

Topic	Amendment	Sections
Senior Housing Flexibility	Makes it **easier to build senior housing** by adjusting open space, bike parking, and minimum unit requirements.	135 155.1 202.1(f)(1)(C)
Small Business Relocation & Early Notification	• Supports **relocation of displaced businesses** by exempting Conditional Use hearings and impact fees; • Requires **early notification** to the commercial tenant and Office of Small Business.	202.17; 311
Efficient Land Use Near Transit; Parking Management	• Establishes **minimum densities** for residential and office uses near transit. • Adjusts **maximum parking ratios** according to proximity to transit.	Various

Planning, Business & Tax Regulation Code Ordinance (File 250701)

Topic	Amendment	Sections
Housing Sustainability District (HSD)	Creates a Housing Sustainability District (HSD), **another ministerial pathway** for qualifying projects in the Local Program.	344
Height and bulk limits	Modifies height and bulk standards to be **consistent with Citywide Design Standards**.	260
Wind Review Standards	**Consolidates wind review standards** for projects 85' and above in some districts	148
Code Cleanup & Local Coastal Plan Consistency	• Conforming edits to **zoning control tables** • Referral of amendments in **Local Coastal Plan** to Coastal Commission • Clarifying edits to conform with **state law** and other **code cleanup**	Various

Local Program (206.10): Menu of Code Flexibility

Automatic Flexibility in Local Program

- **Density:** form-based density (if not already in base zoning)
- **Inclusionary Housing:** flexibility to use all affordable options; rent-control option for <25 units.
- **100% Affordable Projects** receive 2 extra stories (20') and other flexibility.
- **Waive Exposure and Usable Open Space** requirements
- **Waive Large Lot and Non-residential Use Size** Conditional Use hearing.
- **Rear Yard** reduction to the greater of 18% or 15'.
- **Ground Floor Height** waiver for projects in 85' height districts
- **"Catchall" Flexibility:** 15% additional relief on other topics.

Local Program (206.10): Development Bonuses

Projects can receive a **square footage bonus**, added via height or horizontal bonuses:

Height bonuses (Corridors Only)	Horizontal bonuses (Location varies)
Cumulative 2 stories (20') bonus for historic preservation: for adaptive reuse **Cumulative 1 story (10') bonus for various incentives:** • **Commercial:** Warm Shell, Micro-Retail, Legacy Business or displaced business • **Community-serving use:** nonprofits, grocery, community facilities, childcare • **Family-sized units:** 3+ bedrooms	• **Historic preservation (corridors only):** may reduce rear yard • **Family-sized unit incentives:** may reduce rear yard, side yard, and upper-story setbacks • **Family-friendly amenities (residential districts only):** may reduce rear yard, side yard, and upper-story setbacks

Local Costal Plan Amendment Resolution (File 250985)



- **CONSISTENCY WITH COASTAL ACT:** Certifies Local Coastal Plan (LCP) Amendment is **consistent with Coastal Act**
- **REFERRAL TO COASTAL COMMISSION:** Directs Planning Director to submit LCP Amendment to **CA Coastal Commission for public hearing and certification.**

Affordable Housing **Sites Analysis and Strategies**

Topics We'll Cover Today

- Project **Purpose and Context**
- Research and Analysis:
  - **Pipeline and Parcel Analysis**
  - **Policy and Financial Research**
- Recommended **Strategies**

Affordable Housing Sites Analysis & Strategies Purpose

Affordable Housing Sites Analysis and Strategies (AHSAS) informs how the City and affordable housing developers can **acquire and develop sites for 100% affordable housing,** focused on:

- **Effectively managing the existing pipeline** of affordable housing
- **Ensuring ongoing affordable housing production** along with equitable geographic distribution of affordable housing
- **Identifying and acquiring new sites for affordable housing development** using a range of approaches

Affordable Housing Funding as the Key Challenge

Funding and cost lowering are key to produce and preserve affordable housing.

Affordable Housing Leadership Council Report (Spring 2024) addresses **funding, financing,** and **costs**.

- **Increase Federal, State, and regional funding**.
- **Expand San Francisco's capacity and coordination to fund** affordable housing.
- **Innovation and alternative approaches** to delivering affordable housing.

Local Affordable Housing Funding 2018-2023



Property taxes and other revenue from new development provide majority of local funding

Affordable Housing Pipeline Analysis

Mapping and Analysis of Existing Affordable Housing Pipeline

- **Prospective sites & Pre-construction:** 12,600+ units (59 projects)
- **Under Construction:** 2,299 units (30 projects)
- **Inclusionary BMR Units:** 2,500+ units (124 projects)

Geography: Affordable Housing pipeline **mirrors the market-rate pipeline,** with most projects in equity geographies.

Significant funding gap holds back the completion of existing pipeline



Source: MOHCD July 2025

Site Suitability Analysis (pre-rezoning)

Purpose: Identify potential affordable housing sites based on:

- **Policy** (local/state law) and development potential
- **MOHCD and affordable developer criteria**: preference for 100+ units on 8,000+ sq ft for efficiency
- **Analysis excludes existing residential units** and various public sites

Draft Finding: Under today's rules (pre-rezoning), 1,200 parcels may be suitable for affordable housing with capacity for 148,000 units.

Assembling smaller adjacent lots yields additional 2,200 parcels with capacity for 98,000 units.

100% Affordable Sites: Relationship to Rezoning

FAMILY ZONING PLAN

REZONED SITES (overall)

- Required to meet Housing Element (e.g., **RHNA**) at all income levels.
- **Primarily located in Well-Resourced Neighborhoods**.

LOW-INCOME SITES

- Subset of rezoned sites to meet **low-income** RHNA requirement.
- Must meet **minimum size and density**.
- Future projects proposing >20% BMR are eligible for **ministerial approval**

100% AFFORDABLE SITES

- Sites meeting **suitability criteria** for MOHCD, state, and federal funding.
- **Located citywide**; overlaps with rezoning & low-income sites
- **Rezoning will enable additional parcels** to meet criteria.

Affordable Housing Financial and Policy Research

Financial Research: Trends in land and development costs

- **Construction costs are 60%+ of affordable housing development costs while land costs averaged about 10%** (ranging from 7-14%). Land holding can add cost as well
- **Land prices have been relatively stable averaging ~$121K per unit over the last decade**. Fewer land sales in down markets; prices fluctuating just 5%.
- **Rezoning has limited effect on land costs per unit**; effects are linked to economic conditions and financial feasibility. Recent land prices per unit for affordable housing sites were comparable in rezoned areas and areas with no zoning changes

Policy research: Best practices from other cities

- **Establishing stable funding and aligning pipeline growth with funding capacity** and building on **partnerships with public, nonprofit, & faith-based property owners**

Affordable Housing Sites Recommended Strategies

1. **Managing the pipeline** of housing development and site acquisition
2. **Expanding the geography** of affordable housing
3. **Public sites and faith- and nonprofit-owned sites** for affordable housing
4. **Strategic market practices** for site acquisition
5. **Expanding opportunities for "missing middle"** affordable housing types.

Updated Informational Resources

Resources providing factual information and addressing misinformation:

- **What is the Family Zoning Plan?**
- **(NEW) Capacity Calculations**
- **Small Business**
- **Tenant Protections**
- **What Happens if We Don't Rezone?**
- **Example visualizations**

Residential demolitions are extraordinarily rare and will remain so after rezoning.

235

Units demolished (2012-24)

18 units/year
(0.00004% of SF housing stock)

139 single family (**11 units/yr**)
(352 units built; 213 net new)

96 multifamily (**7 units/yr**)
(284 units built; 188 net new)

4%

of no-fault evictions are due to demolition (2015-2025)

96% of evictions are due to **owner move-in (44%), capital improvement (26%), and Ellis Act (24%)**



Source: Planning Department, Rent Board. Demolition data does not include HOPE SF, development agreements, or emergency demolitions.

Most housing developments are built on vacant and underutilized lots.

Case study: Market Street & Ocean Ave

2,800 new homes built since 2007

84% of new housing projects were on sites without storefront businesses

92% did not result in major impacts to historic resources



- Projects without previous commercial
- Previously auto use
- Previously retail
- Previously food business

Source: SF Planning Land Use Database (2025)



Images: MidPen Housing, David Baker Architects

Rezoning will increase housing affordability & diversity.

- **100% AFFORDABLE HOUSING:** funded by **bonds, inclusionary fees, state & federal funds**.
- **MIXED-INCOME HOUSING:** Market-rate projects contribute at least **15-20% affordable** units.
- **SITES FOR AFFORDABLE:** Enabling **sufficient sites** for affordable housing
- **INCENTIVES FOR 100% AFFORDABLE:** through our **Local Program**.
- **DIVERSITY = AFFORDABILITY:** **Allowing more housing will increase affordability**, esp. for middle-income households.

What will change look like?

- **Spending at local businesses** ($5.6 billion over 8yr)
- **Housing diversity and affordability**
- **More housing choices & stability for employees**
- **Revenues for public services & infrastructure**
- **Climate & environmental benefits**

Images: David Baker Architects, Handel Architecture, HKS

Visualization: Geary Blvd at 3rd Ave

Credit: AECOM

Visualization: Noriega St @ 25th Ave

Credit: AECOM

Visualization: Lombard St @ Buchanan St

Credit: AECOM

Visualization: Lombard St at Richardson St

Credit: AECOM

Visualization: Ocean Ave and Lee Ave

Credit: AECOM

Visualization: Divisadero St and Bush St

Credit: AECOM

Visualization: Residential District (composite; not an actual location)
40'
Credit: AECOM

Visualization: Lyon St Steps view

Credit: AECOM

Visualization: Francisco Park view
45
65
45
Credit: AECOM

Visualization: Francisco Park view

Credit: AECOM

Visualization: Coit Tower view

Credit: AECOM

Acknowledgements

Sarah Dennis-Phillips, Planning Director
Rich Hillis, former Planning Director
Rachael Tanner, Citywide Planning Director
AnMarie Rodgers, former Citywide Planning Director
Joshua Switzky, Deputy Citywide Planning Director
Lisa Gibson, Environmental Review Officer
Lisa Chen, Plan Manager

Anne Yalon
Carla de Mesa
David Garcia
Dylan Hamilton
Esmeralda Jardines
Malena Leon-Farrera
Mat Snyder
Reanna Tong
Sarah Richardson
Debra Dwyer
Ryan Shum
Elizabeth White
Liz Watty
Rich Sucre
Trent Greenan
David Winslow
James Pappas
Miriam Chion
Maggie Smith
Melanie Bishop
Alex Westhoff
Amnon Ben-Pazi

Diana La
Gary Chen
Melissa Wong
Candace Soohoo
Martin Thibodeau
Rachael Schuett
Kate Conner
Carly Grob
Corey Teague
Aaron Starr
Rebecca Salgado
Austin Yang (CAT)
Audrey Pearson (CAT)
Giulia Gualco-Nelson (CAT)
Andrea Ruiz-Esquide (CAT)
Jenine Marquez (CAT)

Special thanks: Office of Small Business, MOHCD, SFMTA, Century Urban, AECOM, Groundworks Consulting, ICF, RWDI, PreVision, CivicEdge

Art by ChatGPT with modifications by SF Planning

Thank you!

http://sfplanning.org/sf-family-zoning-plan

sf.housing.choice@sfgov.org

San Francisco Planning

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

October 16, 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: 2021-005878PCWP
Housing Element 2022 Rezoning Initiatives – Affordable Housing Sites Analysis and Strategies (AHSAS)

Planning Commission Recommendation: **Informational**

Dear Ms. Calvillo:

On October 16, 2025, the Planning Department published the Draft Affordable Housing Sites Analysis and Strategies Report which will be presented to the Board of Supervisors Land Use and Transportation Committee along with the Family Zoning Plan on October 20, 2025.

As a part of the transmittal, the Planning Department is hereby requesting that the attached Draft AHSAS Report be uploaded to the Family Zoning Plan Board Files as supporting materials. The Family Zoning Plan Board File Nos. include: 250966, 250700, 250701, and 250985.

The Planning Department will publish the Final AHSAS Report along with additional appendices that will include various consultant memorandums on the Department's project webpage at a later date.

In the interim, if you have any questions or require further information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

James Pappas
Manager, Policies and Strategies

cc: John Carroll, Office of the Clerk of the Board
Lisa Chen, Principal Planner
BOS.Legislation@sfgov.org

ATTACHMENTS :

Draft Affordable Housing Sites Analysis and Strategies Report

Affordable Housing Sites Analysis and Strategies

DRAFT REPORT

OCTOBER 2025

San Francisco Planning

MAYOR'S OFFICE OF
HOUSING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Contents

Executive Summary of the Affordable Housing Sites Analysis and Strategies Report 3
Section 1: Introduction 9
Section 2: Input from Affordable Housing Practitioners and Community 12
Section 3: Need for Affordable Housing Funding 14
Section 4: Existing Practices and Pipeline 17
Section 5: Parcel Suitability Analysis 26
Section 6: Financial and Policy Research 33
Section 7: Recommended Strategies 41
Conclusion 46

Acknowledgments

This report was made possible through the collaboration and expertise of staff across multiple City agencies and consultant partners.

The **San Francisco Planning Department** recognizes James Pappas, Joshua Switzky, Esmeralda Jardines, David H. García, Diana La, Rachael Tanner, Lisa Chen, Miriam Chion, and Gary Chen for their leadership, analysis, and coordination throughout the development of this study.

We also thank our partners at the **Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development**, including Dan Adams, Lydia Ely, Sheila Nickolopoulos, Mara Blitzer, and additional MOHCD staff, for their deep knowledge and contributions to shaping the strategies presented.

Appreciation is also extended to Leigh Lutenski and the **Office of Economic and Workforce Development** for their insight into implementation and alignment with broader economic development goals.

Finally, we acknowledge the valuable partnership and technical support of **Enterprise Community Partners** and **Century Urban**, whose expertise generated policy and financial research and analysis that informed recommendations that guided this report.

Executive Summary of the Affordable Housing Sites Analysis and Strategies Report

October 2025

San Francisco has the tools, sites, and expertise to advance its affordable housing goals, but only with sufficient, consistent financial resources. **The AHSAS provides research-based recommendations for managing limited resources while pursuing equity and geographic distribution objectives. Our affordable housing needs demand additional funding, balancing construction of the existing 12,600-unit pipeline with selective new acquisitions, cultivating opportunities on public, master-planned, and community-owned land, and creating pathways for diverse housing types across all neighborhoods.** By aligning site acquisition with funding availability, continuing cross-sector partnerships, and pursuing policy and program changes that expand tools to secure sites, San Francisco can build a more sustainable and equitable affordable housing future.

San Francisco has a target of facilitating 32,800 additional homes affordable at lower incomes by 2031. This target is part of the City's Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) for 2023-2031 from the Housing Element. The Affordable Housing Sites Analysis and Strategies addresses how the city will continue to develop its pipeline of existing affordable housing projects and acquire and develop additional sites for affordable housing. Led by SF Planning in collaboration with the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD) focuses on the following areas:

- **Pipeline -** Effectively managing the existing affordable housing development pipeline
- **Production** - Boosting the overall production of affordable housing units
- **Acquisition** - Identifying and acquiring new sites for future affordable housing development

The Affordable Housing Sites Analysis and Strategies includes substantial research, stakeholder engagement, and offers strategies based on research findings.

- **Research** covers the current affordable housing development pipeline and the City's pipeline management practices, identifies viable development sites for affordable housing, and analyzes financial and policy considerations for site acquisitions. Stakeholder engagement with affordable housing developers, community organizations, and other practitioners informed the research and strategies.
- **Recommended strategies**, based on research findings and stakeholder input, address pipeline management, geographic equity, partnership with public and nonprofit landowners, strategic market acquisitions, and expanding diverse housing types to address affordability.

Context and Findings

The Central Challenge: Funding

San Francisco's primary barrier to building more affordable housing is not lack of developable sites, but insufficient funding and high construction costs. Currently, over 12,600 affordable units across 59 projects are awaiting funding in pre-construction stages of the pipeline. At current production rates of approximately 650 new 100% affordable units annually, building out the existing pipeline could take over ten years. Development costs are now nearly $1 million per two-bedroom unit with construction costs making up more than 60% of development expenses.

In 2024 the Affordable Housing Leadership Council, a group of affordable housing leaders and experts, released recommendations on expanding funding and financing for affordable housing and lowering costs. The policymakers and agencies have acted on some recommendations, while others await further action. The Board of Supervisors recently passed a resolution calling on City agencies to assess funding tools for affordable housing including infrastructure finance districts in September 2025. This has advanced civic dialogue about ways to secure affordable housing funding.

Pipeline Management and Land Banking

MOHCD coordinates with other public agencies and affordable housing developers to provide funding from up to 25 different local funding sources along with state and federal funding to build an affordable housing pipeline of over 12,000 units. Click here for a brief overview of the City's affordable housing pipeline and related information. The current pipeline includes sites acquired in various ways:

- **Sites purchased in the private market** (2,087 units) or provided by private development agreements (634 units)
- **Sites on land from public agencies,** often as part of large mixed-income developments including development agreements like Treasure Island and Balboa Reservoir (2,320 units), HOPE SF rebuilding of public housing sties (1,415 units), and other public sites (471 units)
- **Former redevelopment projects** funded by OCII (2,494 units)
- **Rehabilitation/preservation projects** (3,195 units)

By holding the land for these projects before all the necessary funding is secured, the city has a de facto land banking process. The city acquires and holds sites until projects secure full financing and permits. Land banking, however, incurs holding costs. Managing this portfolio requires balancing long-term obligations with new opportunities while navigating volatile funding sources.

Geographic Distribution and Equity Goals

Like market-rate housing, affordable housing production is not equitably or evenly distributed across San Francisco. To meet the Housing Element goal of constructing at 25-50% of all new affordable homes in well-resourced areas, San Francisco will need to shift its present pattern of uneven geographic distribution of affordable housing and housing production in general.

- Currently most housing development of all kinds is concentrated in four of 11 supervisorial districts, and the existing Affordable Housing Pipeline is primarily concentrated in Supervisorial Districts 5, 6, 9, and 10, which cover primarily equity communities within the city's eastern neighborhoods.

- Meanwhile, Districts 1, 2, 4, 7, 8, and 11 have few or no 100% affordable projects in the pipeline. These districts are where more of the city's higher resource areas are found.

Most affordable housing sites in the pipeline are concentrated outside of San Francisco's well-resourced Housing Opportunity Areas (HOAs) in the center, west, and north of the city. This pattern continues the exclusion of affordable multifamily housing from HOAs. To meet Housing Element goals and the State's Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) requirements, San Francisco will need to develop at least 25% of all new affordable units in HOAs. The proposed Family Zoning Plan rezoning will create capacity for multifamily housing in these historically exclusionary areas, opening pathways for both 100% affordable developments and inclusionary units in mixed-income projects.

Parcel Suitability Analysis for Affordable Housing

The parcel suitability analysis identified approximately 3,410 viable sites citywide with capacity for roughly 247,000 affordable housing units that meet the City's criteria for 100% affordable housing projects. These sites include 1,204 individual parcels of at least 8,000 square feet (the minimum size requirement for typical subsidized 100% affordable housing) as well as 2,206 contiguous parcels viable through parcel assembly. District 6 shows the greatest capacity, followed by Districts 2, 3, and 9. Site suitability and availability, however, do not guarantee development feasibility. Individual property owners may not be interested in selling or developing due to profitable current uses, low tax basis, or complex ownership structures.

The parcel suitability analysis demonstrates that land supply is not the constraining factor on meeting our affordable housing production goals. **The proposed Family Zoning Plan was not evaluated in this analysis but will increase the capacity for affordable housing even further** by increasing height and density and allowing flexible standards for affordable housing as well as generating funding for affordable housing. Ultimately, advancing our affordable goals depends on acquisition aligned with funding availability for construction.

Financial and Policy Research and Best Practices

The City procured and incorporated comprehensive research by consultants on financial considerations to interrogate the affordable housing financial landscape in San Francisco.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Land prices in San Francisco are higher than many other cities but have been relatively stable. Construction costs and their rapid increase in recent years are responsible for most of the cost for affordable housing units. The average land cost has been $121,000 per unit over the past decade. Land prices may be commonly thought to be a very significant part of building affordable housing, however, they only make up 10% of total development costs, on average, while construction costs account for 60% or more. Construction costs have risen 31% in the last 4 years, pushing total development costs to around $1 million per affordable two-bedroom unit.

Per unit land costs for affordable housing has not shown to be significantly affected by rezoning, and is significantly influenced by economic conditions, location and landowner expectations. Analysis of a major rezoning in the last 20 years shows that rezoning to allow more density of housing can be associated with a drop in land costs on a per unit basis. Recent land transactions for affordable housing also indicate that landowners may expect comparable prices for multifamily development sites regardless of current zoning and regardless of whether the development is market rate or affordable. It is important to note that landowners simply may not sell unless the purchase price exceeds the value of current revenue from their property. Development requirements such as impact fees or inclusionary housing can capture value from rezoning though this value is largely dependent on economic conditions with land sales, development, and resulting revenue slowing when projects are not financially feasible. While land costs may rise on a per acre basis with more intensive zoning (since the acreage cost is influenced by the possible number of units to be built on the property), development cost per unit of affordable housing is not affected.

Purchasing land and holding it until development funds are available results in holding costs for the city. The City's holding costs for properties acquired but awaiting development range from $34,000 to $453,000 annually per site, adding 1–17% to acquisition costs. Interim uses (e.g., pop-ups, leases, nonprofit uses) could help offset these costs so long as they are revenue-generating. Public-serving interim uses—as opposed to profit-driven use—often require additional public funding to open and operate, adding to holding costs.

If ad hoc land banking continues, using ground leases or options to purchase can reduce expenses and reduce overall costs. Ground leases and delayed acquisitions through options to purchase could reduce upfront expenses and holding costs. In addition, practitioner feedback offered strategies for nimble funding for acquisitions, including the need for funding predictability and support for tools like transfer tax relief, leasing options, and nonprofit financial intermediaries.

POLICY BEST PRACTICES

Comparing San Francisco's practices to other cities, research affirmed effective strategies are already employed in San Francisco. Successful strategies include, for example, coordinated NOFAs

for site acquisition and development when local funding is available to supplement state and federal funds.

Establishing stable funding and aligning pipeline growth with funding capacity were important practices to build and grow the affordable housing pipeline efficiently.

Public land and nonprofit land offer ongoing potential for affordable housing sites. Public land may continue to be used for affordable housing based on site conditions and financial and operational needs of public agencies. Faith-based and nonprofit owned land (approximately 280 acres citywide) for affordable housing may be supported through technical assistance and use of emerging tools like Senate Bill 4 streamlining.

"Missing middle" housing strategies emerged as important to encourage more diversity of affordable housing types: single-stair building reform as well as reforms to elevator requirements, pre-approved designs, and the Greek *antiparochi* model (property-for-units exchanges) could all be useful approaches to expand housing options without subsidy.

Recommended Strategies

1. Scale Acquisitions to Funding and Pipeline

- **Build the pipeline while growing it -** Continue funding the development of existing pipeline projects while scaling and pacing new site acquisitions proportional to available funding.

- **More funding, new sources, and more consistent funding-** Explore additional funding tools identified in the Affordable Housing Leadership Council report, including exploring Enhanced Infrastructure Finance Districts (EIFDs), as called for by the Board of Supervisors. Other funding sources could include potential future bonds, one-time or ongoing budget allocations, as well as state and regional sources. Funding is highly variable, leading to uncertainty in pipeline planning, and more consistency in funding would help with pipeline management.

2. Expand Geographic Distribution

- **One affordable development per district -** Work towards at least one affordable housing project in the development pipeline in all 11 Supervisorial Districts, as funding availability allows. Over time, this will address the geographic inequity while continuing investment throughout the city.

- **Acquire sites in western & northern neighborhoods –** The Housing Element goal is that 25% of new affordable homes will be in the city's central, western & northern neighborhoods. Expanding site acquisition efforts to these well-resourced neighborhoods will help meet this goal and affirmatively further fair housing**. Site acquisition and development would continue in equity communities** while increasing affordable housing production citywide.

3. Develop Public and Nonprofit-Owned Land

- **Work with Partners** - Continue working with public agencies, faith-based organizations, and nonprofits to develop underutilized sites that meet the City's criteria for affordable housing.

- **Technical Assistance -** Offer technical assistance and capacity-building programs for faith-based organizations through public, philanthropic and other sources as well as flexible predevelopment funding tailored to organizational contexts.

4. Implement Market Acquisition Tools

- **Deploy strategic incentives and mechanisms** to improve the competitiveness of affordable housing providers to acquire sites through:

    - **Transfer tax exemption** for affordable housing sales (with guardrails against price inflation).
    - **Expansion of Community Opportunity to Purchase Act** (COPA) to cover commercial and development sites.
    - **Partnership for rapid and nimble acquisitions** with the Housing Accelerator Fund, other Community Development Financial Institutions (CDFIs), philanthropy, and other partners.

- **Act opportunistically** when funding is available to pursue distressed properties, foreclosures, and below-market opportunities for suitable development sites in targeted geographies.

5. Enable "Missing Middle" Affordable Housing

- **Support small (2-20 units) and mid-size (21-49 units) developments** through:
    - Form-based density standards in residential districts
    - Single-stair and elevator building code reform to increase feasibility
    - Pre-approved design templates for expedited permitting
    - Exploration of innovative models like antiparochi ("flats-for-land" exchanges), working with private, philanthropic, and nonprofit sectors to develop successful development models.

Section 1: Introduction

San Francisco's 8-year housing plan (the 2022 Housing Element Update) includes permitting and facilitating development of 82,000 housing units, including 32,800 units affordable at lower-incomes. These are the ambitious state-mandated Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) targets. The Housing Element also calls for affirmatively furthering fair housing (AFFH) by increasing affordable housing in well-resourced neighborhoods as well as continuing to invest in historically marginalized communities. The **Affordable Housing Sites Analysis and Strategies (AHSAS)** seeks to make progress on the City's affordable housing targets (32,000 units). The AHSAS complements the **2024 Affordable Housing Leadership Council report** that provides recommendations on funding, financing, cost lowering, and innovation for affordable housing.

The AHSAS, led by the San Francisco Planning Department in collaboration with the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD), focuses on three goals:

(1) Support the effective management of the existing affordable housing development pipeline (Housing Element Action 1.2.4);

(2) Ensure ongoing affordable housing production along with equitable geographic distribution of affordable housing. (Housing Element Action 1.2.1)

(3) Use both strategic and opportunistic approaches[1] to identify and acquire new sites for affordable housing development (Housing Element Action 1.2.1);

This work was informed by close coordination among city agencies and input from affordable housing developers and community partners to address community priorities and the City's equity goals.

Structure of the AHSAS Report

- **Section 1:** Introduction to the project purpose and structure and its connection to the Housing Element, including policies and programs it helps implement and how it relates to rezoning

- **Section 2**: Describes community engagement, including the context that led to the development of AHSAS and a summary of stakeholder engagement for the project

- **Section 3:** Reviews the funding needs for affordable housing, the Affordable Housing Leadership Council recommendations, and emerging funding initiatives.

---

1 Managing San Francisco's affordable housing pipeline combines strategic planning with opportunistic action. Strategically, investments are aligned with funding and policy goals, including equitable geographic distribution and support for nonprofits and religious organizations, through tools like the Housing Accelerator Fund and sustained technical assistance. Opportunistically, the City mobilizes public and private resources to acquire public sites, nonprofit or religious-owned parcels, and privately held properties available at lower costs. This dual approach ensures a flexible, effective pipeline that advances long-term housing goals while responding to immediate opportunities.

- **Section 4:** Describes the existing Affordable Housing Pipeline management practices and the status of geographic distribution of the existing pipeline.

- **Section 5:** Presents the local, state, and federal policies supporting affordable housing as well as the parcel suitability analysis, which identifies sites for affordable housing in Housing Opportunity Areas[2] and in Equity Geographies.

- **Section 6:** Summarizes financial research by Century Urban including trends in site acquisition, land holding, and development costs, and policy research of Enterprise Community Partners on best practices from other cities related to affordable housing pipeline management and site acquisition strategies and partnering with faith-based nonprofit organizations.

- **Section 7:** Concludes with strategy recommendations.

This report comes at a pivotal moment for San Francisco's housing future. The research and analysis provide critical insights on affordable housing pipeline management, site acquisition, and land use that inform how we maximize limited resources to advance production and equity goals.

Implementing the Housing Element and the City's Affordable Housing Goals

The Affordable Housing Sites Analysis and Strategies report helps implement policies and programs from the 2022 Housing Element Update by advancing the following policy goals:

- Policy 15 - Calls for expanding permanently affordable housing investments in Equity Geographies and Policy 19 - Calls for increasing permanently affordable housing units in Housing Opportunity Areas.

- Program 1.2 - Addresses Affordable Housing Production and, within that section, Program 1.2.4 calls for regularly tracking the pipeline of development sites and land banked for affordable housing development funded by OCII, MOHCD, and other relevant agencies. It also calls for developing strategies to ensure sufficient sites to accommodate affordable housing production relative to available funding over a rolling 4- to 8-year outlook and for meeting the goals to construct housing in Priority Equity Geographies and Well-resourced neighborhoods.

Relationship with Housing Element Rezoning and Low-Income Sites Rules

As part of the Housing Element, according to state rules, San Francisco had to assess its capacity to accommodate the 82,000 housing unit RHNA goals through a Sites Inventory. This analysis found a shortfall of capacity for 36,000 housing units, including 15% "No Net Loss" buffer described later in this section. Under state law, the City is required to rezone within three years of Housing Element adoption, by January 31, 2026 in San Francisco's case, to accommodate the shortfall of sites for

[2] Areas designated as "Highest Resource" and "High Resource" on the CTCAC/HCD Opportunity Area Maps (2025) 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.

housing affordable at different income levels. To address AFFH goals in State law and the Housing Element, San Francisco is focusing the required Family Zoning Plan rezoning in Housing Opportunity Areas in the center, west, and north of the city where restrictive zoning has limited new housing construction for decades.

RHNA goals are divided into different income levels: 1) very low and low income, 2) moderate income, and 3) above moderate incomes, to meet diverse housing needs. Jurisdictions must demonstrate they have sufficient capacity to accommodate different income levels. The requirement is **not** to zone sites specifically for affordable housing or limit the development of sites to only affordable housing projects. Because multifamily housing is more likely to be affordable to lower income residents than single family homes, the State requires multifamily zoning for the lower Income RHNA.

Under State rules, parcels identified to meet the lower-income RHNA must have zoning that allows a minimum of 16 units and a minimum density of at least 30 dwelling units per acre. The state's approach ensures that every jurisdiction has sufficient land that is zoned for multi-family housing at a minimum project size and density that is feasible for multifamily development. In addition, sites must have a reasonable likelihood or feasibility of being developed for housing. Meaning that an existing use on the site doesn't make it economically or practically impossible to build more housing. For example, a recently constructed, functioning hospital is unlikely to become housing in the near-term.

The State also requires "No Net Loss" of sites for lower income housing as mentioned above. If any site designated for lower income housing in the City's RHNA Sites Inventory is developed with fewer units of housing affordable at those income levels than indicated in the City's Sites Inventory, the City must identify additional sites to replace that capacity per the state's No Net Loss rules. For example, if Site A has been designated as suitable for low-income housing, but is developed with no on-site affordable housing, the city would need to identify and rezone an additional site to accommodate the affordable housing that was allocated to Site A. For this reason, San Francisco has included a state-recommended buffer of 15% above the 82,000-unit target in its Housing Element numerical goals. The buffer ensures the city maintains sufficient sites for affordable housing over time.

Practically speaking, the city's criteria for ideal affordable housing sites surpass the state's requirements. The City and County of San Francisco and its affordable housing developer partners seek sites that can accommodate at least 50 apartment homes and prefer 100 or more homes. This scale is more efficient to fund, finance, build, and operate. Given these practical considerations, the Affordable Housing Sites Analysis and Strategies **focuses on San Francisco-specific criteria** for analyzing the universe of potential development sites suitable for affordable housing.[3] Because state Housing Element law and local criteria for suitable sites for affordable housing can differ, the low-income sites designated within the rezoning for the Housing Element will overlap with sites meeting local 100% subsidized affordable housing criteria but will not be exactly the same.

3 See parcel suitability analysis section.

Section 2: Input from Affordable Housing Practitioners and Community

Community and Practitioner Input to the Housing Element and Implementation

The 2022 Housing Element included years of dialogue with residents, community organizations, and advocates to ensure that policies reflected citywide needs and neighborhood priorities. Following Housing Element adoption, the Activating Community Priorities process highlighted implementation priorities of residents and organizations in San Francisco's Equity Geographies. The AHSAS helps address community questions by looking at resources needed to build and grow the pipeline of housing throughout the city. Parallel to this work, San Francisco Planning convened and collaborated with the Community Equity Advisory Council. The Equity Council has surfaced specific community needs and recommended approaches to advance affordable housing and community resilience.

Affordable Housing Practitioner and Community Input for the AHSAS

To develop the strategies outlined in this report, AHSAS convened working sessions with affordable housing practitioners and other community-based organizations working on housing—many of whom had also been active participants in the AHLC. Two rounds of working sessions were held, first in June 2024 and again in August 2025. Practitioners provided ideas based on their experience and provided feedback on draft content. The AHSAS working groups built on working groups convened as part of the Affordable Housing Leadership Council (AHLC), which brought together affordable housing developers, advocates, financial experts, and community stakeholders to address affordable housing funding and cost lowering, and is described more in the next section.

Participating organizations included affordable housing developers, community-based nonprofits, advocacy groups, and intermediary agencies, bringing diverse expertise in housing development, policy, and community engagement. These organizations included:

- BRIDGE Housing
- Council of Community Housing Organizations (CCHO)
- Curtis Development
- Habitat for Humanity
- Housing Accelerator Fund (HAF)
- Interfaith Council
- John Stewart Company
- LISC (Local Initiatives Support Corporation)
- MEDA (Mission Economic Development Agency)
- Mercy Housing
- Mission Housing Development Corporation
- Related California Northern California Affordable
- Self-Help for the Elderly
- SFCLT (San Francisco Community Land Trust)
- SOMA Pilipinas
- TNDC (Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation)
- YCD (Young Community Developers)

Affordable housing practitioners shared consistent themes around feasibility, funding, and strategic site selection. In June 2024, participants emphasized the importance of parcel suitability such as criteria size, interim uses, and leveraging public, nonprofit, and religious land, while highlighting challenges like rising costs and the need for predictable funding.

By August 2025, the focus was on insights and strategies, especially for religious and nonprofit developers, streamlined permitting, and policy tools to incentivize land acquisition, especially in Housing Opportunity Areas. In both sessions, practitioners stressed the importance of equity, partnerships, and innovative approaches to overcome systemic barriers. This feedback is integrated throughout the research topic areas and informed proposed strategies.

Feedback and Direction from Planning Commission

Questions about how San Francisco will fund and deliver affordable housing has been a consistent focus of the Planning Commission since the adoption of the 2022 Housing Element. On July 17, 2025, Planning Commissioners, advocates, and the public provided feedback on the Affordable Housing Sites Analysis and Strategies (AHSAS) in the context of the Family Zoning Plan. Public comment focused on the need for increased funding to move the affordable housing pipeline forward. Several Commissioners emphasized that while the Affordable Housing Sites Analysis and Strategies and Family Zoning Plan are critical steps, they must be paired with a clear and credible funding strategy. Suggestions ranged from exploring future local and regional housing bonds, to incentives such as transfer tax relief, strategic land acquisition, and policy reforms to reduce costs.

Commissioners and public commenters also focused on timing and accountability. Commissioners urged that the funding and tenant protection strategies be presented with concrete timelines. Some Commissioners and public commenters raised the need for strategic land banking to secure sites, particularly in areas that will be rezoned and that currently have little affordable housing. Overall, commissioners and members of the public recognized that State deadlines require swift action on rezoning, but stressed that funding and implementation must be developed in parallel to ensure that new capacity results in affordable homes and sustainable neighborhoods.

Section 3: Need for Affordable Housing Funding

Funding for affordable housing production and preservation, alongside efforts to reduce construction and operating costs, are the most critical factors for achieving San Francisco's housing targets. While the AHSAS analyzes the existing development pipeline and potential sites for future affordable housing development, financing and high costs are the bottlenecks to delivering affordable housing at the scale needed. The Affordable Housing Leadership Council (AHLC)—a group of experts convened by the City—directly addressed these issues in its Affordable Housing Leadership Council Report, published in February 2024. The report identified availability of low-cost funding and cost reduction as the most pressing challenges to meeting San Francisco's housing goals and made recommendations to expand resources and improve efficiency.

The AHSAS builds upon this work by focusing on the availability, suitability, and management of sites, while recognizing that funding and cost barriers are determinants of whether affordable housing can be built on potential sites.

Funding is the Central Challenge

Affordable housing developers must assemble local, state, and federal resources, yet federal and state programs remain inadequate relative to the scale of need. Over the past decade, San Francisco has doubled its rate of affordable housing production and preservation by substantially increasing local funding, producing or preserving more affordable homes than any other city in the region. Voter-approved General Obligation (GO) bonds ($310 million in 2015, $600 million in 2019, and $300 million in 2024), along with budget allocations, allowed the city to leverage state and federal dollars. Despite these gains, the city continues to fall short of its Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) targets. High construction costs—approaching $1 million per 2-bedroom unit—reduce the number of units each dollar can deliver and make projects less competitive for limited State funding. A dearth of funding, compounded by escalating development costs, limits the City's ability to accelerate pipeline production.

Recognizing these challenges, the AHLC issued its 2024 Affordable Housing Leadership Council report with recommendations to address funding, financing, and cost barriers.

- **Increasing federal, state, and regional funding** through advocacy, collaboration with other cities and state and national leaders, and strategic partnerships.
- **Expanding local funding and coordination capacity**, including maintaining or increasing local funding and improving alignment across City agencies and requirements.
- **Pursuing innovative and alternative approaches** such as public-private partnerships, philanthropy, and creative financing tools.

Recent Successes and Emerging Challenges

Since the AHLC published its recommendations, the city has accomplished several goals:

- **Local investments**: San Francisco voters approved the March 2024 General Obligation Bond and Proposition G in November 2024, establishing the Affordable Housing Opportunity Fund for rental subsidies to help extremely low-income renters afford housing.

- **Federal progress**: In 2025, federal legislation expanded the availability of private activity bonds and Low-Income Housing Tax Credits.

- **Production growth**: As of summer 2025, 31 affordable housing projects with more than 2,700 units are under construction or renovation.

At the same time, significant challenges persist:

- State programs such as the Multifamily Housing Program and Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities regularly face potential cuts as the State grapples with declining revenue.

- A proposed regional affordable housing bond from the Bay Area Housing Finance Authority (BAHFA) did not advance in 2024, and supporting statewide ballot measures failed to pass.

Advancing Recommendations

To sustain momentum, San Francisco is pursuing several AHLC recommendations.

- Exploring use of ***tax-increment finance tools*** such as Enhanced Infrastructure Finance Districts (EIFDs) along with other potential local funding sources to generate consistent funding for affordable housing as called for in a Board of Supervisors resolution passed September 2025.

- ***Improving coordination of housing agencies,*** including MOHCD, OCII, and the Housing Authority, to maximize federal resources such as rental assistance.

- Supporting ***state and regional housing funding proposals***, including a potential 2026 state affordable housing bond.

Looking forward, the City may advance additional measures in the next 2–3 years, including: consideration of a new local bond by 2028, reducing local cost premiums tied to local regulatory requirements, supporting State reforms to lower insurance and other costs, and re-engaging in regional bond efforts.

Implications for AHSAS

The AHSAS provides critical analysis of sites, pipeline management, and acquisition strategies. Yet these strategies can only succeed if paired with the funding measures outlined above and cost-lowering . The city has sites and tools, but without sufficient financial resources and lower development costs, progress toward RHNA targets will remain out of reach. Advancing the Affordable Housing Leadership Council's recommendations in tandem with the site strategies described in this report is essential to increasing affordable housing production.

Section 4: Existing Practices and Pipeline

Managing San Francisco's affordable housing pipeline requires balancing multiple needs and priorities, complex regulatory requirements, and limited financial resources. The Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD) functions as both funding aggregator and lender. MOHCD coordinates more than 25 different local sources, each with distinct requirements, and aligns them with state and federal resources. The current affordable housing pipeline maximizes housing production through both opportunistic and balanced practices.[4] MOHCD uses local funding to balance affordable housing production, preservation of existing buildings, and acquisition of new sites for development in a way that accounts for existing and anticipated funding sources.[5]

Affordable Housing Building Specs

The rising costs of affordable housing continue to make managing the affordable housing pipeline more challenging. As described in further detail in Section 6, unit costs average upwards of $1 million dollars for a two-bedroom unit. Construction-related hard costs are over 60% of total development costs, while land costs have remained less volatile at about 10 to 14 percent of total per unit costs. Projects are typically 6-8 stories and over 100 units to achieve economies of scale. Sites tend to be over 10,000 square feet for projects with smaller units such as 1 bedrooms and studios geared toward seniors and supportive housing for small households and upwards of 15,000 square feet to accommodate larger units for households with more than three members.

Coordinating Funding Sources for Affordable Housing

Managing funding is one of the most complex aspects of the affordable housing pipeline. In a typical new construction affordable building, there are five to seven funding sources. Local funds constitute about 1/3 of the funding needed. Once state, federal and other funding sources are secured, local city funds fill the gap between total cost and other secured funding sources.

As described in Section 2 of the AHLC report,[6] limited financial resources constrain construction and rehabilitation of pipeline projects and limit acquisition of new sites. Local revenue sources, such as General Obligation Bonds, provide some stability but require voter approval and are subject to fiscal and political conditions. Inclusionary housing fees, once a major resource, have declined sharply as private development has slowed, dropping from over $100 million in 2017 to a projected $3 million in 2025.

Federal allocations through the HOME and CDBG programs remain small, and state and federal Low-Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC), particularly the 9% LIHTC credits, are highly competitive.

---

4 2024 - Affordable Housing: Funding and Feasibility Principles | Office of Resilience and Capital Planning (2024)

5 2024 - Affordable Housing: Funding and Feasibility Principles | Office of Resilience and Capital Planning (2024)

6 Affordable Housing Leadership Funding Recommendations Report (2024)

San Francisco typically secures only one or two of the more generous 9% LIHTC credit allocations annually. A more common funding scenario for a larger affordable housing project is with the 4% LIHTC credits paired with a limited supply of tax-exempt bonds. The 4% LIHTC fund has been oversubscribed statewide for the past five years, leading to a bottleneck; however, recent federal changes will increase the availability of the 4% LIHTC, though the value of the credits may be lower in the short term.

Within these constraints, MOHCD carefully matches projects to available sources and times its commitments to maximize competitiveness. Projects are tracked in a central pipeline allocation system that links anticipated funding availability with project readiness, allowing the City to plan around the state's funding calendar. The City manages its scarce funds through aggregating multiple sites into single Notices of Funding Availability, adjusting underwriting standards to match external scoring priorities, and requiring developers to pursue additional resources, among other ways, as needed by projects. At the same time, MOHCD works to fill critical funding gaps to keep projects viable and competitive for state awards.

A project enters the pipeline when the site is acquired. At this time, the City will either land bank the site or provide predevelopment funds and work with the development team to assemble construction funding and design, then permit, the site. The City's Affordable Housing Loan Committee reviews all requests for City funds. MOHCD requires developers to seek additional funding sources to reduce city costs and MOHCD provides gap funding to leverage competitive state funds. Typically, securing LIHTC and bond funding from the state is one of the last steps in the process of assembling the funding stack. The streamlining measures and permitting process changes have made a significant difference and have helped the city avoid costly delays from community opposition and lawsuits.

Affordable housing pipeline management must balance new opportunities with large, long-term commitments to major public housing and redevelopment sites. Projects such as the HOPE SF communities at Sunnydale, Hunters View, Alice Griffith, and Potrero Hill, as well as major Development Agreements like Treasure Island, require ongoing funding allocations. Managing these obligations involves navigating shifting priorities among the Mayor's Office, Board of Supervisors, state agencies, and federal programs.

Acquiring Sites and Land Banking for Affordable Housing

Sites enter the affordable housing pipeline through NOFA acquisitions, land dedications, development agreements, or as excess public lands. For example, over the past 10 years, the City has used targeted NOFAs to prioritize acquisitions in Housing Opportunity Areas [7] that align with the City's obligation to Affirmatively Further Fair Housing and its 2022 Housing Element[8] and state funding sources. Acquisitions in areas where multi-family and affordable housing have not been permitted helps address historical inequities created by exclusionary zoning and strengthens the competitiveness of projects in state funding competitions.

---

7 CTCAC/HCD Opportunity Area Maps (2025) updated annually by the State.

8 2022 Housing Element

San Francisco integrates “land banking” into its affordable housing pipeline by acquiring sites for future development and holding them until they are ready for development. The City has acquired dozens of sites, either directly or through partnerships, that have been land banked.

Unlike other cities around the state and nationally, San Francisco generally retains ownership of the land and leases it to nonprofit developers and operators, to ensure permanent affordability and public control. This model distinguishes the city nationally, as most federal and state affordability covenants are time limited. By maintaining land ownership, San Francisco can guarantee affordability in perpetuity and step in when restrictions on older projects lapse.

The City’s practice of *de facto* “land banking” carries significant costs. The cost of security and maintenance on land banked sites can range from $34,000 to $500,000 annually per site. With project timelines from acquisition to occupancy averaging five to seven years, these expenses can accumulate into the millions, creating difficult trade-offs in the allocation of finite and inadequate public resources for affordable housing.

Publicly Owned Land in the Pipeline

Publicly owned land can be an important, though limited, avenue for affordable housing development. Policies like the California Surplus Land Act and San Francisco’s Proposition K Surplus Lands Ordinance establish procedures for making underutilized public properties available for housing. In practice, however, relatively few sites qualify as surplus because they continue to host active and critical public facilities. Agencies must balance their contribution to affordable housing with operational and financial need to sustain and improve public services and infrastructure.

The Joint Development Portfolio Program of the SFMTA supports affordable housing on some sites that it owns, while reserving others for essential transit revenue. Across the portfolio, affordable housing is accounted for. On some specific sites, however, the agency aims to cross subsidize construction and generate essential transit revenue through development of its assets.

The San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD) also is exploring opportunities to integrate affordable housing onto more sites, while managing the dynamic changes in school enrollment and site needs. Projects such as Kapuso (SFMTA), Shirley Chisholm Village (SFUSD), and forthcoming Balboa Reservoir (San Francisco Public Utilities Commission) show the potential of this approach. Still, available supply remains modest and is distributed unevenly throughout the city.

Religious and Nonprofit-owned Land in the Pipeline

Partnerships with nonprofit and faith-based landowners can expand the pipeline and require significant alignment of visions and resources. Congregations have a long history of building affordable housing in San Francisco. Recent collaboration with the Interfaith Council, philanthropy, and City partners has renewed momentum.

State laws like SB 4, known as the “Yes in God’s Backyard” bill, are encouraging religious and mission-driven land to develop affordable housing. San Francisco has participated in capacity-building programs with the San Francisco Interfaith Council and partner organizations such as the

San Francisco Foundation, the Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC), and the Housing Action Coalition (HAC) to support affordable housing development on religious and nonprofit owned land. While challenges such as aligning projects with organizational missions, navigating historic preservation issues, or addressing the lack of funding remain, the City has invested in technical and financial assistance to help nonprofit landowners explore development.

Overview of the Current Affordable Housing Pipeline

The "Affordable Housing Pipeline" consists of housing projects in various stages of development, from design to entitlement to under construction. The pipeline includes publicly funded 100% affordable housing projects (new construction and rehabilitation) and privately funded Inclusionary Housing Program (also known as the "Below-Market-Rate program) units. Many pipeline projects not yet in construction are not yet fully funded. Pipeline data is regularly updated and publicly available at DataSF and MOHCD's housing dashboard.[9]

The Affordable Housing Pipeline Overview (including the map shown below) illustrates San Francisco's affordable housing pipeline. The Overview was developed in response to recommendations from the Community Equity Advisory Council who wanted a transparent and accessible resource. It is intended to inform community planning efforts. Please note that the pipeline excludes longer-term projects in development agreements well as sites going through seismic retrofit as well as certain religious and nonprofit-owned redevelopment sites.

9 Regularly updated affordable housing pipeline data for large, multi-phase developments such as Treasure Island or Candlestick may only include affordable housing currently under development not all affordable housing planned over all phases of the development.

Figure 1. Map of Affordable Housing Pipeline (2024)



(Source: MOHCD Affordable Housing Pipeline Data Nov 2024)

Key Findings on the Affordable Housing Pipeline:

The Affordable Housing Pipeline includes a broad range of project types including preservation of existing housing, production of new 100% affordable developments, and BMR inclusionary units in different phases of development.

Pre-Development: There are over 12,600 units across more than 59 100% affordable developments that are currently in pre-construction stages, which include project design, approvals, assembling funding and financing from different sources, and permitting.

- **Production of new 100% affordable housing development** is divided into several categories with development sites obtained in various ways:
    - **Individual Sites Acquired in the Market**: **2,087 units across 13 projects** come from sites that were acquired individually on the private market, reflecting the importance of strategic acquisitions in supporting affordable housing production.
    - **Private Development Agreements**: **634 units across 5 projects** are being delivered through private development agreements, highlighting the role of negotiated land use approvals in securing affordable housing contributions within larger private developments. More development agreements could contribute to sites for 100% affordable housing developments in the future.
    - **HOPE SF: 1,415 units across 3 HOPE SF projects including Potrero and Sunnydale**, represent continued public investment in the transformation and revitalization of historically under-resourced Public Housing communities.
    - **Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure projects: 2,494 units across 4 redevelopment areas,** including Candlestick, Hunters Point Shipyard, Mission Bay, and Transbay, are a significant portion to the affordable housing pipeline and underscore the impact of large-scale, master-planned redevelopment areas.
    - **Large Development Agreements on formerly Publicly-owned Land**: **2,320 units across 2 developments** at Treasure Island and Balboa Reservoir. These projects exemplify long-term planning partnerships on former public land to achieve significant affordable housing.
    - **Individual Publicly-owned Sites: 471 units across 5 projects are planned on individual publicly owned parcels**, pointing to a more modest but ongoing role for site-specific public land development in the pipeline.
- **Rehabilitation Projects**, the acquisition, preservation, and rehabilitation of existing housing, include 21 buildings, which contribute 3,195 units, or 25% of the total units.

Figure 2. **Pre-Construction Affordable Housing Pipeline by Project Type (July 2025)**

Type	*Total Projects or Developments*	*Total Units*
Sites Acquired in the Market	13	2,087
Private Development Agreements	5	634
HOPE SF	3	1,415
OCII	7	2,494
Large Development Agreements on Formerly Publicly-owned Sites	5	2,320
Individual Publicly-owned Sites	5	471
Rehabilitation and Preservation	21	3,195
Total	**59**	**12,616**

(Source: MOHCD Affordable Housing Pipeline Data July 2025) Note: The data set includes projects in pre-construction phases of development and has been adapted from Affordable Housing Pipeline Data that will be published in July 2025. The list includes longer-term DAs and approximately 1,500 seismic retrofit units and 400 religious and non-profit owned site units.

In addition to the pipeline projects discussed above, there are additional affordable units in projects under construction and included as inclusionary units in privately funded market rate developments that are also in the pipeline. These affordable projects are summarized below.

- **Under Construction:** As of fall 2025, there are 30 projects under construction, including 13 new 100% affordable developments and 17 rehabilitation and preservation projects, totaling over 2,299 units.

- **Privately Funded BMR units:** There are over 124 market rate projects in the development pipeline that could provide 2,500 affordable units through the Inclusionary Housing Program (also known at the BMR program.) Many of these mixed-income projects are stalled by high interest rates or material and labor costs, which also hampers the development of 100% affordable housing.

- **Other long-term development agreements (DAs) will contribute significantly to affordable housing** through BMR units, land dedication and/or payment of fees, but are not included in the Affordable Housing Pipeline given their early stage of implementation. These DAs include Schlage Lock, Parkmerced, Stonestown and others. With DAs project sponsors typically have options on how to meet their BMR obligations and are only required to determine the method of fulfilling these obligations as the project is constructed. So, while these projects will significantly contribute both built units and funding for affordable housing per the terms of each DA, the exact mix of units, land, and funding cannot be projected at this time.

The geographic distribution of affordable housing is uneven and mirrors housing development patterns more generally including market rate housing. Planning analyzed the geographic distribution of the Affordable Housing Pipeline list from DataSF available as of February 2025.

The analysis found:

- Most of the new construction and preservation projects are in Supervisor Districts 5, 6, 9, and 10 while District 11 has no project in the pipeline. Districts 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8 have fewer than 4.

- Most affordable housing sites are concentrated outside of San Francisco's well-resourced Housing Opportunity Areas (HOAs), continuing a pattern of exclusion of new multi-family housing accessible to lower and moderate-income households from high-opportunity neighborhoods.

- This geographic distribution reflects similar development patterns for market-rate housing production. This is because (1) zoning that allows multifamily housing has supported the development of both affordable and market rate housing and new infrastructure investments have supported housing development in growing areas and (2) market-rate development directly produces affordable inclusionary units.

Figure 3. **Sites and Units in the Affordable Housing Pipeline by Type and Inclusion in Housing Opportunity Areas (February 2025)**

Pipeline Type	*Percentage of Total Affordable Units in Pipeline*	*Percent of Affordable Projects in the Housing Opportunity Area*	*Percentage of Units Projected for Housing Opportunity Area*
Rehabilitation and Preservation	11%	22%	12%
Production (100% subsidized developments)	64%	13%	16%
Inclusionary BMR Units in Market-rate Projects	25%	20%	10%

(Source: Affordable Housing Pipeline Data February 2025 Note: The data does not include some longer-term DAs or about 1,500 seismic retrofit units and 400 religious and non-profit owned site units listed in the Affordable Housing Overview.)

Figure 4. **Sites and Units in the Affordable Housing Pipeline by Supervisor District (100% New Construction and Preservation Projects)**

Supervisor District	*Percentage of Pipeline Projects*	*Percent of Total Units*
District 1	3%	1%
District 2	4%	2%
District 3	5%	7%
District 4	3%	4%
District 5	11%	10%
District 6	21%	26%
District 7	5%	9%
District 8	4%	3%
District 9	21%	15%
District 10	24%	24%
District 11	0%	0%

(Source: Affordable Housing Pipeline Data February 2025 Note: The data does not include some longer-term DAs or about 1,500 seismic retrofit units and 400 religious and non-profit owned site units listed in the Affordable Housing Overview.)

Additional Insights on the Current Affordable Housing Pipeline:

- **There is a significant funding gap to construct the current pipeline of sites**. The city is holding several years' worth of affordable housing sites ready for development or rehabilitation. The city, however, lacks the funding to bring these projects to fruition. Under current funding cycles and resources, the current pipeline could take more than ten years to build out at the current annual average of 650 units of new construction 100% affordable housing and 280 units of acquisition or rehabilitation.
- **Inclusionary Housing is a significant component of the affordable pipeline**: Inclusionary BMR units—affordable homes generated through requirements on market-rate developments—have contributed 25% of the affordable housing stock in the years leading up to the pandemic. About 250 inclusionary units per year have been constructed for the past five years. Given the economic conditions of this decade, inclusionary production has dropped. Today's current restrictive zoning in HOAs has limited both 100% affordable projects and opportunities for inclusionary BMR units.

The analysis of the current pipeline underscores core challenges facing San Francisco's housing strategy: the scale of the backlog, the pressing need for funding, and concentration of affordable housing in certain neighborhoods.

Section 5: Parcel Suitability Analysis

The Parcel Suitability Analysis analyzed San Francisco parcels' viability for affordable housing development based on key site characteristics and existing development on the site. Assessing parcel suitability helps the City take stock of potential capacity for affordable housing and where capacity is concentrated in different districts of the city.

This information can help guide site acquisition strategies citywide as well as in particular districts and the City may build on this tool with additional detail and functions. To assess parcel suitability, Planning established the analysis methodology in consultation with MOHCD and based on available data and relevant state and local policies that enable affordable housing. This section first presents an overview of the state and local policy considerations; then describes the methodology for the parcel suitability analysis; and then presents the parcel suitability analysis findings.

Policy Context for Affordable Housing Development

Various local, state, and federal policies combine to shape strategies for site acquisition and inform this Parcel Suitability Analysis. These policies and programs are considered when affordable development funding is distributed. They also affect the allowed density and feasibility of affordable housing.

Both the City and County of San Francisco and the State of California have established Executive Directives and legislation to support, prioritize, and streamline housing approvals and permits, especially for affordable housing. Locally, Mayor Ed Lee issued mayoral Executive Directive 13-01 in 2013, prioritizing faster housing project reviews. He further expanded that effort to speed the pace of housing production in 2017 with Executive Directive 17-02. Subsequently, Mayor London Breed and Mayor Daniel Lurie have continued with similar directives that would accelerate housing production.

Local initiatives that have helped shape today's affordable housing pipeline include:

- **Administrative Code Chapter 23A (Surplus Public Lands Ordinance, 2016)** – Requires surplus public sites to be prioritized for 100% affordable housing.

- **Proposition E (Planning Code Section 206.9)** – The 100% Affordable Housing and Educator Housing Streamlining Program facilitates the construction and development of affordable and educator housing.

- **Planning Code Section 315 (100% Affordable Housing Program)** – Provides streamlined approvals and incentives for 100% affordable projects.

At the state level, the legislature has introduced a series of housing bills to facilitate rapid housing review, approval, and permitting throughout California. San Francisco Planning Director Bulletin No. 5 summarizes ministerial approval processes for affordable and supportive housing through SB 35/SB 423, AB 2162, AB 2011/AB 2243, and SB 4 (described further below). The City must approve

the project if it meets all state program criteria and it satisfies the objective rules like zoning and design standards. Depending on the applicable bill, projects can be approved without needing environmental review, public hearings, or extra approvals from elected officials.

State laws that help shape the affordable housing pipeline and its management include:

- **SB 35**/ **SB 423** which establishes streamlined, ministerial approval for housing projects.
- **SB 4** which facilitates housing development on certain faith-based and nonprofit-owned lands.
- **AB 2011** which establishes by-right approvals and incentives for affordable housing along commercial corridors.
- **AB 2162** which establishes streamlined, ministerial approval for supportive housing projects.

California State Density Bonus Law (CA Gov Code Section 65915) is one of the most significant state tools because it grants:

- Projects that include affordable housing can access additional density and additional height (up to three stories for 100% affordable housing or up to a 50% bonus available to both 100% affordable and mixed income housing developments) as well as development waivers and concessions (code or objective standards flexibility).
- Projects can utilize that flexibility for any objective standard (ex. setbacks) that may be needed to provide the bonus units.

Because density bonus law is currently broadly utilized, state density bonus assumptions were incorporated into the AHSAS Parcel Analysis to assess site viability and capacity.

Together, these local and state laws expand the feasibility of building affordable housing on a range of sites while also reducing delays tied to discretionary review. Some of the eligibility criteria for projects to use various ministerial laws include locational considerations to avoid environmentally sensitive or unhealthy sites and avoid the demolition of existing residential uses, among other factors that vary by program. Since a ministerial decision involves only the use of objective standards, government agencies or approval bodies like boards or commissions cannot use subjective judgment in deciding whether to approve a project.

Affordable Housing Funding Considerations for Site Selection

At the federal level, programs like the Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) remain the single largest funding source for affordable housing development. The LIHTC program gives State and local LIHTC-allocating agencies annual funding and the ability to issue tax credits for the acquisition, rehabilitation, or new construction of rental housing targeted to lower-income households. The California Tax Credit Allocation Committee (CTCAC) administers the federal and state LIHTC Programs. In addition, the California Debt Limit Allocation Committee (CDLAC) provides tax exempt

bonds and other financial resources while the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) has various affordable housing funding programs that are typically dependent on annual funding from elected officials or voter-approved sources.

California has adopted Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) laws and policies that shape the funding programs of the state housing agencies by including fair housing issues such as exclusion, segregation, and access to opportunity in funding program design. Other policy priorities including energy efficiency and reducing greenhouse gas emissions also influence state programs. These considerations in turn shape financing strategies and influence site characteristics for affordable developments. These goals also align with San Francisco's social equity commitments as well as important considerations for the quality of life for affordable housing residents including access to services, shopping, jobs, transportation, higher performing schools, and parks and recreation, among other important factors.

To align with AFFH, focusing on inclusion and expanding access, CTCAC has updated its 9% tax credit regulations by:

- Considering Opportunity Area Map designations (the state-designated map[10] that categorizes areas from "Low Resource" to "Highest Resource" based on numerous socioeconomic factors which are updated annually) to increase affordable housing in high-resource areas for families with children.

- Providing a basis boost and site amenity points for projects in High Resource and Highest Resource areas.

- Further incentivizing projects in these areas by adding a tiebreaker provision to the tax credit scoring process.

These changes are intended to affirmatively further fair housing and encourage increasing site acquisitions in High and Highest Resource areas to ensure funding competitiveness. In addition to considering site characteristics and funding programs for affordable housing, it is important to consider site suitability.

Methodology for Parcel Suitability Analysis

To analyze the availability and distribution of potential sites for affordable housing, the AHSAS includes a detailed parcel-level analysis to identify sites most suitable for future affordable housing development. Development criteria were informed by local, state, and federal guidelines and practices, as well as by the practical realities of financing, construction, and operation. Spatial and development program assumptions were applied through a Geographic Information System (GIS) to systematically filter, differentiate, and select sites with the strongest potential to support 100% affordable housing.

Some of the baseline site requirements included ensuring that potential development sites were at least 8,000 square feet or that contiguous suitable parcels added up to that minimum size. This

10 2025 CTCAC/HCD AFFH Mapping Tool NC

minimum size for individual and combined parcels is established in the local 100% Affordable Housing and Educator Housing Streamlining Program because this minimum lot size is conducive to accommodating multi-family housing at a scale competitive for funding and more efficient for construction and operations than smaller buildings on smaller parcels. Approved by San Francisco voters as Proposition E in November of 2019, and subsequently codified in Planning Code Section 206.9., Proposition E also allows affordable housing on sites currently zoned for public uses.

PARCEL SIZE

While 8,000 square feet is a minimum for affordable housing development, MOHCD and affordable housing developers prefer lot sizes of at least 10,000 square feet for households with smaller units. Sites of 15,000 square feet are preferred for households with larger units because this size can more easily accommodate a development with varying dwelling unit mixes and housing programs.

PARCEL DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL

"Softness" for development was calculated for all parcels and then used as part of the selection criteria. Softness is generally defined as the level of development of a particular site's existing structures and use(s) relative to what could be built on the site under local and state laws. Sites that are currently built to a relatively low percentage of potential development capacity are more likely to be suitable and available for development. This analysis used a standard metric of 30% and lower being considered "soft" for new development. In other words, sites are considered "soft" if existing development was less than 30% of the potential gross floor area allowed. For example, if a site could accommodate an 8-story building but currently is built with a 2-story building, it would be considered underdeveloped or "soft" because it is only built to 25% of the allowed capacity.

PARCEL EXCLUSIONS

Given the variety of sites throughout San Francisco and complexities of development, the analysis applied "exclusions" to remove from consideration a range of parcels with various existing uses or characteristics that make development more challenging or unlikely. The exclusions included sites with:

- Existing housing (including rent-controlled housing)
- Entitled development projects that have pulled construction permits
- Large developments that have already been approved and entitled with specific affordable housing requirements
- Some public sites whose agencies are coordinating their own analyses for development (including SFMTA and SFUSD)
- Public universities and some private universities
- Parks and open spaces
- Extremely large sites such as golf courses
- Protected historic resources including resources individually listed under the California and National Registers as well as Articles 10 and 11 of the Planning Code[11]

11 Note that non-contributors in Article 10 and Category V (unrated) buildings in Article 11 were incorporated into the parcel analysis since those historic resources can generally utilize state ministerial laws.

This analysis did not search for sites that are actively for sale or vacant, since those are ever changing. Instead, the analysis took a more inclusive approach to identify the universe of sites or grouping of sites that are both “soft” and meet the mentioned criteria.

PARCEL LAND USE AND STATE DENSITY ASSUMPTIONS

Additionally, the analysis considered land use controls (notably height, bulk, and residential density) as they exist during the time of the analysis in combination with local and state laws (such as Prop E and State Density Bonus Law) that allow additional height and density for 100% affordable projects. The parcel suitability analysis did not incorporate potential heights, density, or flexible standards that will likely be part of the Family Zoning Plan, which is described in more detail below. Current affordable housing policies and programs provide some similar benefits for affordable housing to what the Family Zoning Plan could offer, however, the flexible zoning of the Family Zoning Plan, including increased heights and densities, will create even more development opportunities for affordable housing, as described below.

FAMILY ZONING PLAN AND SITE SUITABILITY ANALYSIS

To expand both overall housing production as well as affordable housing production throughout Housing Opportunity Areas, the Family Zoning Plan is proposing a set of policies to facilitate and accommodate this growth. The Family Zoning Plan continues to evolve but as currently drafted, the Plan includes increases to height limits and changes to density limits (from numeric to form-based density), especially on commercial and transit corridors.

Additionally, a major feature of the proposed Family Zoning Plan is the Housing Choice-SF Local Program, which provides for greater development flexibility. All Housing Choice-San Francisco housing projects, including affordable housing, will receive modified standards such as form-based density, additional height, flexibility on standards for rear yard or lot coverage, usable open space, and dwelling unit exposure, among others, and up to 15% of quantitative objective standards flexibility unless otherwise noted.

Projects that are comprised of 100% affordable housing will additionally receive more code flexibility on a variety of topics plus up to 20 additional feet in additional height. Where applicable, the AHSAS unit capacity is roughly approximating residential units that would be allowed inclusive of the State Density Bonus rules layered on existing zoning (pre-Family Zoning Plan). For example, most residential areas and commercial corridors in San Francisco currently have a height limit of 40 feet and with State Density Bonus could build to 73 feet or three additional stories. With the Family Zoning Plan 100% affordable project could qualify for additional height and other benefits. Because the Family Zoning Plan is still in development, the analysis did not use the proposed local program heights. Therefore, once the rezoning is codified, it will allow further residential capacity throughout these areas, including increasing heights and density and implementing flexible standards specifically for affordable housing that will increase the amount of affordable housing that is possible.

Parcel Suitability Analysis Findings

Across all districts, initial estimates from the draft analysis show that under today's zoning, there are 3,410 total viable sites, with a combined unit capacity of approximately 247,000 units.[12] This includes both stand-alone sites and those that become viable when combined with adjacent parcels. Stand-alone sites (soft, non-residential, and ≥8,000 sq. ft.) account for 1,204 sites and 60% of total capacity (148,231 units). Sites viable with aggregation of adjacent parcels add another 2,206 sites and 98,477 units, demonstrating that parcel assembly could unlock more housing potential. The complexity of aggregation, especially when sites have multiple owners, usually adds time and cost to a project and thus, standalone sites will generally continue to be more straightforward for development.

District 6 has the greatest capacity for affordable housing, likely due to significant number of larger sites without residential development. Districts 2, 3, and 9 also show strong capacity. Districts 8 and 1 have the lowest total capacity, suggesting fewer large parcels without existing residential uses or more constrained development environments.

Figure 4. **Draft Results from Parcel Suitability Analysis**

Supervisor Districts	*Number of Viable Stand-Alone Sites (soft, non-res, and at least 8000 sq. ft.)*	*Unit Capacity*	*Number of Sites Viable Only with Adjacent Sites (soft, non-res, and less than 8000 sq. ft.)*	*Unit Capacity*	*Total Number of Sites*	*Total Sum of Unit Capacity*
1	67	8,037	141	6,599	208	14,636
2	133	17,521	180	9,418	313	26,940
3	121	16,914	192	10,512	313	27,426
4	77	9,659	141	6,997	218	16,656
5	102	12,677	114	6,257	216	18,933
6	237	29,947	491	20,176	728	50,123
7	96	10,284	201	8,261	297	18,545
8	63	7,109	64	3,023	127	10,132
9	125	14,983	319	12,009	444	26,992
10	99	11,385	189	7,956	288	19,341
11	84	9,716	174	7,269	258	16,984
Total	1,204	148,231	2,206	98,477	3,410	246,708

These results underscore that land availability, in and of itself, is not the most significant limiting factor in expanding the city's affordable housing supply. It should be noted that this analysis did not assess the specific availability of any particular site for development or the desire of

12 Note that Planning is still refining and verifying the analysis in partnership with MOHCD and the results will likely continue to evolve.

owners to sell. As discussed more below in Section 6, individual property owners may have disincentives to sell for various reasons, such as complex ownership structures among family members or business partners, low property tax basis under Proposition 13, and satisfactory current revenue. So, while this analysis shows there are many viable, suitable sites for affordable housing development around the city, it will take time and effort to secure sites for development.

The proposed Family Zoning Plan, located primarily in the Housing Opportunity Areas, will expand zoned housing capacity for affordable housing beyond what current policies and programs provide. These changes could spur affordable housing production through mixed-income inclusionary projects, 100% affordable housing development, as well as more affordable “missing middle” housing. By opening multiple pathways to provide affordable housing, the proposed rezoning will provide greater likelihood that a range of affordable housing types will be produced.

Future updates to this analysis will additionally highlight the number of publicly owned sites, religious, and non-profit owned sites by district. Future analyses and findings will help inform more detailed and tailored approaches to district specific strategies for ensuring equitable distribution of new affordable projects. In addition, this inventory currently excludes properties with existing residential uses, which means there remains an additional, longer-term reservoir of sites that could further expand development opportunities as market conditions and policy tools evolve. For example, all sites with even just one unit, such as single-family homes, were excluded from this analysis, however, aggregations of these sites could offer future opportunities for affordable housing development, especially when merged with adjacent underutilized commercial sites. Zoning changes to allow more small and mid-size housing could also allow more affordable housing provided by the private sector as well as by nonprofit and public agencies.

Section 6: Financial and Policy Research

Building on the pipeline and site suitability analyses, the recommendations in this report are further shaped by extensive financial and policy research including case studies and field practices. The Department partnered with Century Urban on the financial analysis and with Enterprise Community Partners on policy research to develop strategies that strengthen pipeline management and support land acquisition. As noted in Section 1, in addition to consultant research, Planning staff convened focus groups in summer 2024 and 2025 with affordable housing developers and practitioners to gather input, surface policy questions, and identify practical strategies, providing additional important input.

This section provides a high-level overview of the research, analysis, and findings conducted by staff and partners, and orients readers to the detailed research memos that will be available on the project website. This section complements the findings and recommendations from the Affordable Housing Leadership Council Report, which covers funding and resources for the affordable housing pipeline more extensively. While there is some overlap, funding, financing, and construction costs are not the main purpose of the research covered here.

Financial Analysis

Planning and MOHCD worked with consultant Century Urban to analyze financial considerations for acquisition and development to inform the City's acquisitions strategies. Their work analyzed trends in the city's land costs and land costs relative to total development costs, land holding costs, the impact of different geographies and zoning on land values, and the effect of rezoning on land prices. Their work also included a review of the City's current investments in site acquisition and evaluation of tools to support affordable housing acquisition. The research summarized here informed the development of strategies in section 7.

LAND VALUE AND LAND COSTS DRIVERS

Land costs are driven by the amount that developers estimate they can afford to pay and the amount that property owners are willing to accept based on their current revenue and their expectations. Land in San Francisco remains among the most expensive in the country. Some factors that contribute to this include limited undeveloped land, proximity to jobs, transit, and amenities, and relatively high revenue from existing uses.

- **Construction costs, rents and sales prices, interest rates, target returns, and other economic and financial factors all play a significant role in determining how much developers are willing to pay for land.**
    - For market-rate developments, "residual land value" provides an estimate of the land cost that they can afford while still achieving a financial return after accounting for all other project costs. This method of land valuation fluctuates with economic conditions, construction costs, and other factors.

- Affordable housing developers compete with market rate developers for land, especially during periods of favorable conditions for market rate development. As a result, the cost of land is similar for affordable and market-rate housing.

- **If the value of the existing buildings or improvements is greater than a parcel's estimated value as a development site, the owner(s) may not be motivated to sell.**

  - Many landowners may have owned their properties for decades, benefitting from low property tax basis, and selling a site may trigger capital gains and/or transfer taxes. A sale must provide sufficient financial incentive to outweigh these factors.

  - Almost all potential development sites in San Francisco are infill parcels with existing buildings or underdeveloped lots, often used for parking or single-story commercial.

- **When economic conditions do not support development feasibility, developers may be unwilling/unable to pay substantial prices for land, while landowners may be unwilling to accept offers substantially below historical or recent land values**, resulting in fewer transactions overall.

LAND COST TRENDS AND DEVELOPMENT COSTS

An analysis of land transactions over the past decade shows relatively stable land prices which generally averaged $121,000 per unit for all projects; about $116,000 per unit for affordable projects, and $125,000 per unit for market rate projects. Starting in 2019, market rate land transactions declined, coinciding with increasing construction costs, decreasing rents, and higher interest rates.

- Average land cost since 2019 is approximately 5% less than the 10-year average, suggesting that despite reduced interest and ability of developers to buy land since 2020, landowners may be reluctant to sell at prices much below historical averages and may be slow to adjust expectations.

- Even in slow years when few or no properties transacted for market rate projects (reflecting challenging market conditions for such development), land sales for affordable housing projects continued to reflect costs at historical averages.

Construction costs have been a far more significant part of development costs than land costs over time. In recent years, construction costs and financing costs have skyrocketed.

- Total development costs per unit have generally increased since 2018, averaging approximately $1 million or more per unit (for a two-bedroom) since 2021.

- Construction costs rose by approximately 31% from Q1 of 2020, at the start of the COVID-19 pandemic, to Q2 of 2024. During this period, rental rates and sales prices did not keep pace with the rise in construction costs. Consequently, mixed-income projects became less economically

feasible.

- Land costs as a percentage of total development costs have remained relatively stable, ranging from 7% to 14% and averaging about 10% of total development costs.

POTENTIAL IMPACT OF EXEMPTION TO TRANSFER TAX

Century Urban also analyzed a potential transfer tax exemption for properties sold for affordable housing, a potential tool mentioned by affordable housing practitioners as a way to incentivize landowners to sell for affordable housing development. If enacted, a transfer tax exemption, discussed in the strategies section of this report (Section 7), would enhance the competitiveness of affordable housing developers in acquiring land.

IMPACT OF REZONING ON LAND VALUES

Century Urban analyzed the impact of rezoning on land values (on a per unit and per acre basis) revealing a complex relationship where rezoning appears to be just one factor affecting land values along with economic conditions and landowner expectations. The analysis also looked at a limited number of land purchases for affordable housing in areas with zoning that allows denser multifamily housing (form-based density) and compared with areas with more restrictive numeric density limits.

Analysis of the Eastern Neighborhoods rezoning (completed in 2009) shows that land value did not increase, and even dropped, on a *per unit* basis following a rezoning. Land transactions, however, appear heavily driven by economic conditions and landowner expectations.

- Before Eastern Neighborhoods rezoning (2009), the land costs in that area averaged $125,100 per unit and after the rezoning (2012), the land dropped to $113,700 per unit, a 9% decrease. Indicating that allowing more units per parcel reduces per unit land costs.

- Average land costs *per acre* increased by approximately 48% in real dollars potentially reflecting the added value generated by the increased residential density. However, it is the per unit costs that are pertinent to the question of how much affordable housing can be delivered for a certain amount of money, not the per acre land cost. The changing economic climate during this time likely also heavily influenced land prices independently of zoning as discussed below.

- Due to the Great Recession, there were no known residential land sales in Eastern Neighborhoods that took place between 2009, when the Area Plan was adopted, and 2012.

- Most land sales in the Eastern Neighborhoods occurred between 2015 and 2018, when the San Francisco was experiencing strong, tech-fueled economic growth that was increasing rents and home prices and driving housing development.

- Land sales volume declined again from 2019 onward as construction costs increased, rents dropped or stagnated, and inflation and interest rates increased.

- Exactions imposed by the city in the Eastern Neighborhoods, including inclusionary housing and impacts fees, may have also captured some of the value created by the rezoning, moderating the potential for land cost increases related to rezoning during this time. Exactions were also likely supported by strong economic conditions and lower development costs from 2012-2019. Value capture may be more limited under current economic conditions.

Century Urban reviewed the City's land acquisitions for development of affordable housing projects, comparing sites in recently rezoned areas with sites in areas that have not been recently rezoned as well as comparing areas based on state opportunity designations.

- **Comparison of recent land sales for affordable housing shows per-unit land costs can be similar across different zoning indicating that market expectations often outweigh zoning differences and land value is influenced by location, current and potential uses, and comparable sales**. Recent land sales for affordable housing in form-based density zoning districts in Eastern Neighborhoods and in districts with numeric density restrictions show comparable land prices per unit despite zoning differences. This data shows that sellers are often setting price expectations for land based on the size of the project (e.g. number of units) they know the buyer intends to build, not necessarily limited just by the zoning of the land.

- The analysis found that there are higher land values in high-resource state-designated Opportunity Areas, reflecting their desirability and access to resources in these areas.

ANALYSIS OF CITY LAND HOLDING COSTS

The city periodically acquires sites for future affordable housing development through direct land purchases or land dedications by developers to meet inclusionary housing requirements. It typically takes between five to seven years from site acquisition to construction start. During this period, the city is responsible for holding and maintenance costs. Site conditions can vary widely from vacant structures and parking lots to buildings with existing tenants. Some sites may accommodate interim uses while some sites may have significant deferred maintenance, affecting tenant retention and overall usability.

- **MOHCD currently manages five city-owned sites for future affordable housing that incur annual holding costs ranging from approximately $34,000 to $453,000.** Resulting in total annual costs currently averaging $837,000. Costs have exceeded $1 million in prior years.

- **Cumulative site holding costs can reach $168,000 to $2.5 million or more, depending on the hold period. Holding costs can add 1% to 17% to the total acquisition cost of a site and commensurately reduce available funding.** Site-specific factors—like existing tenants, capital needs, and interim revenue potential—should be carefully evaluated before site purchase as part of the overall site assessment.

SITE ACQUISITION AND MANAGEMENT FEEDBACK FROM AFFORDABLE HOUSING DEVELOPERS AND PRACTITIONERS

Practitioners across both focus group sessions identified persistent funding challenges as the primary barrier to affordable housing development. They stressed the critical importance of stable and predictable funding sources and asked the city to consider sequencing resources based on project needs to work on acquiring and preparing sites, so they are ready when funding becomes available for construction. They highlighted tools like Transfer Tax exemptions for affordable housing development sites and leasing options to help incentivize sales to affordable housing developers and address the specific challenges affordable developers face in transactions.

Expanding the applicability of the Welfare Property Tax Exemption available to nonprofit-managed 100% affordable housing occupied by low-income residents to sites acquired for affordable housing could lower land holding costs. Expansion of the welfare tax exemption would likely require changes at the state level.

Participants also stressed the value of acquiring sites early, balancing interim uses with holding costs, and removing cost barriers that impact affordable housing including permitting fees and street and infrastructure requirements. These highlights from the discussions and more insights generated from these sessions helped inform the recommended actions described in Section 7 of this report.

Policy Research

Enterprise Community Partners conducted targeted research to identify best practices that can inform San Francisco's affordable housing pipeline management and acquisition. The work examined current practices and how other cities manage and expand their affordable housing pipelines through site acquisition, coordination across public agencies, non-profit and faith-based partners, and the inclusion of smaller "missing middle" housing types to broaden affordability in residential and rezoning areas.

The research combined a literature review, program analysis, and policy recommendations with practitioner insights gathered through interviews with developers, consultants, City staff, and experts. The full memoranda, available on the project website, provide background information, policy analysis and real-world challenges and promising strategies through case studies from the field for further review. The following section highlights insights from the research that informed the recommendations in Section 7.

AFFORDABLE HOUSING PIPELINE MANAGEMENT: BALANCE FUNDING FOR CONSTRUCTION AND SITE ACQUISITION

Enterprise's research finds that a city's affordable housing pipeline must balance two parallel priorities: advancing existing projects to construction and strategically acquiring land for future developments. Both activities are essential for a healthy pipeline, yet they compete for the same limited pool of resources.

A well-managed affordable housing pipeline is central to sustaining production over time. For developers, predictability in process and funding is crucial as it allows for better planning, reduces delays, and ultimately controls costs. Strategic coordination across programs and agencies can help

San Francisco optimize limited resources, accelerate delivery, and ensure a steady flow of affordable housing projects citywide.

Research highlights key considerations and strategies for building an efficient, predictable affordable housing pipeline and offers high-level recommendations to guide City policies that support housing development.

- Given the constrained and limited funding context, cities can strengthen affordable housing production by establishing a local financing strategy that provides a consistent flow of funds for predevelopment and construction—phases that typically occur sequentially.

- A key best practice is consolidating Notices of Funding Availability (NOFAs) to streamline application processes, improve predictability for developers, and enable more strategic, coordinated investment across projects.

- Cities can strengthen affordable housing pipeline management by increasing the availability of local capital, operating, and housing services subsidies through reliable and recurring funding sources.

    - Leading practices include establishing dedicated local revenue streams such as general fund set-asides, voter-approved bonds, or targeted property tax measures to ensure ongoing support for affordable housing development.
    - Creating a dedicated funding stream for site acquisition, whether through a portion of existing permanent sources or future bond allocations, helps maintain project momentum and prevents gaps between acquisition and construction phases.

- Cities can strengthen affordable housing pipeline management by actively supporting coordination and simplification of state funding programs, including advocating for a unified or single-application process that reduces administrative burden and accelerates project timelines.

- Effective pipeline management also includes sustained advocacy for broader policy reforms, such as modernizing property tax structures, expanding state housing funding, and improving federal programs like the Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC), to ensure long-term and scalable investment in affordable housing.

As described previously, new site acquisition should consider the number of sites and units in the existing pipeline and funding available. San Francisco's affordable housing pipeline functions as a de facto land bank managed by MOHCD and holding land in San Francisco incurs significant costs that can exceed $400,000 per site per year. Given the existing affordable housing pipeline awaiting funding, new sites should be acquired strategically; additionally, related holding costs that further limit funding for the construction of the pipeline should continue to be considered.

- Cities can strengthen their affordable housing pipeline by implementing targeted site acquisition programs that advance fair housing goals and expand affordable housing opportunities in high-resource areas. Effective programs establish clear selection criteria co-developed with community and industry partners and aligned with funding frameworks such as LIHTC scoring, ensuring transparency and competitiveness.

- Another emerging best practice is adapting local acquisition policies akin to Community Opportunity to Purchase Act (COPA) to include commercial or underutilized properties with potential for affordable housing redevelopment. This approach broadens the range of eligible sites, supports mixed-use and infill development, and helps cities proactively secure land for long-term affordability.

Public land ownership represents a significant asset for future affordable housing site acquisition but must be weighed with agencies' responsibilities and currently does not come free of costs due to the financial needs of various agencies as well as their charter requirements.

- The City could clarify and, where possible, amend land disposition processes across separately chartered agencies to better prioritize affordable housing while balancing each agency's mission.

- The City could continue transferring underutilized City-owned sites and encourage all enterprise and transit agencies to integrate affordable housing into surplus land use and capital planning efforts while also considering the financial needs of each agency.

ADVANCING AFFORDABLE HOUSING THROUGH FAITH-BASED AND NON-PROFIT PARTNERSHIPS

Faith-based Organizations (FBOs) and non-profits collectively own 280 acres of land in San Francisco, much of it in high-resource, transit-accessible areas. These sites offer a major opportunity to advance affordable housing, racial equity, and climate goals.

- Many FBOs often lack the specialized expertise needed for housing development; the city can expand access to training, technical assistance, and trusted partnerships to strengthen organizational readiness.

- Dedicated predevelopment funding, low-cost financing, and adaptable funding structures are essential to make joint development on FBO- and non-profit-owned sites viable.

- The City could promote use of existing tools—such as SB 4 and State Density Bonus Law—and align local zoning through the FZP and approvals to help FBOs and non-profits deliver affordable housing more efficiently.

APPROACHES TO UNLOCK "MISSING MIDDLE" HOUSING

Much of San Francisco's residential fabric, particularly in high-resource neighborhoods that are included in the Family Zoning Plan, consists of small lots and low-density zoning that have limited the production of affordable rental or ownership options for low- and moderate-income households. Even with zoning changes, these smaller lots do not meet the site requirements for publicly subsidized Low-income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) projects typically funded by MOHCD.

Research emphasizes that meeting the City's housing goals requires a dual-track strategy: continuing to advance larger multifamily projects with public subsidy such as LIHTC on sites larger than 8,000 square feet while simultaneously unlocking smaller sites for "missing middle" housing. Additionally, rents affordable at 100% AMI and up can be similar to rents in the unsubsidized rental

market, suggesting that additional housing typologies for small scale housing can provide more affordable housing options in residential neighborhoods.

The following land use, policy and design strategies support feasibility of "missing middle" affordable housing options across rezoned neighborhoods, can lower costs and increase feasibility:

- **Pre-Approved Designs:** Offer City-reviewed building designs tailored to common lot types and zoning to expedite permitting, reduce review time, and lower costs for developers while incorporating community input.

- **Simplified Land Assembly and Subdivision:** Streamline processes to combine or subdivide parcels, enabling larger multifamily projects and expanding "missing middle" homeownership options.

- **Single-Stair Buildings:** Allow taller, denser buildings with a single stairway to increase unit count and improve feasibility on small sites.

- **"Flats-for-Land" Partnerships (Antiparochi):** Enable landowners to partner with developers by contributing land in exchange for units or project shares, reducing land costs and improving affordability.

- **Elevator Reform:** Bringing down high costs down, reducing size requirements, and expanded labor access could unlock elevator installations in thousands of affordable housing projects.[13]

POLICY CONSIDERATIONS MOVING FORWARD

Across all three policy areas, the research reveals a consistent theme: **Funding predictability, partnerships for site acquisition, and innovation are the cornerstones of a stronger affordable housing pipeline management system**. A balanced pipeline requires reliable funding and interagency coordination. Unlocking land from public, faith-based, and nonprofit owners demands new partnership models and dedicated technical assistance. Finally, broadening housing options through rezoning and design reform offers a pathway to more inclusive, mixed-income neighborhoods.

13 Smith, S. (2024). Elevators. Center for Buildings, accessed via https://www.centerforbuilding.org/publication/elevators.

Section 7: Recommended Strategies

Based on the research detailed in Sections 3-6, the following five areas include strategies to sustainably manage and grow the affordable housing pipeline:

1. Managing the pipeline to advance housing development and site acquisition
2. Expanding the geography of affordable housing
3. Public sites and faith- and nonprofit-owned sites for affordable housing
4. Strategic market practices for site acquisition
5. Expanding opportunities for "missing middle" affordable housing types

Pipeline management, including site acquisition, is meant to complement recommendations on funding, financing, and cost reduction already published in the Affordable Housing Leadership Council Report.

Managing the pipeline to advance housing development and site acquisition

San Francisco's affordable housing production challenge is primarily due to limited funding and high construction costs. The city will need to focus resources on advancing existing commitments, such as HOPE SF and other pipeline projects, while scaling new site acquisitions to align with funding levels. To succeed, sites must be efficient for affordable housing development and competitive for State and Federal dollars, which align to Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Law. The city will need to continue to effectively manage the existing resources while making strategic acquisitions based on goals outlined in the 2022 Housing Element and evolving community needs.

RECOMMENDED STRATEGIES:

- **Increase funding and reduce development costs to produce more affordable housing more quickly.** Implement the 2022 Housing Element and the Affordable Housing Leadership Council recommendations and work with other cities, affordable housing developers, nonprofit and community organizations, and other allies.
    - Efforts to expand local affordable housing funding received a recent endorsement when the San Francisco Board of Supervisors passed a resolution requesting the Controller's Office, Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD), and MOHCD to explore options for an Enhanced Infrastructure Financing District (EIFD) to fund Affordable Housing in Well-resourced areas along with other innovative financing options.
- **Issue NOFAs for site acquisition when funding is available** and coordinate local funding processes with state and federal funding application timelines. Continue to ensure sites for affordable housing are large enough and other necessary characteristics for efficient financing, development, and operation.

- **Scale acquisition of new sites for affordable housing development to available funding to build affordable housing** based on the number of projects already waiting for funding, costs for holding and developing sites, and in balance with goals for equitable geographic distribution of affordable housing around the city (more on geography below in the next section).
    - The total pipeline of units in development should approximately be equal to the average number of units built per year multiplied by the estimated number of years a project takes from predevelopment to construction after a site is acquired.
- **Factor City land holding costs and interim use costs into the land acquisition costs** to fully assess costs.
- **Explore land use policies to support interim use flexibility and lower costs for affordable housing** (ex. removing parking CUAs, vacant to vibrant OEWD programs for MOHCD sites, etc.)
- **Identify opportunities to lower land-holding costs** by having other City agencies, CBO, or other stewards manage the lease, provide capital, and oversee pre-construction site management.

Expanding the Geography of Affordable Housing

To meet Housing Element and Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing goals, San Francisco must expand affordable housing in higher-resource neighborhoods—targeting 25% of new units—while sustaining investment in equity communities. New affordable housing has been built where multifamily housing has been allowed and the Family Zoning Plan can help expand where affordable housing can be developed. The city will continue to monitor the pipeline for geographic gaps.

RECOMMENDED STRATEGIES:

- **Acquire sites to reach the Housing Element's 25% minimum goal for affordable housing production in higher resource areas** while also adding sites in equity communities as available funding for site acquisition allows.
- **Pursue a flexible target of at least one affordable housing development in the development pipeline in all Supervisorial Districts at all times based on funding availability** as part of the effort to increase geographic equity and meet the Housing Element goal.
- **Track existing pipeline and portfolio for geographic gaps and target site acquisition strategies by District based on factors such as**: Existing affordable housing stock, affordable housing pipeline, concentrations of cost burden renters, and inventory of parcels suitable for affordable housing, including publicly-owned and nonprofit and religious owned land.
- **City agencies, nonprofit developers, policymakers, and community organizations can continue to identify development sites that advance the City's housing goals,** specifically sites that have lower than average per unit land costs, are competitive for funding and efficient for development, create housing in higher resource areas, or help stabilize equity communities.

- **Consider an Enhanced Infrastructure Financing District (EIFD**) in well-resourced areas to capture tax increment for affordable housing along with other affordable housing funding and financing tools as called for by the Board of Supervisors.

Public Sites and Faith- and Nonprofit-Owned Sites

Public and nonprofit-owned land is an opportunity to produce affordable housing while advancing the missions of public agencies, faith-based institutions, and community nonprofits. The City should continue to pursue partnerships, using tools like the Parcel Analysis to identify sites and align with agency and community priorities. Success will require coordination—linking landowners, affordable housing developers, and the city—to combine land, technical expertise, and subsidies. Initiatives like LISC's Faith and Housing program offer technical support which can make it easier for nonprofit and faith-based landowners to navigate development. Projects like the Shirley Chisholm Village on SFUSD land model innovative new partnerships.

RECOMMENDED STRATEGIES FOR PUBLIC LAND FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING

- **Coordinate with local public agencies to facilitate land for affordable housing while balancing financial feasibility and revenue for public agencies** and considering site characteristics and agency needs.

    - Continue to analyze and identify publicly owned parcels on an ongoing basis that could be used for affordable housing and collaborate with City agencies that own these properties to explore viability of their use for affordable housing.
    - Collaborate with SFMTA on potential site development as part of their Joint Development Program.
    - Develop agency-specific approaches with SFUSD and others that have significant land holdings.
    - Provide information to support public land for housing including updates to existing webpage on public lands for affordable housing and/or case studies of recent affordable projects developed on public lands in the city within the past 10 years.

- **Identify and secure surplus land for affordable housing in coordination and collaboration with state and federal agencies.**

    - Share examples and showcase options for guidance and support to develop affordable housing on state and federally owned land.

RECOMMENDED STRATEGIES FOR RELIGIOUS AND NONPROFIT PROPERTY OWNED LAND FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING

- **Map and identify priority religious and nonprofit affordable housing development sites per district based on parcel analysis** and coordinate findings with InterFaith Council (SFIC).

    - Advise congregations on historic status of potential development sites to understand implications and best practices for affordable housing development on historic sites.

- **Continue to provide information and technical assistance from City, philanthropic, and nonprofit partners to help religious and nonprofit property owners to assess options for property they own and shepherd affordable developments**. Differentiate approaches for assistance for different types of institutions and where they are in the process.
    - Consolidate resources to support religious and nonprofit partners to explore housing processes through on-line landing page/portal with existing City resources, new content, (primer on process streamlining options for adaptive re-use of properties) and materials from partners such as LISC's SB-4 Housing Accelerator Lab with SFIC.
    - Financially support a series of workshops for congregations on the housing development process to train a cohort of 1-3 FBOs per year (with a goal of 6-12 FBOs over four years).
    - Develop dedicated funding stream for predevelopment phase for religious and non-profit partners through philanthropic and other partners.

Strategic Market Practices for Site Acquisition

The city should continue to take both a strategic and opportunity-driven approach to site acquisition, working with affordable housing developers to control costs and avoid speculation. Incentives such as transfer tax relief and improved valuation methods can help motivate sales, while foreclosures, distressed assets, and below-market properties offer lower-cost options. To prevent price inflation, the city should not publish specific acquisition targets and instead maintain flexibility to pursue a range of sites in every Supervisorial District. Acquisition strategies must balance the goal of expanding affordable housing in Housing Opportunity Areas with the costs of holding and maintaining land. Land banking should be used selectively, in line with available funding and in partnership with nonprofit and philanthropic partners, in balance with advancing the 12,000+ affordable units already in the pipeline.

RECOMMENDED STRATEGIES

Implement programs and policies to strategically acquire and incentivize purchases in the market.

- **Consider a Transfer Tax Incentive for sales of private land for affordable housing** through an exemption for affordable housing project sites.

- **Acquire sites by working with the Housing Accelerator Fund, other CDFIs, Impact Investment Funds, and other philanthropic and nonprofit partners.**

- **Take advantage of lower cost site acquisition opportunities** such as property owners who would like to make sites available for affordable housing, properties in foreclosure or otherwise distressed, through partnerships with nonprofit and religious organizations or other property owners who are willing to offer lower prices.

- **Expand the use of the Community Opportunity to Purchase Act (COPA) to development sites for multifamily housing** as well as existing multifamily buildings for sale if COPA doesn't already apply.

- **Streamline parcel assembly and subdivision.** Coordinate with Public Works and other agencies on an expedited review process that allows for concurrent reviews and reduces iterative processes for the merger or subdivision of parcels. When applicable, encourage the use of ministerial reviews (ex. SB 1123 which expands AB 684) to streamline subdivisions.

- **Leverage public and private resources through joint venture partnerships that** maximize sources of capital. Public entities should continue joint developments with third-party mixed-income developers. For publicly-owned land, consider different approaches to satisfying California's Surplus Land Act by selling or ground leasing all or part of their surplus land to affordable housing developers.

Expanding opportunities for "missing middle" housing types

The City's affordable housing strategy must also consider "missing middle" housing—smaller buildings of 10–50 units—that fit the city's diverse parcel sizes but often lack the economies of scale that make larger projects more feasible. Encouraging small (2–20 units) and mid-size (21–49 units) buildings can expand options for low- and moderate-income households.

Policy changes such as single-stair reform, streamlined permitting, and pre-approved design standards could reduce costs and make these housing types more viable. The city should continue to advocate for code reforms and partner with private, nonprofit, philanthropic, and design sectors to support innovative approaches that grow this segment of the housing market.

RECOMMENDED STRATEGIES

- **Allow form-based density in residential districts** to accommodate as many residential units as possible within the buildable envelope (determined by height and setbacks).

- **Explore and encourage single-stair code reform** at the state and locally along with reforms to elevator requirements.

- **Develop scope for a program of pre-approved designs for small and mid-size housing developments** focused on feasibility and community needs.

- **Convene a working group to develop parameters and provide potential funding support to adapt and pilot the *Antiparochi* or "flats-for-land" model**, to facilitate landowners to exchange property for a share of new multifamily housing.

- **Promote innovation from the private sector, philanthropic sector, design sector, and non-profits for feasible small scale affordable development through RFPs**.

    - Issue a Request for Proposals (RFP) for private developers, philanthropic organizations, design firms, and nonprofit housing providers for *Antiparochi* or "flats-for-land" strategy and pre-approved site plans.

Conclusion

San Francisco faces an urgent challenge: building the affordable housing the city needs with limited financial resources in a costly environment. By aligning land acquisition with funding capacity, strengthening partnerships across public and nonprofit sectors, and pursuing innovative approaches to housing delivery, the City can better manage its pipeline and expand affordable housing opportunities across all neighborhoods. Moving forward, success will require discipline, creativity, and collaboration—but with these strategies in place, San Francisco can chart a more sustainable and equitable path for its affordable housing future.

San Francisco Planning

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

September 22, 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: 2021-005878GPA PCA MAP**
Housing Element 2022 Rezoning Initiatives – Family Zoning Plan
General Plan Amendments (Board File to be Assigned)

Planning Commission Recommendation: Approval

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 General Plan, 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. The Planning Commission initiated related General Plan Amendments on July 17, 2025 by Resolution No. 21784.

At the September 11, 2025 hearing the Planning Commission adopted a recommendation for approval for the General Plan and Map Amendments and a recommendation of approval with modifications for the Planning Code Text Amendments.

On September 18, 2025, the Planning Department transmitted Planning Commission Resolution Nos. R-21809 and R-21910 recommending approval and approval with modifications, respectively, of the Zoning Map and Planning Code Text Amendments. This transmittal is for the General Plan Amendments.

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.

As a part of the transmittal, the Planning Department is hereby requesting that the attached Draft Ordinance for the Family Zoning Plan General Plan Amendments be introduced on September 30, 2025 and that the required 30-day hold period be waived.

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
Calvin Ho, President Mandelman
BOS.Legislation@sfgov.org

ATTACHMENTS :

Planning Commission Resolution Nos. R-21808

Draft General Plan Amendments Ordinance

Proposed Revised Urban Design Element Map 04 – Urban Design Guidelines for the Height of Buildings

Planning Department Executive Summary

San Francisco Planning

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

PLANNING COMMISSION RESOLUTION NO. 21808

HEARING DATE: September 11, 2025

Project Name: Family Zoning Plan (Housing Element Rezoning Program)
Case Number: 2021-005878GPA MAP PCA
Initiated by: Planning Department Staff
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 AMENDMENTS TO THE SAN FRANCISCO GENERAL PLAN TO AMEND THE GENERAL PLAN, PURSUANT TO SECTION 340, INCLUDING AMENDMENTS TO URBAN DESIGN ELEMENT, THE TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT, THE COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY ELEMENT, THE BALBOA PARK STATION AREA PLAN, THE GLEN PARK COMMUNITY PLAN, THE MARKET & OCTAVIA AREA PLAN; NORTHEASTERN WATERFRONT PLAN, THE VAN NESS AVENUE AREA PLAN, THE WESTERN SHORELINE AREA PLAN, WESTERN SOMA AREA PLAN, THE DOWNTOWN AREA PLAN, AND THE LAND USE INDEX IN RELATION TO THE FAMILY ZONING PLAN, AND ADOPTING AMENDMENTS TO THE LAND USE PLAN OF THE CITY'S CERTIFIED LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM, AND MAKING FINDINGS OF PUBLIC NECESSITY, CONVENIENCE, AND WELFARE, FINDINGS OF CONSISTENCY WITH THE GENERAL PLAN AND PLANNING CODE SECTION 101.1, AND FINDINGS UNDER THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT.

WHEREAS, Section 4.105 of the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco mandates that the Planning Commission ("Commission") shall periodically recommend to the Board of Supervisors for approval or rejection proposed amendments to the General Plan in response to changing physical, social, economic, environmental, or legislative conditions; 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 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 June 24, 2025, Mayor Lurie introduced a companion ordinance amending the Planning Code (Board File No 250701); and

WHEREAS, the General Plan Amendments, the Zoning Map Amendments (Board File 250700), and the related Planning Code Amendments (Board File 250701) (collectively "the 2025 Actions" or "the Project") implement the San Francisco Family Zoning Plan ("Family Zoning Plan" or "Plan"); and

WHEREAS, on January 31, 2023, the Board of Supervisors adopted Ordinance No.010-23, that amended the San Francisco General Plan by establishing a completely revised Housing Element ("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 "San Francisco Family Zoning Plan" ("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 San Francisco 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 is a required implementation action of the recently adopted Housing Element of the General Plan, is consistent with all of the policies in the Housing Element and broadly consistent with the current General Plan. However, in order to implement the policies and required rezoning actions described in the Housing Element, additional conforming amendments must be made to various objectives, policies, and maps of the following areas of the General Plan: the Urban Design Element, the Transportation Element, the Commerce and Industry Element, the Balboa Park Station Area Plan, the Glen Park Community Plan, the Market & Octavia Area Plan, the Van Ness Avenue Area Plan, the Northeastern Waterfront Plan, the Van Ness Avenue Area Plan, the Western Shoreline Area Plan, the Western SoMa Area Plan, the Downtown Plan, and the Land Use Index. Most of these amendments relate to the height, density, and scale of development in particular geographies to conform with the Housing Element generally and the proposed Family Zoning Plan specifically; and

WHEREAS, a draft ordinance, substantially in the form attached hereto as Exhibit 5b, and approved as to form by the City Attorney's office, would make a number of conforming amendments to various elements of the General Plan, including the Urban Design Element, the Transportation Element, the Commerce and Industry Element, the Balboa Park Station Area Plan, the Glen Park Community Plan, the Van Ness Avenue Area Plan, the Market & Octavia Area Plan, Northeastern Waterfront Plan, the Van Ness Avenue Area Plan, the Western Shoreline Area Plan, the Western SoMa Area Plan, the Downtown Plan, and Land Use Index. Height Maps in the Balboa Park Station Area Plan, the Glen Park Community Plan, the Market Octavia Area Plan, and the Northeastern Waterfront Plan, and the Bulk Map of the Urban Design Element are proposed for removal; and

WHEREAS, the proposed amendments to the Western Shoreline Area Plan constitute amendments to the Land Use 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 General Plan Amendments, together with proposed Zoning Map Amendments (Board File 250700) and Planning Code Amendments (Board File 250701), provide a comprehensive set of policies to implement key actions of the Housing Element 2022 Update; 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 the 150,000 parcels), and increase the permitted heights on approximately 17% of parcels citywide; 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 to consider the proposed General Plan Amendments; 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

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that pursuant to Planning Code Section 340(d), the Commission finds from the facts presented that the public necessity, convenience, and general welfare require the proposed General Plan Amendments for the following reasons:

1. The General Plan Amendments will create development capacity for more than 36,200 additional housing units 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 General Plan Amendments will facilitate the increase in supply of housing units, helping to alleviate the City's housing shortage and affordability crisis. Allowing for greater density and building height 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 General Plan 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 General Plan 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 and services can increase in capacity as our population grows in addition to supporting reinvestment in existing facilities.

5. The General Plan Amendments will increase 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 General Plan Amendments will increase 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, that the Commission finds the General Plan Amendments, along with the Family Zoning Plan's proposed Planning Code and Zoning Map Amendments, (together "the Family Zoning Plan", or "the Project"), are, on balance, consistent with the General Plan as proposed for amendment and with the eight priority policies of Planning Code Section 101.1(b), as follows:

1. That existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced and future opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of such businesses enhanced;

The Family Zoning Plan will enable increased density along commercial and transit corridors in western and northern San Francisco. The increased development capacity will both provide new commercial spaces for San Francisco businesses and provide additional residential density; the increased residential density, will, in turn, provide an enlarged client base and increased pedestrian activity for these businesses. The Family Zoning Plan contemplates measures that address the needs of small businesses, such as flexibility in establishing such businesses in new developments, incentives for new development to provide space and support for new and relocating small businesses, and zoning flexibility for Legacy Businesses to re-establish themselves in other locations if they must relocate.

2. That existing housing and neighborhood character be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhoods;

The Family Zoning Plan aims to increase housing capacity within the rezoned areas, while maintaining key aspects of the neighborhoods that are key to San Francisco's character. New housing projects, while potentially larger than surrounding buildings, must meet objective design standards that require appropriate treatment of ground floor commercial and residential uses, building modulation and articulation, and attention to the public interface of new buildings with existing neighborhood context, among other requirements. The Family Zoning Plan maintains all current Planning Code process that strictly limits the ability to demolish existing multi-family housing units and protects existing tenants. Companion legislation to the Family Zoning Plan proposes enhancing protections for existing tenants by establishing similar policies required by State law. As noted above, the Family Zoning Plan also looks to support local businesses by both providing new opportunities in new development and facilitating relocation of Legacy Businesses. The Plan will not affect current policies and review processes for listed Historic Buildings, including properties that are listed in Article 10 and Article 11 of the Planning Code. The Family Zoning Plan includes a flexible housing entitlement program (referred to as "the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program"), whereby housing developers can obtain reductions of certain Planning Code and design standards requirements as a means to encourage housing development. Projects that include demolition of properties listed in the National Register of Historic Places, the California Register of Historic Resources, or Articles 10 or 11 of the Planning Code would not be eligible for this program. Similarly, projects that involve additions or major modifications to Historic Buildings would be reviewed for compliance with the Commission's adopted Preservation Design Standards, helping to assure the ongoing historic integrity of Historic Buildings.

3. That the City's supply of affordable housing be preserved and enhanced;

The Family Housing Zoning Plan is part of the City's effort to produce 82,000 housing units, including 47,000 for lower- and moderate-income households. Increasing housing production overall will lead to an increase of subsidized affordable units, which are supported by the City's inclusionary housing requirements. Additionally, the Family Zoning Plan will increase the variety and types of housing available in these neighborhoods by providing increased development capacity in different neighborhood contexts. Housing stock in the Housing Opportunity Area is predominantly single-family homes, which are expensive and provide little opportunity for households looking for more affordable or smaller units. A greater diversity of new housing stock, including apartments and condominiums in multi-family buildings, will provide more housing opportunities for households of all income levels and sizes in High Opportunity neighborhoods. In addition to providing opportunity for larger multi-family buildings on commercial and transit corridors, the Family Zoning Plan will encourage the development of smaller scale additional of housing, including fourplexes, accessory dwelling units (ADUs), townhomes, and small- mid-sized multi-family buildings in residential areas; all of these housing types tend to be more affordable to a greater range of households than single-family homes.

4. That commuter traffic not impede MUNI transit service or overburden our streets or neighborhood parking;

The Family Zoning Plan will not impede transit service or overburden streets and neighborhood parking. The Family Zoning Plan would increase housing capacity along existing transit corridors, thereby decreasing reliance on automobile ownership, vehicle trips, and parking. The anticipated increases in

housing density and height are concentrated on high-capacity transit lines. The Family Zoning Plan would reduce maximum allowable off-street parking to reduce vehicle trips generated at future projects. This will also encourage non-auto travel, such as by transit, in compliance with regional Transit Oriented Communities Policy adopted by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission. The rezoning would also restrict new curb cuts for off-street parking and loading on certain core pedestrian-oriented commercial blocks in order to limit conflicts with pedestrian activity and to maintain vibrancy of commercial districts.

5. That a diverse economic base be maintained by protecting our industrial and service sectors from displacement due to commercial office development, and that future opportunities for resident employment and ownership in these sectors be enhanced;

The Family Housing Zoning Plan increases development capacity primarily in residential, neighborhood-commercial, and mixed residential-commercial areas that generally do not include significant amounts of existing industrial uses; no industrial (PDR) districts are proposed for rezoning in the Family Zoning Plan. The Family Zoning Plan does not increase capacity for office development; instead, it increases housing and ancillary small scale ground floor commercial spaces for small businesses and institutions to serve future residents. The Family Zoning Plan would increase housing capacity along existing commercial corridors, which will generate more consumer demand – and therefore more opportunity for service sector employment – at the businesses located therein. Furthermore, it will advance measures to address impacts to existing businesses from new development.

6. That the City achieve the greatest possible preparedness to protect against injury and loss of life in an earthquake;

New construction taking place as a result of the Family Zoning Plan would be required to comply with all current structural and seismic requirements under the San Francisco Building Code.

7. That the landmarks and historic buildings be preserved;

The Family Zoning Plan would maintain current policies for listed Historic Buildings, including properties that are listed in Article 10 or Article 11 of the Planning Code, the California Register, or National Register. As noted above, projects that include demolition of properties listed in the National Register of Historic Places, the California Register of Historic Resources, Article 10 of the Planning Code or Article 11 of the Planning Code would not be eligible for the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program. Similarly, projects that involve additions to Historic Buildings would be reviewed against the Commission's adopted Preservation Design Standards.

8. That our parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas be protected from development;

San Francisco policies and procedures regarding shadows on public parks would not be affected by the Family Housing Zoning Plan.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Commission finds that the Family Zoning Plan, including the General Plan, Planning Code and Zoning Map Amendments are in conformity with the General Plan as it is proposed to be amended. The General Plan Amendments will articulate and implement many of

the Goals, Objectives, and Policies described in the General Plan. The Family Zoning Plan is consistent with the following Objectives and Policies of the General Plan, as it is proposed to be amended, as follows:

HOUSING ELEMENT

OBJECTIVE 1.A
ENSURE HOUSING STABILITY AND HEALTHY HOMES

The Project would advance the City's goal of generating 82,000 housing units over the coming years, including 47,000 for lower- and moderate-income residents.

OBJECTIVE 3.B
CREATE A SENSE OF BELONGING FOR ALL COMMUNITIES OF COLOR WITHIN WELL-RESOURCED NEIGHBORHOODS THROUGH EXPANDED HOUSING CHOICE

POLICY 25
Reduce governmental constraints on development in Well-resourced Neighborhoods to enable small and mid-rise multi-family buildings providing improved housing choice and affordability.

The General Plan Amendments and the Family Housing Zoning Plan would increase housing development capacity, relax certain development standards, and generally provide increased housing development opportunities where they currently do not exist. For example, small-scale and mid-rise multi-family housing would be permitted in neighborhoods that previously only allowed single-family homes. Mid-rise buildings would be permitted on commercial and transit corridors.

OBJECTIVE 4.B
EXPAND SMALL AND MID-RISE MULTI-FAMILY HOUSING PRODUCTION TO SERVE OUR WORKFORCE, PRIORITIZING MIDDLE-INCOME HOUSEHOLDS

POLICY 20
Increase mid-rise and small multi-family housing types by adopting zoning changes or density bonus programs in Well-resourced Neighborhoods and adjacent lower-density areas near transit, including along SFMTA Rapid Network and other transit.

POLICY 26
Streamline and simplify permit processes to provide more equitable access to the application process, improve certainty of outcomes, and ensure meeting State- and local-required timelines, especially for 100% affordable housing and shelter projects.

POLICY 31
Facilitate small and mid-rise multi-family buildings that private development can deliver to serve middle-income households without deed restriction, including through adding units in lower density areas or by adding Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs).

The Family Housing Zoning Plan increases capacity for housing development across a wide range of residential, neighborhood-commercial, and mixed residential-commercial neighborhoods across the City. It creates a local streamlined approval process for housing projects (the Housing Choice-San Francisco

Program) that features objective review and approval, without need for discretionary public hearings, thereby providing a simple permitting process for housing development, in addition to a wide range of code flexibility. The Housing Choice-San Francisco program also provides for additional capacity and code flexibility for 100% affordable housing projects.

OBJECTIVE 4.C
EXPAND AND DIVERSIFY HOUSING TYPES FOR ALL

POLICY 32

Promote and facilitate aging in place for seniors and multi-generational living that supports extended families and communal households.

POLICY 33
Prevent the outmigration of families with children and support the needs of families to grow.

By increasing potential development capacity in various contexts, the Family Zoning Plan enables the creation of a wide variety of housing typologies including those for various populations. By increasing the availability of housing of all types, it will encourage housing for seniors, multi-generational and communal households, and for families with children. By providing for new construction of multi-family housing, more appropriate housing for seniors, such as elevator buildings and smaller units, would be enabled in neighborhoods where existing housing stock is limited to larger single-family homes.

OBJECTIVE 5.A
CONNECT PEOPLE TO JOBS AND THEIR NEIGHBORHOOD WITH NUMEROUS, EQUITABLE, AND HEALTHY TRANSPORTATION AND MOBILITY OPTIONS

POLICY 37
Facilitate neighborhoods where proximity to daily needs and high-quality community services and amenities promotes social connections, supports caregivers, reduces the need for private auto travel, and advances healthy activities.

POLICY 38
Ensure transportation investments create equitable access to transit and are planned in parallel with increase in housing capacity to advance well-connected neighborhoods consistent with the City's Connect SF vision, and encourage sustainable trips in new housing.

The Family Zoning Plan would increase capacity for new housing in mixed use districts and commercial and transit corridors in San Francisco's Well-Resourced Neighborhoods, allowing for improved access to daily goods and services, public transportation and jobs.

TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT

OBJECTIVE 2
USE THE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM AS A MEANS FOR GUIDING DEVELOPMENT AND IMPROVING THE ENVIRONMENT

POLICY 2.1
Use rapid transit and other transportation improvements in the city and region as the catalyst for desirable development, and coordinate new facilities with public and private development.

POLICY 2.2
Reduce pollution, noise and energy consumption

OBJECTIVE 11
ESTABLISH PUBLIC TRANSIT AS THE PRIMARY MODE OF TRANSPORTATION IN SAN FRANCISCO AND AS A MEANS THROUGH WHICH TO GUIDE FUTURE DEVELOPMENT AND IMPROVE REGIONAL MOBILITY AND AIR QUALITY

The Family Zoning Plan would increase housing development capacity along major transit corridors and near major transit stations and nodes. The geography and intensity of housing capacity in the Family Zoning Plan is heavily guided by the public transit system and proximity to commercial and educational centers to improve access and mobility by transit, walking and other non-automobile modes and limit VMT growth from new development.

URBAN DESIGN ELEMENT

OBJECTIVE 1
EMPHASIS OF THE CHARACTERISTIC PATTERN WHICH GIVES TO THE CITY AND ITS NEIGHBORHOODS AN IMAGE, A SENSE OF PURPOSE, AND A MEANS OF ORIENTATION

POLICY 1.1

Recognize and protect major views in the city, with particular attention to those of open space and water

The Family Zoning Plan tailors heights to emphasize characteristic elements of the city pattern, with a predominantly low and mid-rise plan of generally eight stories or less that recognizes topography and maintain key characteristic vistas from public vantage points, locating taller heights at key locations of transit nodes and major intersections for citywide orientation, and locating higher density adjacent to mass transit. The scale of allowable mid-rise buildings is generally aligned with factors such as the width of the street and the significance of adjacent transit and transportation. Buildings of 160 feet and taller will be allowed at key locations and intersections that mark transit nodes and major corridors as envisioned by the Urban Design Element. Large sites will be configured to ensure a small, walkable block pattern that is characteristic of the city fabric. Projects must adhere to Objective Design Standards, including Preservation Design Standards, which emphasize breaking down larger buildings into a finer scale of building patterns characteristic of the city through building modulation and articulation standards.

OBJECTIVE 2
CONSERVATION OF RESOURCES WHICH PROVIDE A SENSE OF NATURE, CONTINUITY WITH THE PAST, AND FREEDOM FROM OVERCROWDING

POLICY 2.4

Preserve notable landmarks and areas of historic, architectural or aesthetic value, and promote the preservation of other buildings and features that provide continuity with the past

The HC-SF Program will not be available to projects that propose to demolish landmarks listed in Article 10 of the Planning Code, contributory structures to Historic Districts in either Article 10 and Article 11, or properties listed in either the California Register of Historic Resources or National Register of Historic Places. All projects proposing alterations or additions to historic buildings are required to comply with the adopted Preservation Design Standards. The Project will increase capacity for new development while ensuring that buildings and sites identified as cultural resources will be subject to requirements intended to preserve character defining features.

POLICY 2.7

Recognize and protect outstanding and unique areas that contribute in an extraordinary degree to San Francisco's visual form and character.

OBJECTIVE 3

MODERATION OF MAJOR NEW DEVELOPMENT TO COMPLEMENT THE CITY PATTERN, THE RESOURCES TO BE CONSERVED, AND THE NEIGHBORHOOD ENVIRONMENT

POLICY 3.5

Relate the height of buildings to important attributes of the city pattern and to the height and expression of existing development

POLICY 3.6

Relate the bulk of buildings to the prevailing scale of development to avoid an overwhelming or dominating appearance in new construction.

The Family Zoning Plan tailors heights to emphasize characteristic elements of the city pattern, with a predominantly low and mid-rise plan of generally 8 stories or less that recognizes topography and maintains key characteristic vistas from public vantage points. The Family Zoning Plan locates taller heights at key locations of transit nodes and major intersections for citywide orientation and locates higher densities adjacent to mass transit. The scale of allowable mid-rise buildings is generally aligned with factors such as the width of the street and the significance of adjacent transit and transportation. Buildings of 160 feet and taller will be allowed at key locations and intersections that mark transit nodes and major corridors as envisioned by the Urban Design Element. Large sites will be configured to ensure a small, walkable block pattern that is characteristic of the city fabric. Projects must adhere to objective Citywide Design Standards, including Preservation Design Standards, which emphasize breaking down larger buildings into a finer scale characteristic of the city pattern through building modulation and articulation standards. The Family Zoning Plan and the Citywide Design Standards also contain bulk limits for taller buildings to avoid overly bulky massing, as well as stepbacks for the upper floors of larger buildings adjacent to lower scale housing.

The Family Zoning Plan respects and accounts for existing neighborhood character while increasing allowable heights; areas that are presently comprised predominantly of small residential parcels off of the

main commercial and transit corridors would generally remain at a height limit of 40 feet, with limited allowance for six stories on corners and larger lots.

COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY ELEMENT

OBJECTIVE 6
MAINTAIN AND STRENGTHEN VIABLE NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL AREAS EASILY ACCESSIBLE TO CITY RESIDENTS

POLICY 6.1
Ensure and encourage the retention and provision of neighborhood-serving goods and services in the city's neighborhood commercial districts, while recognizing and encouraging diversity among the districts.

POLICY 6.2
Promote economically vital neighborhood commercial districts which foster small business enterprises and entrepreneurship, and which are responsive to economic and technological innovation in the marketplace and society.

The Family Zoning Plan concentrates density and new residences along commercial corridors, which will benefit local businesses by generating more customers and demand for their goods and services. The proposed zoning maintains Neighborhood Commercial zoning and encourages ground floor commercial uses, including through the creation of a new Residential Transit Oriented – Commercial zoning district, to allow more flexibility to provide ground floor commercial space for neighborhood-serving businesses. The Housing Choice program also includes incentives to support small businesses. While a modest number of small businesses may be directly affected over time by proposed housing development on sites that they operate, on the whole the Family Zoning Plan will increase the viability and vitality of neighborhood commercial businesses and districts overall.

POLICY 6.7
Promote high quality urban design on commercial streets.

The Family Zoning Plan will advance Citywide Design Standards that create clear expectations for new construction, including high quality pedestrian-oriented storefronts and active ground floors that encourage pedestrian and commercial activity, as well as fine-grained well-designed buildings overall.

POLICY 6.8
Preserve historically and/or architecturally important buildings or groups of buildings in neighborhood commercial districts.

The Family Zoning Plan will increase capacity for new development while ensuring that buildings and sites listed as cultural resources will be subject to requirements intended to preserve cultural heritage.

BALBOA PARK STATION AREA PLAN

OBJECTIVE 1.1
Integrate the diverse uses in the plan area around the commercial spine and transit node.

POLICY 1.1.1

Strengthen the link between transportation and land use.

The Family Zoning Plan will increase allowed heights along Ocean Avenue and around the BART station within the Area Plan's boundaries thereby encouraging additional housing development and the increased diversification of the land uses along these important commercial spine and transit nodes.

OBJECTIVE 1.2

STRENGTHEN THE OCEAN AVENUE NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT.

POLICY 1.2.2

Encourage mixed-use residential and commercial infill within the commercial district.

Permitted heights will be increased along the Ocean Avenue commercial district thereby strengthening the commercial district with heights appropriate to the scale and importance of the street and providing housing for additional residents, who will in turn provide an additional customer base for the commercial businesses.

OBJECTIVE 4.6

ENHANCE AND PRESERVE THE EXISTING HOUSING STOCK

POLICY 4.6.2

Discourage dwelling unit mergers.

The Family Zoning Plan reinforces existing policies that discourage unit mergers by introducing new provisions that strengthen the Planning Commission's stance against the loss of residential flats.

GLEN PARK COMMUNITY PLAN

OBJECTIVE 2

ENSURE THE COMPATIBILITY OF NEW DEVELOPMENT WITH THE FORM AND CHARACTER OF GLEN PARK

POLICY 2.2

Consider new housing and commercial opportunities in appropriately scaled infill development that supports the commercial area.

The Family Zoning Plan increases allowed heights in the Glen Park Plan Area appropriate for its location next to major regional transit facilities including the Glen Park BART Station and the MUNI J-Church Metro line. Developments using the local program will be required to meet the Citywide Design Standards, which include design standards addressing buildings' bulk, articulation and relationship to adjacent smaller buildings. The existing height limits in the commercial area are so low as to suppress all possible new housing and infill development, and are not appropriate for the location adjacent to a BART and Muni Metro station, and so are not aligned with this policy.

MARKET OCTAVIA AREA PLAN

OBJECTIVE 1.2

ENCOURAGE URBAN FORM THAT REINFORCES THE PLAN AREA'S UNIQUE PLACE IN THE CITY'S LARGER URBAN FORM AND STRENGTHENS ITS PHYSICAL FABRIC AND CHARACTER.

POLICY 1.2.2

Maximize housing opportunities and encourage high-quality commercial spaces on the ground floor.

POLICY 1.2.7

Encourage new mixed-use infill on Market Street with a scale and stature appropriate for the varying conditions along its length.

The Family Zoning Plan would increase height along Market Street within the Market and Octavia Area Plan's boundaries as well as in the "Hub" area near Market and Van Ness and the blocks just south of this intersection. The additional height will help emphasize Market Street's role as San Francisco's "main street", while enabling greater housing capacity along the City's most intensive transit spine. Heights will be varied to a scale and stature appropriate for the varying conditions along its length.

OBJECTIVE 2.3

PRESERVE THE AFFORDABILITY OF EXISTING HOUSING STOCK AND STRENGTHEN TENANT PROTECTION PROGRAMS.

POLICY 2.3.3

Discourage dwelling-unit mergers.

The Family Zoning Plan reinforces existing policies that discourage unit mergers by introducing new provisions that affirm the Planning Commission's commitment to preserving residential flats. The Plan maintains existing Code restrictions against merging and demolishing existing units in multi-family buildings.

OBJECTIVE 7.1

CREATE A VIBRANT NEW MIXED-USE NEIGHBORHOOD IN THE HUB.

POLICY 7.1.2

Encourage residential towers on selected sites.

The Family Zoning Plan will increase heights at key sites within the HUB subarea, encouraging more housing in one of the City's most transit-rich locations. The construction of residential towers would be permitted and encouraged, but projects must comply with new zoning requirements to ensure towers are appropriately scaled and integrated with the surrounding urban fabric.

NORTHEASTERN WATERFRONT AREA PLAN

OBJECTIVE 6
TO DEVELOP AND MAINTAIN RESIDENTIAL USES ALONG THE NORTHEASTERN WATERFRONT IN ORDER TO ASSIST IN SATISFYING THE CITY'S HOUSING NEEDS AND CAPITALIZE ON THE AREA'S POTENTIAL AS A DESIRABLE LIVING ENVIRONMENT.

POLICY 6.2
Encourage the development of additional housing wherever feasible (except on new or replacement fill).

POLICY 6.4
Encourage the development of a variety of unit types for households of all sizes where practical.

The Family Zoning Plan will allow increased heights within the Fisherman's Wharf subarea of the Northeastern Waterfront Area Plan. This targeted upzoning responds to the area's relatively underutilized character and has the potential to introduce significant new housing. In addition to addressing the City's broader housing needs, new residents would help enliven the neighborhood and provide a stronger balance between commercial, tourist, and residential uses.

The Housing Choice program enables flexibility in providing a variety of housing types and means of satisfying affordability requirements.

VAN NESS AVENUE AREA PLAN

Land Use

SUBAREA 1: Redwood to Broadway

OBJECTIVE 1
CONTINUE EXISTING COMMERCIAL USE OF THE AVENUE AND ADD A SIGNIFICANT INCREMENT OF NEW HOUSING.

POLICY 1.1
Encourage development of high-density housing above a podium of commercial uses in new construction or substantial expansion of existing buildings.

POLICY 1.4
Maximize the number of housing units.

POLICY 1.5
Employ various techniques to provide more affordable housing.

The Family Zoning Plan will increase heights along all portions of Van Ness Avenue within the Plan Area. The Van Ness Avenue corridor would see the most intensive housing capacity increases in the Family Zoning Plan. These height increases would allow for significantly more housing along this prominent corridor, consistent with its stature and role as a major transit spine. The addition of new residents would also strengthen the customer base, supporting a vibrant retail presence as envisioned in the Area Plan.

ENCOURAGE DEVELOPMENT WHICH REINFORCES TOPOGRAPHY AND URBAN PATTERN, AND DEFINES AND GIVES VARIETY TO THE AVENUE.

POLICY 5.1
Establish height controls to emphasize topography and adequately frame the great width of the Avenue, and support the redevelopment of the Avenue as a diverse, mixed use boulevard and transit corridor.

Although heights will increase along the entire corridor, they would remain sensitive to the surrounding topography, consistent with a key urban design value of San Francisco. The tallest buildings would be located at Geary Boulevard and Van Ness Avenue, with heights gradually tapering down in all directions.

Preservation of Significant Buildings

OBJECTIVE 11
PRESERVE THE FINE ARCHITECTURAL RESOURCES OF VAN NESS AVENUE.

POLICY 11.1
Avoid demolition or inappropriate alteration of historically and architecturally significant buildings.

The Housing Choice Program will not apply to projects that propose the demolition of listed historic buildings, including those identified in the Van Ness Avenue Area Plan. Projects proposing alterations to these landmarks could participate, but only if they comply with the City's Preservation Design Standards and satisfactorily pass review for appropriate alterations to such structures.

WESTERN SOMA AREA PLAN

OBJECTIVE 3.2
ENCOURAGE NEW NEIGHBORHOOD RESIDENTIAL USES IN LOCATIONS THAT PROVIDE THE GREATEST OPPORTUNITIES TO BUILD ON THE EXISTING NEIGHBORHOOD PATTERNS

POLICY 3.2.2
Encourage in-fill housing that utilizes design strategies that consider the existing built housing qualities in terms of heights, prevailing density, yards and unit sizes. [*as proposed for amendment*]

POLICY 3.2.3
Provide additional housing production incentives for areas identified as most appropriate for housing production.

The Family Zoning Plan will increase heights along the major arterials of the far western blocks of Western SoMa Area Plan while maintaining the lower scale of interior alley environments. These height increases would expand housing capacity on well-located, often underutilized sites.

OBJECTIVE 3.3
ENSURE THAT A SIGNIFICANT PERCENTAGE OF THE NEW HOUSING CREATED IS AFFORDABLE TO PEOPLE WITH A WIDE RANGE OF INCOMES

POLICY 3.3.3
Encourage a mix of affordability levels in new residential development.

The Family Zoning Plan and its Housing Choice Program enables flexibility in meeting the City's robust affordable. housing requirements.

WESTERN SHORELINE AREA PLAN

Transportation

OBJECTIVE 1
IMPROVE PUBLIC TRANSIT ACCESS TO THE COAST.

POLICY 1.5
Consolidate the Municipal Railway turnaround at the former Playland-at-the-Beach site

The SFMTA La Playa and Cabrillo Terminal Bus Loop site falls within the proposed SFMTA Non-Contiguous SUD, which would preserve and potentially expand its role as a key Richmond District bus facility while also allowing the addition of future housing.

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 *[as proposed for amendment]*

POLICY 11.1
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. *[as proposed for amendment]*

POLICY 11.3
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 11.4
Strive to increase the amount of housing units citywide, especially units for low- and moderate-income people

In most portions of the Western Shoreline Area Plan, existing height limits would be retained while permitting greater residential density. Select pockets along neighborhood commercial corridors would allow modest height increases, consistent with the City's broader policy of encouraging additional height along such corridors. The Family Zoning Plan and its Local Program also provide flexibility in meeting the City's robust affordability requirements.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Commission finds that the General Plan 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 the collectively, the General Plan Amendment, the Zoning Map Amendments and 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 Land Use Plan of the City's certified LCP meet the requirements of, and are in conformity with, the policies of Chapter 3 of the Coastal Act (California Public Resources Code Section 30200 et seq.) for the reasons set forth in the Consistency Analysis, attached hereto as Exhibit 7. The Commission further finds that the LCP 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 Family Zoning Plan, 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 forth 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 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 adopts the General Plan Amendments in the proposed Ordinance attached to this Resolution and recommends approval by the Board of Supervisors.

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

Jonas P Ionin Digitally signed by Jonas P Ionin
Date: 2025.09.17 14:36:55 -07'00'

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 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 5c

MAP 04 Urban Design Guidelines for the Height of Buildings

URBAN DESIGN ELEMENT | SAN FRANCISCO GENERAL PLAN



General Residential Neighborhood Fabric

Generally up to four stories, with 5 or 6 stories in certain conditions, such as adjacent to major transit corridors and certain major employment or educational centers, corner parcels, and large sites.[3]

Commercial Streets, Major Transit Corridors, and General Mixed Use Districts

65' on narrower or less significant streets, 85' on wider and more significant streets or segments of streets. General medium density mixed-use areas and major industrial areas should have height limits from 6 to 8 stories.[2, 3]

High-Density Residential and Mixed-Use Neighborhoods, Lower Scale High-Rise Districts

A general fabric of 8 to 25 story buildings. Most areas typically 85' podium buildings, with some areas of taller structures, including widely-spaced lower towers.[2]

High-Rise Districts

Concentrated areas or corridors of tall buildings. Tower spacing controls above street wall heights related to street width.

Points on Skyline and Taller Height than Surrounding Area

Neighborhood Skyline Markers

Notable Citywide Skyline Sub-Peaks

Tallest Peak of Skyline Citywide

NOTES:

1. Guidelines for Building Height Limits are intended to convey the desired actualbuilt height of buildings inclusive of any bonuses or other regulatory programs. This diagram conveys policy intent and guidance for the establishment of height limits and regulatory programs, and should not be construed or used as a regulatory map of height limits.
2. Pockets of lower height limits may be warranted in discrete areas to address certain conditions, such as residential enclaves on narrow alleys, listed historic districts, adjacencies to certain open spaces, or other conditions.
3. Public, cultural and institutional buildings may, on a case-by-case basis, rise above the prevailing neighborhood heights by a modest amount due to their civic importance and role as visual landmarks.
4. Buildings in open spaces and on piers require special review and consideration. Not all open spaces are shown this generalized map.

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

San Francisco Planning

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

PLANNING COMMISSION RESOLUTION NO. 21784

HEARING DATE: July 17, 2025

Project Name:	Family Zoning Plan (Housing Element Rezoning Program)
Case Number:	2021-005878GPA
Initiated by:	Planning Department Staff
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

ADOPTING A RESOLUTION OF INTENT TO INITIATE AMENDMENTS TO THE SAN FRANCISCO GENERAL PLAN, PURSUANT TO SECTION 340, IN RELATION TO IMPLEMENTATION OF THE HOUSING ELEMENT 2022 UPDATE AND ADOPTION OF THE SAN FRANCISCO FAMILY ZONING PLAN, INCLUDING AMENDMENTS TO 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.

WHEREAS, Section 4.105 of the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco provides that the Planning Commission ("Commission") periodically recommend General Plan Amendments to the Board of Supervisors; and

WHEREAS, the General Plan consists of goals, policies and programs for the future physical development of the City and County of San Francisco that take into consideration social, economic and environmental factors; and

WHEREAS, the General Plan shall be periodically amended in response to changing physical, social, economic, environmental or legislative conditions; and

WHEREAS, Planning Code Section 340 provides that an amendment to the General Plan may be initiated by the Commission; and

WHEREAS, On January 31, 2023 the Board of Supervisors adopted Ordinance No. 010-23, which amended the San Francisco General Plan by establishing a completely revised Housing Element ("Housing Element 2022 Update"). 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 the 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 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, 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 and 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. This rezoning effort is commonly referred to as the "San Francisco Family Zoning Plan" ("Family Zoning Plan"). As called for in the Housing Element 2022 Update, the Family Zoning Plan focuses on the well-resourced neighborhoods of the western and northern portions of San Francisco (also referred to as Housing Opportunity Areas); and

WHEREAS, The General Plan Amendments, together with proposed Zoning Map Amendments and Planning Code Amendments, provide a comprehensive set of policies to implement key actions of the Housing Element 2022 Update; and

WHEREAS, The Proposed General Plan Amendments would amend certain objectives, policies and maps of 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, to align these Area Plans and Elements with the Housing Element 2022 Update and the Family Zoning Plan; and

WHEREAS, The Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting to consider initiation of the proposed Ordinance on July 17, 2025; and

WHEREAS, a proposed Ordinance has been drafted in order to make the necessary amendments to the General Plan to implement the Family Zoning Plan. The Office of the City Attorney has approved the Proposed Ordinance as to form; and

WHEREAS, the Commission certified the Housing Element 2022 Update EIR on November 17, 2022 and adopted CEQA findings for the Housing Element Update in December 2022. This General Plan Amendment initiation would not, in and of itself, result in a physical change to the environment, and is not an approval of the proposed General Plan Amendments or of the Family Zoning Plan. Therefore, this action is not considered a project under the California Environmental Quality Act. The

Planning Department is currently preparing an addendum to the EIR, which will be completed prior to the Commission taking action on the subject General Plan Amendments; 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

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that pursuant to Planning Code Section 340(c), the Commission adopts this Resolution of Intent to initiate amendments to the General Plan;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that pursuant to Planning Code Section 333, the Commission authorizes the Department to provide appropriate notice for a public hearing to consider the above referenced General Plan amendments substantially in the same form as in the draft ordinance, approved as to form by the City Attorney in Exhibit A, to be considered at a publicly noticed hearing on or after September 11, 2025.

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was ADOPTED by the Commission at its meeting on July 17, 2025.

Jonas P Ionin Digitally signed by Jonas P Ionin
Date: 2025.07.31 08:55:18 -07'00'

Jonas P. Ionin
Commission Secretary

AYES: Campbell, McGarry, Braun, Imperial, So

NOES: Moore, Williams

ABSENT: None

ADOPTED: July 17, 2025

San Francisco Planning

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

NOTICE OF ELECTRONIC TRANSMITTAL

DATE: October 16, 2025

TO: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

FROM: Ryan Shum, Environmental Review Coordinator, (628) 652-7542 or ryan.shum@sfgov.org

RE: Environmental Review for the Family Zoning Program
Board Files 250700, 250701, and 250966

In compliance with San Francisco's Administrative Code Section 8.12.5 "Electronic Distribution of Multi-Page Documents," the Planning Department is submitting a link to the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the 2022 Housing Element Update and Addendum No. 1 to the FEIR for the Family Zoning Program documents in digital format to the Clerk of the Board for distribution to the members of the board of supervisors. In addition, enclosed are a memo addressing public comments on the addendum as well as analysis of the modifications to the zoning program provided in substitute legislation on September 30, 2025.

The Land Use and Transportation Committee of the Board of Supervisors will hold a hearing on the Family Zoning Program on October 20, 2025. These environmental documents are associated with Board Files 250700, 250701, and 250966. For questions regarding the environmental review for this project, please contact Ryan Shum at the above contact information.

Links: Housing Element FEIR - Vol. 1
Housing Element FEIR – Vol. 2
Housing Element FEIR – Vol. 3
Addendum No. 1 to the Housing Element FEIR

All documents related to the environmental review of the Housing Element Update and Family Zoning Program are available at: https://sfplanning.org/environmental-review-documents?title=housing+element&field_environmental_review_categ_target_id=All&items_per_page=10

Enclosures

1. Memorandum: Responses to Public Comments on the Environmental Review of the Family Zoning Plan – Housing Element Rezoning Program
2. Memorandum: CEQA Analysis for Family Zoning Plan – Substitute Legislation (Version 3)

San Francisco Planning

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

MEMORANDUM

Date: October 16, 2025
To: San Francisco Board of Supervisors
From: Lisa Gibson, Environmental Review Officer – lisa.gibson@sfgov.org , (628) 652-7571
Debra Dwyer, Principal Planner – debra.dwyer@sfgov.org, (628) 652-7576
Ryan Shum, Senior Planner – ryan.shum@sfgov.org, (628) 652-7542

RE: **Responses to Public Comments on the Environmental Review of the Family Zoning Plan – Housing Element Rezoning Program**
Planning Case Nos. 2019-016230ENV, 2021-005878CWP, and 2021-005878GPA
Board file nos. 250700, 250701, and 250966

Introduction

The purpose of this memorandum is to respond to questions and concerns raised in public comments on the September 3, 2025, Addendum No. 1 to the Housing Element 2022 Update Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR), which addressed the Family Zoning Plan (rezoning program). Although neither the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) nor chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code establish a public comment period or require written responses to comments on an addendum, the San Francisco Planning Department (department) has prepared this memorandum to inform the Board of Supervisors (board) and the public that the department has carefully considered the comments received and finds that the addendum is the appropriate environmental review document for the rezoning program, pursuant to CEQA and chapter 31.

The department published Addendum No. 1 to the Housing Element Final Environmental Impact Report (addendum) on September 3, 2025, pursuant to CEQA, specifically California Public Resources Code section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines sections 15162–15163, for the rezoning program. The Planning Commission (commission) heard the rezoning program on September 11, 2025, and recommended approval with modifications to the board. Members of the public submitted written comments to the board and the commission prior to the commission hearing and also orally at the commission hearing. Additional public comments have been submitted to the board and the department since the commission hearing.

CEQA Requirements for an Addendum

When a FEIR has been certified for a project, CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines state that no new, subsequent, or supplemental FEIR 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 FEIR 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 with respect to the circumstances under which the project is being undertaken, requiring major revisions to the previous FEIR 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 FEIR was certified, has become available. (See CEQA section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines sections 15162–15163.)

The Housing Element FEIR analyzed the indirect effects of housing element implementation including rezoning to accommodate the City's RHNA and future housing development in the City. None of the events listed above has occurred as substantiated below; therefore, an addendum to the Housing Element FEIR is the appropriate level of environmental review.

The California Supreme Court has determined that the legal standard of review of an addendum to an EIR is substantial evidence in the record, and that a lead agency's decision of whether or not to prepare a subsequent EIR after one has already been certified for a project depends on whether the EIR still retains relevant information for the project.[1] As noted in the addendum, the Housing Element FEIR still retains information relevant to environmental review of the rezoning program, and substantial evidence supports the department's decision to prepare an addendum to the FEIR for the rezoning program.

Approach to Analysis of Rezoning Program

Broadly, many of the comments contend that the rezoning program would result in new significant impacts that were not analyzed in the Housing Element FEIR considering differences in the assumptions for where housing growth could occur due to increased height limits and removal of density limits (known as form-based density). As a result, the commenters state that a new or subsequent FEIR should be prepared. For the reasons provided below, an addendum is the appropriate environmental review document for the rezoning program as the rezoning program would not result in any new or substantially more severe significant impacts, or result in the need for new mitigation measures.

As detailed in the addendum, the FEIR adequately disclosed all significant impacts that would result from the anticipated rezoning program and subsequent housing development. The FEIR mitigation measures remain effective to reduce the significant impacts that would result from future development consistent with the rezoning program, though they would not eliminate all significant impacts, as disclosed in the FEIR and the addendum.

The FEIR acknowledged that the housing element itself would not result in direct physical impacts on the environment. However, the FEIR noted that indirect effects of adopting the housing element would include future rezoning programs primarily in the well-resourced areas, but not limited to them, to accommodate

1 *Friends of the College of San Mateo Gardens v San Mateo County Community College Dist.* (2017) 11 CA5th 596, 603

the City's regional housing needs allocation (RHNA). Further, the FEIR disclosed that at the time the 2022 housing element update was being considered, the specific rezoning actions had not been developed in detail, and therefore the FEIR presented a representative analysis of the locations where the resulting housing development could occur.

As such, the FEIR and the addendum present an inherently representative analysis of impacts, and minor changes in the location of actual growth within the well-resourced areas of the city would not automatically constitute a new significant impact. Incremental new growth adjacent to well-resourced areas and taller building heights similarly do not necessarily constitute a new significant impact, as the impacts resulting from taller buildings or future housing development in different areas would be substantially similar to the impacts disclosed in the FEIR. In addition, the FEIR indicated that an increased share of the city's future housing growth would occur within, *but would not be limited to*, well-resourced areas (FEIR Responses to Comments, p. 2-1).

Furthermore, the housing growth distribution analyzed in the FEIR was described as a hypothetical scenario and not indicative of the final zoning proposal:

> "The impact analysis in the EIR is based on…representative future conditions, [and] the depictions are not intended to be precise maps of where future development would occur. Rather, the depictions are used to identify the types and magnitude of impacts anticipated from the increased density and redistribution of housing growth under the proposed action compared to the 2050 environmental baseline." (FEIR, p. 1-4)

> "[The project description figure] presents one possible distribution of future housing development growth that could occur and informs the programmatic environmental impact analysis presented in the EIR. While the impact analysis in the EIR is based on these representative future conditions, future housing development could occur in any areas of the city where zoning allows." (FEIR, p. 4-5)

That is, the FEIR impact conclusions are based upon a representative analysis and do not apply to only one specific growth and height distribution. The purpose of the FEIR was to disclose the reasonably foreseeable impacts of constructing approximately 50,000 new housing units throughout the city, primarily in the well-resourced areas of the city, but not limited to those areas and not necessarily in the exact locations depicted in the EIR. Furthermore, as clarified in the FEIR, the boundary of the well-resourced area(s) of the city is not static and changes from year to year (FEIR, p. S-2).[2]

While the distribution of housing growth in the rezoning program differs from the scenario analyzed in the FEIR and proposes slightly more units than originally contemplated, the additional analysis conducted for the proposed rezoning program, as documented in the addendum, confirmed that the representative analysis from the FEIR remains valid and that the rezoning scenario would not result in new or substantially more severe environmental impacts that were not already disclosed in the EIR.

[2] California Tax Credit Allocation Committee. *CTCAC/HCD Opportunity Area Maps*. Published December 2024. Accessed October 1, 2025.

Further responses below address why further environmental analysis is not required as a result of changed circumstances or new information of substantial importance and also address comments regarding consistency with the general plan, Senate Bill 131, and housing sustainability districts.

As described in more detail below, a new or subsequent FEIR for the rezoning program is not required.

No New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts

Comments related to the adequacy of the addendum state that the rezoning program would result in new and/or more severe significant impacts because it proposes new growth and/or new height limits in areas of the city that were not explicitly depicted in the FEIR. However, as previously discussed, the FEIR presents a programmatic analysis that considered the reasonably foreseeable impacts of constructing 50,000 new housing units primarily within, but not limited to, the well-resourced areas of the city. The FEIR acknowledged that future implementation actions such as rezoning to increase housing capacity in the city and future development consistent with the Housing Element would result in significant and unavoidable impacts related to:

- Built-environment historic resources,
- Transportation (construction, public transit delay and loading),
- Noise (construction and operation),
- Air quality (criteria air pollutant emissions and health effects),
- Wind,
- Shadow, and
- Utilities and service systems.

Effective mitigation measures were identified to reduce impacts to the extent feasible. The FEIR acknowledged that impacts for these topics would be significant and unavoidable even with mitigation. In addition, the FEIR found certain impacts, such as liquefaction hazards and hazardous materials, to be less than significant due to existing regulations that would be complied with as applicable.

The department analyzed the proposed rezoning program and evaluated its impacts in comparison with the impacts identified in the FEIR and documented its conclusions in the addendum. Below is a summary of why the rezoning program would not result in new or substantially more severe impacts for the topics raised in the comment letters.

Wind and Shadow

With regards to impacts related to taller building heights, including wind and shadow, the addendum acknowledged that taller and denser development in certain areas of the city would likely result in significant wind and shadow impacts. However, because the FEIR impact findings are programmatic and not specific to one particular area of the city, these impacts would be similar to those that were discussed in the FEIR and there would not be new or substantially more severe wind and shadow impacts.

Both the FEIR wind and shadow discussions are representative analyses that indicate the range of wind and shadow impacts that could occur across the city with implementation of the housing element update. Key areas were selected based on a variety of factors such as geography and neighborhood building heights to

represent the nature and severity of impacts based on the hypothetical height map, but the impacts could occur in any part of the city and would not be limited to only the key areas. See FEIR pp. 4.7-9 to 4.7-13 in the wind section and FEIR p. 4.8-18 to 4.8-42 in the shadow section for more information.

Mitigation measures were identified to minimize wind and shadow impacts from future development, and these mitigation measures would apply to future development at the time that they are proposed, if applicable. The mitigation measures require site- and project-specific analysis and incorporation of building features to reduce wind and shadow impacts to the extent feasible. The changes to growth distribution and building heights in the proposed rezoning program would not result new or more severe wind and shadow impacts that were not already discussed, and the same mitigation measures to reduce impacts would continue to apply.

With respect to the change from a one-hour to a nine-hour per year wind hazard standard, the addendum noted the policy reasons for the modification (see addendum pp. 102 to107). Namely, the policy change would remove a constraint for housing development by easing the ability of housing projects to comply with the wind standards more quickly and with less cost, consistent with housing element policies. The change would not modify the 26 miles per hour (mph) equivalent threshold of a wind hazard.

Notably, even with modification of the standard, any project over 85 feet would still be required to conduct a wind tunnel test to determine if there is potential for hazardous winds, consistent with current practice, and projects would need to incorporate wind-reducing features to address net new hazard exceedances of nine or more hours in a year. The addendum acknowledged that the change *may* lead to accelerated ground-level winds for one to eight hours *per year* in a location. But, on average over the course of a year, a wind hazard exceedance of less than nine hours would not substantially harm pedestrians, and the one-hour per year wind hazard criterion was overly conservative. Therefore, modification of the wind hazard criterion from one to nine hours would not result in a new or more significant impact than was previously disclosed in the FEIR.

Built-Environment Historic Resources

The FEIR impact analysis on built-environment historic resources was also programmatic and representative. As discussed on FEIR p. 4.2-77, the growth projections illustrate possible future conditions and are not intended to be precise depictions of where future development could occur. Rather, the analysis identifies the types and magnitude of impacts that could occur to both known and forecasted built-environment historic resources. Not all built-environment historic resources that could be identified between present day and 2050 are known, as new historic resources may be identified in the future. Therefore, the EIR established a projection, or forecast, that anticipated how the city's built-environment historic resources setting will evolve over the next approximately 30 years while development implements the policies of the adopted housing element. Environmental impacts are assessed against a forecast rather than the current setting, which contains only a portion of the resources that could be affected through 2050. The impact analysis is representative in that a range of representative scenarios that could occur with future housing projects that involve a historic resource were described and considered in making an overall impact conclusion. Specifically, the EIR considered a range of outcomes for types of housing projects that may impact the range of known and forecasted built-environment cultural resource identified within San Francisco, see Table 4.2-7 (Summary of Housing Project Types Anticipated for Future Development Consistent with Housing Element Update and Anticipated Impacts prior to Application of Mitigation [Revised])on FEIR pp. 4.2-85 and 86. The

EIR analysis disclosed the scope and magnitude of impacts to built-environment historic resources, including both individual resources and historic districts.

Thus, the FEIR analyzed the impact of future development on built-environment historic resources at a citywide, programmatic level, and identified 12 mitigation measures (Mitigation Measures M-CR-1a through M-CR-1l) that would apply to future housing projects that adversely affect historic resources. At the time that these development projects are proposed, they would be required to undergo project-level environmental review as applicable to determine which mitigation measures would apply and what specific measures would be required based on the project scope and design and the specific historic resource(s) that would be affected.

Topics addressed through Regulations

For some environmental resource topics, significant impacts would not occur due to the reliance on existing regulations. Projects throughout the city must comply with these regulations, as applicable. Therefore, contrary to commenter statements, changes to the location, density and height of housing development would not result in new or substantially more severe impacts due to compliance with regulations described below.

Geology and Soils Impacts – Liquefaction Hazards

The FEIR determined that future housing development would result in less than significant impacts related to geology and soils. No mitigation measures related to geology and soil impacts were identified and would be required of future construction. Future housing development enabled by the Housing Element and future rezoning programs would be required to comply with state and local building codes and conduct site-specific geotechnical reports by a qualified licensed engineer at the time they are proposed. Pursuant to the Seismic Hazards Mapping Act of 1990 (Public Resources Code, Chapter 7.8, Section 2690-2699.6), projects located within a seismic hazard zone, including for liquefaction hazard, are required to specifically identify measures needed to protect life and property from seismic hazards. There have been no substantive changes to the geotechnical regulatory requirements since the EIR. Thus, taller buildings in certain parts of the City would not alter the conclusion of the FEIR or result in new or substantially more severe impacts.

Hazardous Materials

The FEIR determined that future housing development would result in less than significant impacts related to hazardous materials. As discussed in the FEIR, all projects in the city that disturb more than 50 cubic yards of soil on sites with potentially hazardous soils or groundwater are subject to the Maher Program, which is overseen by the health department. Construction and transportation of hazardous materials are also regulated by the state. All projects are required to comply with the Maher Program and mitigate any potential hazardous material impacts to less-than-significant levels prior to building construction and occupancy.

Biological Resources

The FEIR determined that future housing development would result in less than significant impacts related to biological resources. Biological resources in the city are protected at the federal, state, and local levels through existing regulations and no further mitigation measures are required to reduce potential impacts. For example, the city has adopted regulations for bird-safe designs within the city. Planning code section 139, Standards for Bird-Safe Buildings, establishes building design standards to reduce bird strikes and avian mortality rates. Compliance with planning code section 139 is required, applies city-wide, and would ensure that impacts related to bird hazards would be less than significant.

Changed Circumstances and New Information

As described below, there are no new significant impacts nor a substantial increase in the severity of identified significant impacts due to changed circumstances or new information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence, at the time the Housing Element FEIR was certified as complete.

Great Highway Closure (Public Transit Delay)
The addendum notes the Great Highway road closure and acknowledges that its closure has diverted additional vehicles onto nearby roadways, including 19th Avenue. This change results in additional travel time for nearby public transit routes such as the Muni 28/28R. However, the diverted vehicle volume is not so substantial such that there would be a significant increase in transit delay on the previously identified significant impact on the 28/28R. As shown in Table 6 (addendum p. 76), there would not be a substantial increase in transit travel time on the 19th Avenue corridor during both the AM and PM peak hours under the proposed rezoning program. Furthermore, the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) is working on signal timing upgrades and improvements at key bottlenecks to improve traffic flow and transit operations in the area.[3] For these reasons, the closure of the Great Highway is not a change in circumstance that would result in new or more significant impacts, and no new or subsequent FEIR is required.

Air Pollutant Exposure Zone (Air Quality and Health Risk)
As acknowledged in the addendum, the air pollutant exposure zone (APEZ) map was updated following the publication of the housing element EIR. The most recent update added areas of the city to the APEZ. The expansion of the APEZ map is not a change in circumstance that would result in new or substantially more severe air quality impacts because it would not worsen air quality impacts. In fact, the map update is more protective compared to the prior APEZ map because more future housing development would be subject to the protective mitigation measures required to be implemented when constructing within the APEZ, including incorporation of enhanced ventilation for sensitive use developments such as residential projects. Additionally, the expansion of the map is not new information because the APEZ map and fact that it is updated every five years was known at the time of the EIR. The expansion of the APEZ map does not meet the definition of new information of substantial importance as defined in CEQA Guidelines section 15162, noted above.

Consistency with the General Plan

Commenters claim that that the general plan protects historic districts such as North Beach and Telegraph Hill and priority equity geographies from development, and therefore the rezoning is inconsistent with the general plan. The commenters do not specify which specific general plan policy the rezoning is inconsistent with. Additionally, one commenter claims that the rezoning would exceed the height and density limits set forth in the general plan. The general plan, which includes the housing element, is a long-term vision document with a policy framework and plan to guide policy and decision-making in the city. The general plan does not include specific height or development parameters such as housing density or land use, as these are regulated by the city's planning code and zoning map, which implements the general plan.

[3] San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency. "New Data on Great Highway Road Closure: How We're Supporting Your Trips." Available at: https://www.sfmta.com/blog/new-data-great-highway-road-closure-how-were-supporting-your-trips. Accessed October 2, 2025.

With regards to development in historic districts and priority equity geographies, there are no general plan policies that preclude development in any part of the city, including in historic districts or priority equity geographies. The general plan has policies for the city to consider and develop policy to address specific community needs and goals, but the policies do not comprehensively prohibit development in historic districts or priority equity geographies.

The commission found that the rezoning program is consistent with the general plan, for the reasons set forth in the Resolution recommending adoption of the program for approval by the board (Resolutions 21808-21810.). Specifically, the commission found that the rezoning program is, on balance, consistent with general plan policies. The comments do not specify which general plan policies the rezoning program is in conflict with and it is unclear how the rezoning program is inconsistent with the general plan.

Senate Bill 131

One commenter claims that SB 131 does not apply to the rezoning program. SB 131 establishes a statutory exemption from CEQA for rezoning programs meeting specified criteria. The rezoning program qualifies for an addendum under CEQA and the discussion regarding SB 131 is provided in the addendum primarily for informational purposes. The addendum acknowledged that SB 131 would not apply to natural and protected lands and thus separate environmental review (i.e., the two-pronged approach noted in the addendum) would be required for parcels within the rezoning program that are located on natural and protected lands, as defined, were the department to rely upon SB 131, which it does not. The addendum acknowledges that presenting a two-pronged approach could be confusing for decision makers and the public, and thus the department elected to undertake a singular approach (i.e., the addendum). Nonetheless, a lead agency's decision to prepare an addendum for a project does not preclude the project's eligibility for applicable statutory exemptions. Nothing in SB 131 precludes the use of the statutory exemption for a rezoning of parcels that are not natural or protected lands.

Housing Sustainability Districts

Contrary to the assertions of some comments, the Housing Element FEIR discusses housing sustainability districts throughout the document and identifies areas that could be designated as a housing sustainability district (see "Housing Sustainability District" section starting on FEIR p. 2-27 and Figure 2-8 "Areas of the City Under Consideration for Possible Housing Sustainability Districts"). The addendum also includes a figure comparing the areas which the FEIR identified as potential housing sustainability district areas versus what is ultimately being proposed (see addendum Figure 1). Establishment of a housing sustainability district creates a streamlined ministerial process for project approval. Development that could occur within the district is accounted for within the 54,000 units anticipated under the rezoning program. Therefore, the FEIR and addendum adequately address the physical impacts associated with the housing sustainability district.

Conclusion

This memorandum demonstrates that the department has carefully considered the comments received and provides further substantial evidence that the FEIR addendum is the appropriate environmental review document for the rezoning program pursuant to CEQA and chapter 31.

The Housing Element FEIR analyzed a hypothetical rezoning scenario of future housing growth in the city. The FEIR acknowledged that the height and growth distribution depicted in the FEIR was hypothetical and not intended to be a precise depiction of future zoning changes. As a result, the FEIR employed a representative analysis to assess the reasonably foreseeable impacts of new housing growth in the city. Following the publication of the FEIR and adoption of the Housing Element, the department undertook an iterative process to develop the proposed rezoning program and prepared an addendum to confirm the findings of the FEIR analysis. The addendum included additional technical analysis and determined that the representative analysis from the FEIR remained valid, and that the rezoning program would not result in new or substantially more severe significant impacts that were not already disclosed in the EIR. Furthermore, there have been no substantial changes in circumstances in the city or the revelation of new information of substantial importance such that there would be a new significant impact, or a substantial increase in severity of a previously identified significant impact, compared to what was discussed in the EIR. For projects subject to CEQA, the mitigation measures identified in the FEIR would continue to apply to future development projects, as determined applicable, during the project-specific environmental review.

As discussed in this memorandum, the commission found that the rezoning program is consistent with the general plan. The addendum and FEIR also adequately analyzed the proposed housing sustainability districts and changed circumstances with regards to the APEZ expansion and closure of the Great Highway. Lastly, the discussion in the addendum regarding SB 131 is provided primarily for informational purposes, but the department's decision to prepare an addendum does not preclude the applicability of SB 131 to the rezoning.

For these reasons, a new or subsequent FEIR is not required, and an addendum is the appropriate CEQA document for the proposed rezoning program.

San Francisco Planning

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

MEMORANDUM

Date: October 16, 2025
To: San Francisco Board of Supervisors
From: Lisa Gibson, Environmental Review Officer – lisa.gibson@sfgov.org , (628) 652-7571
Debra Dwyer, Principal Planner – debra.dwyer@sfgov.org, (628) 652-7576
Ryan Shum, Senior Planner – ryan.shum@sfgov.org, (628) 652-7542

RE: CEQA Analysis for Family Zoning Plan – Substitute Legislation (Version 3)
Planning Case Nos. 2019-016230ENV, 2021-005878CWP, and 2021-005878GPA
Board file nos. 250700, 250701, and 250966

Attachments: Attachment A – Summary Table for Substitute Legislation (Version 3 –September 30, 2025)
Attachment B – Map of Family Zoning Plan Changes between July and September 2025

Introduction

The purpose of this memorandum is to document why recent minor modifications in the substitute Family Zoning Plan legislation do not require further analysis pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) beyond the previously prepared environmental impact report and addendum.

Following the publication of the Housing Element 2022 Update Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) and adoption of the Housing Element, the San Francisco Planning Department (department) undertook an iterative process to develop a proposed rezoning program. The Mayor introduced the Family Zoning Plan (rezoning program) on June 24 and July 28, 2025. The department reviewed the legislation in compliance with CEQA, determined that there would be no new environmental impacts from the legislation, and prepared an addendum to the FEIR to confirm the findings of the FEIR analysis. The department published Addendum No. 1 to the Housing Element 2022 Update FEIR (addendum) on September 3, 2025, pursuant to CEQA.[1] The Planning Commission (commission) heard the rezoning program on September 11, 2025 and recommended its approval with modifications to the Board of Supervisors (board).

1 San Francisco Planning Department. *Addendum No. 1 to the Environmental Impact Report*. September 3, 2025. Available at: https://sfplanning.org/environmental-review-documents?title=housing+element&field_environmental_review_categ_target_id=All&items_per_page=10

After the September 11 hearing at the Planning Commission, the Mayor submitted substitute legislation on September 30, 2025 that includes minor changes to the zoning map and the planning code.[2]

This memorandum provides analysis for the modifications in the substitute legislation (Version 3 – September 30, 2025) pursuant to CEQA Statute section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines section 15162-15164, and incorporates by reference analysis in the FEIR and addendum.

Description and Analysis of Proposed Modifications

A summary list of proposed changes in the substitute legislation is included with this memorandum as Attachment A and the full text of the proposed ordinances and map changes are available online at on the board's Legislative Research Center (https://sfbos.org/legislative-research-center-lrc) under board file nos. 250700, 250701, and 250966.

The proposed changes include clarification and consistency modifications to the Planning Code, and modifications in response to Planning Commission recommendations. The proposed modifications with the potential to result in physical environmental effects are discussed further below. Table 1 below presents the environmental analysis of proposed map changes. Table 2 presents the potential environmental analysis of proposed planning code changes.

TABLE 1: CEQA Analysis of Map Changes

#	Block/Lot(s)	Amendment	CEQA Analysis
1	1701/001A, 002, 006, and 007 1804/001	Reclassify height limit and bulk district from 40-X to 40//40-R-4	Proposed modification would not alter the maximum height or density or number of units allowed compared to the rezoning program analyzed in the addendum. No further analysis required.
2	1354/001	Reclassify zoning use district from RH-2 to RM-1) instead of to RTO-C	The proposed modification would not alter the maximum height achievable and the overall units allowed would not change. The proposed modification is covered by the addendum, and no further analysis is required.
3	0035/001 0015/001 0017/002	Remove from table and maps completely	Removal of Port property from the rezoning program. No increase in height or units is proposed compared to what was previously analyzed in the addendum. No further analysis is required.
4	All parcels on Blocks 0018-0023, 0028-0034, 0040-0041, and 0043	Revise base height for North Beach/Fisherman's Wharf parcels on blocks between Columbus Avenue and the Embarcadero and between Francisco and Beach streets that have Local Program height	The maximum achievable heights would not exceed what was previously analyzed in the addendum for these parcels. No further analysis is required.

2 San Francisco Planning Department. *Family Zoning Plan: July 29, 2025, Substitute Legislation (version 3).* Available at: https://sfgov.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=14834613&GUID=01515652-61EE-41BB-B353-CFB0C61A2C95

#	Block/Lot(s)	Amendment	CEQA Analysis
		of 85 ft. to 40 ft. (from 50 ft.) (i.e., Change from 50//85-R-4 to 40//85-R-4)	
5	All NC and parcels proposed for RTO-C on Blocks 0248-0249, 0621-0622, 0643-0645; All lots on blocks 0250-0251 and 0277-0278	Revise proposed local program height on certain parcels in the Polk Neighborhood Commercial (NC) district and proposed RTO- C parcels from 85 ft. to 120 ft.	The proposed modification would increase the maximum number of units in the area by 289 units. The substitute legislation includes a decrease of 103 units in the North Beach area, which is located near these proposed changes along and near Polk Street in the same northeastern part of the city. In aggregate, the proposed modifications would result in a net increase of approximately 186 units in the area. **Transportation.** The net increase of 186 units in the area would result in a marginal increase in housing growth closer to the 19-Polk Muni route, but the number of vehicle trips would be similar and would result in similar transportation impacts. The proposed modification would add approximately 836 daily person trips (208 automobile, 54 TNC/taxi, 234 transit, 24 bike, and 316 walking trips) to the area. Of the 180 automobile trips, only 15 vehicle trips would occur during the PM peak hour. These 15 peak hour vehicle trips would not significantly contribute to transit delay on the 19-Polk. The proposed modification would not result in a new significant transportation impact that was not previously identified in the FEIR and addendum, nor would it result in substantially more severe impacts than those previously identified. **Shadow.** The proposed modification would increase the maximum allowable building heights on the subject parcels up to 120 feet. Future development on the subject parcels may affect nearby Recreation and Park property. As described in the addendum, future development projects would be subject to future project-level CEQA review, as applicable. If subject to CEQA and the department determines that the future development would have a significant shadow impact, FEIR Mitigation Measure M-SH-1 would be required. However, given that the specific massing, location, orientation, and design of individual projects is currently unknown, and there would be uncertainties regarding the feasibility of redesigning projects to avoid or reduce significant shadow impacts to a less-than-significant level, the impact remains significant and unavoidable, consistent with the FEIR and addendum conclusions. **Wind.** The proposed modification would increase the maximum allowable building heights on the subject parcels up to 120 feet.

#	Block/Lot(s)	Amendment	CEQA Analysis
			Buildings over 85 feet in height could result in accelerated wind speeds at ground level and wind hazard impacts. 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 citywide, if subject to CEQA and if a significant wind impact is identified. The proposed modification is similar in nature to the proposed rezoning program changes throughout the city, and subsequent development standards would be substantially similar. For these reasons, the proposed modification 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. **Other Topics.** The proposed modification would increase the maximum allowable height on the subject properties up to 120 feet, but would otherwise be similar in nature to other rezoning changes proposed by the rezoning program throughout the city. The proposed modification does not consist of peculiar features or unusual circumstances that would distinguish these areas from other areas of the rezoning that have been analyzed. Thus, while the proposed modification would result in a minor increase in housing units in the area, the impacts of the following topics would be similar as to what is 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, and wildfire. No further analysis is required.
6	Blocks 0089-0091, 0100-101, 0103, 0117-0118	Remove from parcel table and maps completely all parcels on Blocks 0090, 0101, 0117, 0118 and NC parcels on Blocks 0089, 0091 and 0103. Revise	There would be no increase in height limits or anticipated units compared to what was previously analyzed in the addendum. No further analysis is required.

#	Block/Lot(s)	Amendment	CEQA Analysis
		Local Program Height from 50 ft. to 40 ft. on non-NC parcels on Blocks 0089, 0091, and 0100.	

Table 2: CEQA Analysis of Planning Code Changes

#	Planning Code Sec.	Amendment	CEQA Analysis
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.	The proposed modification would not alter the maximum height or density or number of units allowed compared to the assumptions in the FEIR or the indirect effects of the rezoning program analyzed in the addendum. No further analysis required.
2	Table 155.2	Eliminate or reduce (e.g., cut by 50%) the bike parking requirements for Senior Housing.	The proposed modification would not alter the maximum height or density or number of units allowed compared to the assumptions in the FEIR or the indirect effects of the rezoning program analyzed in the addendum. No further analysis required.
3	202.2(f)(1)(C)	Change the definition of Senior Housing so that there is no minimum number of units to qualify.	The proposed modification would not alter the maximum height or density or number of units allowed compared to the assumptions in the FEIR or the indirect effects of the rezoning program analyzed in the addendum. No further analysis required.
4	202.17	Expand the waiver of the Conditional Use Authorization (for use authorization) and impact fees waivers from only Legacy Businesses to all displaced businesses.	The proposed modification would not alter the maximum height or density or number of units allowed compared to the assumptions in the FEIR or the indirect effects of the rezoning program analyzed in the addendum. No further analysis required.
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-ft. height districts.	The proposed modification of the ground floor ceiling height requirement would not alter the maximum allowable overall building height of 85 feet. Therefore, no further analysis is required.
6	206.10(d)(1)(B)	Amend the unit mix requirement applicable to projects using the Local Program as follows: • 4-unit building: minimum one 2+BR	The proposed modification would not alter the maximum height or density or number of units allowed compared to the assumptions in the FEIR or the indirect

#	Planning Code Sec.	Amendment	CEQA Analysis
		• 5-9 units: minimum 25% 2+BR, including at least one 3+BR unit • 10+ units: minimum 25% 2+BR, including at least 5% 3+BR	effects of the rezoning program analyzed in the addendum. No further analysis required.
7	206.10(e)(4)	Provide a 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 required unit(s) • 4+BR units: 400 sq. ft. for each unit provided, including any required unit(s)	The proposed modification may result in an incremental increase in height of up to one to three[3] additional story(ies) and a marginal increase in the number of units allowed on a project site. The incremental increase in height would not result in new or more significant shadow or wind impacts and would be subject to project-level environmental review, if applicable. FEIR shadow and wind mitigation measures to reduce shadow and wind impacts, respectively, would apply, as applicable; the planning department would determine whether shadow or wind mitigation measures are required during project-level environmental review. The marginal increase in the number of units on-site would not result in new or substantially more severe impacts that were not previously identified in the FEIR and addendum.
8	206.1(d)(1)(E) and (K); 414A; various	Provide a 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	The proposed modification may result in an incremental increase in height of up to one to three additional story(ies)[4] and a marginal increase in the number of units allowed on a project site. The incremental increase in height would not result in new or more significant shadow or wind impacts and would be subject to project-level environmental review, as applicable. FEIR shadow and wind mitigation measures to reduce shadow and wind impacts, respectively, would apply, as applicable; the planning department would determine

3 The various square footage bonuses cannot cumulatively add more than one story onto a building, except on projects involving historic preservation on the parcel (see proposed code change #12 "Square Footage Bonus and Code Flexibility for Preservation of Historic Structures". Projects that utilize the square footage bonus and code flexibility for preservation of historic structures may be allowed up to two additional stories for the preservation bonus, plus one additional story cumulatively for the non-preservation incentives. In total, a project may be allowed to add up to three stories if they achieve the maximum allowable square footage bonus for both the preservation and non-preservation incentives. However, note that the square footage bonuses would not automatically grant additional height as horizontal bonuses would be considered and the total amount of square footage bonus would need to add up to one additional story. Furthermore, parcels in residential districts would not be allowed to use the additional square footage bonus as height at all and would be required to use the bonus space in other horizontal ways (e.g., reduced rear yard, etc.).

4 See footnote 3.

#	Planning Code Sec.	Amendment	CEQA Analysis
		through any combination of the following: • Reducing the required rear yard (from 30% down to 25% rear yard or 20 ft, 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 ft down to 10 ft. (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).	whether shadow or wind mitigation measures are required during project-level environmental review, if applicable. The marginal increase in the number of units on-site would not result in new or substantially more severe impacts that were not previously identified in the FEIR and addendum.
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.	The proposed modification would not alter the maximum height or density or number of units allowed compared to the assumptions in the FEIR or the indirect effects of the rezoning program analyzed in the addendum. No further analysis required.
10	206.10(d)(1)(G)	Remove Planning Code exposure requirements for projects using the Local Program.	The proposed modification would not alter the maximum height or density or number of units allowed compared to the assumptions in the FEIR or the indirect effects of the rezoning program analyzed in the addendum. No further analysis required.
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").	The proposed modification may result in an incremental increase in height of up to one to three additional story(ies)[5] and a marginal increase in the number of units allowed on a project site. The incremental increase in height would not result in new or more significant shadow or wind impacts and would be subject to project-level environmental review, as applicable. FEIR shadow and wind mitigation measures to reduce shadow and wind impacts, respectively, would apply as applicable; the planning department would determine

5 See footnote 3.

#	Planning Code Sec.	Amendment	CEQA Analysis
			whether shadow or wind mitigation measures are required during project-level environmental review, if applicable. The marginal increase in the number of units on-site would not result in new or substantially more severe impacts that were not previously identified in the FEIR and addendum.
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.	The proposed modification may result in an incremental increase in height of up to one to three additional story(ies)[6] and a marginal increase in the number of units allowed on a project site. **Preservation.** Future development projects that utilize this proposed bonus would be required to preserve the historic resource on-site and comply with the Preservation Design Standards so that the project would not result in a significant and unavoidable impact on the historic resource. Therefore, the proposed modification would not result in a new or substantially more severe significant impact on built-environment historic resources. **Wind & Shadow.** The incremental increase in height would not result in new or more significant shadow or wind impacts and would be subject to project-level environmental review, as applicable. FEIR shadow and wind mitigation measures to reduce shadow and wind impacts, respectively, would apply, as applicable; the planning department would determine whether shadow or wind mitigation measures are required during project-level environmental review. **Other Topics.** The potential additional units on-site would be similar in nature to other housing units in the rezoning and on the project site, and would represent a marginal increase over the number of units allowed without the square footage bonus. Thus, the marginal increase in units would not result

6 See footnote 3.

#	Planning Code Sec.	Amendment	CEQA Analysis
			in new or substantially more severe impacts that were not previously identified in the FEIR and addendum.
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).	The proposed modification would not alter the maximum height or density or number of units allowed compared to the assumptions in the FEIR or the indirect effects of the rezoning program analyzed in the addendum. No further analysis required.
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)."	The proposed modification would not alter the maximum height or density or number of units allowed compared to the assumptions in the FEIR or the indirect effects of the rezoning program analyzed in the addendum. No further analysis required.
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.	The proposed modification would not result in a physical environmental effect. No further analysis required.
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	The proposed modification is a process change and would not alter the maximum height or density or number of units allowed compared to the assumptions in the FEIR or the indirect effects of the rezoning program analyzed in the addendum. No further analysis required.

#	Planning Code Sec.	Amendment	CEQA Analysis
		units on the property.	
17	Various	Clean up Planning Code Section 151 references and supersede those with 151.1 references. Planning code section 151.1 is the only remaining off-street parking section.	The proposed modification would not result in a physical environmental effect. The addendum includes analysis of the proposed changes to section 151.1, and the proposed modifications are consistent with what was analyzed in the addendum. No further analysis required.
18	207.9	Add provision that Planning Dept must maintain a publicly available list and information online of housing element reused/low income sites subject to subsection 207.9.	The proposed modification would not result in a physical environmental effect. No further analysis required.
19	Ordinance uncodified	Add clause to ordinance regarding the Local Coastal Program: “in cases of conflict between the existing Implementation Plan and this amendment, this amendment shall prevail.”	The proposed modification would not result in a physical environmental effect. No further analysis required.
20	206.10(d)(1)(M)	Add language to the 15% catchall that rear yard in any district is not eligible beyond what the local program already provides for.	The proposed modification would not result in a physical environmental effect. No further analysis required.
21	334(d)(3)	Revise Major Modifications "Exclusions" language to remove specific Code section references related to height, parking, wind, and minimum density to read as follows: "...to the following requirements: maximum permitted building height; maximum permitted accessory off-street parking amounts; wind standards; minimum density requirements; Floor Area Ratio limits;..."	The proposed modification would not result in a physical environmental effect. No further analysis required.
22	Ordinance uncodified	Uncodified findings that the new list of rezoning sites and low-income sites are compliant with Housing Element and state law and will be eligible.	The proposed modification would not result in a physical environmental effect. No further analysis required.
23	Ordinance uncodified	Add uncodified language regarding consistency with Coastal Act affordability goals	The proposed modification would not result in a physical environmental effect. No further analysis required.

Conclusion

The proposed modifications could result in minor increases in height, density, and housing unit growth in certain parts of the city, primarily in well-resourced areas. Limited growth could occur in areas adjacent to well-resourced areas, but the Housing Element FEIR and addendum acknowledged that the height and growth distribution depicted in the FEIR was hypothetical and not intended to be a precise depiction of future zoning changes. In addition, the FEIR indicated that future growth would likely be concentrated in, but is not limited to, the well-resourced areas of the city. The incremental growth would not result in new or substantially more severe significant impacts that were not already disclosed in the EIR. The mitigation measures that were identified in the FEIR would continue to apply to future development projects as determined applicable, and the department will determine which mitigation measures would apply during the project-specific environmental review phase. For these reasons, additional environmental review is not required for the modifications included in the substitute legislation.

Attachment A

FAMILY ZONING PLAN

Zoning Map & Code Ordinances | July 29, 2025 Substitute Legislation (version 2)

ZONING MAP AMENDMENTS: Board File 250700 - version 3 [xx/xx/xx]				
#	**Page**	**Parcel Map Block and Lot**	**Amendment**	**Policy Intent**
1	Ordinance uncodified		Add clause to ordinance re:LCP "in cases of conflict between the existing IP and this amendment, this amendment shall prevail."	California Coastal Commission request
2	Parcel Tables and maps	Blocks 1701 (001A, 002, 006, 007) and 1804 (001)	Reclassify from 40-X to 40//40-R-4	These blocks in CZ accidentally left off table and maps (Narrative in text already indicates this change)
3	Parcel Tables and maps	Block 1354 Lot 001 (300 Lake)	Change zoning use district reclassification to RM-1 (from RH-2) instead of to RTO-C	Given the unusually large size of the site, ensure that taller proposed heights are only through local program.
4	Parcel Tables and maps	Block/lots: 0035/001, 0017/002, and 0015/001	Remove from table and maps completely	As Port property, any height increases are subject to voter approval per Prop B. (Only height/bulk changes were proposed, no zoning use map amendments were proposed for these parcels)
5	Parcel Tables and maps	All parcels on Blocks 0018-0023, 0028-0034, 0040-0041, and 0043	Revise base height for parcels on blocks between Francisco and Beach that have Local Program height of 85' to 40' (from 50') (ie. Change from 50//85-R-4 to 40//85-R-4)	Given the large size of these parcels, reducing possibility of projects using base zoning with SDB to exceed the LP height of 85'.
5	Parcel Tables and maps	All NC and parcels proposed for RTO-C on Blocks 0248-0249, 0621-0622, 0643-0645; All Lots on Blocks 0250-0251 and 0277-0278	Revise proposed local program height on certain parcels in the Polk NC district and proposed RTO-C parcels to 120'	Increase capacity to account for other changes, align Local Program heights to reflect base height of 65' or higher

6	Parcel Tables and maps	Blocks 0089-0091, 0100-101, 0103, 0117-0118	Remove from table and maps completely all parcels on Blocks 0090, 0101, 0117, 0118 and NC parcels on Blocks 0089, 0091 and 0103. Revise Local Program Height from 50' to 40' on non-NC parcels on Blocks 0089, 0091, and 0100	Remove some non-HOA blocks in North Beach area and NC parcels south of Greenwich. Maintain existing 40' as Local Program height for non-NC parcels in NB area south of Greenwich.
7	Parcel Maps		Add Coastal Zone boundary to pdf maps	
8	Ordinance uncodified?		Add language re: consistency with Coastal Act affordability goals	
PLANNING, BUSINESS & TAX REGULATIONS CODE AMENDMENTS: Board File 250701 - version 3 [xx/xx/xx]				
#	**Page**	**Planning Code Sec.**	**Amendment**	**Policy Intent**
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.	PC recommendation
2		Table 155.2	Eliminate or reduce (e.g., cut by 50%) the bike parking requirements for Senior Housing.	PC recommendation
3		202.2(f)(1)(C)	Change the definition of Senior Housing so that there is no minimum number of units to qualify.	PC recommendation
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.	PC recommendation
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.	PC recommendation

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	PC recommendation
7		206.10(e)(4)	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)	PC recommendation

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).	PC recommendation
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.	PC recommendation
10		206.10(d)(1)(G)	Remove Planning Code exposure requirements for projects using the Local Program.	PC recommendation
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").	PC recommendation

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.	PC recommendation
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).	PC recommendation

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)."	clean-up
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.	PC recommendation
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.	clean-up; previous draft language inadvertently allowed demo without CU
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.	clean-up

18		207.9	Add Reused/Low Income sites ministerial to the purpose subsection. Add provision that Planning Dept must maintain a publicly available list and information online of HE reused/LI sites subject to this.	Meet HCD requirements/requests.
19		Ordinance uncodified	Add clause to ordinance re:LCP “in cases of conflict between the existing IP and this amendment, this amendment shall prevail.”	CCC request
20		206.10(d)(1)(M)	Add language to the 15% catchall that rear yard in any district is not eligible beyond what the LC already provides for.	clean-up
21		334(d)(3)	Revsie Major Mod "Exclusions" language to remove specific Code section references related to height, parking, wind, and min density to read as follows: "...to the following requirements: maximum permitted building height; maximum permitted accessory off-street parking amounts; wind standards; minimum density requirements; Floor Area Ratio limits;..."	clean-up
		Ordinance uncodified	Uncodified findings that the new list of rezoning sites and low-income sites are compliant with Housing Element and state law and will be eligible	Meet HCD requirements/requests.
		Ordinance uncodified	Add uncodified language re: consistency with Coastal act affordability goals	CCC request

Attachment B

Family Zoning Plan

Changes between July 29, 2025 and September 30, 2025

- Added in September
- Removed in September
- Height or Zoning Use District Changed in September
- No Change between July and September



BOARD of SUPERVISORS

City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689
Tel. No. (415) 554-5184
Fax No. (415) 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. (415) 554-5227

MEMORANDUM

Date: October 16, 2025

To: Planning Department/Planning Commission

From: John Carroll, Assistant Clerk, Land Use and Transportation Committee

Subject: Board of Supervisors Legislation Referral - File No. 250966
General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan

☒ California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Determination
(California Public Resources Code, Sections 21000 et seq.)
☒ Ordinance / Resolution
☐ Ballot Measure

CEQA clearance under the September 2, 2025 Addendum No. 1 to Environmental Impact Report for the San Francisco Housing Element 2022 Update (Planning Department Case No.2019-016231ENV certified November 17, 2022).

10/16/2025 Joy Navarrete

☐ Amendment to the Planning Code, including the following Findings:
(Planning Code, Section 302(b): 90 days for Planning Commission review)
☐ General Plan ☐ Planning Code, Section 101.1 ☐ Planning Code, Section 302

☐ Amendment to the Administrative Code, involving Land Use/Planning
(Board Rule 3.23: 30 days for possible Planning Department review)

☐ General Plan Referral for Non-Planning Code Amendments
(Charter, Section 4.105, and Administrative Code, Section 2A.53)
(Required for legislation concerning the acquisition, vacation, sale, or change in use of City property; subdivision of land; construction, improvement, extension, widening, narrowing, removal, or relocation of public ways, transportation routes, ground, open space, buildings, or structures; plans for public housing and publicly-assisted private housing; redevelopment plans; development agreements; the annual capital expenditure plan and six-year capital improvement program; and any capital improvement project or long-term financing proposal such as general obligation or revenue bonds.)

☐ Historic Preservation Commission
☐ Landmark *(Planning Code, Section 1004.3)*
☐ Cultural Districts *(Charter, Section 4.135 & Board Rule 3.23)*
☐ Mills Act Contract *(Government Code, Section 50280)*
☐ Designation for Significant/Contributory Buildings *(Planning Code, Article 11)*

Please send the Planning Department/Commission recommendation/determination to John Carroll at john.carroll@sfgov.org.

Member, Board of Supervisors
District 1

City and County of San Francisco

CONNIE CHAN

陳詩敏

第一區市參事

November 17, 2025

Mayor Daniel Lurie
City Hall, Room 200
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Mayor Lurie:

In partnership with community advocates across the city, we have been working with you in good faith to improve the proposed upzoning plan by doing more to mitigate harm to tenants and small businesses facing displacement. We understand that the proposal is one version in response to the state-mandate, but we need full and transparent accounting of the capacity the City has created over the past year to ensure we protect San Francisco and maintain local control.

After months of meeting and public discussion, and now with the steadfast support of our community stakeholders, **we remain committed to the following "non-negotiable" amendments:**

1. We will not demolish people's homes to replace them with market-rate units. Our existing housing is our most affordable housing.
2. We will not demolish the most important parts of San Francisco's iconic history and culture.
3. We will protect our coastal zone and defend against Trumpian privatization of public access.
4. We demand real family housing.

As stated in the proposed ordinance, Housing Element 2022 requires that the city has a realistic capacity for 82,000 additional units by 2032. This capacity comes from a combination of pipeline projects, inventory of the city's existing development sites, and changing the city's existing zoning. The Sites Inventory in the Housing Element identified approximately 58,500 units of

existing realistic capacity and was certified by California Housing and Community Development (HCD) in 2023. The proposed upzoning plan aims “to rezone and address the shortfall of 36,200 housing units” (File No. 250701, Page 7, Line 2).

Since the Sites Inventory was conducted over two years ago, the shortfall of 36,200 units was determined according to the conditions in 2022 and has not been updated to account for any capacity created as a result of zoning changes between then and the publication of the proposed upzoning plan.

This is a fact that Planning had foreseen in its Sites Inventory, citing that pending legislations – including Board File 210866 “Fourplex” and Board File 211092 "Automotive Uses and Housing Density” – “will raise the number of available sites in sites inventory output and lower the anticipated shortfall and potential rezoning proposal accordingly” (Housing Element - Appendix B, Page 46). Both of the legislations have since passed and been signed into law.

Additionally, in March of this year, the Board of Supervisors unanimously passed legislation sponsored by the Mayor and Supervisor Matt Dorsey, which reduced commercial and office development requirements for large projects in the Central SoMa Area Plan and the Transit Center C-3-O SUD (Board Files 240787 and 250003). **This action alone increased the city’s realistic housing capacity by as much as 8,500 units.**

For example, the following five large sites can now accommodate thousands more additional housing units according to new project applications submitted by developers after the recent policy change:

- 610 Brannan (Former Flower Mart) - Developer Kilroy Realty submitted new plans to Planning in September 2025 which include a variant with 3,532 additional housing units.
- 88 Bluxome - Developer Strata has submitted new plans in response to this new legislation with 1,500 new housing units.
- 725 Harrison - Currently entitled office project (845,000 sf) can now accommodate up to 1,000 housing units (Estimation proportionate to Flower Market project variants).
- 598 Brannan - Entitled office project (1 million sf) can now accommodate 1,175 housing units (Estimation proportionate to Flower Market project variants).
- 490 Brannan - Entitled office project (269,000 sf) can now accommodate 315 housing units (Estimation proportionate to Flower Market project variants).
- 3 large “opportunity sites” – approximately 1,000 unentitled units spread across three undisclosed “soft sites” identified by SF Planning. “One of these sites is in the Transit Center District and two are in Central SoMa” (SF Planning Department report on its change to the Central SoMa Plan, Page 6).

It is evident that the Board of Supervisors has been proactively working towards compliance of the Housing Element, but San Francisco has yet to receive credit for capacity created before the proposed upzoning plan. The upzoning plan's goal of creating 36,200 should be amended to reflect the increased capacity.

Again, we remain committed to meeting the State's housing mandate. We also believe that San Francisco has the capacity to meet this goal and develop family housing without displacement and erasure of San Francisco's most critical assets.

We sincerely urge you to stand with San Francisco, defend local control, and accept the collective amendments into your proposed upzoning plan.

Sincerely,

Connie Chan
Board of Supervisors

CC:
Supervisor Rafael Mandelman, President of the Board of Supervisors
Supervisor Myrna Melgar, Chair of the Land Use & Transportation Committee
Supervisor Chyanne Chen, Vice Chair of the Land Use & Transportation Committee
Supervisor Bilal Mahmood, Land Use & Transportation Committee
Director Sarah Dennis Phillips, San Francisco Planning Department
San Francisco Planning Commission

Member, Board of Supervisors
District 1

City and County of San Francisco

CONNIE CHAN
陳詩敏
第一區市參事

October 20, 2025

Chair Myrna Melgar
Vice Chair Chyanne Chen
Supervisor Bilal Mahmood
San Francisco Board of Supervisors Land Use and Transportation Committee
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Suite 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Chair Melgar, Vice Chair Chen, and Supervisor Mahmood:

I first want to thank Chair Melgar for your efforts in organizing the agenda for today's hearing and allowing us the opportunity for a robust policy discussion on the Mayor's proposed upzoning plan and our proposed amendments.

It is our full intention to meet the State's housing mandate and I believe that San Francisco can both meet this goal and develop without displacement.

Since this summer, I have not only been studying the Mayor's proposed upzoning plan, my team and I have also been in conversations with many stakeholders and community members in the Richmond and citywide. We have heard from many San Franciscans who are questioning whether they will be part of our City's future or whether they will be left in the past because of this proposed upzoning plan.

Together with stakeholders, we have gone to great lengths to study the Housing Element's Site Inventory and Rezoning Program previously submitted by the City and approved by California Department of Housing and Community Development (California HCD). We used the approved guidelines to evaluate the Mayor's proposed upzoning plan and have found that the Mayor's proposed plan is a significant departure from what was already approved, with a great increase of upzoning and density to sites that have existing dwelling units. This ignores the overarching principle already agreed upon by both our local and state governments, that "change that the city needs must not harm

City Hall • 1 Dr.Carlton B. Goodlett Place • Room 244 • San Francisco, California 94102-4689
Office (415) 554-7410 • TDD/TTY (415) 554-5227 • E-mail: Connie.Chan@sfgov.org

people", as clearly stated on page 36 in the Site Inventory and Rezoning Program document.

As a result, the amendments we propose before the Land Use Committee today, will remarkably improve this Plan and add a balanced approach to encourage housing production and meet the state housing mandate, without incentivizing displacement.

Based on the model used for the Existing Sites Inventory in the Site Inventory and Rezoning Program, again a document approved by California HCD, there is a list of characteristics used to determine non-vacant sites to be excluded for rezoning unit potential. With this model determining site inventory and excluding specific non-vacant sites, the City can still meet the mandate of San Francisco's Regional Housing Needs Allocation and Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing laws to accommodate about 36,282 new units in Well-Resourced Neighborhoods.

In fact, as indicated in the very same document on page 42, "Sites with existing residential uses of any amount that have not otherwise been wholly excluded from the Rezoning capacity assessment were deemed to have very low reasonable likelihood of redevelopment and, as a result, had their net capacities reduced downward (generally by 98%, leaving only 2% of their theoretical capacity represented in the Rezoning capacity)."

With that in mind, we are proposing language ranging from:

- Furthering demolition controls to protect tenants;
- Implementing nexus studies and impact fees to ensure adequate infrastructure investment, especially given the fact the City is facing existing funding challenges to build out the emergency water firefighting system for well-resourced neighborhoods, a deficit in public transit, and increased risk of tenant and small business displacement;
- Placing a "shot clock" to require developers to build within 30 months to boost housing production in the near future to meet the state mandated timeline of 2031;
- Limiting Form-Based Density to the Local Density Bonus Program to provide meaningful incentives to build family housing with 2-3 bedroom requirements; and
- Strengthening historic preservation to protect the unique characters of our neighborhoods and history of San Francisco;

In the end, when the proposed amendments are overlaid with each other, they meet one policy goal: that the displacement of tenants and small businesses should not be the

cost of doing business. Instead, we can meet our housing mandate and provide incentives for developers to drive housing developments at vacant sites.

We have been in discussion with Mayor Lurie and his team almost weekly since the end of summer. Our conversation has been productive and I want to especially thank the Mayor's Deputy Chief of Staff Aly Bonde for her efforts. We have been sharing with her our amendments and continuing our conversations.

As we all know, to build housing we need both land and money. And the housing San Francisco needs most is housing people can afford. In fact, it is my intention to request the drafting and introduction of an Affordable Housing Special Use District at a later date to identify all public land, including SF Municipal Transportation Authority owned land, private land of 8,000 square feet or larger and merger lots, as well as vacant and blighted lots, and rezone them specifically for housing with a different set of local density bonus. We also must identify funding to build, and to this end I will continue to push forward conversations for a Regional Housing Bond in 2028.

I appreciate all the months of dialogue and the incredible amount of work that has gone into this upzoning plan and I know that it is our intent as a City to meet our housing needs without harming San Franciscans. I believe the amendments I have before you today will do just that. We can develop without displacement.

So again thank you, Chair Melgar and the entire Land Use Committee, for doing your due diligence of evaluating the Plan accordingly and reviewing our proposed amendments. I look forward to having your support.

Sincerely,

Connie Chan
Supervisor, District 1

City Hall • 1 Dr.Carlton B. Goodlett Place • Room 244 • San Francisco, California 94102-4689
Office (415) 554-7410 • TDD/TTY (415) 554-5227 • E-mail: Connie.Chan@sfgov.org

BOARD of SUPERVISORS

City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689
Tel. No. (415) 554-5184
Fax No. (415) 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. (415) 554-5227

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco's Land Use and Transportation Committee will hold a public hearing to consider the following proposals and said public hearing will be held as follows, at which time all interested parties may attend and be heard:

Date: **Monday, October 20, 2025**

Time: **1:30 p.m.**

Location: **Legislative Chamber, Room 250, located at City Hall**
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102

Subject: **File No. 250700.** Ordinance amending the Zoning Map to implement the Family Zoning Plan by: amending the Zoning Use District Maps to: 1) reclassify certain properties currently zoned as various types of Residential to Residential Transit Oriented - Commercial (RTO-C); 2) reclassify properties currently zoned Residential Transit Oriented (RTO) to Residential Transit Oriented - 1 (RTO-1); 3) reclassify certain properties from Residential districts other than RTO to RTO-1; 4) reclassify certain properties currently zoned Neighborhood Commercial (NC) or Public (P) to Community Business (C-2); and 5) reclassify certain properties from Public to Mixed-Use or Neighborhood Commercial Districts; amending the Height and Bulk Map to: 1) reclassify properties in the Family Zoning Plan to R-4 Height and Bulk District; 2) change the height limits on certain lots in the R-4 Height and Bulk District; and 3) designating various parcels to be included in the Non-Contiguous San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Sites Special Use District (SFMTA SUD); amending the Local Coastal Program to: 1) reclassify all properties in the Coastal Zone to R-4 Height and Bulk District; 2) reclassify certain properties to RTO-C and Neighborhood Commercial District; 3) designate one parcel as part of the SFMTA SUD; and 4) directing the Planning Director to transmit the Ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of public necessity, convenience, and welfare under Planning Code, Section 302; making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and making findings under the City's Local Coastal Program and the California Coastal Act of 1976.

Subject: **File No. 250701.** Ordinance amending the Planning Code to: 1) create the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program to incent housing development through a local bonus program and by adopting a Housing Sustainability District, 2) modify height and bulk limits to provide for additional capacity in well-resourced neighborhoods, and to allow additional height and bulk for projects using the local bonus program, 3) require only buildings taller than 85 feet in certain Districts to reduce ground level wind currents, 4) make conforming changes to the RH (Residential, House), RM (Residential, Mixed), and RC (Residential-Commercial) District zoning tables to reflect the changes to density controls, and parking requirements made in this ordinance, 5) create the RTO-C (Residential Transit Oriented-Commercial) District, 6) implement the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's Transit-Oriented Communities Policy by making changes to parking requirements, minimum residential densities, and minimum office intensities, and requiring maximum dwelling unit sizes, 7) revise off-street parking and curb cut obligations citywide, 8) create the Non-contiguous San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Sites Special Use District, 9) permit businesses displaced by new construction to relocate without a conditional use authorization and waive development impact fees for those businesses, 10) make technical amendments to the Code to implement the above changes, 11) make conforming changes to zoning tables in various Districts, including the Neighborhood Commercial District and Mixed Use Districts, and 12) reduce usable open space and bicycle parking requirements for senior housing; amending the Business and Tax Regulations Code regarding the Board of Appeals' review of permits in the Housing Choice Program Housing Sustainability District; also, amending the Local Coastal Program to implement the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program and other associated changes in the City's Coastal Zone, and directing the Planning Director to transmit the ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and making public necessity, convenience, and welfare findings under Planning Code, Section 302.

Subject: **File No. 250966.** Ordinance amending the General Plan to revise the Urban Design Element, Commerce and Industry Element, Transportation Element, Balboa Park Station Area Plan, Glen Park Community Plan, Market and Octavia Area Plan, Northeastern Waterfront Plan, Van Ness Avenue Area Plan, Western SoMa (South of Market) Area Plan, Western Shoreline Area Plan, Downtown Area Plan, and Land Use Index, to implement the Family Housing Zoning Program, including the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program, by adjusting guidelines regarding building heights, density, design, and other matters; amending the City's Local Coastal Program to implement the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program and other associated changes in the City's Coastal Zone, and directing the Planning Director to transmit the Ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and adopting findings of public necessity, convenience, and welfare under Planning Code, Section 340.

In accordance with Administrative Code, Section 67.7-1, persons who are unable to attend the hearing on these matters may submit written comments. These comments will be added to the official public record in these matters and shall be brought to the attention of the Board of Supervisors. Written comments should be addressed to Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board, City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA, 94102 or sent via email (bos@sfgov.org). Information relating to these matters are available with the Office of the Clerk of the Board or the Board of Supervisors' Legislative Research Center (https://sfbos.org/legislative-research-center-lrc). Agenda information relating to these matters will be available for public review on Friday, October 17, 2025.

For any questions about this hearing, please contact the Assistant Clerk for the Land Use and Transportation Committee:

John Carroll (john.carroll@sfgov.org ~ (415) 554-4445)

Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
City and County of San Francisco

jec:bjj:ams

San Francisco Examiner

PUBLIC NOTICES

Qualified for San Francisco and San Mateo Counties
File & Publish New Business Name: Examiner.DBAStore.com
Other Legal Notices: Examiner.LegalAdStore.com

San Francisco Examiner • Daly City Independent • San Mateo Weekly • Redwood City Tribune • Enquirer - Bulletin • Foster City Progress • Millbrae - San Bruno Sun • Boutique & Villager • Examiner - So. San Francisco • Examiner - San Bruno

GOVERNMENT

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MONDAY OCTOBER 20, 2025 - 1:30 PM Legislative Chamber, Room 250, City Hall 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco. CA 94102

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco's Land Use and Transportation Committee will hold a public hearing to consider the following proposals and said public hearing will be held as follows, at which time all interested parties may attend and be heard:

File No. 250700. Ordinance amending the Zoning Map to implement the Family Zoning Plan by: amending the Zoning Use District Maps to: 1) reclassify certain properties currently zoned as various types of Residential to Residential Transit Oriented - Commercial (RTO-C); 2) reclassify properties currently zoned Residential Transit Oriented (RTO) to Residential Transit Oriented - 1 (RTO-1); 3) reclassify certain properties from Residential districts other than RTO to RTO-1; 4) reclassify certain properties currently zoned Neighborhood Commercial (NC) or Public (P) to Community Business (C-2); and 5) reclassify certain properties from Public to Mixed-Use or Neighborhood Commercial Districts; amending the Height and Bulk Map to: 1) reclassify properties in the Family Zoning Plan to R-4 Height and Bulk District; 2) change the height limits on certain lots in the R-4 Height and Bulk District; and 3) designating various parcels to be included in the Non-Contiguous San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Sites Special Use District (SFMTA SUD); amending the Local Coastal Program to: 1) reclassify all properties in the Coastal Zone to R-4 Height and Bulk District; 2) reclassify certain properties to RTO-C and Neighborhood Commercial District; 3) designate one parcel as part of the SFMTA SUD; and 4) directing the Planning Director to transmit the Ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of public necessity, convenience, and welfare under Planning Code, Section 302; making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and making findings under the City's Local Coastal Program and the California Coastal Act of 1976.

File No. 250701. Ordinance amending the Planning Code to: 1) create the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program to incent housing development through a local bonus program and by adopting a Housing Sustainability District, 2) modify height and bulk limits to provide for additional capacity in well-resourced neighborhoods, and to allow additional height and bulk for projects using the local bonus program, 3) require only buildings taller than 85 feet in certain Districts to reduce ground level wind currents, 4) make conforming changes to the RH (Residential, House), RM (Residential, Mixed), and RC (Residential-Commercial) District zoning tables to reflect the changes to density controls, and parking requirements made in this ordinance, 5) create the RTO-C (Residential Transit Oriented-Commercial) District, 6) implement the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's Transit-Oriented Communities Policy by making changes to parking requirements, minimum residential densities, and minimum office intensities, and requiring maximum dwelling unit sizes, 7) revise off-street parking and curb cut obligations citywide, 8) create the Non-contiguous San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Sites Special Use District, 9) permit businesses displaced by new construction to relocate without a conditional use authorization and waive development impact fees for those businesses, 10) make technical amendments to the Code to implement the above changes, 11) make conforming changes to zoning tables in various Districts, including the Neighborhood Commercial District and Mixed Use Districts, and 12) reduce usable open space and bicycle parking requirements for senior housing; amending the Business and Tax Regulations Code regarding the Board of Appeals' review of permits in the Housing Choice Program Housing Sustainability District; also, amending the Local Coastal Program to implement the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program and other associated changes in the City's Coastal Zone, and directing the Planning Director to transmit the ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and making public necessity, convenience, and welfare findings under Planning Code, Section 302.

File No. 250966. Ordinance amending the General Plan to revise the Urban Design Element, Commerce and Industry Element, Transportation Element, Balboa Park Station Area Plan, Glen Park Community Plan, Market and Octavia Area Plan, Northeastern Waterfront Plan, Van Ness Avenue Area Plan, Western SoMa (South of Market) Area Plan, Western Shoreline Area Plan, Downtown Area Plan, and Land Use Index, to implement the Family Housing Zoning Program, including the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program, by adjusting guidelines regarding building heights, density, design, and other matters; amending the City's Local Coastal Program to implement the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program and other associated changes in the City's Coastal Zone, and directing the Planning Director to transmit the Ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and adopting findings of public necessity, convenience, and welfare under Planning Code, Section 340.

In accordance with Administrative Code, Section 67.7-1, persons who are unable to attend the hearing on these matters may submit written comments. These comments will be added to the official public record in these matters and shall be brought to the attention of the Board of Supervisors. Written comments should be addressed to Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board, City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA, 94102 or sent via email (bos@sfgov.org). Information relating to these matters are available with the Office of the Clerk of the Board or the Board of Supervisors' Legislative Research Center (https://sfbos.org/legislative-research-center-lrc). Agenda information relating to these matters will be available for public review on Friday, October 17, 2025.

For any questions about this hearing, please contact the Assistant Clerk for the Land Use and Transportation Committee: John Carroll (john.carroll@sfgov.org ~ (415) 554-4445)

EXM-3973931#

NOTICE OF REGULAR MEETING SAN FRANCISCO BOARD OF SUPERVISORS LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE CITY HALL, LEGISLATIVE CHAMBER, ROOM 250 1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT PLACE, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102 MONDAY, OCTOBER 6, 2025 - 1:30 PM

The agenda packet and legislative files are available for review at https://sfbos.org/legislative-research-center-lrc, in Room 244 at City Hall, or by calling (415) 554-5184.

EXM-3973907#

NOTICE OF REGULAR MEETING SAN FRANCISCO BOARD OF SUPERVISORS RULES COMMITTEE CITY HALL, LEGISLATIVE CHAMBER, ROOM 250 1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT PLACE, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102 October 6, 2025 – 10:00 AM

The agenda packet and legislative files are available for review at https://sfbos.org/legislative-research-center-lrc, in Room 244 at City Hall, or by calling (415) 554-5184.

EXM-3973812#

NOTICE OF SPECIAL MEETING SAN FRANCISCO BOARD OF SUPERVISORS GOVERNMENT AUDIT AND OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE CITY HALL, COMMITTEE ROOM 263 1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT PLACE SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102 October 6, 2025 - 12:00 PM

The agenda packet and legislative files are available for review at https://sfbos.org/legislative-research-center-lrc, in Room 244 at City Hall, or by calling (415) 554-5184.

EXM-3971474#

CIVIL

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME

Case No. 25CIV06662
Superior Court of California, County of SAN MATEO
Petition of: AI ZHEN XIAN AKA JANE AIZHEN XIAN AKA AIZHEN XIAN for Change of Name
TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS:
Petitioner AI ZHEN XIAN AKA JANE AIZHEN XIAN AKA AIZHEN XIAN filed a petition with this court for a decree changing names as follows:
AI ZHEN XIAN AKA JANE AIZHEN XIAN AKA AIZHEN XIAN to JANE AIZHEN XIAN
The Court orders that all persons interested in this matter appear before this court at the hearing indicated below to show cause, if any, why the petition for change of name should not be granted. Any person objecting to the name changes described above must file a written objection that includes the reasons for the objection at least two court days before the matter is scheduled to be heard and must appear at the hearing to show cause why the petition should not be granted. If no written objection is timely filed, the court may grant the petition without a hearing.
Notice of Hearing:
Date: 11/18/2025, Time: 9:00 A.M., Dept.: MC, Room: N/A
The address of the court is 400 COUNTY CENTER, REDWOOD CITY, CA 94063
(To appear remotely, check in advance of the hearing for information about how to do so on the court's website. To find your court's website, go to www.courts.ca.gov/find-my-court.htm.)
A copy of this Order to Show Cause must be published at least once each week for four successive weeks before the date set for hearing on the petition in a newspaper of general circulation, printed in this county: EXAMINER REDWOOD CITY TRIBUNE
Date: 9/15/2025

Judge of the Superior Court
9/26, 10/3, 10/10, 10/17/25
SPEN-3971404#
EXAMINER - REDWOOD CITY TRIBUNE

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME

Case No. CNC-25-56120
Superior Court of California, County of San Francisco
Petition of: Azar Saeidi for Change of Name
TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS:
Petitioner Azar Saeidi filed a petition with this court for a decree changing names as follows:
Azar Saeidi to Azar Sona Saeidi
The Court orders that all persons interested in this matter appear before this court at the hearing indicated below to show cause, if any, why the petition for change of name should not be granted. Any person objecting to the name changes described above must file a written objection that includes the reasons for the objection at least two court days before the matter is scheduled to be heard and must appear at the hearing to show cause why the petition should not be granted. If no written objection is timely filed, the court may grant the petition without a hearing.
Notice of Hearing:
Date: 11/04/2025, Time: 9 am, Dept.: 103, Room: 103
The address of the court is 400 McAllister Street San Francisco, CA-94102
A copy of this Order to Show Cause shall be published at least once each week for four successive weeks prior to the date set for hearing on the petition in the following newspaper of general circulation, printed in this county: - SAN FRANCISCO EXAMINER
Date: 09/18/2025
Michelle Tong
Judge of the Superior Court
9/26, 10/3, 10/10, 10/17/25
CNS-3971228#

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME

Case No. CNC-25-560132
Superior Court of California, County of SAN FRANCISCO
Petition of: JORDAN SUGAR-CARLSGAARD ON BEHALF OF MONROE MARGOT SUGAR-PICKLES, A MINOR for Change of Name
TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS:
Petitioner JORDAN SUGAR-CARLSGAARD filed a petition with this court for a decree changing names as follows:
MONROE MARGOT SUGAR-PICKLES to MONROE MARGOT SUGAR
The Court orders that all persons interested in this matter appear before this court at the hearing indicated below to show cause, if any, why the petition for change of name should not be granted. Any person objecting to the name changes described above must file a written objection that includes the reasons for the objection at least two court days before the matter is scheduled to be heard and must appear at the hearing to show cause why the petition should not be granted. If no written objection is timely filed, the court may grant the petition without a hearing.
Notice of Hearing:
Date: NOVEMBER 6, 2025, Time: 9:00 A.M., Dept.: 103, Room: 103
The address of the court is 400 MCALLISTER STREET, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102
(To appear remotely, check in advance of the hearing for information about how to do so on the court's website. To find your court's website, go to www.courts.ca.gov/find-my-court.htm.)
A copy of this Order to Show Cause must be published at least once each week for four successive weeks before the date set for hearing on the petition in a newspaper of general circulation, printed in this county: SAN FRANCISCO EXAMINER
Date: SEPTEMBER 23, 2025
MICHELLE TONG
Judge of the Superior Court
10/3, 10/10, 10/17, 10/24/25
CNS-3971201#
SAN FRANCISCO EXAMINER

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME

Case No. CNC-25-560088
Superior Court of California, County of SAN FRANCISCO
Petition of: MIA ROSE HAYNES for Change of Name
TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS:
Petitioner MIA ROSE HAYNES filed a petition with this court for a decree changing names as follows:
MIA ROSE HAYNES to MIA ROSE OUSSET
The Court orders that all persons interested in this matter appear before this court at the hearing indicated below to show cause, if any, why the petition for change of name should not be granted. Any person objecting to the name changes described above must file a written objection that includes the reasons for the objection at least two court days before the matter is scheduled to be heard and must appear at the hearing to show cause why the petition should not be granted. If no written objection is timely filed, the court may grant the petition without a hearing.
Notice of Hearing:
Date: OCTOBER 21, 2025, Time: 9:00 A.M., Dept.: 103N, Room: 103N
The address of the court is 400 MCALLISTER STREET, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102
(To appear remotely, check in advance of the hearing for information about how to do so on the court's website. To find your court's website, go to www.courts.ca.gov/find-my-court.htm.)
A copy of this Order to Show Cause must be published at least once each week for four successive weeks before the date set for hearing on the petition in a newspaper of general circulation, printed in this county: SAN FRANCISCO EXAMINER
Date: SEPTEMBER 5, 2025
MICHELLE TONG
Judge of the Superior Court
9/12, 9/19, 9/26, 10/3/25
CNS-3966299#
SAN FRANCISCO EXAMINER

FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAMES

FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT

File No. 2025-0407217
Fictitious Business Name(s)/Trade Name (DBA):
OMEN & AETHER, 1640 KIRKHAM ST APT 8, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94122
County of SAN FRANCISCO
Registered Owner(s):
MARIA KEEHN, 1640 KIRKHAM ST APT 8, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94122
This business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL
The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on 9/02/2025.
I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. (A registrant who declares as true any material matter pursuant to Section 17913 of the Business and Professions code that the registrant knows to be false is guilty of a misdemeanor punishable by a fine not to exceed one thousand dollars ($1,000).)
S/ MARIA KEEHN
This statement was filed with the County Clerk of San Francisco County on 09/02/2025.
NOTICE-In accordance with Subdivision (a) of Section 17920, a Fictitious Name Statement generally expires at the end of five years from the date on which it was filed in the office of the County Clerk, except, as provided in Subdivision (b) of Section 17920, where it expires 40 days after any change in the facts set forth in the statement pursuant to Section 17913 other than a change in the residence address of a registered owner. A new Fictitious Business Name Statement must be filed before the expiration. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a Fictitious Business Name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (See Section 14411 et seq., Business and Professions Code).
10/3, 10/10, 10/17, 10/24/25
CNS-3972840#
SAN FRANCISCO EXAMINER

FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT

File No. 2025-0407319
Fictitious Business Name(s)/Trade Name (DBA):
AFFIRM, 650 CALIFORNIA ST. 12TH FLOOR, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94108
County of SAN FRANCISCO
Registered Owner(s):
AFFIRM, INC, (DE) 650 CALIFORNIA ST., 12TH FLOOR, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94108
This business is conducted by: A CORPORATION
The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on 2/5/2013.
I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. (A registrant who declares as true any material matter pursuant to Section 17913 of the Business and Professions code that the registrant knows to be false is guilty of a misdemeanor punishable by a fine not to exceed one thousand dollars ($1,000).)
S/ KATHERINE ADKINS, SECRETARY
This statement was filed with the County Clerk of San Francisco County on 09/12/2025.
NOTICE-In accordance with Subdivision (a) of Section 17920, a Fictitious Name Statement generally expires at the end of five years from the date on which it was filed in the office of the County Clerk, except, as provided in Subdivision (b) of Section 17920, where it expires 40 days after any change in the facts set forth in the statement pursuant to Section 17913 other than a change in the residence address of a registered owner. A new Fictitious Business Name Statement must be filed before the expiration. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a Fictitious Business Name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (See Section 14411 et seq., Business and Professions Code).
10/3, 10/10, 10/17, 10/24/25
CNS-3972838#
SAN FRANCISCO EXAMINER

FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT

File No. M-301718
The following person(s) is (are) doing business as:
Garcia Home and Office Solutions, 1532 Day Ave, San Mateo, CA 94403 County of California
Sonia Maribel Garcia, 1532 Day Ave, San Mateo, CA 94403
This business is conducted by an Individual
The registrant(s) commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on 12/17/24.
I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. (A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime.)
S/ Sonia Garcia,
This statement was filed with the County Clerk of San Mateo County on 09/23/2025.
Mark Church, County Clerk
[Deputy], Deputy
Original
10/3, 10/10, 10/17, 10/24/25
NPEN-3972731#
EXAMINER - BOUTIQUE & VILLAGER

FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT

File No. 2025-0407333
Fictitious Business Name(s)/Trade Name (DBA):
FANCY MONKEYS PUBLISHING, 385 10TH STREET, APT 3, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94103
County of SAN FRANCISCO
Registered Owner(s):
ARIEL ONGOCO, 385 10TH STREET APT 3, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94103
This business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL
The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on 9/92025.
I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. (A registrant who declares as true any material matter pursuant to Section 17913 of the Business and Professions code that the registrant knows to be false is guilty of a misdemeanor punishable by a fine not to exceed one thousand dollars ($1,000).)
S/ ARIEL ONGOCO
This statement was filed with the County Clerk of San Francisco County on 09/16/2025.
NOTICE-In accordance with Subdivision (a) of Section 17920, a Fictitious Name Statement generally expires at the end of five years from the date on which it was filed in the office of the County Clerk, except, as provided in Subdivision (b) of Section 17920, where it expires 40 days after any change in the facts set forth in the statement pursuant to Section 17913 other than a change in the residence address of a registered owner. A new Fictitious Business Name Statement must be filed before the expiration. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a Fictitious Business Name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (See Section 14411 et seq., Business and Professions Code).
10/3, 10/10, 10/17, 10/24/25
CNS-3971878#
SAN FRANCISCO EXAMINER

FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT

File No. 2025-0407351
Fictitious Business Name(s)/Trade Name (DBA):
SHINE FACILITY SERVICES, 970 FOLSOM ST, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94107
County of SAN FRANCISCO
Registered Owner(s):
GREEN LIVING PLANET LLC, (CA), 970 FOLSOM ST,

CALIFORNIA NEWSPAPER SERVICE BUREAU

D A I L Y J O U R N A L C O R P O R A T I O N

Mailing Address : 915 E 1ST ST, LOS ANGELES, CA 90012
Telephone (800) 788-7840 / Fax (800) 464-2839
Visit us @ www.LegalAdstore.com

SF BOS (OFFICIAL) SF
CCSF BD OF SUPERVISORS (OFFICIAL NOTICES)
1 DR CARLTON B GOODLETT PL #244
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

EXM# 3973931

COPY OF NOTICE

Notice Type: GPN GOVT PUBLIC NOTICE

Ad Description

JEC - LUT HEARING - OCTOBER 20, 2025 - FILE NOS. 250700, 250701, and 250966

To the right is a copy of the notice you sent to us for publication in the SAN FRANCISCO EXAMINER. Thank you for using our newspaper. Please read this notice carefully and call us with ny corrections. The Proof of Publication will be filed with the County Clerk, if required, and mailed to you after the last date below. Publication date(s) for this notice is (are):

10/03/2025

The charge(s) for this order is as follows. An invoice will be sent after the last date of publication. If you prepaid this order in full, you will not receive an invoice.

Publication	$1719.90
Set aside for CCSF Outreach Fund	$191.10
Total	$1911.00

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MONDAY OCTOBER 20, 2025 - 1:30 PM Legislative Chamber, Room 250, City Hall 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco. CA 94102

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco's Land Use and Transportation Committee will hold a public hearing to consider the following proposals and said public hearing will be held as follows, at which time all interested parties may attend and be heard:

File No. 250700. Ordinance amending the Zoning Map to implement the Family Zoning Plan by: amending the Zoning Use District Maps to: 1) reclassify certain properties currently zoned as various types of Residential to Residential Transit Oriented - Commercial (RTO-C); 2) reclassify properties currently zoned Residential Transit Oriented (RTO) to Residential Transit Oriented - 1 (RTO-1); 3) reclassify certain properties from Residential districts other than RTO to RTO-1; 4) reclassify certain properties currently zoned Neighborhood Commercial (NC) or Public (P) to Community Business (C-2); and 5) reclassify certain properties from Public to Mixed-Use or Neighborhood Commercial Districts; amending the Height and Bulk Map to: 1) reclassify properties in the Family Zoning Plan to R-4 Height and Bulk District; 2) change the height limits on certain lots in the R-4 Height and Bulk District; and 3) designating various parcels to be included in the Non-Contiguous San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Sites Special Use District (SFMTA SUD); amending the Local Coastal Program to: 1) reclassify all properties in the Coastal Zone to R-4 Height and Bulk District; 2) reclassify certain properties to RTO-C and Neighborhood Commercial District; 3) designate one parcel as part of the SFMTA SUD; and 4) directing the Planning Director to transmit the Ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of public necessity, convenience, and welfare under Planning Code, Section 302; making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and making findings under the City's Local Coastal Program and the California Coastal Act of 1976.

File No. 250701. Ordinance amending the Planning Code to: 1) create the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program to incent housing development through a local bonus program and by adopting a Housing Sustainability District, 2) modify height and bulk limits to provide for additional capacity in well-resourced neighborhoods, and to allow additional height and bulk for projects using the local bonus program, 3) require only buildings taller than 85 feet in certain Districts to reduce ground level wind currents, 4) make conforming changes to the RH (Residential, House), RM (Residential, Mixed), and RC (Residential-Commercial) District zoning tables to reflect the changes to density controls, and parking requirements made in this ordinance, 5) create the RTO-C (Residential Transit Oriented-Commercial) District, 6) implement the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's Transit-Oriented Communities Policy by making changes to parking requirements, minimum residential densities, and minimum office intensities, and requiring maximum dwelling unit sizes, 7) revise off-street parking and curb cut obligations citywide, 8) create the Non-contiguous San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Sites Special Use District, 9) permit businesses displaced by new construction to relocate without a conditional use authorization and waive development impact fees for those businesses, 10) make technical amendments to the Code to implement the above changes, 11) make conforming changes to zoning tables in various Districts, including the Neighborhood Commercial District and Mixed Use Districts, and 12) reduce usable open space and bicycle parking requirements for senior housing; amending the Business and Tax Regulations Code regarding the Board of Appeals' review of permits in the Housing Choice Program Housing Sustainability District; also, amending the Local Coastal

A0000072180 92

Program to implement the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program and other associated changes in the City's Coastal Zone, and directing the Planning Director to transmit the ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and making public necessity, convenience, and welfare findings under Planning Code, Section 302.

File No. 250966. Ordinance amending the General Plan to revise the Urban Design Element, Commerce and Industry Element, Transportation Element, Balboa Park Station Area Plan, Glen Park Community Plan, Market and Octavia Area Plan, Northeastern Waterfront Plan, Van Ness Avenue Area Plan, Western SoMa (South of Market) Area Plan, Western Shoreline Area Plan, Downtown Area Plan, and Land Use Index, to implement the Family Housing Zoning Program, including the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program, by adjusting guidelines regarding building heights, density, design, and other matters; amending the City's Local Coastal Program to implement the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program and other associated changes in the City's Coastal Zone, and directing the Planning Director to transmit the Ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and adopting findings of public necessity, convenience, and welfare under Planning Code, Section 340.

In accordance with Administrative Code, Section 67.7-1, persons who are unable to attend the hearing on these matters may submit written comments. These comments will be added to the official public record in these matters and shall be brought to the attention of the Board of Supervisors. Written comments should be addressed to Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board, City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA, 94102 or sent via email (bos@sfgov.org). Information relating to these matters are available with the Office of the Clerk of the Board or the Board of Supervisors' Legislative Research Center (https://sfbos.org/legislative-research-center-lrc). Agenda information relating to these matters will be available for public review on Friday, October 17, 2025.

For any questions about this hearing, please contact the Assistant Clerk for the Land Use and Transportation Committee: John Carroll (john.carroll@sfgov.org ~ (415) 554-4445)

EXM-3973931#

San Francisco Planning

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

NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY

LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM AMENDMENT

(GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT, PLANNING CODE TEXT AMENDMENT, ZONING MAP AMENDMENT)

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT in accordance with the applicable provisions of the California Coastal Act and implementing regulations, drafts of the proposed amendments to the San Francisco General Plan, Zoning Map, Planning Code, and **Local Coastal Program** are available for public review and inspection for a six-week public review period beginning August 1, 2025.

Documents are available at the following locations and online:

San Francisco Planning Code, Zoning Map, and Local Coastal Program Implementation Plan Amendments:

- San Francisco Planning Department 49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103
- Office of the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA 94102
- https://sfbos.org/legislative-research-center-lrc (File Nos. 250700, 250701)
- City and County of San Francisco - File #: 250700
- City and County of San Francisco - File #: 250701

San Francisco General Plan and Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan Amendments:

- San Francisco Planning Department, 49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103
- https://citypln-m-extnl.sfgov.org/Commissions/CPC/7_17_2025/Commission Packet/2021-005878GPA.pdf

Ordinance and Local Coastal Program Amendment Description: Three Ordinances are proposed for adoption by the City. Because the Ordinances apply in part to property located in the Coastal Zone, enactment requires amending the Land Use Plan and Implementation Plan of the City's Local Coastal Program.

1) Board File No. 250700 - Ordinance amending the Zoning Map to implement the Family Zoning Plan by amending the Zoning Use District Maps to: 1) reclassify certain properties currently zoned as various types of Residential to Residential Transit Oriented - Commercial (RTO-C); 2) reclassify properties currently zoned Residential Transit Oriented (RTO) to Residential Transit Oriented - 1 (RTO-1); 3) reclassify certain properties from Residential districts other than RTO to RTO-1; 4) reclassify certain properties currently zoned Neighborhood Commercial (NC) or Public (P) to Community Business (C-2); and 5) reclassify certain properties from Public to Mixed-Use or Neighborhood Commercial Districts; amending the Height and Bulk Map to: 1) reclassify properties in the Family Zoning Plan to R-4 Height and Bulk District; 2) change the height limits on certain lots in the R-4 Height and Bulk District; and 3) designating various parcels to be included in the Non-Contiguous San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Special Use District (SFMTA SUD); **amending the Local Coastal Program to: 1) reclassify all properties in the Coastal Zone to R-4 Height and Bulk District; 2) reclassify certain properties to RTO-C and Neighborhood Commercial District; 3) designate one parcel as part of the SFMTA SUD; and 4) directing the Planning Director to transmit the Ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment;**

2) Board File No. 250701 - Ordinance amending the Planning Code to: 1) create the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program to incent housing development through a local bonus program and by adopting a Housing Sustainability District, 2) modify height and bulk limits to provide for additional capacity in well-resourced neighborhoods, and to allow additional height and bulk for projects using the local bonus program, 3) require only buildings taller than 85 feet in

certain Districts to reduce ground level wind currents, 4) make conforming changes to the RH (Residential, House), RM (Residential, Mixed), and RC (Residential-Commercial) District zoning tables to reflect the changes to density controls, and parking requirements made in this ordinance, 5) create the RTO-C (Residential Transit Oriented-Commercial) District, 6) implement the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's Transit-Oriented Communities Policy by making changes to parking requirements, minimum residential densities, and minimum office intensities, and requiring maximum dwelling unit sizes, 7) revise off-street parking and curb cut obligations citywide, 8) create the Non-contiguous San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Sites Special Use District, 9) permit certain Legacy Businesses to relocate without a conditional use authorization and waive development impact fees for those businesses, 10) make technical amendments to the Code to implement the above changes, and 11) make conforming changes to zoning tables in various Districts, including the Neighborhood Commercial District and Mixed Use Districts; amending the Business and Tax Regulations Code regarding the Board of Appeals' review of permits in the Housing Choice Program Housing Sustainability District; **amending the Local Coastal Program to implement the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program and other associated changes in the City's Coastal Zone, and directing the Planning Director to transmit the Ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment;**

3) Planning Commission Case Number 2021-005878GPA - Ordinance amending the General Plan to revise the Urban Design Element, Commerce and Industry Element, Transportation Element, Balboa Park Station Area Plan, Glen Park Community Plan, Market and Octavia Area Plan, Northeastern Waterfront Plan, Van Ness Avenue Area Plan, Western SoMa (South of Market) Area Plan, Western Shoreline Area Plan, Downtown Area Plan, and Land Use Index, to implement the Family Housing Zoning Program, including the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program, by adjusting guidelines regarding building heights, density, design, and other matters; **amending the City's Local Coastal Program to implement the Housing Choice- San Francisco Program and other associated changes in the City's Coastal Zone, and directing the Planning Director to transmit the ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment;**

The Planning Commission will consider these Amendments on or after September 11, 2025. The Planning Commission recommendation on these Amendments will be advisory to the Board of Supervisors, which has final approval authority over the San Francisco General Plan, Planning Code, Zoning Map, and Local Coastal Program Amendments.

The final decision by the Board of Supervisors will occur no sooner than six weeks after the date of this notice; after which the City shall submit the Local Coastal Program Amendments to the California Coastal Commission for certification. The Ordinances and Local Coastal Program Amendments are not operative within the Coastal Zone until final certification by the California Coastal Commission. If the California Coastal Commission certifies these Local Coastal Program Amendments, subject to modifications, the Local Coastal Program Amendments shall become effective 30 days after enactment of the modifications.

All interested persons are invited to comment on the draft amendment either in person at the scheduled public hearing, or in writing to the San Francisco Planning Department, 49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103 before September 11, 2025. If you wish to challenge the City's action on the above proceedings in court, you may be limited to addressing only those issues you or someone else have raised at the public hearing described in this notice or written in correspondence to the City at or before the public hearing.

For any questions about this Notice of Availability, please contact Amnon Ben-Pazi, Planning Department staff, at Amnon.Ben-Pazi@sfgov.org or call (628) 652-7428.

From:	Ben-Pazi, Amnon (CPC)
To:	Carroll, John (BOS)
Cc:	GUALCO, GIULIA (CAT)
Subject:	FW: Notice of Availability of Local Coastal Program Amendment
Date:	Monday, August 4, 2025 1:47:49 PM

John, FYI this is the email that went out 8/1.

Amnon Ben-Pazi, Senior Planner
Citywide Division
San Francisco Planning
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 628.652.7428 | www.sfplanning.org
San Francisco Property Information Map

From: San Francisco Planning Department <CPC.PlanningNews@sfgov.org>
Sent: Friday, August 01, 2025 12:00 PM
To: Ben-Pazi, Amnon (CPC) <amnon.ben-pazi@sfgov.org>
Subject: Notice of Availability of Local Coastal Program Amendment

San Francisco Planning logo

NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY: LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM AMENDMENT (GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT, PLANNING CODE TEXT AMENDMENT, ZONING MAP AMENDMENT)

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT in accordance with the applicable provisions of the California Coastal Act and implementing regulations, drafts of the proposed amendments to the San Francisco General Plan, Zoning Map, Planning Code, and **Local Coastal Program** are available for public review and inspection for a six-week public review period beginning August 1, 2025.

Documents are available at the following locations and online:

- **San Francisco Planning Code, Zoning Map, and Local Coastal Program Implementation Plan Amendments:**
  - San Francisco Planning Department 49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103
  - Office of the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA 94102
  - Board Of Supervisors File #250700

- Board Of Supervisors File #250701

- **San Francisco General Plan and Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan Amendments:**
  - San Francisco Planning Department, 49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103
  - Planning Commission Case Number 2021-005878GPA

Ordinance and Local Coastal Program Amendment Description: Three Ordinances are proposed for adoption by the City. Because the Ordinances apply in part to property located in the Coastal Zone, enactment requires amending the Land Use Plan and Implementation Plan of the City's Local Coastal Program.

1. **Board File No. 250700 - Ordinance amending the Zoning Map** to implement the Family Zoning Plan by amending the Zoning Use District Maps to: 1) reclassify certain properties currently zoned as various types of Residential to Residential Transit Oriented - Commercial (RTO-C); 2) reclassify properties currently zoned Residential Transit Oriented (RTO) to Residential Transit Oriented - 1 (RTO-1); 3) reclassify certain properties from Residential districts other than RTO to RTO-1; 4) reclassify certain properties currently zoned Neighborhood Commercial (NC) or Public (P) to Community Business (C-2); and 5) reclassify certain properties from Public to Mixed-Use or Neighborhood Commercial Districts; amending the Height and Bulk Map to: 1) reclassify properties in the Family Zoning Plan to R-4 Height and Bulk District; 2) change the height limits on certain lots in the R-4 Height and Bulk District; and 3) designating various parcels to be included in the Non-Contiguous San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Special Use District (SFMTA SUD); **amending the Local Coastal Program to: 1) reclassify all properties in the Coastal Zone to R-4 Height and Bulk District; 2) reclassify certain properties to RTO-C and Neighborhood Commercial District; 3) designate one parcel as part of the SFMTA SUD; and 4) directing the Planning Director to transmit the Ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment;**
2. **Board File No. 250701 - Ordinance amending the Planning Code** to: 1) create the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program to incent housing development through a local bonus program and by adopting a Housing Sustainability District, 2) modify height and bulk limits to provide for additional capacity in well-resourced neighborhoods, and to allow additional height and bulk for projects using the local bonus program, 3) require only buildings taller than 85 feet in certain Districts to reduce ground level wind currents, 4) make conforming changes to the RH (Residential, House), RM (Residential, Mixed), and RC (Residential-Commercial) District zoning tables to reflect the changes to density controls, and parking requirements made in this ordinance, 5) create the RTO-C (Residential Transit Oriented-Commercial) District, 6) implement the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's Transit-Oriented Communities Policy by making changes to parking requirements, minimum residential densities, and minimum office intensities, and requiring maximum dwelling unit sizes, 7) revise off-street parking and curb cut obligations citywide, 8) create the Non-contiguous San Francisco Municipal

Transportation Agency Sites Special Use District, 9) permit certain Legacy Businesses to relocate without a conditional use authorization and waive development impact fees for those businesses, 10) make technical amendments to the Code to implement the above changes, and 11) make conforming changes to zoning tables in various Districts, including the Neighborhood Commercial District and Mixed Use Districts; amending the Business and Tax Regulations Code regarding the Board of Appeals' review of permits in the Housing Choice Program Housing Sustainability District; **amending the Local Coastal Program to implement the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program and other associated changes in the City's Coastal Zone, and directing the Planning Director to transmit the Ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment;**

3. **Planning Commission Case Number 2021-005878GPA - Ordinance amending the General Plan** to revise the Urban Design Element, Commerce and Industry Element, Transportation Element, Balboa Park Station Area Plan, Glen Park Community Plan, Market and Octavia Area Plan, Northeastern Waterfront Plan, Van Ness Avenue Area Plan, Western SoMa (South of Market) Area Plan, Western Shoreline Area Plan, Downtown Area Plan, and Land Use Index, to implement the Family Housing Zoning Program, including the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program, by adjusting guidelines regarding building heights, density, design, and other matters; **amending the City's Local Coastal Program to implement the Housing Choice- San Francisco Program and other associated changes in the City's Coastal Zone, and directing the Planning Director to transmit the ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment;**

The Planning Commission will consider these Amendments on or after September 11, 2025. The Planning Commission recommendation on these Amendments will be advisory to the Board of Supervisors, which has final approval authority over the San Francisco General Plan, Planning Code, Zoning Map, and Local Coastal Program Amendments.

The final decision by the Board of Supervisors will occur no sooner than six weeks after the date of this notice; after which the City shall submit the Local Coastal Program Amendments to the California Coastal Commission for certification. The Ordinances and Local Coastal Program Amendments are not operative within the Coastal Zone until final certification by the California Coastal Commission. If the California Coastal Commission certifies these Local Coastal Program Amendments, subject to modifications, the Local Coastal Program Amendments shall become effective 30 days after enactment of the modifications.

All interested persons are invited to comment on the draft amendment either in person at the scheduled public hearing, or in writing to the San Francisco Planning Department, 49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103 before September 11, 2025. If you wish to challenge the City's action on the above proceedings in court, you may be limited to addressing only those issues you or someone else have raised at the public hearing described in this notice or written in correspondence to the City at or before the public hearing.

For any questions about this Notice of Availability, please contact Amnon Ben-Pazi,

Planning Department staff, at Amnon.Ben-Pazi@sfgov.org or call (628) 652-7428.

PLEASE DO NOT REPLY TO THIS AUTOMATED EMAIL.

中文詢問請電 (628) 652-7550.
Para información en Español llamar al (628) 652-7550.
Para sa impormasyon sa Tagalog tumawag sa (628) 652-7550.

Manage your preferences | Opt Out using TrueRemove™
Got this as a forward? Sign up to receive our future emails.
View this email online.

49 South Van Ness | San Francisco, CA 94103 US

This email was sent to amnon.ben-pazi@sfgov.org.
To continue receiving our emails, add us to your address book.

From:	Lagunte, Richard (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); BOS-Operations; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject:	5 letters regarding zoning
Date:	Tuesday, November 25, 2025 10:00:11 AM
Attachments:	File Nos 250700, 250701, 250966.pdf

Dear Supervisors,

Please see attached for 5 letters regarding Zoning.

File No. 250966: General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 250700: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan (Mayor, Sauter, Mahmood, Dorsey)

File No. 250701: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan (Mayor)

File No. 251072: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan (Mayor)

Regards,

Richard Lagunte
Office of the Clerk of the Board – Operations Division
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Voice (415) 554-7709 | Fax (415) 554-5163
richard.lagunte@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

Pronouns: he, him, his

Disclosures: *Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors' website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: agandi@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of ader gandi
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date: Friday, November 21, 2025 11:40:05 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I live on a narrow russian hill alley called lynch. This unchecked building boom is crazy. completely ruins the flavor os sf and legacy neighborhood. dont let this irreversible decision happen.

The Land Use Committee, on a vote of 2-1, has blocked Supervisor Chan's amendments and its Chair declined to invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Committee must advance these compliant amendments for the protection of sound housing, historic resources, and our coastline to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparent and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
ader gandi
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: rbinsf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Rita Pisciotta
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Sunday, November 23, 2025 9:52:15 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan,born and raised here in North Beach, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

My Italian Grandparents immigrated here to North Beach in 1898

Sincerely,
Rita Pisciotta
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: justintruong56@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Justin Truong
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 24, 2025 12:00:45 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Justin Truong

From: selizabethvaughan@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Susan Vaughan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 24, 2025 7:40:26 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisor Chan,

San Francisco is already build out. Increasing density will be hard to to without evicting and displacing current tenants and small businesses and demolishing the buildings they already occupy -- including the one that I occupy. Therefore, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes this demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

I am also an environmentalist, and I do not agree that evictions, displacement, and demolition are effective ways to protect the environment.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Susan Vaughan
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: lrb louisbiro.com
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Support for Tenant Protection Amendments in North Beach Family Zoning Plan
Date: Monday, November 24, 2025 8:34:47 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I hope this message finds you well. I am writing to express our strong support for all amendments aimed at protecting tenants within the proposed family zoning plan.

As you consider the upzoning changes, it is crucial to prioritize the needs and rights of the current tenants in our community. North Beach is not just a neighborhood; it is a vibrant community rich in history and diversity. We believe that the amendments designed to safeguard tenant rights will enhance our neighborhood's resilience, ensuring that long-standing residents can continue to call North Beach home.

The proposed family zoning plan offers a promising opportunity for growth and development in our area, but this growth should not come at the expense of our community's residents. It is vital that we create an inclusive environment that respects the contributions of all who live here, particularly those who have built their lives in North Beach over the years.

We appreciate your attention to this matter and urge you to consider our support for these important amendments. Protecting tenants is essential for maintaining the character and culture of our beloved North Beach community.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Louis Biro & Adrienne Biro Petrikovics

546 Filbert Street

San Francisco, CA 94133

From: D M LaPointe
Subject: Re: Family Zoning - continue item
Date: Monday, November 24, 2025 12:00:01 PM
Attachments: Melgar - 11-24-25 response.docx

Dear Supervisor Melgar,

Thank you for responding. Please find attached a response outlining legitimate concerns from your constituents in your reply and requesting additional clarification and information.

Denise

On 2025-11-21 20:24, Melgar, Myrna (BOS) wrote:

> Dear Denise and Members of the West of Twin Peaks Central Council,
>
> Thank you for your letter. Please find my response attached.
>
> The next Committee hearing on the rezoning items will be on Monday, December 1, 2025 at 1:30pm.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> Myrna
>
> ---
>
> **From:** D M LaPointe <president@westoftwinpeaks.org>
> **Sent:** Monday, November 17, 2025 8:32 AM
> **To:** Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>
> **Cc:** Wtpcc Delegates <wtpcc-delegates@googlegroups.com>; Wtpcc Officers <wtpcc-officers@googlegroups.com>; Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>; Segal, Ned (MYR) <ned.segal@sfgov.org>; Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC) <sarah.dennis-phillips@sfgov.org>; Tanner, Rachael (CPC) <rachael.tanner@sfgov.org>; Farrah, Michael (BOS) <michael.farrah@sfgov.org>
> **Subject:** Family Zoning - continue item
>
> This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.
>
> Please find attached a letter of concern from WTPCC on the Family Zoning Plan.
>
> --
> Denise M. LaPointe
> President
> WTPCC

Office of Supervisor Myrna Melgar, District 7
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 260
San Francisco, CA 94102
www.sfbos.org/melgar
Sign up to receive Supervisor Melgar's Newsletter

--
Denise M. LaPointe
President
WTPCC

West of Twin Peaks Central Council
A Resource for Neighborhood Organizations West of Twin Peaks in San Francisco since 1936

PO Box 27112
San Francisco, CA 94127

http://www.westoftwinpeaks.org/

November 24, 2025

Supervisor Myrna Melgar
Chair, Land Use and Transportation Committee

Supervisor Melgar,

Thank you for your response and for outlining your perspective as Chair of Land Use and Transportation on the Family Zoning Plan which was received after the close of business on November 21,2025. I appreciate the time you took to address several of the issues we raised. That said, there remain important points that deserve clarification if we are to maintain a constructive and transparent dialogue on a matter of such significant consequence to District 7 residents.

I do, however, want to better understand one particular line in your letter:

"These goals are not mutually exclusive, but neither should be held hostage by the other."

To be candid, this characterization is troubling. West of Twin Peaks Central Council (WTPCC) has raised substantive, good-faith concerns about the Family Zoning Plan's timing, implications, and state-law compliance to you, the Planning Department and the Mayor's office. Engaged neighborhood advocacy is not "hostage-taking," nor is it an attempt to obstruct the City's legal obligations. It is the core of civic participation - something I know you value. I would appreciate your clarification on why that framing was used and what, specifically, you believe our membership is "holding hostage."

Beyond that, several areas require further explanation if our member organizations are to fully understand the implications of the proposal:

First**,** while we understand the Charter deadlines that govern the General Plan Amendment, the community is seeking assurance that the accelerated timeline does not come at the expense of meaningful public review. The 90-day clock may be fixed, but thoughtful policymaking still requires engagement beyond procedural minimums - particularly on a zoning overhaul that will reshape long-established neighborhoods and our quality of life.

Second**,** you note that the City has been informed that density decontrol cannot be removed under current state compliance expectations. For many residents, this remains the most consequential component of the proposal. If this position is indeed immovable, we ask that your office clearly articulate what alternative adjustments are available to ensure predictability, impact mitigation, and neighborhood-appropriate outcomes across District 7.

Third, your letter references improvements the Board has made to the mayor's original legislation - including tenant protections, small business incentives, and safeguards for landmarks and historic buildings. We ask for a full summary of these amendments prior to December 1, 2025, so our member organizations can accurately understand their scope and effect.

While we recognize the legal framework imposed by state law, constituents expect their supervisor – our representative - to advocate for solutions that both comply with state requirements and reflect local conditions and impacts. West of Twin Peaks homeowners and residents want a zoning plan that achieves housing goals responsibly, without unforeseen consequences for infrastructure, public safety, schools, and neighborhood character. We believe these objectives are not only compatible but essential and achievable.

Our role is to represent the residents who will live with the consequences of these decisions. Your role is to ensure those concerns are fully considered, heard without dismissive language, and integrated into the City's policymaking rather than caricatured.

We remain willing partners in improving San Francisco's housing future. What we ask, respectfully, is that our concerns be met with the same seriousness and responsibility with which we bring them forward. We look forward to your clarification and to a continued dialogue rooted in mutual respect and accountability to the people of District 7.

Sincerely,
Denise LaPointe
President, West of Twin Peaks Central Council

Cc: Mayor Daniel Lurie
Board President, Supervisor Rafael Mandelman
WTPCC Delegates and interested neighbors

From:	Melgar, Myrna (BOS)
To:	D M LaPointe; Carroll, John (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS)
Cc:	Wtpcc Delegates; Wtpcc Officers; Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Segal, Ned (MYR); Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC); Tanner, Rachael (CPC); Farrah, Michael (BOS)
Subject:	Re: Family Zoning - continue item
Date:	Friday, November 21, 2025 5:24:44 PM
Attachments:	Melgar Response to WTPCC - 11.20.2025.pdf

Dear Denise and Members of the West of Twin Peaks Central Council,

Thank you for your letter. Please find my response attached.

The next Committee hearing on the rezoning items will be on Monday, December 1, 2025 at 1:30pm.

Sincerely,

Myrna

From: D M LaPointe <president@westoftwinpeaks.org>
Sent: Monday, November 17, 2025 8:32 AM
To: Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>
Cc: Wtpcc Delegates <wtpcc-delegates@googlegroups.com>; Wtpcc Officers <wtpcc-officers@googlegroups.com>; Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>; Segal, Ned (MYR) <ned.segal@sfgov.org>; Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC) <sarah.dennis-phillips@sfgov.org>; Tanner, Rachael (CPC) <rachael.tanner@sfgov.org>; Farrah, Michael (BOS) <michael.farrah@sfgov.org>
Subject: Family Zoning - continue item

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

Please find attached a letter of concern from WTPCC on the Family Zoning Plan.

--
Denise M. LaPointe
President
WTPCC

Office of Supervisor Myrna Melgar, District 7
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 260
San Francisco, CA 94102
www.sfbos.org/melgar
Sign up to receive Supervisor Melgar's Newsletter

Member, Board of Supervisors
District 7

City and County of San Francisco

MYRNA MELGAR

November 20, 2025

Ms. Denise LaPointe
President
West of Twin Peaks Central Council

RE: Letter Responding to Family Zoning Plan Deadline and State Law

Dear Ms. LaPointe,

I appreciate the time and effort you invested in outlining the concerns of the West of Twin Peaks Central Council. Your commitment to your neighborhoods is evident, and your voice is an important part of this conversation. That said, I need to be equally clear in my response.

The passage of the Family Zoning Plan cannot be delayed. The deadline is dictated by our own City and County Charter. If the Board of Supervisors fails to act within 90 days of receipt of the General Plan Amendment, which is part of the Zoning package, the General Plan Amendment will be deemed approved. It would be irresponsible for the Board to lapse on this timeframe. The vacancy of a member of the Board of Supervisors for District 4 created by the recall of the former District 4 representative can only be addressed by the Mayor, not the Board, but it cannot delay or stop the Board's work. We have a quorum, and the authority and responsibility to carry on our work. Additionally, I can assure you that former Supervisor Engardio did work on this plan extensively until he was recalled.

In addition, as you note in reference to recent communications from the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), extensions are not being considered at this time. The City has been informed that removal of density decontrol is likewise not on the table under current state compliance expectations. We cannot operate under the assumption that delay or rollback is a viable strategy when the state has been explicit about its requirements.

I also recognize and share concerns about SB 79, which is why my office advocated for amendments to ensure that it did not impede our ability to pass a local plan. This exemption is critical and sets the framework moving forward. The Family Zoning Plan, inclusive of density decontrol, would provide the City the ability to submit a compliant alternative plan that exempts the City now and into the future. SB 79 requires that the alternative plan be resubmitted for approval by 2032.

San Francisco must move forward within the legal and regulatory framework we are given. The Board of Supervisors has greatly improved on the Mayor's original legislation: we have added protections for tenants, incorporated incentives for small businesses, larger family-sized units, transparency in the process, protection for landmarks and historic buildings, and made the plan more workable for each district.

I respect the long history and civic stewardship of the West of Twin Peaks neighborhoods. I also believe that San Francisco must grapple honestly with its housing and land use responsibilities. These goals are not mutually exclusive, but neither should be held hostage by the other.

Thank you again for your letter and for your continued engagement.

Sincerely,

Myrna Melgar
Supervisor, District 7
San Francisco Board of Supervisors

City Hall • 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place • Room 244 • San Francisco, California 94102-4689 • (415) 554-6516 Fax
(415) 554-6546 • TDD/TTY (415) 554-5227 • E-mail: Myrna.Melgar@sfgov.org

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations; BOS Legislation, (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject:	4 Letters regarding Zoning
Date:	Friday, November 21, 2025 11:39:18 AM
Attachments:	4 Letters regarding Zoning.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached for 4 letters regarding Zoning.

File No. 250966: General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 250700: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan (Mayor, Sauter, Mahmood, Dorsey)

File No. 250701: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan (Mayor)

File No. 251072: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan (Mayor)

Sincerely,

Joe Adkins
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: Deanb182@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Dean Badessa
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, November 20, 2025 3:55:56 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Dean Badessa
San Francisco, CA 94109

From:	carobikam@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Robert Heisler
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Wednesday, November 19, 2025 8:24:20 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

The Land Use Committee, on a vote of 2-1, has blocked Supervisor Chan's amendments and its Chair declined to invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Committee must advance these compliant amendments for the protection of sound housing, historic resources, and our coastline to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparent and accountable planning, not obvious trained obedience to the developer syndicate.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Robert Heisler

From: debhowj@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Debra Leifer
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Wednesday, November 19, 2025 2:06:47 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I voted for Mayor Lurie and I am in favor of housing development. However, as both a long time resident of San Francisco, and someone who had a career of over 40 years in the architecture and design industry, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's current upzoning plan. To begin with - the proposed 8 story, 526 unit development over Safeway in my Outer Richmond neighborhood is totally out of scale with the neighborhood where the adjacent condo complexes are all just 3 stories high. Why not start building this 8 story, 526 unit at the abandoned Car wash site on Divisadero Street, which was slated for housing? Or, how about building these units at the Coronet Theatre and / or the Alexandria Theatre on Geary Blvd, both closed over 20 years ago and awaiting redevelopment? How about Park Merced where 4 towers were supposed to be built for additional housing?

It appears that Mayor Lurie's current upzoning plan incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displaces renters and small businesses, and transforms our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors. Therefore, we call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Debra Leifer
San Francisco, CA 94121

From:	Bob Fitch
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	demolition of rent controlled housing
Date:	Wednesday, November 19, 2025 9:27:24 AM

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

Any Supervisor who votes for an "up zoning plan" that includes demolition of existing housing will face a recall. period.

Bob Fitch
North Beach

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations; BOS Legislation, (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject:	43 Letters regarding Zoning
Date:	Wednesday, November 19, 2025 12:10:50 PM
Attachments:	43 Letters regarding Zoning.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached for 43 letters regarding Zoning.

File No. 250966: General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 250700: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan (Mayor, Sauter, Mahmood, Dorsey)

File No. 251071: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan (Mayor, Sauter, Mahmood, Dorsey)

File No. 250701: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan (Mayor)

File No. 251073: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations, Administrative Codes - Family Zoning Plan (Mayor)

File No. 251072: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan (Mayor)

Sincerely,

Joe Adkins
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From:	mel.e.simp@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Melinda Simpson
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 1:31:06 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Sincerely,
Melinda Simpson
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: mary.lipian@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mary Lipian
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 1:30:27 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am a long time resident in District 3 having lived there since 1997. This is the most highly concentrated area in the entire city and I'm concerned that the best interests of the residents are not being taken into account? How can that be?

North Beach and Telegraph Hill are magical and full of character. This is the Barbary Coast. Why would we want to change what is working so well? The 40 foot height limit needs to be protected to ensure this character.

I heard that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won’t invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

I feel strongly that the Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Mary Lipian
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: mpegdietz@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Margaret Dietz
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 1:25:01 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan and renter in District 3, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing AFFORDABLE rent-controlled buildings, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable (and therefore vacant) luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps - JUST DO THE MINIMUM TO MEET STATE MANDATES FOR NOW!
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Limit new construction to 6 stories.
Save the Coastal Zone from this.
City land must be used only if the housing is 100% AFFORDABLE.
Do not densify so-called "transit corridors" until Muni can handle it. The 38 GEARY is already too crowded and unpleasant to ride, forcing people back into their cars.
The Mayor's Plan is TOO EXTREME and not focused on Affordability.

Sincerely,
Margaret Dietz
San Francisco, CA 94109

From:	shopdicke@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Leslie Dicke
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 1:05:03 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

I'm a fourth generation San Franciscan who cares deeply about our city growing in a thoughtful and intelligent way that preserves character, enhances affordability and supports small business.

Sincerely,
Leslie Dicke
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: cutelynx@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Qi Wolf
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 1:01:47 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Qi Wolf
San Francisco, CA 94123

From:	cutelynx@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Qi Wolf
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 1:01:18 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Qi Wolf
San Francisco, CA 94123

From:	paulagiants@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Paula Katz
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 12:36:21 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

My name is Paula Katz and I am a decades-long District 4 homeowner and resident without a supervisor to represent me and the rest of District 4. We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

It's critical that the Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands. These amendments are important, and SF residents should know how each of their representatives stand on these critical amendments. Hopefully by that time we'll have a new D4 supervisor, and we'll want to know how she/he stands on both of these amendments, which I and many other D4 residents support.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance. This is useful information for all supervisors, as they will not have studied the Mayor's proposals as closely as the Land Use Committee has. And the HD's information will be critical for helping to educate our new supervisor and bringing them up to speed on this issue.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Sincerely,
Paula Katz
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: ms.pedroni@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lilianna Pedroni
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 12:28:25 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Lilianna Pedroni
San Francisco, CA 94133

From:	ms.pedroni@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lilianna Pedroni
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 12:27:56 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Sincerely,
Lilianna Pedroni
San Francisco, CA 94133

From:	sf.lorna@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lorna Walker
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 12:22:33 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Sincerely,
Lorna Walker
San Francisco, CA 94115

From: joanneshanahan135@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of joanne shanahan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 12:17:43 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

I am a 4th generation San Franciscan and was appalled when I heard that! You need to hear from all of us especially those that live in the affected areas. I realize the need for housing but what works for one neighborhood does not work for another. Please listen to us!

Sincerely,
joanne shanahan
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: rkinsf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Richard Kay
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 12:16:20 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

I honestly don't think that there's enough information available to the average San Franciscan. I can't tell by looking at maps, what my neighborhood will become. Please do more outreach! I haven't heard anything from my supervisor. thank you.

Sincerely,
Richard Kay
San Francisco, CA 94117

From:	awawd@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Ansel Wettersten
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 12:15:48 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Ansel Wettersten
San Francisco, CA 94109

From:	naplisa123@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Ann Napoli
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 12:12:37 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Sincerely,
Ann Napoli
San Francisco, CA 94127

From:	johngarrity@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Garrity
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 12:12:26 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
John Garrity
San Francisco, CA 94127

From:	familyadler@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of B Adler
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 12:10:10 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

My neighbors in the Sunset District are shocked to hear this lack of response and transparency!

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

We expect much better from our government.

Sincerely,
B Adler

From: shop@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of beth weissman
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 12:05:51 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
beth weissman
San Francisco, CA 94115

From:	ademas1@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Anita Demas
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 12:05:44 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

This upzoning is causing clear and deserved outrage. The fact that there are attempts to circumvent and silence the voices of constituents is unacceptable. This is clearly an ill-thought out and devastatingly impactful plan. As a 35+ year resident, I am disgusted and disappointed that the beauty of SF is at stake and that lawmakers are pandering to developers and others. I vote and your choices will be noted.

Dr. Anita Demas

Sincerely,
Anita Demas
San Francisco, CA 94118

From: jamiespiral55@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of J Sheldon
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 12:01:59 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisor Connie Chan,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments: I was born in San Francisco over 70 years ago, and have lived in District 1 for nearly 27 years. I urge you to not let Supervisor Melgar to block your and Chen's amendments ASAP.

Sincerely,
J Sheldon

From: marycmcf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mary McFadden
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 11:43:38 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Prohibiting public opinion is the opposite of representing one's constituents. To forbid oversight & prevent citizens from determining the shape of the city we built, we live in, & we maintain is anti-democratic and the opposite of what supervisors are elected to do. Melgar needs to be reminded that her job is to represent constituents, not special interests, developers, or her own ambitions.

Sincerely,
Mary McFadden
San Francisco, CA 94115

From: amy7w2m@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Amy Meyer
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 11:33:46 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I live in Lincoln Manor on Clement Street.

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

I am very concerned that full information come before the public at this meeting, in order to understand the full effects of the legislation.

Sincerely,
Amy Meyer
San Francisco, CA 94121

From:	wrthoma@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Walter Thoma
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 11:33:37 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

I have noticed an large increase in new multi-story housing complexes in my Excelsior neighborhood yet the infrastructure remains unchanged resulting in further congestion, poor law enforcement (we don't even have a police station) and lack of parking for residents and businesses. It's also unclear how many units are for lower income, elderly and working class San Franciscans. I personally believe that without analyzing the impact of increased housing on traffic, safety, public transit and quality of life issues, San Francisco will become an unlivable city for most outside of the wealthy class.

Sincerely,
Walter Thoma
San Francisco, CA 94112

From:	Paul Conroy
To:	Melgar, Myrna (BOS)
Cc:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); Lurie, Daniel (MYR)
Subject:	"Family Zoning Plan"
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 1:37:18 PM
Attachments:	To Supervisor Melgar re Family Zoning Plan.pdf

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

Dear Supervisor Melgar,
Ingleside Terraces Homes Association, representing your constituents and neighbors in Ingleside Terraces, again asks that you take steps to protect our neighborhood from the damage that will be inflicted by adoption of the "Family Zoning Plan" in its present form. This appeal follows on our August 29, 2025 letter to the mayor which we copied to you, setting forth a multitude of reasons why this unnecessary and destructive plan should be rejected. Our members have also provided public comment before your committee, expressing our strong concerns about this plan.

We reiterate those reasons, and further request that, if this plan is to be adopted, at a minimum: the amendments proposed to prevent demolition of sound housing and historic resources be adopted; density decontrol be removed; setbacks, height transitions and massing rules be preserved; forty-foot height limits be preserved for commercial corridors adjoining low scale residences; and historic resources, including category "A" structures, be preserved.

We also request that your committee postpone final consideration of this plan until our neighbors, the residents of District 4, have a new supervisor in place to represent their interests. We believe that every district should be represented by its own supervisor to advance the interests of that district's constituency. Certainly, the purpose of district elections is for communities within each district to be truly represented by a supervisor who has the best interests of their constituents at heart.

Very truly yours,
Paul Conroy, President
Ingleside Terraces Homes Association

Cc: Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Mayor Lurie
Ingleside Terraces Homes Association (ITHA) Board of Directors
All Ingleside Terraces residents via Email and ITHA Website
West of Twin Peaks Central Council

Neighborhoods United SF

Paul Conroy, President
Ingleside Terraces Homes Association
www.ithasf.org

Ingleside Terraces Homes Association

P.O. Box 27304 ● San Francisco, California 94127

November 17, 2025

The Honorable Myrna Melgar, Chair
Land Use and Transportation Committee
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Via email

Re: "Family Zoning Plan"

Dear Supervisor Melgar,

Ingleside Terraces Homes Association, representing your constituents and neighbors in Ingleside Terraces, again asks that you take steps to protect our neighborhood from the damage that will be inflicted by adoption of the "Family Zoning Plan" in its present form. This appeal follows on our August 29, 2025 letter to the mayor which we copied to you, setting forth a multitude of reasons why this unnecessary and destructive plan should be rejected. Our members have also provided public comment before your committee, expressing our strong concerns about this plan.

We reiterate those reasons, and further request that, if this plan is to be adopted, at a minimum: the amendments proposed to prevent demolition of sound housing and historic resources be adopted; density decontrol be removed; setbacks, height transitions and massing rules be preserved; forty-foot height limits be preserved for commercial corridors adjoining low scale residences; and historic resources, including category "A" structures, be preserved.

We also request that your committee postpone final consideration of this plan until our neighbors, the residents of District 4, have a new supervisor in place to represent their interests. We believe that every district should be represented by its own supervisor to advance the interests of that district's constituency. Certainly, the purpose of district elections is for communities within each district to be truly represented by a supervisor who has the best interests of their constituents at heart.

Very truly yours,

Paul Conroy, President
Ingleside Terraces Homes Association

Cc: Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Ingleside Terraces Homes Association (ITHA) Board of Directors
All Ingleside Terraces residents via Email and ITHA Website
West of Twin Peaks Central Council
Neighborhoods United SF

From: robert.stern47@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Robert Stern
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 2:45:13 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:
I also wanted to note that I'm a Sunset District resident, and these issues directly affect my neighborhood and my ability to remain in my home.

Sincerely,
Robert Stern
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: ajsmith@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Artemis Smith
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 2:44:53 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:
I also wanted to note that I'm a Sunset District resident, and these issues directly affect my neighborhood and my ability to remain in my home.

Sincerely,
Artemis Smith
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: soaring_leap@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lauren Meredith
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 2:38:30 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments: Upzoning should be about affordable housing and little else. And squeezing out public input on such a massively important issue is wildly unfair. Let Chan and Chen's amendments advance!

Sincerely,
Lauren Meredith
San Francisco, CA 94121

From:	antispila@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Candace Low
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 2:35:53 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Candace Low
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: sf_district6@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Michael Nulty
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 2:24:31 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees. Zoning can be done in phases and not all at once, for some reason the politicians are giving away the keys to the city!

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Michael Nulty
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: carolkellyclark@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Carol Clark
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 2:23:20 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am a resident in the West Portal area.
I reject any idea of buildings more 4 stories.
It is unnecessary to have huge high rise buildings in residential areas.
High rises belong downtown.

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's up zoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required.
This is not planning.

Sincerely,
Carol Clark
San Francisco, CA 94127

From:	kielygomes@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Karen Schwartz
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 2:19:32 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Karen Schwartz
San Francisco, CA 94114

From:	clarable@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Claire Mills
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 1:43:04 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Our city is our city and we all should be a part of this public process!

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountability.

Sincerely,
Claire Mills
San Francisco, CA 94123

From:	Devon Bolla
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	Ryan Patterson; Ephraim Margolin; Sonja Trauss
Subject:	Proposed Family Zoning Plan and Housing Element Implementation: File Nos. 250700, 250701, 251071, 251073, 250985, and 250966
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 2:44:12 PM
Attachments:	2025.11.17 Ltr re SF Family Zoning Plan - RJP.pdf

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

Good afternoon,

Attached for your review is a memo regarding a proposed family zoning plan and housing element implementation.

Thank you,

Devon J. Bolla
(she/her)
Paralegal
Patterson & O'Neill, PC
Office: (415) 907-9110
Direct: (415) 907-7703
Fax: (415) 907-7704
235 Montgomery Street, Suite 950
San Francisco, CA 94104
devon@pattersononeill.com
www.pattersononeill.com

This email may contain privileged or confidential material for the sole use of the intended recipient. Review or distribution by others is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the original sender and delete all copies. Nothing in this email or any attachments should be regarded as tax advice unless expressly stated.

From:	Ryan Patterson
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	Ephraim Margolin; Sonja Trauss; Devon Bolla
Subject:	RE: Proposed Family Zoning Plan and Housing Element Implementation: File Nos. 250700, 250701, 251071, 251073, 250985, and 250966
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 2:58:40 PM
Attachments:	2025.11.17 Ltr re SF Family Zoning Plan - RJP.pdf

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

Further to the below email, can you please kindly add the attachment to the above-captioned files?

Thank you very much,

Ryan J. Patterson
Patterson & O'Neill, PC
Main: (415) 907-9110
Direct: (415) 907-7701
Mobile: (530) 913-7609
Fax: (415) 907-7704
235 Montgomery Street, Suite 950
San Francisco, CA 94104
ryan@pattersononeill.com
www.pattersononeill.com

This email may contain privileged or confidential material for the sole use of the intended recipient. Review or distribution by others is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the original sender and delete all copies. Nothing in this email or any attachments should be regarded as tax advice unless expressly stated.

From: Devon Bolla <devon@pattersononeill.com>
Sent: Monday, November 17, 2025 2:43 PM
To: john.carroll@sfgov.org; Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
Cc: Ryan Patterson <ryan@pattersononeill.com>; Ephraim Margolin <emargolin@pattersononeill.com>; Sonja Trauss <sonja@yimbylaw.org>
Subject: Proposed Family Zoning Plan and Housing Element Implementation: File Nos. 250700, 250701, 251071, 251073, 250985, and 250966

Good afternoon,

Attached for your review is a memo regarding a proposed family zoning plan and housing

element implementation.

Thank you,

Devon J. Bolla
(she/her)
Paralegal
Patterson & O'Neill, PC
Office: (415) 907-9110
Direct: (415) 907-7703
Fax: (415) 907-7704
235 Montgomery Street, Suite 950
San Francisco, CA 94104
devon@pattersononeill.com
www.pattersononeill.com

This email may contain privileged or confidential material for the sole use of the intended recipient. Review or distribution by others is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the original sender and delete all copies. Nothing in this email or any attachments should be regarded as tax advice unless expressly stated.

PATTERSON & O'NEILL, PC

235 Montgomery Street, Suite 950
San Francisco, CA 94104
Telephone: (415) 907-9110
Facsimile: (415) 907-7704

November 17, 2025

VIA EMAIL

Chair Myrna Melgar
Land Use and Transportation Committee
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
49 South Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94103
john.carroll@sfgov.org
Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Proposed Family Zoning Plan and Housing Element Implementation
File Nos. 250700, 250701, 251071, 251073, 250985, and 250966

Dear Chair Melgar and Honorable Supervisors:

Our office represents Yes In My Back Yard ("YIMBY Law"), a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization whose mission is to enforce state housing laws. We write to share our concerns regarding San Francisco's proposed Family Zoning Plan ("FZP"). Our comments incorporate the comments of YIMBY Action and its members, including the attached letters dated September 11, 2025 and October 29, 2025.

I. The City Will Violate the Housing Element Law if it Adopts the FZP Knowing that it Will Not Produce the Required Housing Units

The City's 6th cycle housing element noted that the City was unable to identify enough sites to accommodate the number of units for lower- and moderate-income households, including a 15% buffer, that it was assigned to plan for during its 6th cycle ("RHNA Shortfall"). The Department of Housing and Community Development, therefore, directed the City to include a program in its housing element identifying sites for rezoning to accommodate these units as mandated by the Housing Element Law. (Gov. Code § 65584.09(a)-(b); Gov. Code § 65583(c)(1); *Martinez v. City of Clovis* (2023) 90 Cal. App. 5th 193, 225.) However, the City's proposed rezoning program—Program 7.1.1— and the FZP, which implements Program 7.1.1, are inadequate because (1) the City's own analysis found that the FZP will not create enough units for the City to meet its RHNA Shortfall; (2) the FZP will not create sufficient capacity because it relies on density decontrol in residential neighborhoods without corresponding changes in development standards; and (3) the FZP's local alternative to the state Density Bonus Law will not increase

density because it is duplicative of existing capacity under the state Density Bonus Law.

A. The Chief Economist's Report Confirms that the FZP Will Not Create Enough Units for the City to Meet its RHNA Shortfall

On October 29, 2025, the City's Chief Economist published a report, which found that the FZP will produce **less than half** the number of housing units that the City is required to plan for to meet its RHNA Shortfall – in more than double the time allowed. The report concluded that in a best-case scenario, the FZP would only produce around 14,600 additional units over the next 20 years, representing just 40% of the 36,282 units the City is required to plan for over the next eight years. Under a low-growth scenario, the FZP would only produce 8,504 units over 20 years. Either scenario is inadequate and would be a spectacular failure of the City to comply with the Housing Element Law, which requires local governments to plan to meet their RHNA shortfall through rezoning programs. (Gov. Code § 65583(c)(1) and Gov. Code § 65583.2(h).)

B. The FZP Will Not Create Sufficient Capacity Because it Relies on Density Decontrol in Single-Family Neighborhoods But Does Not Create Room for Additional Density

The FZP uses form-based zoning without corresponding changes in development standards in single-family neighborhoods, which means developers cannot build in these areas. Therefore, the FZP does not actually increase capacity in these neighborhoods.

The FZP uses form-based zoning (also called density decontrol), which regulates the allowed density on a site by setting limits on height, bulk, setbacks, and other features (rather than setting numerical density limits). And while the City claims that the change from the existing numerical density limits to form-based zoning will produce additional units, its refusal to ease the existing limitations on height, bulk, and other standards that limit the buildable envelope for construction in these neighborhoods means there is no actual capacity to build additional units. For example, a lot with an existing single-family home that occupies most or all of the buildable area is unlikely to be redeveloped into multifamily housing because without easing height limits, setbacks, parking minimums, and the like, there will be no place to build the additional units.

The FZP promises to increase density, but its use of form-based density without easing height limits, setbacks, parking minimums, and other development standards will prevent building in the City's highest-resourced neighborhoods.

C. The FZP's Alternative to the State Density Bonus Law Does Not Add Sufficient Density

The City contends that its local alternative to the state Density Bonus Law will create additional capacity for housing production, and it relies on that claim to meet its RHNA shortfall. However, almost all of the capacity that the City is relying on is already available for housing production through the state Density Bonus Law, so the City's local alternative is duplicative of existing capacity under the state Density Bonus Law.

The state Density Bonus Law requires local agencies to grant density bonuses under the state law to qualifying projects. (Gov. Code § 65915(a)(1)-(b).)

The FZP would give applicants a local alternative to the state Density Bonus Law called Housing Choice-San Francisco ("HCSF"). Crucially, HCSF does not offer any increase in density beyond what is offered by the state Density Bonus Law in most locations. Moreover, when both the state Density Bonus Law and HCSF are available, applicants can only avail themselves of one.

The state Density Bonus Law is intended as a bonus on *top* of local rules. (Gov. Code § 65915(u)(1).) But the HCSF offers no increase in density beyond what developers are already entitled to under the state Density Bonus Law when a project is eligible for both. Therefore, the HCSF does not create the additional capacity required by the Housing Element Law.

II. The City Fails to Use the Required "Analytical Model" to Determine the Likelihood of Site Development

The FZP fails to use the "analytical model" required by the City's housing element. When a city includes a program in its housing element, the Housing Element Law makes it mandatory to implement the features of those programs. (Gov. Code § 65581(b); Gov. Code § 65583(c)(1); *Hoffmaster v. City of San Diego* (1997) 55 Cal.App.4th 1098.)

Program 7.1.1 of the City's housing element commits the City to implementing a rezoning program that "reasonably account[s] for sites' likelihood of development during the planning period using an analytical model." In addition to the Housing Element Law, which makes it mandatory for the City to use an "analytical model," the City's housing element uses mandatory language, stating that the City "shall" build its rezoning program around such a "probability-of-development" analysis. The FZP, however, fails to use an "analytical model," in violation of the housing element. Instead, the FZP uses three alternative methods to estimate how many housing units the FZP will produce, none of which meets the requirements of Program 7.1.1.

First, the City proposes using a "soft sites" method, which assumes that a site that is already developed with a residential use has a two percent probability of being redeveloped with the FZP's planned residential capacity, and a site that is already developed with a non-residential use has a seventy percent probability of redevelopment with a residential use. This assumption is just that, and not an analytical model. Such rigid calculations based on uniform, citywide assumptions about the odds of development on thousands of very different sites are not an "analytical model" and do not "reasonably account for sites' likelihood of development" as required by Program 7.1.1.

Second, the City assesses the likelihood of a given site being developed under the rezoning proposal using a model that evaluates whether new housing is financially feasible at a given site. The model assumes that two percent of sites currently occupied by residential uses and thirty-five percent of other sites will be redeveloped with economically feasible new housing developments. Again, this is not an "analytical model" that "reasonably account[s] for sites' likelihood of development" as required by Program 7.1.1 because its assumptions are not grounded in historical development standards in San Francisco, and its focus on financial feasibility is a distinct concept from focusing on "the probability of development." It may be financially feasible for a property to be redeveloped, but that same property can have a low likelihood of being redeveloped for a variety of reasons, especially for single-family homes that play a big role in the FZP, and which already contain high-value structures or the property owner faces financial constraints, lack of development experience, or the need to use the property for their own housing. Moreover, even if this method were accurate, it projects only 19,000 new units of housing over the planning period – far below the requirement of 36,282 new units.

The third model that the City relies on involves examining the rate at which units across the City were approved using historical data from 2005-2023 and multiplying that by the theoretical capacity of the sites. This model does not qualify as an "analytical model" because it ignores the fact that much of the development in the City in recent years has taken place on vacant sites or extremely underutilized land. In fact, around 25% of sites that were redeveloped from 2005-2023 had residential uses before redevelopment, while around 84% of sites under the FZP have residential uses. Non-vacant sites already containing residential uses are 70% less likely to be redeveloped according to the City's own analysis, and the FZP errs in assuming that non-vacant and vacant sites will be redeveloped at the same rate. (*See* Housing Element, Appendix B.2, Figure 2.) Since the FZP mostly contains parcels with residential uses, unlike past development, this approach of extrapolating from past development does not correspond to future development predictions.

The areas where housing would be built under the FZP already contain high-value structures, such as single-family homes, where the owners are unlikely or unable to redevelop the site as multi-family housing due to financial constraints, lack of development experience, and the need to use their properties for their own housing.

These areas will have much lower rates of redevelopment, which this model does not take into account. Moreover, this model has unrealistically low estimates of the City's residential zoning capacity in prior years (thus inflating the share of residential zoned capacity that has been built out) and the inclusion of residential projects built under development agreements, which do not correspond to rezonings, and which were separately counted towards the City's pre-existing residential zoned capacity in the housing element. These two reasons disqualify this model from being an "analytical model."

Additionally, the FZP does not create sufficient capacity because it assumes certain large pipeline projects will actually be constructed within the planning period, when in reality such development is exceedingly unlikely – if not impossible. For the Hunters Point/Candlestick project, approximately 3,500 units are located on Navy-owned parcels. The City will not even obtain control of these parcels until the Navy finishes remediation, which is estimated to take at least 11 more years. ("The Navy has recently informed OCII that completion of remediation and conveyance of all portions of the Shipyard Site, excluding Parcel F, to Developer will occur between 2036-2038 . . . ." (Resolution No. 26-2024, available at https://sfocii.org/sites/default/files/2024-08/5.%20RESO%2026-2024_HPS%20Approval%20of%20Amendments%20to%20Redevelopment%20Plan.pdf; *see also* https://www.sfchronicle.com/sf/article/hunters-point-shipyard-radioactive-materials-21129542.php.) Similarly, Treasure Island's phasing includes a maximum of 4,600 units completed before 2031, but the City is counting all 8,000 units toward the pipeline. (*See* https://media.api.sf.gov/documents/Ex._JJ_-_SOP.pdf; Treasure Island Sub-Phase Application 3, Schedule of Performance, Exh. JJ, Appendix B, https://media.api.sf.gov/documents/TI_Sub-Phase_Application_3_Book-Revision_1_-_reduced.pdf.)

Since none of the three models that the City considers qualifies as a reasonable "analytical model," the City is violating its legally binding commitment under Program 7.1.1.

III. The FZP Adds New Constraints On Housing Production and Fails to Analyze the Impact of These Constraints

The FZP adds new constraints on housing development, which were not analyzed in its housing element, in violation of the Housing Element Law and Senate Bill ("SB") 330.

A. The FZP's New Constraints Violate the Housing Element Law

The FZP adds new constraints on housing production, which it fails to analyze as required by the Housing Element Law. When considering rezoning plans, the Housing Element Law requires local governments to analyze new governmental constraints on housing production. (Gov. Code § 65583(a)(5); *see also Californians*

for Homeownership, Inc. v. City of Beverly Hills (2023) Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCP00143, at p. 6, [finding planned rezonings for housing element site inventory must analyze new constraints].)

The FZP adds new constraints on development that were not analyzed by the City's housing element, including caps on dwelling unit size, limits on curb cuts, lower parking maximums, and limits imposed by the City's local alternative to the state Density Bonus Law. As explained above, the FZP imposes new constraints because it deprives applicants of the ability to use the state Density Bonus Law in conjunction with the City's local alternative to the state Density Bonus Law, which reduces the number of units the FZP will produce. Other constraints reduce physical development capacity, e.g., caps on dwelling unit size that cannot accommodate larger families, and reduce the economic feasibility of developing housing. The FZP does *not* analyze the impact of these policies on housing production. The FZP, therefore, violates the Housing Element Law's requirement that local governments analyze new governmental constraints on housing production if they were not analyzed in a housing element. (Gov. Code § 65583(a)(5).)

B. The FZP's New Constraints Violate SB 330's Prohibition Against Rezonings Which Decrease Housing Intensity

The FZP's new constraints on housing violate SB 330's prohibition against rezonings which "lessen the intensity of housing." (Gov. Code § 66300(b)(1)(A).)

SB 330—also known as the Housing Crisis Act—prohibits local governments from enacting a development policy, standard, or condition that would "Chang[e] the general plan land use designation, specific plan land use designation, or zoning of a parcel or parcels of property to a less intensive use or reduc[e] the intensity of land use within an existing general plan land use designation, specific plan land use designation, or zoning district below what was allowed under the land use designation and zoning ordinances of the affected county or affected city, as applicable, as in effect on January 1, 2018[.]" (*Id.*) SB 330 defines "less intensive use" as including situations where a local government imposes reductions to the height, density, or floor area ratio, new or increased open space or lot size requirements, new or increased setback requirements, minimum frontage requirements, maximum lot coverage limitations, or "*any other action that would individually or cumulatively reduce [a] site's residential development capacity*." (*Id.*; emph. added.)

As mentioned above, the FZP contains new constraints on housing, including caps on dwelling unit size, limits on curb cuts, and lower parking maximums, reduces the number of units the FZP will produce. These new constraints run afoul of SB 330 because they reduce the size of units that applicants are able to construct, which physically reduces the intensity of residential use and reduces the financial viability of residential construction. The City has also conducted no analysis to show

that there will be a concurrent increase in intensity of land use to offset the decrease in intensity of land use caused by the FZP. (Gov. Code § 66300(h).)

IV. The FZP Violates the Housing Element Law By Relying on an Overlay for Nonvacant Sites Where Development of Nonresidential Uses Is Permitted

The FZP violates the recent decision in *New Commune v. City of Redondo Beach et al.* (2025) 337 Cal.Rptr.3d 782 that overlays cannot be used to meet minimum density requirements required by rezoning programs if they permit developers to redevelop sites for non-residential uses.

As explained above, when a local government cannot accommodate its RHNA Shortfall for lower-income households with a site inventory, it has to include a rezoning program in its housing element. The Housing Element Law also requires jurisdictions that must develop rezoning programs to ensure that at least 50% of the lower income housing the agency must plan for is "accommodated on sites designated for residential use and for which nonresidential uses or mixed uses are not permitted." (Gov. Code § 65583.2(h)(2).) As the City acknowledges in Program 7.1.1, it is subject to this statutory minimum density requirement.

In *New Commune*, the court ruled that residential "overlays are unlawful when they allow development below the statutory minimum density [required by Gov. Cod § 65583.2(h)(2)]." (*Id*. at 797.) The court in *New Commune* also noted that residential overlays are unlawful whether they are overlaid over a base zoning that permits residential or industrial and commercial uses. (*Id*.)

The FZP runs afoul of the *New Commune* decision and the Housing Element Law's minimum density requirement because it still permits nonresidential redevelopment of sites. The FZP is an overlay because it does not change the base zoning of properties, but is instead overlaid over existing zones, including non-residential zones. For instance, for properties subject to the FZP developers can still use the underlying C-2 and C-3 zoning to construct commercial structures, which would be below the statutory minimum density because no residential units would be constructed. By permitting developers to build nonresidential projects within the overlay, the FZP violates the Housing Element Law as explained by the court in *New Commune*.

V. The FZP Violates the Prohibition against Jurisdictions Forcing Applicants to Waive Their Right to Use the State Density Bonus Law

The FZP primarily relies on a local alternative to the state Density Bonus Law, which developers can only use if they waive their right to use the state Density Bonus Law. This is a violation of the state Density Bonus Law.

Local agencies are prohibited from adopting ordinances that conflict with the state Density Bonus Law or using their local alternative to impose development requirements that are more restrictive than the state Density Bonus Law. (*Schreiber v. City of Los Angeles* (2021) 69 Cal.App.5th 549.) The court in *Schreiber* made it clear that applicants have the right to use the state Density Bonus Law regardless of any local provisions, and that cities cannot deny, limit, or condition the use of the state Density Bonus Law by requiring an applicant to instead use a local alternative.

The FZP creates a local alternative to the state Density Bonus law called Housing Choice-San Francisco ("HCSF"). HCSF—proposed Planning Code Section 206.10(b)(5)—has only one criterion: that applicants agree to "not receive any density or development bonuses or relief from applicable Planning Code standards in any other State or local law or program[.]" HCSF violates the state Density Bonus Law's prohibition that local agencies cannot bar an applicant from using the state Density Bonus Law, regardless of any local provisions. The FZP illegally forces applicants to choose between the state Density Bonus Law and HCSF, which violates the rule that "an otherwise valid local ordinance that conflicts with the state Density Bonus Law is preempted." (*Latinos Unidos Del Valle De Napa Y Solano v. County of Napa* (2013) 217 Cal.App.4th 1160, 1169.) The City must amend the FZP so that the state Density Bonus Law can be used on *top* of the HCSF, which has the potential to create meaningful housing production.

VI. Conclusion

We urge the City to comply with the law and remedy the deficiencies in its rezoning plan. If the City fails to significantly increase its proposed residential capacity, there will be no realistic chance of meeting its RHNA obligations. YIMBY Law is prepared to take legal action to hold the City accountable for these clear violations of state housing law.

PATTERSON & O'NEILL, PC

Ryan J. Patterson
General Counsel for Yes In My Back Yard

CC CA Department of Housing and Community Development
Mayor Daniel Lurie

Encl. September 11, 2025 Letter from Yes In My Back Yard
October 29, 2025 Letter from Yes In My Back Yard
October 29, 2025 Report from the Chief Economist of San Francisco

EXHIBIT A

YIMBY Law

2261 Market Street STE 10416
San Francisco, CA 94114
hello@yimbylaw.org

9/11/2025

San Francisco Planning Commission
400, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

(via email) commissions.secretary@sfgov.org

Re: San Francisco's Draft Housing Rezoning Program and Compliance with State Law

Dear Commissioners,

YIMBY Law is a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization dedicated to ensuring compliance with California's housing laws. We write today to express significant concerns regarding the City's proposed Housing Element Rezoning Program and the accompanying "Housing Choice–San Francisco" local bonus ordinance.

Summary

While the rezoning plan, including the local program, is a good step forward for housing in San Francisco, we are concerned that the plan does not actually fulfill what it promises to do. The city has produced no publicly available reports that show how the plan will be more capable of delivering the housing San Franciscans desperately need than what state laws already allow. While we support density decontrol, we do not believe the city has shown that the handful of incentives that are coupled with it will be enough to produce any more housing than state laws such as the Density Bonus Law already do.

Capacity Projections

San Francisco's Housing Element made a binding commitment to meet its Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) through a rezoning program rooted in a probabilistic analytical model Program 7.1.1. San Francisco did not base its rezoning on a site's inventory, but on the projected housing based on that model. The targets and assumptions it sets are enforced by Program 8.1.5. If San Francisco does not produce sufficient units, Program 8.1.5. applies additional upzoning requirements.

Despite the City's commitments to specific unit production, applying the city's own model used to determine the shortfall on the rezone sites, we can determine that the map would produce around 17k homes by 2031, or 47% of the 36k units promised by Program 7.1.1. That regression analysis was built on different logic than the Housing Element's existing capacity analysis. While the proposal does not clearly make up for the RHNA shortfall, its usefulness is difficult to gauge when it functions by different logic than the original rezoning analysis. In order to be comprehensible, realistic, and enforceable, San Francisco must produce a "realistic capacity" table for the rezoned sites that incorporates the Housing Element' regression analysis.

We understand that the City has conducted its own analysis that disputes these figures, but the methodology and details of this analysis have not been made publicly available; therefore we remain concerned and skeptical about the efficacy of the rezoning program in meeting the city's needed housing requirements under housing element law.

Compliance with State Law

San Francisco's rezoning program would institute a local density bonus program that, theoretically, according to the city's assertions (which are not supported by any publicly available information), would accommodate the City's RHNA shortfall. The practical and legal realities according to our analysis suggest that it would fail to produce housing at the suggested rates, and fail to meet statutory requirements.

The latest staff report associated with the September 11 Planning Commission hearing notes that 77% of parcels in the rezoning plan fall into the form based zoning code and will not have their heights increased, while for "the vast majority of residential sites, these changes are only available for projects opting into the local program."

Some proposed areas not eligible for the state bonus would benefit from San Francisco's local program. However, this local program would be exclusive to California's state density bonus law in all areas where both options are available. Whether or not the local program is superior to state incentives, the one cannot replace the other. State density bonus law is intended as a bonus on top of local rules, and should not be supplanted when it generally offers superior development potential.

San Francisco's density decontrol is generally less feasible than the state program. While we applaud the city for applying a local density bonus program to projects between 2-4 units, which are not otherwise eligible for the state density bonus, as well as allowing alternatives to providing on-site affordable units, such as off-site developments, for the vast majority of the city's proposed "rezoning" program, state density bonus law offers a superior alternative: unlimited waivers from local zoning and development standards,

providing limited discretion for local review. Comparatively, the local program is far more stringent. It contains strict rules about building size, setbacks, open space, dwelling unit exposure, and parking allowances. It contains only a 15% reduction of other development standards. The proposal would allow for greater than 15% reductions if approved by a discretionary process. Even if that expensive, time consuming process doesn't result in universal denials, it renders the project not code compliant, forcing the developer to lose protections under the Housing Accountability Act.

While we support the majority of the proposed staff changes made to the local program, we believe that they do not go far enough to ensure that the local program is a superior alternative to state density bonus law. For example, the proposal to require projects with 5+ units to reserve a minimum of 25% of the units for 2+BR units is a constraint that is not required under state density bonus law that will negatively impact density potential for the local program. Additionally, the proposed local program not only requires applicants to choose to give up their option to pursue waivers and incentives under state density bonus law, but *any other* state program that provides its own bonuses or waivers from local zoning, such as AB 2011, which offers waivers of local side and rear setback requirements when those requirements limit feasibility, limits front setback requirements, and allows 55 foot heights, which are greater than the 40 foot height limits proposed for the majority of the local program's rezoned sites.

This proposal not only replaces state density bonus allowances with a worse option, it places new constraints on any such developments via inclusionary requirements and requiring new wind studies on construction. These constraints were not reviewed in the Housing Element, meaning that they may not be imposed or that San Francisco must amend its Element to account for those constraints. New constraints must be accounted for in the Element, to demonstrate how San Francisco can realistically meet its RHNA requirements.

San Francisco must also analyze how this program would interact with existing land use regulations. Transfer taxes, inclusionary requirements, and impact fees are key drivers of unit loss, but have not been incorporated into any City analyses yet. We encourage the City Economist to incorporate them into any future analysis of this program.

Even if all of these deficiencies are corrected, they cannot make up for the requirement to change the base zoning of parcels, as required by Housing Element law and HCD interpretation. Under the new scheme, San Francisco would not change its zoned capacity, and therefore would not comply with state law. Density bonuses must add capacity on top of that allowed for in the zoning code.

Conclusion

Given the substantial deficiencies in San Francisco's rezoning program and the speculative nature of its local density bonus ordinance, the City's Housing Element certification is at risk. The burden is on San Francisco to demonstrate compliance. The use of analytical models that inflate development probability, the reliance on unproven local bonus mechanisms, and the introduction of new constraints all undermine that burden. In short, the program is not legally defensible as currently drafted, with the limited information supporting the city's conclusions that it exceeds the city's RHNA obligation

YIMBY Law has taken legal action against the City of Los Angeles for a similar failure to deliver a legally compliant rezoning program. We sincerely hope litigation will not be necessary in San Francisco. However, San Francisco will be vulnerable to lawsuits from parties working to ensure that the City complies with state law and delivers a realistic path toward housing affordability and accessibility.

We urge the Board to direct Planning to:

- Re-run the BlueSky regression analysis used for the Housing Element's "existing capacity" estimate on the rezoning proposal to produce a transparent, realistic capacity table that is made publicly available.

- Incorporate the waiver and incentive framework of SDBL into the local bonus program, or ensure that projects can access SDBL concurrently.

- Remove new constraints on development introduced by the ordinance.

- Ensure that the rezoning program meets or exceeds the 36,282-unit requirement via base zoning and that its methodology aligns with Program 7.1.1.

The stakes for San Francisco are high. We urge the City to correct course by allowing the use of density bonus and other state programs in combination with the local program.

Sincerely,

Jack Farrell, Esq.
Research Attorney
YIMBY Law

EXHIBIT B

From:	Jane Natoli
To:	paul.mcdougall@hcd.ca.gov
Cc:	gustavo.velasquez@hcd.ca.gov; melinda.coy@hcd.ca.gov; Zisser, David@HCD; megan.kirkeby@hcd.ca.gov; shannan.west@hcd.ca.gov; Frank, Lisa@HCD; Herrera, Fidel@HCD; matthew.struhar@doj.ca.gov; david.pai@doj.ca.gov; alex.fisch@doj.ca.gov; Annie Fryman; Tanner, Rachael (CPC); Chen, Lisa (CPC); Sonja Trauss; matt@caforhomes.org; senator.wiener@senate.ca.gov; Severiano.Christian@sen.ca.gov; Mohtashemi, Raayan; David Broockman; Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Supervisors; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Bonde, Aly (MYR); Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC)
Subject:	SF YIMBY"s letter on the City Economist"s report
Date:	Wednesday, October 29, 2025 4:13:34 PM
Attachments:	SF YIMBY FZP Letter October 29 2025.pdf

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

Hello,

We are writing to urgently draw your attention to the just released report from the City Economist that shows San Francisco's rezoning will not meet our state housing requirements. Please see our attached letter, and let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you,

--

Jane Natoli (she/her)
San Francisco Organizing Director
415-335-9950

Check out everything we achieved in 2024!

Paul McDougall, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Mayor Daniel Lurie
San Francisco Board of Supervisors (re: file #250700)
October 29, 2025

We write to urgently draw your attention to **an analysis the City of San Francisco ("SF") released that finds that its own rezoning plan would violate state law.** The Family Zoning Plan ("FZP") is a significant step forward, but the city's analysis found that it will not meet the city's Housing Element's 36,282-unit requirement. **According to the city's own numbers, state law requires the city to conduct additional rezoning beyond the FZP.**

As a reminder, in 2022, the California Department of Housing and Community Development ("HCD") suggested that, instead of a traditional sites inventory, SF instead pledge to assess the capacity of its rezoning using the method from its underutilized sites analysis (a model called BlueSky, which estimates the likelihood of development). Housing Element Program 7.1.1 thus committed that SF's rezoning "shall reasonably account for sites' likelihood of development during the planning period using an analytical model."

SF's August submission to HCD revealed that SF still had not done so (see Appendix). HCD thus instructed SF that "As part of Program 7.1.1 and using analytical models to account for a site's likelihood of development in the planning period, the city should continue to explore additional and multiple methods and make adjustments as appropriate."

Today, SF did so: its City Economist reported that he used an updated version of the BlueSky analytical model—the same method HCD originally suggested SF use—to estimate the number of units the FZP will likely develop. **He reported that, in the best case scenario, the City's analytical model finds that the FZP is only likely to develop 14,646 units by 2045, far less than the 36,282 required by 2031** under 7.1.1. In other words, **using the exact method HCD suggested SF use, the City itself has found that its rezoning plan does not meet Program 7.1.1's requirements, and is around 10 times too small.**

Gov. Code § 65588(e)(4)(C)(iii) states, "If a jurisdiction...fails to complete the required rezoning within the time period required, the jurisdiction's adopted housing element shall be subject to" the housing element decertification process. Thus, **if SF fails to expand its plan, HCD will be legally obliged to begin the decertification process**.

We encourage HCD to offer SF guidance about how to bring its proposed rezoning into compliance, building on HCD's recent guidance to the city to "make adjustments as appropriate" when more analysis was made available. For example, using recent changes in state law (e.g., SB 131, SB 79), additional rezoning or policy changes that supplement the FZP (e.g., reduced fees and exactions) could be passed within months. Given the timeline required for decertification, HCD could reasonably offer SF up to six months before the builders' remedy would apply to fully complete its "required rezoning" through such a supplement.

Confirming that SF must rely on the City Economist's updated BlueSky analytical model to assess the rezoning's capacity, as well as the actions taken to satisfy Program 8.1.5 (the "circuit breaker"), would also be consistent with HCD's recent direction to the city to "us[e] conservative assumptions...that facilitate the highest housing outcomes."

SF's actions risk paving a path for other cities to evade state law. In particular, rather than "demonstrat[ing] that the existing use [on each non-vacant site] does not constitute an impediment to additional residential development" (Gov. Code, § 65583.2(g)), cities will be tempted to follow SF: promise in a Housing Element to provide this evidence later in the form of statistical analysis—but then ignore what this evidence shows when rezoning.

Best regards,

Salim Damerdji

Volunteer Lead, San Francisco YIMBY

Jane Natoli

San Francisco Organizing Director,

YIMBY Action

CC: Gustavo Velasquez, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Megan Kirkeby, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Melinda Coy, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Shannan West, California Department of Housing and Community Development
David Zisser, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Lisa Frank, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Fidel Herrera, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Alex Fisch, California Department of Justice
Matthew Struhar, California Department of Justice
David Pai, California Department of Justice
Annie Fryman, SPUR
Aly Bonde, Office of Mayor Daniel Lurie
Sarah Dennis-Phillips, Rachael Tanner, and Lisa Chen, San Francisco Planning
Sonja Trauss, YIMBY Law
Matt Gelfand, Californians for Homeownership
Senator Scott Wiener

Appendix: Why the Planning Department's methods do not satisfy the Housing Element's requirement to "reasonably account for sites' likelihood of development during the planning period using an analytical model"

The San Francisco Planning Department's August 1 submission to HCD contained three analyses of the capacity provided by its rezoning. None of these analyses satisfy Program 7.1.1's commitment to "reasonably account for sites' likelihood of development during the planning period using an analytical model." The below details why each of the Planning Department's methods do not satisfy this requirement. Indeed, a closer look at the Planning Department's analyses suggests conclusions that are in line with the City Economist's finding that the rezoning is insufficient.

"Soft Sites Method"

Under this method, the vast majority of the rezoning's capacity is from sites without existing residential uses (but that largely have other uses). The Planning Department assumes that 70% of these sites will be developed to their maximum capacity during the planning period. This 70% assumption is not "reasonabl[e]" (and certainly not "conservative" like the city claims):

1. In San Francisco, fewer than 70% of entitled projects are ultimately developed — making it implausible that 70% of all sites without residential use will be developed, even those where no interest has been expressed in development or discontinuing existing uses. As another comparison, the Terner Center found that only 8.6% of LA's very best sites are developed over 5 years (versus SF's 70% assumption across a huge number of sites).
2. These sites largely do have other non-residential uses which make their development especially improbable. For example, the first page of SF's parcel list includes 1201-05 Columbus Avenue, a 3-story Travelodge in Fisherman's Wharf. The city assumes there is a 70% chance that properties like this will be redeveloped during the planning period.
3. The city's related assertion that 2% of sites with existing residential uses will be redeveloped during the planning period is similarly made without evidence.

This approach also allows the city to evade complying with GC 65583.2(g)'s requirement that the city provide substantial evidence that existing uses on "lower income" sites are likely to be discontinued during the planning period. The city has not provided site-specific evidence supporting their assertion that most sites with existing non-residential uses will be developed during the planning period. The lack of site-specific evidence would not be a problem if the city had provided statistical evidence (i.e., had statistically estimated what percent of these sites will have their existing use discontinued during the planning period based on historical data, as action 7.1.1 promises). But the Planning Department simply provides no evidence whatsoever that 70% of sites with existing non-residential uses will be developed, either site-specific or

statistical. This 70% figure is simply fabricated — not from “an analytical model,” and it is not at all “reasonable.”

“Citywide Capacity Method”

This method calculates what share of the city’s remaining zoned capacity was developed annually over the last 18 years (2005-2023). It then assumes the new capacity created by the rezoning will be developed at a similar annual rate.

While reasonable in theory, there are several errors and problems with how the Planning Department is implementing this approach that make it not “reasonabl[e]” in practice:

1. The city has two versions of this approach, each with errors:
    a. The primary version (with “exclusions”) divides citywide development by the amount of capacity on only a subset of parcels. This overstates the rate at which capacity historically translates into development because less capacity is considered despite all development being considered. This is like computing the average grades of all students in a class by adding up all students’ grades but then dividing this total by half the number of students there are in the class.
    b. The city describes another version of the method that measures capacity on all parcels but uses Planning entitlements to measure development; during this period there were 90K entitlements but only 53K building permits. Using entitlements to measure development overstates the historical development rate, as in San Francisco many entitlements are never developed (in part due to constraints the city places on development).
2. The city’s statistic that 53K units were constructed citywide 2005-2023 includes development from development agreements (DAs). By counting historical DA development when computing the rate at which historical zoned capacity is developed, the city therefore assumes that the rezoning will produce new DA development during this planning period. This is unreasonable, as DAs do not result from (re)zoning. Furthermore, the city’s housing element already counted expected development from DAs during the planning period in its claims of existing capacity.
3. Parcels where projects have been proposed but have not received permits are excluded from the city’s calculation of its historical capacity; this leads the city to underestimate how much historical capacity it had, and therefore overstate the development rate of its capacity.
4. The new rezoned capacity is also less developable than the existing remaining capacity. Specifically, according to the city’s Bluesky model (the model it used for its underutilized sites analysis), the new capacity is about 20% less likely to be developed. This is because, for example, rezoned capacity is 3x more likely to be on sites with an existing residential use than existing capacity. It’s therefore not entirely reasonable to assume that the city’s historical rate of development will manifest for the new capacity.

5. The Planning Department is relying on its UrbanSim tool to measure its remaining zoned capacity (313K). But the city's housing element (Sites Inventory Appendix B2 p. 4) gives a much larger number for this (572K), as do our own calculations. Insofar as the city is now understating how much capacity it has, it is therefore overstating the rate at which that capacity has been developed. We have asked for data that would help us understand this discrepancy, but the city has indicated that its UrbanSim tool is unable to provide the underlying data that supports this 313K calculation.

When addressing the first four errors and issues above, and when using the city's housing element's estimate that the city has 572K units of capacity remaining (see point 5), the historical development rate is 0.4% and the adjusted capacity of the rezoning is therefore 10K units.

"Financial Feasibility Method"

The Planning Department has contracted with UrbanSim to estimate whether development will be economically feasible on rezoned parcels. While this analysis is welcome, there are several problems with this approach:

1. Totaling the amount of economically feasible development does not "account for sites' likelihood of development." Historically, only a fraction of economically feasible units are actually developed, and some research practitioners have advised us that there is nearly an order of magnitude difference between the two.
2. The Planning Department's economic assumptions are not "reasonabl[e]": the Department assumes that construction costs, interest rates, and developer return expectations will drop without providing evidence. It also assumes rents will jump. The Department justifies these optimistic assumptions by asserting that it is only responsible for making housing feasible to develop under better economic conditions than are likely during this planning period — but action 7.1.1 commits to providing enough capacity to make 36K units likely developed during this planning period. Furthermore, the city's poor economic environment for development reflects the city's constraints on development that Housing Element Law is supposed to remediate. I.e., the fact that the city so heavily constrains development makes more rezoning (and changes to its other policies) necessary, and cannot be ignored when considering the appropriate scope of actions to accommodate development.
3. The Department's submission describes a flawed approach for using UrbanSim's output to account for the likelihood of development: asserting that 2% of economically feasible projects will occur on sites with existing residential uses and 35% of economically feasible projects will occur on sites with other non-residential uses. These assumptions are not based on any evidence and, for the same reasons we described in the context of the "soft sites" method, are not reasonable.
4. After applying this flawed approach for accounting for the likelihood of development, the Planning Department nevertheless finds that only 19K units will be developed during the planning period. This is short of the 36K required by action 7.1.1. The Planning

Department argues that this is acceptable because the method must only demonstrate sufficient capacity for meeting the city's 16K RHNA shortfall in the Moderate and Above-Moderate income categories. But action 7.1.1 makes no reference to separate by-category targets, it simply states that the rezoning must "accommodate… approximately 36,282 new units." Furthermore, the Department's argument is also belied by the Housing Element Law and the No Net Loss Law, both of which contemplate development of market-rate and mixed-income projects on "lower income" sites (GC 65583.2(c) & (h); GC 65863(c)(2)).

EXHIBIT C

Family Zoning Plan: Economic Impact Report

Office of the Controller
Office of Economic Analysis

Items 250700 & 250701
October 29, 2025

Introduction

- Two proposed ordinances would change zoning controls to permit more housing on a large segment of San Francisco, particularly on the western half of the city. They implement changes to the Housing Element of the City's General Plan, a planning document whose revisions were adopted in 2023.
- The Ordinance in file #250700, the Zoning Map Amendment, would generally raise allowable building heights along commercial corridors and transit lines, to permit mid-rise and some high-rise development.
- The Ordinance in file #250701 implements the Housing Choice-San Francisco program, which offers an alternative to the State Density Bonus program.
- The Office of Economic Analysis (OEA) has prepared this report because the proposed legislation may have a material impact on the city's economy. This report uses a model that estimates potential new development, in order to assess economic impact. That model is not a replacement for the City's estimates of realistic capacity under Government Code § 65583.2.

Zoning Map Amendment: Key Provisions

- The Zoning Map Amendment would make changes to allowable building heights and bulk, and/or zoning districts, in over 92,000 parcels in the city.
- The vast majority are residential parcels, whose allowable heights would either remain at 40 feet, or rise to 50 or 65 feet.
- On these and many other rezoned parcels, the Housing Choice San Francisco program (described on the next page) relaxes existing controls on the number of housing units allowed on a parcel.
- Allowable heights are generally increased to 65 to 85 feet along many commercial corridors, with development along wider streets near transit stations or major lines increased to 85 feet.
- Heights above 140 feet are allowed on certain streets that currently allow high-rise development or have larger parcels, at key intersections, and near certain major transit routes and stations. The map on page 5 provides additional details.

Housing Choice San Francisco – Key Provisions

- The Housing Choice San Francisco program, or “Local Program”, gives developers an alternative to the State Density Bonus.
- Many of the rezoned residential parcels are too small to be eligible for the State Density Bonus, but may achieve greater density through the use of the Local Program.
- Local Program users also gain benefits associated with housing unit mix, methods of complying with inclusionary housing requirements, rear-yard and setback requirements, broad code flexibility, and certain process changes.
- The ordinance has several other provisions, including limiting the maximum size of new residential units, reducing allowable parking, and restricting new curb cuts. These policy changes are not considered in this report.
- Additionally, the proposed ordinance gives displaced businesses the right to relocate anywhere in the city where their activity is permitted by zoning, without a conditional use permit, and waives development impact fees associated with the relocation.

Details of the Rezoning



The map to the left, from the City Planning department, indicates which parcels in the city will be rezoned, and to which heights. It reflects the plan as of July.

Gray parcels will be zoned for low-rise, 40-50 feet housing developments. This includes single-family residential zones, within which greater density will be permitted via the Local Program.

Yellow and orange parcels will be upzoned to mid-rise development of 65-105 feet.

Pink and purple parcels will have height limits ranging from 120-180 feet, and the blue and green parcels will be upzoned for high-rise development, of 240 feet or greater.

The Rezoning and the Regional Housing Needs Assessment

- Each jurisdiction in California is required to have its Housing Element be certified by the State's Housing and Community Development Department.
- Certification involves, among other things, ensuring that the City has the zoning capacity to meet the city's obligations under the State's Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA).
- RHNA is a Statewide planning process, in which future needs are forecasted for metropolitan areas, and then allocated to the individual cities and counties that administer land use planning.
- In San Francisco's case, the RHNA obligation requires the City to have realistic capacity for approximately 82,000 new housing units, at different economic levels, within an 8-year planning period ending in 2031.
- Of this 82,000 unit requirement, the City must create capacity for approximately 36,000 units.

Substitutions and Proposed Amendments

- On September 30, a new version of #250700 was substituted by Mayor Lurie, which made relatively minor zoning changes on a number of parcels. This analysis reflects those changes.
- On October 21, Supervisor Melgar proposed an amendment that would prohibit the use of the Local Program on any parcel containing more then two existing housing units, which would involve the demolition of a unit subject to rent control.
- Also on October 21, Supervisor Sauter introduced an amendment that creates incentives for developers to replace lost commercial space.
- As the language of these two amendments was made public less than one week ago, this report does not attempt to model their economic impact.

Economic Impact Factors

- When the City relaxes zoning controls, by reducing density restrictions or increasing allowable heights, more development projects will become financially feasible, and the supply of housing in the city will rise.
- This increased supply will put downward pressure on housing prices in the city. Cheaper housing benefits city residents who move within the city, and also makes San Francisco more affordable for new arrivals.
- The development of new housing also stimulates investment and employment in construction and related industries.
- The population growth associated with new housing also stimulates the local economy, by expanding the numbers of workers and consumers.
- On the other hand, the limited amount of vacant lots in the city means that new housing generally involves the loss of existing buildings, including both residential and commercial properties. This can impose relocation and other costs on residential and commercial tenants.

Estimating the Likelihood of New Housing Development

- The amount of new housing that the rezoning will produce is an important contributor to its economic impact. To estimate this, OEA refined a statistical model that it has used since 2016 to estimate the impact of policy changes on housing production in the city[1].
- The model was the result of statistical analysis of housing production in San Francisco over the 2004-2024 period. Technical details on the model are provided in the Appendix.
- The first part of the model estimates the likelihood that multifamily housing will be developed on a given parcel, in a given year. The statistical analysis found that a parcel is more likely to develop when:
  - it has smaller existing buildings (or is vacant), and is located closer to downtown.
  - its zoning allows for a greater height, makes it eligible for the State Density Bonus, and does not restrict the number of units that may be constructed.
  - housing prices are relatively high, and construction costs are relatively low, compared to other years.

Estimating the Number of Units Produced

- The second part of the model estimates the number of units that will be produced when a parcel does develop housing. Based on past experience, the statistical analysis found that a parcel developing housing will produce more units when:
  - its land area and allowable maximum height are greater;
  - it is eligible for the State Density Bonus;
  - its zoning does not restrict the number of units that may be built.
- The OEA used the first part of the model to estimate the probability that housing will be built on a parcel over the next twenty years[2]. That probability was multiplied by the estimate of housing units from the second part, to create an expected number of housing units generated for each parcel over twenty years. When this is summed across all parcels, a citywide housing total is generated.
- This method was used to create estimates of housing production under the existing zoning, and the proposed rezoning. The difference is the estimate of housing that could be produced as a result of the proposed zoning changes.

Limitations of the Housing Development Model

- The housing development model can forecast future housing development based on the city's past experience, but important caveats must be made.
- Because of data availability, not every factor that affects housing production could be included. Missing data may include features of the parcel itself, or policies that may have changed over the 2004-24 period, or vary within the aggregated zoning designations used by the model.
- Limited data also prevents the analysis of fine-grained policy changes in the proposed rezoning, such as restrictions on unit size and mix.
- Several new City and State policies that were intended to encourage housing production have been enacted in recent years, such as, for example, the City's 2023 Housing Production Ordinance (0248-23). The model may be unable to properly assess the impact of these policies in the future.
- Despite these limitations, the OEA believes this approach is well-suited to estimating housing production, for the purposes of economic impact reporting.

Future Housing Market Scenarios

- As noted earlier, the amount of housing that will be produced as a result of the rezoning, and its economic impact, will depend on future housing market conditions. This creates an additional level of uncertainty in the forecasts.
- Gauging future market conditions is further complicated by changes in the city's housing market since the COVID-19 pandemic, as described on the next page.
- To understand the scope of what could potentially happen, the OEA created two future scenarios for housing prices and costs in San Francisco.
- In a high-growth scenario, San Francisco's housing prices, relative to the U.S., return to pre-COVID levels by 2030, and grow at the city's pre-COVID rate after that. Construction costs are assumed to grow at the same rate as inflation.
- In a low-growth scenario, San Francisco's post-COVID relative housing prices are assumed to represent a "new normal," and housing prices are assumed to grow only at a national average level over the next twenty years. Construction costs are also assumed to grow at the same rate as inflation.

San Francisco and U.S. Housing Price Trends Since 2000



While San Francisco's housing has always been expensive, during the 2010s, average San Francisco condo prices rose much faster than the rest of the U.S., to as much as 5 times the typical U.S. price.

Since 2020, however, San Francisco condo prices have declined, despite rising inflation and rising U.S. condo prices. Adjusted for inflation, typical San Francisco condo prices in 2025 are 25% lower than they were in 2019.

Among other factors, the increase in remote office work during COVID has reduced the value of a residence near large office employment centers like downtown San Francisco.

Source: Zillow. Data retrieved October 1, 2025.

Housing Price Trends Within the City



Source: Zillow. Data retrieved October 1, 2025.

The reduced value of a downtown location has also shifted multifamily price patterns within the city.

Condos in neighborhoods like Downtown and South of Market have experienced inflation-adjusted price drops of more than 40% since 2016, while the Richmond and Sunset have fallen by far less.

Because most multifamily housing in the city is near downtown, but most of the proposed rezoning is not, the use of a citywide average condo price index is inappropriate. This analysis uses an average price across the 10 Zillow neighborhoods most affected by the zoning, which is somewhat higher than the citywide average.

High and Low Growth Scenario Price Forecasts



Our high-growth scenario assumes that San Francisco's housing prices, relative to the U.S., return to pre-pandemic levels by 2030, and then grow at the city's long-term average rate until 2045. This implies a rapid growth in housing prices over the next five years, of over 10% per year.

In the low-growth scenario, the post-COVID housing market represents a new normal, and San Francisco housing prices are assumed to grow only at the U.S. long-term rate at 1.8% per year, in inflation-adjusted dollars. Under this assumption, San Franciso housing prices would not recover to their pre-COVID peak, in inflation-adjusted dollars, until 2041.

Source: Zillow. 10 Neighborhoods are Buena Vista, Polk Gulch, Inner Sunset, Marina, Mission, North Waterfront, Outer Sunset, Outer Richmond, Inner Richmond, and Western Addition.

Construction Cost Trends and Scenarios



Source: Bureau of Economic Analysis; U.S. Census Bureau, "Quarterly Workforce Indicators

The housing development model uses two measures of construction costs: materials cost and local construction industry wages. They are blended into a single index for modeling purposes. Details are in the Appendix.

The cost of construction materials and local wages have grown faster than overall inflation, particularly in the last few years. In 2024, real construction materials costs were 18% higher, and real local wages were 10% higher, than they were in 2016.

In both the high-growth and low-growth scenarios, the blended index is assumed to grow at 0% (after inflation) over the 2026-2045 period. This reflects an assumption that both labor and material costs inflation will revert to the broader rate of inflation in the long term.

Housing Production Forecasts Under Current Zoning

Planning District	Historic, 2000-24	Low-Growth Scenario Forecast, 2026-45	High-Growth Scenario Forecast, 2026-45
Buena Vista	975	43	90
Central	72	192	390
Downtown	289	112	230
Ingleside	0	58	120
Inner Sunset	123	28	59
Marina	131	126	263
Mission	187	197	406
Northeast	449	136	283
Outer Sunset	15	16	33
Richmond	0	23	47
South Central	0	6	11
Western Addition	997	658	1,265
Total	3,238	1,594	3,199

Generally, the housing development model forecasts that the current zoning will produce fewer units in the next 20 years than the numbers of units that were produced in the last 20 years.

The table to the left only covers the portion of each planning district that is in the proposed rezoning area. In total, under the current zoning, the model forecasts 1,594 or 3,199 units under the low- and high-growth forecasts, respectively, while 3,238 units were built in the same areas over the 2000-2024 period.

On the next two pages, the model's forecasts of the additional housing created by the proposed zoning is discussed.

Source: For historic housing production, San Francisco Planning Department

Forecast Net Effect of the Zoning

- As shown in the table below, under the low-growth and high-growth scenarios described earlier, the rezoning would lead to 8,504 and 14,646 additional housing units, beyond what would be produced under current zoning, over the next 20 years.

Low Growth Scenario	**Units**
20-Year Housing Production, Existing Zoning	1,594
20-Year Housing Production, Proposed Rezoning	10,098
Effect of Proposed Rezoning	8,504

High Growth Scenario	**Units**
20-Year Housing Production, Existing Zoning	3,199
20-Year Housing Production, Proposed Rezoning	17,845
Effect of Proposed Rezoning	14,646

Summary by Current Zoning District

		Low-Growth			High-Growth		
Current Zoning[3]	Number of Parcels	Average Housing Likelihood, Current	Average Housing Likelihood, Proposed	Change in Housing Units	Average Housing Likelihood, Current	Average Housing Likelihood, Proposed	Change in Housing Units
RH1	43,009	0.001%	0.205%	798	0.003%	0.446%	1,731
RH2	26,486	0.002%	0.259%	576	0.005%	0.565%	1,250
RH3_RM1	13,741	0.009%	0.347%	547	0.018%	0.756%	1,186
Office/Commercial	114	0.570%	0.780%	48	1.185%	1.639%	104
Public	239	0.060%	1.450%	3,483	0.122%	2.560%	4,814
Density-Restricted Multifamily	7,079	0.336%	0.490%	3,007	0.674%	1.026%	5,467
Form-Based Multifamily	2,053	0.725%	0.725%	46	1.502%	1.502%	94
Total	92,721			8,504			14,646

The table to the left breaks out the results by current zoning. It illustrates how many rezoned parcels are in the RH-1, RH-2, and RH-3 or RM-1 residential zones, primarily in the western side of the city. These areas will see a substantial increase in the likelihood of developing housing over the next 20 years, but the chances are still small, so those 83,000+ parcels are only forecast to produce about additional 4,200 housing units by 2045, in the high growth scenario.

Fewer Public parcels (generally owned by the City or SFUSD) are larger, and more likely to develop housing through the rezoning, though this depends on the owner's decisions.

Estimating the Loss of Existing Residential Units

- To evaluate the economic impact, OEA calculated the net increase in housing units.
- In the low-growth scenario, 463 more units would be lost under the proposed zoning than under current zoning, over the 20-year forecast period. In the high-growth scenario, 1,031 more housing units would be lost. These losses represent a 6-8% of the housing units gained as a result of the rezoning. Amendments proposed on October 20th may reduce these losses, along with overall housing production.
- The loss of existing housing slightly dampens the housing price reductions associated with the rezoning, and may impose financial harms on existing tenants. City and State law heavily restricts, but does not prohibit, the eviction of tenants for the purpose of demolition, or the demolition of rent-controlled housing. These events have been quite rare in recent decades. If this occurs, tenants are entitled to relocation payments.
- Without any way to meaningfully estimate the number of evictions or demolitions of rent-controlled units, or the financial impact on tenants, this report does not attempt to quantify these potential costs.

Impacts on Housing Prices

- The responsiveness of housing prices to increases in housing supply is a function of price elasticities of supply and demand, which the OEA has estimated in past research[4].
- The elasticities imply that the proposed rezoning would lead to a -2.5% to -4.2% change in housing prices in the city, depending on the scenario. For context, those percentages are also expressed in terms of current housing prices and apartment rents.

	Low Growth Scenario	**High Growth Scenario**
Net Change in Housing Supply (units produced less demolitions)	8,041	13,615
Percentage Change in Housing Supply[5]	2.0%	3.4%
Price Elasticity of Demand	-0.7	-0.7
Price Elasticity of Supply	0.1	0.1
Percent change in housing prices	-2.5%	-4.2%
Corresponding change in condo prices[6]	-$24,500	-$41,600
Corresponding change in annual apartment market rents[7]	-$903	-$1,529

Estimating Relocation and Disruption Costs

- To account for the impact on commercial businesses, OEA estimated potential displacement costs. Details are provided in the Appendix.
- Displaced businesses are estimated to occupy commercial space ranging from approximately 1.5 to 2.6 million square feet, depending on the scenario. This displacement would occur over twenty years, and it is highly likely that the rezoning would lead to an increase in the amount of commercial space in the city.
- Annual business disruption and relocation costs range from $16 to $28 million, in today's dollars.

	Low Growth	High Growth
Loss of occupied commercial space (million sf)	1.5	2.6
Disruption-relocation cost/sf	$190	$190
Annual disruption/relocation cost (2025 $ million)	$16	$28

REMI Economic Impact Simulation

- Based on the economic impact factors described earlier, the OEA used the REMI model to measure the net economic impact of the changes associated with the high and low growth scenarios to the city's economy over the 2026-2045 period:
  - An increase in the city's residential capital stock of $8.0 billion (low growth) to $13.5 billion (high growth) in today's dollars, representing the investment associated with the new units forecast under the two scenarios. These figures are calculated by multiplying the net increase in units by average prices.
  - A reduction in citywide housing prices, reaching 2.5% (low growth) and 4.2% (high growth) by 2045.
  - Annual business disruption and relocation costs for retail businesses of $16 million (low growth) and $28 million (high growth) in today's dollars, until 2045.

Economic Impact Assessment

- In the low-growth scenario, the city's GDP would be $560 million larger, in today's dollars, on average over the 2026-45 period. Total employment in the city would be approximately 3,000 more than under the current zoning, on average over the period.
- In the high-growth scenario, the city's GDP growth would be $940 million larger than under current zoning, in 2025 dollars. Employment would be about 5,000 higher.
- Employment gains are expected in every sector, but would be most heavily concentrated in the construction, health care, real estate, and accommodations and food services sectors.
- Despite the displacement of businesses, retail trade is forecast to grow as a result of the population and economic growth created by the proposed rezoning, adding about 210 jobs in the low-growth scenario and about 350 jobs in the high-growth scenario.
- Like most major policies, the proposed rezoning involves benefits and costs. Our analysis suggests the proposed rezoning's positive impact on the city's economy, from lower housing prices and construction, outweighs the negative impact from displaced businesses, by a factor of approximately 22:1.

Conclusions

- The context for housing development in San Francisco has changed profoundly in the past several years. Since 2019, after adjusting for inflation, condo prices in San Francisco have dropped by 25%, while our blended construction cost index has risen by 8%.
- Given this starting point, an expansive rezoning effort, like the proposed Family Zoning plan, will be challenged to match the 2010s levels of new housing development in the city, even under an optimistic high-growth scenario.
- Nevertheless, under both scenarios considered in this report, the proposed rezoning would lead to a significant increase in the city's housing supply, and have broadly positive effects on housing prices and the city's broader economy. The benefits of new residential investments and lower housing prices are projected to outweigh the costs of business interruption and displacement by a factor of roughly 22:1.
- If market conditions were such that the 36,000 unit target was achieved, as a result of the rezoning, the economic impact on the city would likely be significantly more positive than the estimates in this report.

Footnotes

1. See, for example, Inclusionary Housing Working Group: Preliminary Report September 2016.
2. Three large parcels were excluded from the analysis: Laguna Honda Hospital, and the USF Main and Lone Mountain campuses. While all three parcels receive height increases in the proposed rezoning, their size and unique uses makes them unsuitable for the model. If the model could accurately estimate the amount of housing likely to occur on those parcels, the total housing estimate reported in this report would be larger.
3. These are the aggregate zoning classifications used by the model. See the Appendix for details.
4. See Potential Effects of Limiting Market-Rate Housing in the Mission.
5. Assuming 406,000 housing units in the city.
6. Based on Zillow's 2025 average condo prices for San Francisco.
7. Based on 2025 average apartment asking rents, from ApartmentList.

Appendix

- Housing Development Model
  - Methodology
  - Data sources
  - Model coefficients and performance
  - Scenario Inputs
  - Zoning District Classification
  - Logic of Applying the Model to the Proposed Rezoning
- Estimates of Business Interruption and Relocation Costs

Appendix: Housing Development Model: Methodology

- The housing development model is a two-stage step model. The first stage is a logistic regression, covering every parcel in the city, except those subject to a development agreement, over the 2004-2024 period.
- The dependent variable of the logistic regression is 1 if the parcel produced housing in a given year, and 0 otherwise. Parcels that produce housing in a given year were removed from the dataset for subsequent years. Independent variables, reflecting existing land use, market conditions, and zoning, are listed on the next page.
- The second stage is a regression model including all parcels that produced multifamily housing with more than 10 units, over the 2004-24 period. The dependent variable is the number of units produced on the parcel, and the independent variables are the parcel's "building envelope" (its area multiplied by its allowable height), and two interaction variables: the building envelope times a dummy indicating if the parcel was eligible for the State Density Bonus in that year, and the building envelope times a dummy indicating if the parcel was subject to density-restricted zoning in that year. The intercept of the model was fixed at zero.

Appendix: Housing Development Model: Methodology

- The models' coefficients were used in a forecast that calculated the log-likelihood of development for each rezoned parcel, in each of the forecast years 2026-2045, using the site and zoning information, and the price and cost assumptions for each year (shown on the next page). The log-likelihoods were converted into annual probabilities, from which a 20-year probability of development was calculated.
- The model coefficients were also used to calculate a units estimate; the 20-year probability times the units estimate is the expected number of units produced on that parcel in the 20-year forecast period.
- The forecast model was run for both the current and the proposed zoning. See the section "Logic of Applying the Model to the Proposed Rezoning" for more details.
- Three parcels were excluded from the forecast: Laguna Honda Hospital, the University of San Francisco Main Campus, and the University of San Francisco Lone Mountain Campus. While some housing may be built on those parcels in the forecast period, the model is not well-suited for large parcels with unique uses like these.

Appendix: Housing Development Model: Data Sources

Variable Description	Variable	Data Source
Height limit for site in ft	Height_Ft	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Area for lot in 1000 sq ft	Area_1000	Planning Department, Land Use Database 4/16/25
Extisting building square footage in 1000 sq ft	Bldg_SqFt_1000	Planning Department, Land Use Database 4/16/25
Residential Existing Use using ResUnits (Dummy)	Res_Dummy	Planning Department, Land Use Database 4/16/25
Historic Status for Parcel (Dummy)	Historic	Planning Department, Land Use Database 4/16/25
Real Construction Cost Variable, 2 years prior	Construc_Cost_Real	a 60/40 average of Real Construction Materials PPI and Real San Francisco MSA Construction Wages, 2016=100
10-Neighborhood Housing Price Index (Zillow), Real, 2 years prior	Zillow_Price_Real	SF real condo prices per Zillow, 2016=100
Dummy indicating eligibility for State Density Bonus, 2016 forward	SDB_2016_5Plus	Calculated from Zoning Districts
Zoning dummy: Office/Commercial	zp_OfficeComm	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Zoning dummy: Density Restricted Multifamily, RTO = Form Based	zp_DRMulti_RTO	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Zoning dummy: Form Based Multifamily, RTO = form based	zp_FBDMulti_RTO	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Zoning dummy: Industrial / Production, Distribution & Repair	zp_PDRInd	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Zoning dummy: Public/Open Space	zp_Public	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Zoning dummy: Redevelopment Area	zp_Redev	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Zoning dummy: Residential 2-Family (2 Units per Lot)	zp_RH2	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Zoning = Residential 3-Family or Res Mixed (1/800 sqft)	zp_RH3_RM1	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Planning District dummy variables	DIST_<District Name>	Planning District from Assessor's Secured Roll DB

Appendix: Logistic Regression Coefficients

Variable Description	Variable	Coeff	StdErr	WaldChiSq	Prob>Chi Sq
Intercept	Intercept	(1.6226)	1.2829	1.5998	0.2059
Height limit for site in ft	Height_Ft	0.0017	0.0007	4.9693	0.0258
Area for lot in 1000 sq ft	Area_1000	0.0049	0.0009	30.6563	0.0000
Envelope Area in 1000 sq ft (area/1000*ht/10)	Env_1000_Area_Height	0.0002	0.0001	5.0369	0.0248
Extisting building square footage in 1000 sq ft	Bldg_SqFt_1000	(0.0023)	0.0007	10.7241	0.0011
Residential Existing Use using ResUnits (Dummy)	Res_Dummy	(0.8231)	0.1222	45.3669	0.0000
Historic Status for Parcel (Dummy)	Historic	(1.0378)	0.1271	66.6847	0.0000
Real Construction Cost Variable	Construc_Cost_Real	(0.0992)	0.0129	58.8929	0.0000
SF Housing Price Index (Zillow), Real	Zillow_Price_Real	0.0143	0.0053	7.1326	0.0076
Dummy for State Density Bonus, 5+ Unit Sites, 2016 forward	SDB_2016_5Plus	0.6303	0.1608	15.3724	0.0000
Zoning = Office/Commercial	zp_OfficeComm	4.2634	0.4873	76.5337	0.0000
Zoning = Density Restricted Multifamily, RTO = Form Based	zp_DRMulti_RTO	4.2450	0.4523	88.0989	0.0000
Zoning = Form Based Multifamily, RTO = form based	zp_FBDMulti_RTO	5.0508	0.4640	118.4768	0.0000
Zoning = Industrial / Production, Distribution & Repair	zp_PDRInd	3.4115	0.4790	50.7257	0.0000
Zoning = Public/Open Space	zp_Public	1.2491	0.8385	2.2190	0.1363
Zoning = Redevelopment Area	zp_Redev	4.5361	0.4999	82.3213	0.0000
Zoning = Residential 2-Family (2 Units per Lot)	zp_RH2	0.2674	0.6672	0.1607	0.6885
Zoning = Residential 3-Family or Res Mixed (1/800 sqft)	zp_RH3_RM1	1.3187	0.6064	4.7289	0.0297

Appendix: Logistic Regression Coefficients (Continued)

Variable Description	Variable	Coeff	StdErr	WaldChiSq	Prob>Chi Sq
District = South Bayshore	DIST_SBayshore	(1.4824)	0.3179	21.7380	0.0000
District = Bernal Heights	DIST_BernalHts	(1.7011)	0.6087	7.8100	0.0052
District = South Central	DIST_Scentral	(1.7307)	0.3867	20.0267	0.0000
District = Central	DIST_Central	(1.1523)	0.3353	11.8102	0.0006
District = Buena Vista	DIST_BuenaVista	(2.5369)	1.0188	6.2010	0.0128
District = Northeast	DIST_Northeast	(1.4171)	0.2539	31.1439	0.0000
District = Western Addition	DIST_WestAddition	(0.6831)	0.2362	8.3630	0.0038
District = South of Market	DIST_SOMA	(0.0756)	0.1903	0.1579	0.6911
District = Inner Sunset	DIST_InnerSunset	(1.6187)	0.4882	10.9939	0.0009
District = Richmond	DIST_Richmond	(2.8019)	0.5355	27.3716	0.0000
District = Ingleside	DIST_Ingleside	(1.8670)	0.4925	14.3711	0.0002
District = Outer Sunset	DIST_OuterSunset	(2.6147)	0.6098	18.3867	0.0000
District = Marina	DIST_Marina	(1.2492)	0.3253	14.7457	0.0001
District = Mission	DIST_Mission	(1.0938)	0.2380	21.1176	0.0000

Omitted Variables for Groups of Dummy Variables:

Omitted zoning = RH1

Omitted district = Downtown

Appendix: Units Regression Coefficients

Variable Description	Variable	Coeff	St Error	T-Stat
Simple building envelope (area/1000 * ht/10)	Env_1000_Area_Height	0.4252	0.0159	26.72
State Density Bonus * Simple Bldg Envelope (5+ Unit Sites, 2016 forward)	SDB_2016_5Plus_EnvFull	0.4385	0.0389	11.28
Simple Bldg Envelope only if density-restricted	Zoning_DR_EnvFull	(0.1601)	0.0174	(9.22)

Note: Model removes largest 5% (Positive and Negative) residual outliers

Appendix: Model Performance

Logistic Regression	
Number of Observations	3,369,573
Number with Dependent Variable = 1	422
Pseudo R-Square	0.000611
Max Rescaled R-Square	0.244596

Units Regression	
Number of Observations	383
R-Sq	0.867779
Adj R-Sq	0.866735
Dependent Mean Value	81.87206
Standard Error of Regression	48.40184

Appendix: Zoning Classifications

- The table below shows the correspondence between the City's zoning districts, and the aggregate zoning variables in the model.

Zoning Variable	Zoning Districts
zp_RH1	C-2/RH-1(D); RH-1(D)/C-2; C-M/RH-1; M-1/RH-1; NC-1/RH-1; NC-1/RH-1/RH-2; NC-2/RH-1; NC-2/RH-1(D); NC-3/RH-1; NCD/RH-1; NCD/RH-1(D); NC-S/RH-1; NCT-OCEAN/RH-1(D); NCT/RH-1(D); P/P-W/RH-1; P/RH-1; P/RH-1(D); P/RH-1/RH-1(D); P/RH-1/RH-2; RH-1; RH-1(D); RH-1(D)/NC-2; RH-1(D)/RH-1; RH-2/RH-1; RH-2/RH-1(D); RH-1(D)/RH-2; RH-1(D)/RM-1; RH-1(S); RH-1/C-M; RH-1/M-1; RH-1/NC-1; RH-1/NC-2; RH-1/NC-3; RH-1/NC-S; RH-1/RH-1(D); RH-1/RH-2; RH-1/RH-2/RM-1; RH-1/RM-1; RM-1/RH-1; RH-3/RH-1
zp_RH2	NC-1/RH-1/RH-2; P/RH-1/RH-2; RH-2/RH-1; RH-2/RH-1(D); RH-1(D)/RH-2; RH-1/RH-2; RH-1/RH-2/RM-1; M-1/RH-2/RM-1; MUR/RH-2; NC-1/RH-2; NC-2/RH-2; NC-3/RH-2; NCD/RH-2; NC-S/RH-2; NCT-GLEN PARK/RH-2; NCT-OCEAN/RH-2; NCT/RH-2; P/RH-2; P/RM-1/RH-2; RH-2; RH-2/NC-1; RH-2/NC-2; RH-2/NC-3; RH-2/RH-3; RH-2/RM-1; RM-1/RH-2; RH-2/RM-2; RM-2/RH-2; RH-2/RM-3; RM-3/RH-2; RH-3/RH-2
zp_RH3_RM1	RH-1/RH-2/RM-1; M-1/RH-2/RM-1; P/RM-1/RH-2; RH-2/RH-3; RH-2/RM-1; RM-1/RH-2; RH-3/RH-2; RH-1(D)/RM-1; RH-1/RM-1; RM-1/RH-1; RH-3/RH-1; C-2/RH-3; C-2/RM-1; C-2/RM-1/RM-4; C-M/RM-1; HP-RA/RM-1; M-1/RM-1; M-2/RH-3; NC-1/RM-1; RM-1/NC-1; NC-2/RH-3; NC-2/RM-1; NC-3/RH-3; NC-3/RM-1; NCD/RH-3; NCD/RH-3/UPR MARKET; NCD/RH-3/UPR MARK; NCD/RH-3/VALENCIA; NCD/RM-1; NCD/RM-1/SACRAMENTO; NCD/SACRAMENTO ST; NCD/SACRAMENTO/RM-1; NCD/RM-1/SACRAMEN; NCT-DIVISADERO/RH-3; NCT-DIVISADERO/RM-1; NCT/RH-3; NCT/RM-1; P/PM-R/RM-1; P/RH-3; P/RM-1; PM-MU2/PM-OS/PM-R/RM-1; PM-R/RM-1; RH-3; RH-3/C-2; RH-3/HAYES; RH-3/M-2; RH-3/NC-2; RH-3/RM-1; RM-1/RH-3; RH-3/RM-2; RM-2/RH-3; RH-3/RM-3; RM-3/RH-3; RH-3/RSD; RH-3/VALENCIA; RM-1; RM-1/C-M; RM-1/C-M/M-1; RM-1/NC-3; RM-1/RM-2; RM-1/RM-3; RM-1/RM-4; RM-1/SACRAMENTO
zp_OfficeComm	C-2/RH-3; C-2/RM-1; C-2/RM-1/RM-4; C-M/RM-1; RH-3/C-2; RM-1/C-M; RM-1/C-M/M-1; C-2/RH-1(D); RH-1(D)/C-2; C-M/RH-1; RH-1/C-M; C-2; C-2/M-1; C-2/M-1/P; C-2/P; C-3-G; C-3-G/C-3-R; C-3-G/C-M; C-3-G/RC-4; C-3-O; C-3-O(SD); C-3-O(SD)/P; C-3-O(SD)/TB DTR; C-3-O/C-3-O(SD); C-3-O/C-3-R; C-3-O/C-3-S; C-3-O/C-3-S/P; C-3-O/TB DTR; C-3-R; C-3-S; C-3-S/P; C-M; C-M/M-1; CMUO; CMUO/MUR; CMUO/P; MUO; NCD/C-2; P/C-3-R; RM-3/C-2; RM-4/C-2; WMUO

Appendix: Zoning Classifications (Continued)

Zoning Variable	Zoning Districts
zp_DRMulti_RTO	NC-2/P; NC-3/P/RM-3; NCD/P; NC-S/P; P/NC-S; P/NC-2; P/RC-4; P/RM-2; P/RM-3; C-2/RM-1/RM-4; C-3-G/RC-4; NCD/C-2; RM-3/C-2; RM-4/C-2; NC-1/RM-1; RM-1/NC-1; NC-2/RH-3; NC-2/RM-1; NC-3/RH-3; NC-3/RM-1; NCD/RH-3; NCD/RH-3/UPR MARKET; NCD/RH-3/UPR MARK; NCD/RH-3/VALENCIA; NCD/RM-1; NCD/RM-1/SACRAMENTO; NCD/SACRAMENTO ST; NCD/SACRAMENTO/RM-1; NCD/RM-1/SACRAMEN; RH-3/HAYES; RH-3/NC-2; RH-3/RM-2; RM-2/RH-3; RH-3/RM-3; RM-3/RH-3; RH-3/RSD; RH-3/VALENCIA; RM-1/NC-3; RM-1/RM-2; RM-1/RM-3; RM-1/RM-4; RM-1/SACRAMENTO; NC-1/RH-1/RH-2; NC-1/RH-2; NC-2/RH-2; NC-3/RH-2; NCD/RH-2; NC-S/RH-2; RH-2/NC-1; RH-2/NC-2; RH-2/NC-3; RH-2/RM-2; RM-2/RH-2; RH-2/RM-3; RM-3/RH-2; NC-1/RH-1; NC-2/RH-1; NC-2/RH-1(D); NC-3/RH-1; NCD/RH-1; NCD/RH-1(D); NC-S/RH-1; RH-1(D)/NC-2; RH-1/NC-1; RH-1/NC-2; RH-1/NC-3; RH-1/NC-S; 24TH-MISSION; 24TH STREET- NOE VALL; 24TH-NOE; BROADWAY; BROADWAY NEIGHBORHOOD; C-2/RM-4; CASTRO STREET NEIGHBO; CASTRO; CCB; CRNC; CR-NC; CRNC/CVR; CR-NC/CVR; CRNC/RM-4; CVR; DTR/RC-4; FILLMORE; HAIGHT; HAIGHT STREET NEIGHBO; HAYES; HAIGHT STREET NEIGHBO; INNER CLEMENT; INNER CLEMENT STREET; INNER SUNSET; INNER SUNSET NEIGHBOR; M-1/NC-2; M-1/RM-2; M-1/RSD; NC-1; NC-1/RM-2; NC-1/RM-3; NC-2; NC-2/M-1; NC-2/NC-3; NC-3/NC-2; NC-2/RM-3; NC-2/RM-4; NC-3; NC-3/RC-4; NC-3/RM-3; NC-3/RM-4; NCD; NCD/; NCD/24TH STREET- NOE VALL; NCD/24TH STREET-; NCD/24TH-MISSION; NCD/24TH-NOE; NCD/24TH-NOE-VALLE; NCD/24TH-NOE-VALLEY; NCD/BROADWAY; NCD/BROADWAY NEIG; NCD/BROADWAY NEIGHBORHOOD; NCD/CASTRO; NCD/CASTRO STREET; NCD/CASTRO STREET NEIGHBO; NCD/EXCELSIOR OUTER MISSI; NCD/EXCELSIOR OUT; EXCELSIOR OUTER MISSI; NCD/FILLMORE; NCD/HAIGHT; NCD/HAIGHT STREET; NCD/HAIGHT STREET NEIGHBO; NCD/HAYES; NCD/HAYES NCT; NCD/HAYES NCT/RTO; NCD/INNER CLEMENT; NCD/INNER CLEMENT STREET; NCD/INNER SUNSET; NCD/INNER SUNSET NEIGHBOR; NCD/IRVING STREET NEIGHBO; NCD/IRVING STREET; NCD/IRVING; IRVING STREET NEIGHBO; NCD/JAPANTOWN NEIGHBORHOO; NCD/JAPANTOWN NEI; JAPANTOWN NEIGHBORHOO; NCD/JUDAH STREET NEIGHBOR; NCD/JUDAH; NCD/JUDAH STREET; JUDAH STREET NEIGHBOR; NCD/NC-1; NCD/NC-2; NCD/NC-3; NCD/NCT; NCD/NO BEACH; NCD/NORIEGA STREET NEIGHB; NCD/NORIEGA STREE; NCD/NORIEGA; NCD/NORTH BEACH NEIGHBORH; NCD/NORTH BEACH N; NCD/NORTH BEACH; NCD/NORTHBEACH; NCD/NORTH BEACH/RM-1; NCD/NORTHBEACH/RM-1; NCD/OUTER CLEMENT; NCD/OUTER CLEMENT STREET; NCD/OUTER CLEMENT STREET; NCD/PACIFIC; NCD/PACIFIC AVENU; NCD/PACIFIC/RM-3; NCD/PACIFIC;RM-3; NCD/PACIFIC AVENUE NEIGHB; NCD/POLK; NCD/POLK STREET N; NCD/POLK STREET NEIGHBORH; NCD/POLK/RC-3; NCD/POLK/RC-4; NCD/RC-3; NCD/RESIDENTIAL- HOUSE, O; NCD/RESIDENTIAL-; NCD/RM-2; NCD/RM-3; NCD/RM-3/PACIFIC; NCD/RTO; NCD/SACRAMENTO; NCD/SACRAMENTO STREET NEI; NCD/TARAVAL STREET NEIGHB; NCD/TARAVAL STREE; NCD/TARAVAL; NCD/UNION; NCD/UNION STREET; NCD/UNION STREET NEIGHBOR; NCD/UPPER FILLMORE NEIGHB; NCD/UPPER FILLMOR; NCD/UPPER FILLMORE; NCD/UPPERFILLMORE; NCD/UPPER MARKET STREET N; NCD/UPPER MARKET; NCD/UPR MARKET NC; NCD/UPR MARKET; NCD/UPR MARKET NCT; NCD/UPR MARKET NCT/; NCD/VALENCIA; NCD/WEST PORTAL; NCD/WEST PORTAL A; NCD/WEST PORTAL AVENUE NE; NCD/BAYVIEW; NCD/COLE VALLEY; NCD/CORTLAND AVENUE; NCD/GEARY BOULEVARD; NCD/GEARY BOULEVA; NCD/GEARY BOULEVARD/RH-2; NCD/GEARY BOULEVARD/RM-1; NCD/INNER BALBOA STREET; NCD/INNER BALBOA S; NCD/OUTER BALBOA STREET; NCD/ OUTER BALBOA STREET; NCD/OUTER BALBOA S; NCD/LOWER HAIGHT STREET; NCD/LOWER HAIGHT S; NCD/LOWER HAIGHT STREET/RH-3; NCD/LOWER POLK STREET; NCD/MISSION BERNAL; NCD/INNER TARAVAL STREET; NCD/INNER TARAVAL; NCD/SAN BRUNO AVENUE; NCD/LAKESIDE VILLAGE; NCD/LAKESIDE VILLAG; NC-S; NC-S/PM-R; NC-S/RM-3; NCT-DIVISADERO/RM-3; NCT/RM-3; NCT/RM-4; NO BEACH; OUTER CLEMENT; POLK; RC-3; RC-3/POLK; RC-3/RM-3; RC-4; RC-4/NC-3; RC-4/RH DTR; RC-4/RM-4; RED/SLR; RM-2; RM-2/M-1; RM-2/NC-1; RM-2/NC-2; RM-2/NO BEACH; RM-2/RM-3; RM-2/RM-4; RM-3; RM-3/NC-1; RM-3/NC-2; RM-3/NC-3; RM-3/NC-S; RM-3/RC-3; RM-3/RM-4; RM-4; RM-4/CR-NC; RM-4/NC-2; RM-4/NC-3; RM-4/RC-4; RSD; RSD/SLR; SACRAMENTO; SLR; SSO; UNION; UPR MARKET; VALENCIA; WEST PORTAL

Appendix: Zoning Classifications (Continued)

Zoning Variable	Zoning Districts
zp_Public	C-2/M-1/P; C-2/P; C-3-O(SD)/P; C-3-O/C-3-S/P; C-3-S/P; CMUO/P; P/C-3-R; P/RM-1/RH-2; P/PM-R/RM-1; P/RH-3; P/RM-1; PM-MU2/PM-OS/PM-R/RM-1; P/RH-1/RH-2; P/RH-2; P/P-W/RH-1; P/RH-1; P/RH-1(D); P/RH-1/RH-1(D); Remove; HP-RA/M-1/M-2/P; HP-RA/M-2/P; M-1/M-2/P; M-1/P; M-2/MB-OS; M-2/MB-RA/P; M-2/P; MB-O; MB-O/MB-RA; MB-OS; MB-RA/P; MUG/P; NC-2/P; NC-3/P/RM-3; NCD/P; NC-S/P; NCT/P; NCT-3/P; NCT-3/RTO; P; P/C-3-O(SD); P/M-1; P/M-2; P/MISS BAY S PL; P/MISS BAY S PLN; P/MUR; P/NC-S; P/NC-2; P/PDR-2; P/PM-OS; P/PM-OS/PM-R; P/P-W; P/RC-4; P/RM-2; P/RM-3; P/TB DTR; P/RTO-C; P, RTO-C; PM-CF; PM-CF/PM-OS; PM-CF/PM-OS/PM-R; PM-MU1/PM-OS; PM-MU2/PM-OS/PM-R; PM-OS; PM-OS/PM-R; PM-OS/PM-R/PM-S; PM-OS/PM-S; Public
zp_FBDMulti_RTO	DTR/RC-4; NCD/HAYES NCT; NCD/HAYES NCT/RTO; NCD/NCT; NCD/RTO; NCD/UPR MARKET NCT; NCD/UPR MARKET NCT/; NC-S/PM-R; NCT-DIVISADERO/RM-3; NCT/RM-3; NCT/RM-4; RC-4/RH DTR; RED/SLR; P/PM-R/RM-1; PM-MU2/PM-OS/PM-R/RM-1; MUG/P; NCT/P; NCT-3/P; NCT-3/RTO; P/MUR; P/PM-OS/PM-R; P/TB DTR; P/RTO-C; P, RTO-C; PM-CF/PM-OS/PM-R; PM-MU1/PM-OS; PM-MU2/PM-OS/PM-R; PM-OS/PM-R; PM-OS/PM-R/PM-S; C-3-O(SD)/TB DTR; C-3-O/TB DTR; CMUO/MUR; NCT-DIVISADERO/RH-3; NCT-DIVISADERO/RM-1; NCT/RH-3; NCT/RM-1; PM-R/RM-1; MUR/RH-2; NCT-GLEN PARK/RH-2; NCT-OCEAN/RH-2; NCT/RH-2; NCT-OCEAN/RH-1(D); NCT/RH-1(D); DTR; DTR/M-1; M-1/RH DTR; M-2/MR-MU; M-2/P70-MU; MB-RA/MR-MU; MR-MU; MUG; MUG/RED; MUR; NCT; NCT-DIVISADERO; NCT-FOLSOM; NCT-GLEN PARK; NCT-HAYES; NCT-HAYES/RTO; NCT-HAYES/RTO-1; NCT-MISSION; NCT-UPPER MARKET; NCT-UPPER MARKET;; NCT-UPPER MARKET/RH-2; NCT-UPPER MARKET/RH-3; NCT-OCEAN; NCT-SOMA; NCT/NCT-3; NCT/RCD; NCT/RED-MX; NCT/RTO; NCT/RTO-M; NCT/UMU; NCT-1; NCT-2; NCT-3; NCT-3/NCT-HAYES; RTO-1/NCT-3; RTO/NCT-3; P70-MU; PDR-1-D/UMU; PDR-1-G/UMU; PM-MU1; PM-MU1/PM-R; PM-MU2/PM-R; PM-MU2; PM-R; RCD; RED; RED-MX; RED-MX/WMUG; RH DTR; RH DTR/SB-DTR; RH DTR/TB DTR; RTO; RTO-1; RTO/NCT; RTO-1/RTO-C; RTO-C; RTO-M; SB-DTR; SPD; TB DTR; UMU; WMUG
zp_PDRInd	DTR/M-1; M-1/RH DTR; M-2/MR-MU; M-2/P70-MU; PDR-1-D/UMU; PDR-1-G/UMU; M-1/NC-2; M-1/RM-2; M-1/RSD; NC-2/M-1; RM-2/M-1; C-2/M-1/P; HP-RA/M-1/M-2/P; HP-RA/M-2/P; M-1/M-2/P; M-1/P; M-2/MB-OS; M-2/MB-RA/P; M-2/P; P/M-1; P/M-2; P/PDR-2; C-2/M-1; C-M/M-1; RH-1/RH-2/RM-1; M-1/RH-2/RM-1; M-1/RM-1; M-2/RH-3; RH-3/M-2; M-1/RH-1; RH-1/M-1; HP-RA/M-1; HP-RA/M-2; M-1; M-1/M-1; M-1/M-2; M-1/PDR-1-B; M-1/PDR-2; M-2; M-2 (MB); M-2/MB-RA; M-2/PDR-2; M-2/SLI; MISS BAY S PLN/M-2; MISS BAY S PL; MISS BAY S PLN; MISS BAY S PLN/M-; PDR-1; PDR-1/PDR-2; PDR-1-B; PDR-1-B/PDR-2; PDR-1-D; PDR-1-G; PDR-2; SALI; SLI; SLI/M-2
zp_Redev	HP-RA/M-1/M-2/P; HP-RA/M-2/P; M-2/MB-RA/P; HP-RA/M-1; HP-RA/M-2; M-2/MB-RA; MISS BAY S PLN/M-2; MISS BAY S PL; MISS BAY S PLN; MISS BAY S PLN/M-; MB-RA/MR-MU; MB-O/MB-RA; MB-RA/P; P/MISS BAY S PL; P/MISS BAY S PLN; HP-RA/RM-1; HP-RA; MB-RA; MISS BAY N RED; MISS BAY N RED PLN; MISS BAY N RED PL; MISS BAY S RED; MISS BAY S RED PLN; MISS BAY S RED PL

Appendix: Logic of Applying the Model

- This section of the appendix describes in more detail how the model was used to produce estimates of future housing production.
- For the existing zoning ("baseline"), the application of the model is straightforward. Current zoning was encoded using the zoning classification on the previous page, and current allowable height was used as the height variable in the logistic regression, and to calculate building envelope in the units regression.
- For the proposed rezoning ("policy"), the logic used was as follows: based on the units regression, each 1000 square feet of building envelope results in 0.42 units. The State Density Bonus adds an additional 0.44 units. Parcels that elect to use the Local Program therefore need to accommodate at least 0.44 additional units per 1000 square feet of envelope if developers are to choose this option. For parcels where the Local Program was more desirable, and on parcels that are ineligible for the SDB, because their zoning and size prevents them from building more than 5 units, the Local Program was applied. For all other parcels the SDB was used.

Appendix: Logic of Applying the Model (Continued)

- Probabilities and units for any parcel using the State Density Bonus were calculated by:
  - In the logistic regression, using the first new height in the rezoning table for Height_Ft and in the Env_1000_Area_Height calculation.
  - In the units regression, using the first new height in the rezoning table to calculate Env_1000_Area_Height;
  - Incorporating the SDB_2016_5Plus_EnvFull effect;
  - Incorporating the Zoning_DR_EnvFull if applicable (i.e. the parcel is density-restricted.

Appendix: Logic of Applying the Model (Continued)

- Probabilities and units for any parcel using the Local Program were calculated by:
  - In the logistic regression, setting zp_FBDMulti_RTO = 1, to account for the relaxation of density controls in the Local Program;
  - In the logistic regression, using the second new height in the rezoning table for Height_Ft and in the Env_1000_Area_Height calculation.
  - In the units regression, using the second new height in the rezoning table to calculate Env_1000_Area_Height;
  - In the units regression, removing the SDB_2016_5Plus_EnvFull effect;
  - In the units regression, removing the Zoning_DR_EnvFull effect.

Appendix: Business Disruption / Relocation Costs

- The analysis makes the following assumptions about business disruption and relocation costs:
  - Lost space will be 10% vacant, so 90% of the loss represents the loss of occupied space.
  - Lost business net income (for 6 months of disruption): $5/occupied square foot.
  - Fixed labor costs (for 6 months): $10/occupied square foot.
  - Moving costs and build-out of space at new premises: $175/occupied square foot

Staff Contact

Ted Egan, Ph.D., Chief Economist ted.egan@sfgov.org

From:	Bobak Esfandiari
Cc:	Mike Chen
Subject:	SF Democratic Party"s Resolution in support of the Family Zoning Plan
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 3:00:25 PM
Attachments:	Resolution In Support of the Family Zoning Plan to Make Housing More Affordable And Preserve Local Control_Combined.pdf

---

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

To all interested parties,

On October 22, 2025 the San Francisco Democratic Party passed a resolution supporting the Family Zoning Plan to Make Housing More Affordable And Preserve Local Control.

The resolution was passed with a vote of 21 AYEs, by the members present and was introduced by Michael Chen and Nancy Tung.

A certificate detailing the vote count is included on the attached PDF which includes the resolution.

If you have further questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to reach out to myself or the author, who is copied on this email.

Best,
Bobak Esfandiari

--
Bobak Esfandiari
Executive Director, San Francisco Democratic Party
bobak@sfdems.org | +1.925.899.2409 he/him

SF DEMS
SAN FRANCISCO DEMOCRATIC PARTY

Date Passed: October 22, 2025

Resolution Number: 2025-10-Family Zoning

Aye: 21 – Akbar, Arce, Calamuci, Chandler, Chen, Coles, Dorsey, Gupta, Hare, Ho, Kingsbury, Lai, Mahmood, Philhour, Sangirardi, Tung, Ma, Cohen, Wiener, Haney, Stefani

Nay: 5 – Avalos, Chan, Gallotta, Mar, Mullin

Abstain: 3 – Tu, Pelosi, Kounalakis

Absent: 3 – Alioto-Pier, Kim, Nguyen

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was ADOPTED on October 22, 2025 by the San Francisco Democratic Party.

Bobak Esfandiari

Bobak Esfandiari
Executive Director

SAN FRANCISCO DEMOCRATIC COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE

OFFICERS
Nancy Tung, Chair
Dan Calamuci, First Vice Chair
Marjan Philhour, Second Vice Chair
Cedric Akbar, Third Vice Chair
Emma Hare, Fourth Vice Chair
Michael Lai, Finance Director
Mike Chen, Internal Operations Director
Lanier Coles, External Operations Director

MEMBERS
Michela Alioto-Pier
Joshua Arce
John Avalos
Connie Chan
Trevor Chandler
Matt Dorsey
Peter Gallotta
Parag Gupta
Lily Ho
Jane Kim
Eric Kingsbury
Bilal Mahmood
Gordon Mar
Michael Nguyen
Joe Sangirardi
Jade Tu

EX OFFICIO MEMBERS
U.S. Speaker Emerita Nancy Pelosi
U.S. Congressmember Kevin Mullin
Lieutenant Governor Eleni Kounalakis
State Treasurer Fiona Ma
State Controller Malia Cohen
State Senator Scott Wiener
State Assemblymember Matt Haney
State Assemblymember Catherine Stefani

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
Bobak Esfandiari

San Francisco Democratic Party
1390 Market Street, Suite 200
San Francisco, CA 94102

(415) 226-9771
info@sfdems.org
www.sfdems.org

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE FAMILY ZONING PLAN TO MAKE HOUSING MORE AFFORDABLE AND PRESERVE LOCAL CONTROL

Principal Authors: Mike Chen, Nancy Tung
Co-Sponsors: Cedric Akbar, Joshua Arce, Dan Calamuci, Trevor Chandler, Lanier Coles, Matt Dorsey, Parag Gupta, Eric Kingsbury, Michael Lai, Bilal Mahmood, Marjan Philhour, Joe Sangirardi

WHEREAS, San Francisco's decades-long housing shortage has caused housing prices to explode; high housing costs are a burden on San Franciscans and contribute to the homelessness, displacement, and cost of living crises; and San Francisco must proactively address rising housing costs in order to retain and attract workers, artists, innovators, and young people to live here; and

WHEREAS, California law requires cities and counties to plan for more housing to meet population growth; to comply with state law, in 2023, after outreach and neighborhood input, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors adopted a plan to allow 82,069 new homes at varying income affordability levels by 2031;[1] the plan commits San Francisco to a rezoning program to allow more homes to be created; and

WHEREAS, If the city fails to follow through on the plan and rezone, the city will go back on its commitments to the state, leading to court penalties, the loss of over $100 million every year in state funds for transportation and low-income housing, and loss of local land use authority through a state takeover that nullifies all local planning standards around height, setbacks, design, density, parking, and shadows through the Builder's Remedy; without a rezoning plan, San Francisco will continue to become more expensive, less racially diverse, and less welcoming to working families, young people, seniors, and immigrants, while losing the ability to plan responsibly; and

[1] Board File #230001, Housing Element https://sfgov.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=5982213&GUID=A8FDFF26-50BF-4031-9A36-D58ECD208048

PROPOUNDED BY: Chen, Tung
ADOPTED: 10-22-2025
RESOLUTION NO. 2025-10-Family Zoning

WHEREAS, the proposed Family Zoning Plan for San Francisco (a) focuses more housing capacity along transit and commercial corridors where more housing makes the most sense; (b) would facilitate low-income housing in priority equity neighborhoods such as the Mission, Chinatown or South of Market; (c) would generate funding and expand opportunities for low- and middle-income housing built by community-based non-profit organizations, including (but not limited to) drug-free housing for people recovering from substance use disorder; (d) incentivizes construction of family-sized homes with at least two bedrooms; (e) includes strategies to prevent small business displacement; (f) complements state housing laws and labor standards that promote union construction jobs and lift up working conditions and standards for all residential construction workers; (g) ensures that low-income affordable housing is preserved or replaced, and that tenants can return there after construction; (h) allows the creation of new rent-controlled housing; and

WHEREAS, the Family Zoning Plan will also build on existing and developing policies to stabilize families and communities, including the inclusionary housing program for generating affordable housing for low-income workers and immigrant families, the neighborhood preference program to keep vulnerable low-income families in their own neighborhoods and the city, demolition controls to preserve tenant-occupied and guard against the destruction and loss of rent-controlled housing, rent control, tenant eviction protections, and fully-funded small business assistance and relocation programs; and therefore

RESOLVED, that the San Francisco Democratic Party supports the Family Zoning Plan with the aforementioned goals and principles, which preserves local control, complies with the state-mandated Housing Element, makes housing more affordable, supports union construction jobs with high labor standards, advances recovery from addiction, and protects tenants and small businesses from displacement; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, that copies of this Resolution be sent to Mayor Daniel Lurie and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors; and that the San Francisco Democratic Party directs the Executive Director to support the Family Zoning Plan.

PROPOUNDED BY: Chen, Tung
ADOPTED: 10-22-2025
RESOLUTION NO. 2025-10-Family Zoning

From:	Lee Heidhues
To:	Lurie, Daniel (MYR)
Cc:	Luke Bornheimer; Lucas Lux; DPH-jodie; Robin at KidSafe SF; Andy Thornley; Chan, Connie (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Joe Eskenazi; Joe Fitzgerald; rswan@sfchronicle.com; Garcia-Ruiz, Emilio; Ms. Lizzie Ann Heidhues
Subject:	Fwd: Upzoning plan amendments: What got stalled?
Date:	Tuesday, November 18, 2025 5:50:25 PM

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

Mayor Lurie

https://newspack-missionlocal.s3.amazonaws.com/mission/wp-content/uploads/2025/11/D4-Questionnaire-Final.pdf

The questionnaire has an implicit bias in that it asks how the respondent voted on Proposition Kpp and refers to "Great Highway" even though the proper name is Sunset Dunes Park
Given that you, Mayor Lurie, are opposed to the Park the phrasing of the question lays bare your bias.
A proponent of Proposition K will never be appointed

In Solidarity,
Lee Heidhues

---------- Forwarded message ---------
From: **Lee Heidhues** <leerossh@gmail.com>
Date: Tue, Nov 18, 2025, 5:33 PM
Subject: Fwd: Upzoning plan amendments: What got stalled?
To: Barish Jean <jeanbbarish@hotmail.com>

Jean

Thought you might like to see this

In Solidarity,
Lee

---------- Forwarded message ---------
From: **Mission Local** <info@missionlocal.com>
Date: Tue, Nov 18, 2025, 5:31 PM
Subject: Upzoning plan amendments: What got stalled?
To: <leerossh@gmail.com>

mission-local-logo

Good afternoon!

Want to be D4 supervisor? Mission Local obtained the 5-page questionnaire the **Mayor's office** is sending out to applicants. In an only-in-San Francisco touch, applicants were asked whether they'd ever hired a **permit expediter** on their properties.

The Land Use committee of the S.F. Board of Supervisors approved a few state-supported **amendments to the city's controversial upzoning plan**, and tabled more sweeping attempts to **exempt** certain areas from development. **Io Yeh Gilman** explains what's happening—and what's next.

The legacy business **Bissap Baobab** is closing its Mission Street venue after **28 years.** The owner, **Marco Senghor**, is actively looking for a new location, and promises a **farewell party** for the neighborhood December 20.

For the **back story**, read about Senghor's previous move from '**Little Baobab**' to 'Big Baobab.'

More soon,

Sara

Latest News



Sweeping amendments to S.F. upzoning plan tabled

"We cannot simply agree to demolish San Francisco for the sake of meeting a state mandate."

Want to be D4 supervisor? Here's the mayor’s questionnaire.

"Have you ever said anything that could be perceived as offensive on social media platforms such as X?"

Bissap Baobab to close Mission St. location

"Let us be clear: Baobab is NOT done. The Baobab bends, but it never breaks."

Back Story



‘Big Baobab’ to plant fresh roots on Mission Street

"I feel like Baobab is not mine anymore; it belongs to the community."

SNAP

Viva KitKat

By Elina Davenport

Events

All Events

Today: Wendy DeWitt, Queen of Boogie Woogie at the Woodchopper's Ball, Verdi Club, November 18, 9-11:30PM

Tomorrow: Public Board Meeting at the Mission Cultural Center for Latino Arts, November 19, 6-8PM

We have $76,500 in matching funds!

One gift, twice the impact. Donate today to keep Mission Local **forever free — for everyone.**

I'm in! Match my gift.

This email was sent to leerossh@gmail.com
why did I get this? unsubscribe from this list update subscription preferences
Mission Local · 2489 Mission St Ste 22 · San Francisco, CA 94110-2473 · USA

From: hobb2@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sherri Samu
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Tuesday, November 18, 2025 1:44:18 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Sherri Samu
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: young.erika@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Erika Young
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 10:47:24 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

What on earth is happening to City Hall? Do Scott Wiener and his YIMBY overlords decide everything now? The Land Use Committee just voted to kill Supervisor Chan and Chen's amendments to Mayor Lurie's “Rich Family Housing Plan”. This means that Daniel Lurie deliberately created a housing plan that would drive his own residents and small businesses out of the city.

I can only assume that greed and money are driving Senator Wiener and Supervisor Melgar, because I can't find a way to explain their actions with logic. I also find it shameful that Wiener would come to the city of San Francisco and make it his home -- a city that ensures his personal freedom as a gay man -- and then turn around and do everything he can to destroy it.

Regarding Supervisor Melgar, I've seen news coverage that the residents of D7 are starting to consider a recall. I've also seen quotes from constituents who really used to like her, and now can't understand why she literally ignores them.

A lot of city residents have been asking how something like Redevelopment could have happened. Now we know.

Sincerely,
Erika Young
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: jennifer_mahoney@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of jennifer mahoney
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 4:55:16 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):Lincoln Manor neighborhoods parking is a big problem because there are not any parking permits here-all the apartment residents on Geary and Clement use our street (shore view) as a parking lot!! Because there isn't any enforcement, it's a real nuisance for ppl who live here It cannot get any worse.

Sincerely,
jennifer mahoney
San Francisco, CA 94121

From:	dadaray2002@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Linda Ray
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 4:32:28 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning. The proposed zoning changes are the most far reaching in decades and should not be rushed through behind closed doors.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Linda Ray
San Francisco, CA 94133

From:	kielykids@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of LaVive Kiely
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 4:05:40 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

What are you tying to hide from us?

Sincerely,
LaVive Kiely
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: betho9@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Beth O Kellenberger
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 3:21:30 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

THIS PLAN jumps the gun. Poorly considered. We don't even really know how much vacant housing there is because that's "hard to determine" in S.F. Meanwhile, owners don't want to rent because they can't get bad tenants out. LET'S FIX THAT FIRST. Also , we don't have public transit built for NORTH/SoUTH travel by car OR by public transit…. Especially now that great highway is closed….. SO LET'S FIX THAT first.

Sincerely,
Beth O Kellenberger
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: timepuzzle@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Robert Smith
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 3:07:51 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
John Robert Smith
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: noguera@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Hatun Noguera
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 3:06:25 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments: Do what the people who elected you want, not what you want.

Sincerely,
Hatun Noguera
San Francisco, CA 94127

SF DEMS
SAN FRANCISCO DEMOCRATIC PARTY

Date Passed: October 22, 2025

Resolution Number: 2025-10-Family Zoning

Aye: 21 – Akbar, Arce, Calamuci, Chandler, Chen, Coles, Dorsey, Gupta, Hare, Ho, Kingsbury, Lai, Mahmood, Philhour, Sangirardi, Tung, Ma, Cohen, Wiener, Haney, Stefani

Nay: 5 – Avalos, Chan, Gallotta, Mar, Mullin

Abstain: 3 – Tu, Pelosi, Kounalakis

Absent: 3 – Alioto-Pier, Kim, Nguyen

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was ADOPTED on October 22, 2025 by the San Francisco Democratic Party.

Bobak Esfandiari

Bobak Esfandiari
Executive Director

SAN FRANCISCO DEMOCRATIC COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE

OFFICERS
Nancy Tung, Chair
Dan Calamuci, First Vice Chair
Marjan Philhour, Second Vice Chair
Cedric Akbar, Third Vice Chair
Emma Hare, Fourth Vice Chair
Michael Lai, Finance Director
Mike Chen, Internal Operations Director
Lanier Coles, External Operations Director

MEMBERS
Michela Alioto-Pier
Joshua Arce
John Avalos
Connie Chan
Trevor Chandler
Matt Dorsey
Peter Gallotta
Parag Gupta
Lily Ho
Jane Kim
Eric Kingsbury
Bilal Mahmood
Gordon Mar
Michael Nguyen
Joe Sangirardi
Jade Tu

EX OFFICIO MEMBERS
U.S. Speaker Emerita Nancy Pelosi
U.S. Congressmember Kevin Mullin
Lieutenant Governor Eleni Kounalakis
State Treasurer Fiona Ma
State Controller Malia Cohen
State Senator Scott Wiener
State Assemblymember Matt Haney
State Assemblymember Catherine Stefani

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
Bobak Esfandiari

San Francisco Democratic Party
1390 Market Street, Suite 200
San Francisco, CA 94102

(415) 226-9771
info@sfdems.org
www.sfdems.org

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE FAMILY ZONING PLAN TO MAKE HOUSING MORE AFFORDABLE AND PRESERVE LOCAL CONTROL

Principal Authors: Mike Chen, Nancy Tung
Co-Sponsors: Cedric Akbar, Joshua Arce, Dan Calamuci, Trevor Chandler, Lanier Coles, Matt Dorsey, Parag Gupta, Eric Kingsbury, Michael Lai, Bilal Mahmood, Marjan Philhour, Joe Sangirardi

WHEREAS, San Francisco's decades-long housing shortage has caused housing prices to explode; high housing costs are a burden on San Franciscans and contribute to the homelessness, displacement, and cost of living crises; and San Francisco must proactively address rising housing costs in order to retain and attract workers, artists, innovators, and young people to live here; and

WHEREAS, California law requires cities and counties to plan for more housing to meet population growth; to comply with state law, in 2023, after outreach and neighborhood input, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors adopted a plan to allow 82,069 new homes at varying income affordability levels by 2031;[1] the plan commits San Francisco to a rezoning program to allow more homes to be created; and

WHEREAS, If the city fails to follow through on the plan and rezone, the city will go back on its commitments to the state, leading to court penalties, the loss of over $100 million every year in state funds for transportation and low-income housing, and loss of local land use authority through a state takeover that nullifies all local planning standards around height, setbacks, design, density, parking, and shadows through the Builder's Remedy; without a rezoning plan, San Francisco will continue to become more expensive, less racially diverse, and less welcoming to working families, young people, seniors, and immigrants, while losing the ability to plan responsibly; and

---

[1] Board File #230001, Housing Element https://sfgov.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=5982213&GUID=A8FDFF26-50BF-4031-9A36-D58ECD208048

PROPOUNDED BY: Chen, Tung
ADOPTED: 10-22-2025
RESOLUTION NO. 2025-10-Family Zoning

WHEREAS, the proposed Family Zoning Plan for San Francisco (a) focuses more housing capacity along transit and commercial corridors where more housing makes the most sense; (b) would facilitate low-income housing in priority equity neighborhoods such as the Mission, Chinatown or South of Market; (c) would generate funding and expand opportunities for low- and middle-income housing built by community-based non-profit organizations, including (but not limited to) drug-free housing for people recovering from substance use disorder; (d) incentivizes construction of family-sized homes with at least two bedrooms; (e) includes strategies to prevent small business displacement; (f) complements state housing laws and labor standards that promote union construction jobs and lift up working conditions and standards for all residential construction workers; (g) ensures that low-income affordable housing is preserved or replaced, and that tenants can return there after construction; (h) allows the creation of new rent-controlled housing; and

WHEREAS, the Family Zoning Plan will also build on existing and developing policies to stabilize families and communities, including the inclusionary housing program for generating affordable housing for low-income workers and immigrant families, the neighborhood preference program to keep vulnerable low-income families in their own neighborhoods and the city, demolition controls to preserve tenant-occupied and guard against the destruction and loss of rent-controlled housing, rent control, tenant eviction protections, and fully-funded small business assistance and relocation programs; and therefore

RESOLVED, that the San Francisco Democratic Party supports the Family Zoning Plan with the aforementioned goals and principles, which preserves local control, complies with the state-mandated Housing Element, makes housing more affordable, supports union construction jobs with high labor standards, advances recovery from addiction, and protects tenants and small businesses from displacement; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, that copies of this Resolution be sent to Mayor Daniel Lurie and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors; and that the San Francisco Democratic Party directs the Executive Director to support the Family Zoning Plan.

PROPOUNDED BY: Chen, Tung
ADOPTED: 10-22-2025
RESOLUTION NO. 2025-10-Family Zoning

Public Comment to the Land Use Committee 11/17/2025
Jessica Vistnes

My name is Jessica Vistnes and I am a resident of District 2. I've given public comment several times before and was thinking about not coming again today but I feel so strongly about this issue that here I am. I have a lot of concerns about the upzoning in District 2, but in my 2 minutes I want to concentrate on the upzoning to 14 stories on Lombard Street from Laguna going east to Van Ness.

My understanding of how this came about was that it was in response to a proposal from the Cow Hollow Association. I am attaching a copy of that proposal with my comments today and I am hoping you will read it. The proposal had asked to taper the increase of heights on Lombard so that there would be no increase from four stories around the Palace of Fine Arts up through Webster Street so people could see the Palace of Fine Arts. Then the proposal called for increasing heights to five stories from Webster to Gough and then six stories between Gough and Van Ness. This proposal seemed very reasonable to me and fits with the scale of the neighborhood.

My understanding was that in response to this proposal heights WERE lowered close to the Palace of Fine Arts – in line with neighborhood concerns. But heights were not lowered to five stories on the next part of Lombard and instead of heights of six stories closer to Van Ness they were increased from what had been in the plan before to now be 14 stories. And my further understanding is this was done to maintain the count along Lombard Street – which is, in my opinion, not a thoughtful way to do planning.

This part of San Francisco has many of the views of the Bay that are iconic. These blocks on Lombard would affect views of Fort Mason and Alcatraz from many viewpoints. So, I am here again to ask you to put in an amendment to lower the heights from 14 stories on the blocks from Laguna to Van Ness. If the heights were so easily increased from maps that had been in the works for years, they should be able to be decreased although time is getting very short.

COW HOLLOW ASSOCIATION
P.O. BOX 471136 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94147

April 30, 2025

Supervisor Stephen Sherrill
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Proposed Revisions to the Upzoning Map to Reflect District 2's Community Planning, Safety, and Growth Objectives

Dear Supervisor Sherrill,

Thank you for your engagement with our neighborhood as we collectively work toward a vision of housing growth that respects San Francisco's history, diverse communities, scale, and distinctive public spaces.

As SF Planning continues to revise the proposed Upzoning Map, we request a series of specific, actionable changes critical to maintaining the identity, livability, and uniqueness of this part of San Francisco. We look forward to working with you to:

- Maintain Lombard Street as a Scenic Gateway to San Francisco
- Protect Existing Housing and Prioritize Safety
- Safeguard Neighborhood-Serving Retail Corridors
- Remove Density Decontrol Provisions

This part of District 2 features some of San Francisco's most iconic landmarks—from the Bay and the Palace of Fine Arts to the Golden Gate Bridge. As drivers enter the city via the Presidio Parkway, they experience a rare blend of hillside housing and urban density, evoking the charm of Europe's great coastal cities. The combination of natural setting, architectural rhythm, and cultural legacy makes this area both a world-class tourist destination and a cherished residential neighborhood.

For over a century, development west of Van Ness has followed the city's natural topography, integrating the urban grid with the land's slope, sunlight, and airflow. This is no accident—it is the result of organic, community-guided planning. Taller buildings crown the hilltops, gradually stepping down to 40 feet as the land slopes toward the Bay. Where this balance has been ignored, the consequences have been damaging.

As the city updates its zoning map to meet housing goals, it has both the opportunity and the obligation to respect this historic, context-sensitive development pattern. A one-size-fits-all approach invites speculative land grabs, drives up land costs, and risks replacing community-serving homes and businesses with unaffordable, investor-driven development.

Requested Map Changes & Policy Adjustments

1. Maintain Lombard Street as a Scenic Gateway to San Francisco

Lombard Street forms a gateway into San Francisco from the Golden Gate Bridge, framing iconic landmarks like the Palace of Fine Arts. Longstanding planning principles recognize that such landmarks must retain their visual prominence within the surrounding cityscape.

The proposed Upzoning Map undermines those principles by allowing buildings 6 to 8 stories tall—or more—immediately adjacent to or within the vicinity of lower-scale blocks and historic landmarks. These oversized structures, up to 100% larger than their surroundings, would crowd and compete with iconic features like the Palace of Fine Arts—a City Landmark that has long defined San Francisco's northern waterfront. Its visual stature depends on a built environment that respects both scale and setting. A blunt, uniform upzoning to 85 feet disregards topography and erodes the historic character that makes this area both livable and globally recognized.

We recommend a tapered height approach: 40 feet near the Palace, rising gradually to 50 and then 65 feet approaching Van Ness. This reflects the area's historical development pattern and ensures a balanced transition from the waterfront to the city's interior.

Recommended Height Limits:

- Limit building height to 40' on Richardson Avenue and on Lombard Street (starting at the Lombard Gate) to Webster Street
- Allow gradual increases beyond Webster to Van Ness:
    - 50' between Webster and Gough
    - 65' between Gough and Van Ness

This part of San Francisco — including Cow Hollow, the Marina, and Pacific Heights — has been assigned thousands of new units of housing capacity through broad density decontrol and increased height allowances, all contributing to the state's RHNA targets. It is more than our fair share in one of the city's most densely populated neighborhoods. These policies, when done properly, could enable new growth by allowing duplexes, triplexes, and small multi-unit buildings across the neighborhood.

In addition, Lombard is home to many small, independent motels dating back to the era of the Golden Gate Bridge — a rare remnant of San Francisco's history of welcoming visitors within neighborhood settings. Lombard is one of the last Motorways in the country that captures that hope-filled era of travel in mid-century America, rebuilding after World War II. These motels provide reasonably priced rooms and proximity to a major tourist destination, and support for our local businesses. Several of these motels have already been converted to student housing for the Academy of Art University. Losing others will result in losing tourism to our community and neighborhoods.

These recommendations align with the Planning Department's stated goals under the General Plan to preserve neighborhood character, maintain economic diversity, and enhance citywide view corridors.

2. Protect Existing Housing and Prioritize Safety

Lombard Street already has many residents living in rent-controlled apartments. These homes are essential to neighborhood stability and affordability, and support a vibrant mix of retail, services, and housing. Let's ensure long-time tenants in older rent-controlled buildings will not be quietly displaced through buyouts and demolitions.

As the upzoning plans allowed for more residents, we need to ensure the safety of those residents. The Planning Department must consider the serious risk of liquefaction in these areas. Much of the low-lying Marina and Cow Hollow was built on infill and remains vulnerable to seismic activity.

Aside from Lombard being a liquefaction zone, fire response time is a consideration. Cow Hollow boasts a newly rebuilt fire station on Greenwich Street. However, the fire truck ladders at this station can only service buildings as tall as 6-7 stories. If the building heights nearby are raised to 85' or taller, trucks must come from other neighborhoods, increasing the response time and endangering residents and visitors. This public safety issue has not been addressed anywhere in the city where buildings are proposed for drastic height increases.

These issues point to the need for thoughtful major corridor plans along not only Lombard, but Geary, 19th, and Taraval, among others, to ensure that urban planning practices can be implemented with the public input and care that went into the Market-Octavia or Central SOMA Plans of recent years.

3. Safeguard Neighborhood-Serving Retail Corridors

Chestnut, Union, and Fillmore streets are economic and cultural anchors. Their small-scale, sunlit retail corridors support thousands of jobs and contribute significantly to neighborhood livability and a large contingent of the city's 20+ million visitors that further contribute to supporting local employment and small businesses.

Upzoning these corridors would trigger redevelopment that almost always begins with demolition—many of these buildings are historic one-story Art Deco structures that currently house thriving small businesses. These businesses will not survive the transition, and adjacent shops are often dragged down by years of construction-related disruption. Noise, fencing, blocked sidewalks, lost parking, and reduced foot traffic can destabilize entire commercial blocks. The result is not affordable housing—it is the slow erosion of the vitality and street life that make these neighborhoods work.

The Marina Safeway site is another concern. While redevelopment may be considered, its location and current use are vital for residents—especially seniors and families without access to private transportation. A high-rise would be inappropriate and disruptive in this context.

Recommended Height Limits:

- Limit height to 40 feet on:
    - Union Street
    - Chestnut Street
    - Lower Fillmore Street (within the Marina and Cow Hollow)
    - Upper Fillmore Street (from Jackson to Bush)
    - Safeway site (corner of Laguna and Marina Blvd)

4. Remove Density Decontrol Provisions

To promote transparency and encourage meaningful neighborhood engagement, urge SF Planning to update the current interactive Upzoning Map to clearly reflect the two key provisions. Most San Franciscans are unfamiliar with these kinds of online tools and may not realize they need to click the "Info" button in the left-hand legend to uncover the proposed changes.

Currently, if someone clicks on a corner lot within the density decontrol area, the map still shows a proposed height of 40 feet—rather than the actual 65 feet being contemplated. This creates confusion and obscures the true scope of the changes. Failure to make these provisions plainly visible may not meet the standards of procedural transparency or informed public review expected under CEQA and other land use statutes. Complete clarity is essential.

But clarity alone is not enough. These provisions are deeply flawed and should be removed:

Recommended Changes:

- **Remove the provision that allows 65' heights on corners lots.** This will result in taller, randomly-placed towers among otherwise consistent 1-4 story residential blocks — with no relationship to neighborhood form or any broader planning vision.
- **Remove the provision that allows lots 8,000 sq. ft. or greater to automatically rise to 65'.** This provision encourages lot mergers that will invade the unique and vital greenbelts, backyards, and trees that provide vital open space in dense urban living.

Conclusion

We support new housing through thoughtful, context-sensitive growth. Like the city, we believe in expanding housing opportunities through planning that respects topography, preserves neighborhood identity, and safeguards essential services.

This area has already added housing capacity through the 4- and 6-plex legislation led by Supervisor Mandelman and adopted in 2023. We welcome further improvements that recognize Lombard Street's role as a scenic gateway.

But the current map goes too far. It invites speculation, drives up land costs, and encourages the demolition of sound housing—quietly displacing tenants and small businesses in favor of unaffordable luxury towers. These are the very people and places that give our neighborhoods their life and character.

Incorporating the revisions we've outlined will build public trust, reflect sound planning, and reduce the risk of unnecessary conflict or delay.

We urge you to support a smarter, long-term strategy—one that protects what makes San Francisco unique: its layered history, diverse communities, small businesses, and walkable, human-scale neighborhoods that reflect generations of thoughtful planning—while ensuring that truly affordable housing is the outcome, not just the promise, of these efforts.

Sincerely,

Lori Brooke
President, Cow Hollow Association

cc:
CHA Association Board and Membership
Mayor Daniel Lurie
Ned Segal, Chief of Housing and Economic Development
Rich Hillis, Director, Planning Department
Rachael Tanner, Director of Citywide Planning, Planning Department
Joshua Switzky, Deputy Director of Citywide Policy, Planning Department
Lisa Chen, Principal Planner, Planning Department

SUBMITTED FOR FAMILY ZONING CUT 11/17/2023

SB 9 does not produce below-market-rate (BMR) units, without a substantial increase in supply, it will not realistically assist moderate, low, or extremely low income households (below 120% AMI) obtain housing.

Many areas of the city with lower land values, high percentages of households of color, and/or with lower outcomes in health, wealth, and life expectancy also have high rates of owner-occupied single family housing, for example, the Bayview (73%), Visitation Valley (70%), and Outer Mission (75%). SB 9 may offer these homeowners the opportunity to add units for extended families or to generate rental income, or gain wealth through lot splits. However, there are significant hurdles to realize these gains. Acquiring financing for project development, navigating a complex permitting process, and having the resiliency to manage the significant disruption and take financial risks of construction are major barriers facing existing homeowners in communities of color and low-income communities. Without City investment in programs that support owner-occupied development, such as construction loans or funding prioritized for owners of color or low-income owners, the more straightforward option would be for existing owners to sell their property, or "cash out," and leave San Francisco for areas with lower home costs. While the bill includes a provision that the applicant of an SB 9 lot split is required to occupy one of the housing units as their principal residence for a minimum of three years from the date of the lot split approval, it does not apply to SB 9 project without the lot split. And while selling may financially benefit an individual household, this practice has been incrementally devastating to communities of color, Cultural Districts, and areas of the city where residents have a common sense of cultural identity, and a historic and major loss to San Francisco as a whole.

Supervisor Yahmood

Additional Considerations

THIS IS A PRELUDE TO THE REZONING BEING APPROVED

Beyond the issues addressed above, there are unintended consequences for any legislation and these conditions can be difficult to study and anticipate. Some property owners or developers may use SB 9 to streamline the redevelopment of smaller, existing homes into larger, more expensive single family homes with a small additional unit that may never be rented, undermining the intent of creating more housing stock. Renters are protected by SB 9, but may be vulnerable to unscrupulous landlords due to a variety of circumstances, like being undocumented, in a dire financial state, or otherwise exploited. While the city must implement projects that meet the requirements of SB 9, and other state requirements such as SB 330, the Housing Accountability Act, and others, it may also consider allowable measures to tailor SB 9 through local implementation such as creating owner-occupied development programs that prioritize households of color and low income households, unit parity requirements that balance housing unit size, or others new programs.

NEED MITIGATION. FOR EXAMPLE: WHAT HAPPENED TO SMALL SITES PROGRAM?

SB 10 Summary

Senate Bill 10 (Wiener)[7] authorizes a local government to adopt an ordinance to zone any parcel for up to 10 units of residential density per parcel, at a height specified in the ordinance if the parcel is located in a transit-rich area or an urban infill site. Specifically, this bill:

TO: LUT FROM: Jorge Schulzish

[7] The legislative history and full text of the bill is available at https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=202120220SB10

From:	Ryan Patterson
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	Ephraim Margolin; Sonja Trauss; Devon Bolla
Subject:	RE: Proposed Family Zoning Plan and Housing Element Implementation: File Nos. 250700, 250701, 251071, 251073, 250985, and 250966
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 2:58:40 PM
Attachments:	2025.11.17 Ltr re SF Family Zoning Plan - RJP.pdf

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

Further to the below email, can you please kindly add the attachment to the above-captioned files?

Thank you very much,

Ryan J. Patterson
Patterson & O'Neill, PC
Main: (415) 907-9110
Direct: (415) 907-7701
Mobile: (530) 913-7609
Fax: (415) 907-7704
235 Montgomery Street, Suite 950
San Francisco, CA 94104
ryan@pattersononeill.com
www.pattersononeill.com

This email may contain privileged or confidential material for the sole use of the intended recipient. Review or distribution by others is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the original sender and delete all copies. Nothing in this email or any attachments should be regarded as tax advice unless expressly stated.

From: Devon Bolla <devon@pattersononeill.com>
Sent: Monday, November 17, 2025 2:43 PM
To: john.carroll@sfgov.org; Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
Cc: Ryan Patterson <ryan@pattersononeill.com>; Ephraim Margolin <emargolin@pattersononeill.com>; Sonja Trauss <sonja@yimbylaw.org>
Subject: Proposed Family Zoning Plan and Housing Element Implementation: File Nos. 250700, 250701, 251071, 251073, 250985, and 250966

Good afternoon,

Attached for your review is a memo regarding a proposed family zoning plan and housing element implementation.

Thank you,

Devon J. Bolla
(she/her)
Paralegal
Patterson & O'Neill, PC
Office: (415) 907-9110
Direct: (415) 907-7703
Fax: (415) 907-7704
235 Montgomery Street, Suite 950
San Francisco, CA 94104
devon@pattersononeill.com
www.pattersononeill.com

This email may contain privileged or confidential material for the sole use of the intended recipient. Review or distribution by others is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the original sender and delete all copies. Nothing in this email or any attachments should be regarded as tax advice unless expressly stated.

PATTERSON & O'NEILL, PC

235 Montgomery Street, Suite 950
San Francisco, CA 94104
Telephone: (415) 907-9110
Facsimile: (415) 907-7704

November 17, 2025

VIA EMAIL

Chair Myrna Melgar
Land Use and Transportation Committee
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
49 South Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94103
john.carroll@sfgov.org
Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Proposed Family Zoning Plan and Housing Element Implementation
File Nos. 250700, 250701, 251071, 251073, 250985, and 250966

Dear Chair Melgar and Honorable Supervisors:

Our office represents Yes In My Back Yard ("YIMBY Law"), a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization whose mission is to enforce state housing laws. We write to share our concerns regarding San Francisco's proposed Family Zoning Plan ("FZP"). Our comments incorporate the comments of YIMBY Action and its members, including the attached letters dated September 11, 2025 and October 29, 2025.

I. The City Will Violate the Housing Element Law if it Adopts the FZP Knowing that it Will Not Produce the Required Housing Units

The City's 6th cycle housing element noted that the City was unable to identify enough sites to accommodate the number of units for lower- and moderate-income households, including a 15% buffer, that it was assigned to plan for during its 6th cycle ("RHNA Shortfall"). The Department of Housing and Community Development, therefore, directed the City to include a program in its housing element identifying sites for rezoning to accommodate these units as mandated by the Housing Element Law. (Gov. Code § 65584.09(a)-(b); Gov. Code § 65583(c)(1); *Martinez v. City of Clovis* (2023) 90 Cal. App. 5th 193, 225.) However, the City's proposed rezoning program—Program 7.1.1— and the FZP, which implements Program 7.1.1, are inadequate because (1) the City's own analysis found that the FZP will not create enough units for the City to meet its RHNA Shortfall; (2) the FZP will not create sufficient capacity because it relies on density decontrol in residential neighborhoods without corresponding changes in development standards; and (3) the FZP's local alternative to the state Density Bonus Law will not increase

density because it is duplicative of existing capacity under the state Density Bonus Law.

A. The Chief Economist's Report Confirms that the FZP Will Not Create Enough Units for the City to Meet its RHNA Shortfall

On October 29, 2025, the City's Chief Economist published a report, which found that the FZP will produce **less than half** the number of housing units that the City is required to plan for to meet its RHNA Shortfall – in more than double the time allowed. The report concluded that in a best-case scenario, the FZP would only produce around 14,600 additional units over the next 20 years, representing just 40% of the 36,282 units the City is required to plan for over the next eight years. Under a low-growth scenario, the FZP would only produce 8,504 units over 20 years. Either scenario is inadequate and would be a spectacular failure of the City to comply with the Housing Element Law, which requires local governments to plan to meet their RHNA shortfall through rezoning programs. (Gov. Code § 65583(c)(1) and Gov. Code § 65583.2(h).)

B. The FZP Will Not Create Sufficient Capacity Because it Relies on Density Decontrol in Single-Family Neighborhoods But Does Not Create Room for Additional Density

The FZP uses form-based zoning without corresponding changes in development standards in single-family neighborhoods, which means developers cannot build in these areas. Therefore, the FZP does not actually increase capacity in these neighborhoods.

The FZP uses form-based zoning (also called density decontrol), which regulates the allowed density on a site by setting limits on height, bulk, setbacks, and other features (rather than setting numerical density limits). And while the City claims that the change from the existing numerical density limits to form-based zoning will produce additional units, its refusal to ease the existing limitations on height, bulk, and other standards that limit the buildable envelope for construction in these neighborhoods means there is no actual capacity to build additional units. For example, a lot with an existing single-family home that occupies most or all of the buildable area is unlikely to be redeveloped into multifamily housing because without easing height limits, setbacks, parking minimums, and the like, there will be no place to build the additional units.

The FZP promises to increase density, but its use of form-based density without easing height limits, setbacks, parking minimums, and other development standards will prevent building in the City's highest-resourced neighborhoods.

C. The FZP's Alternative to the State Density Bonus Law Does Not Add Sufficient Density

The City contends that its local alternative to the state Density Bonus Law will create additional capacity for housing production, and it relies on that claim to meet its RHNA shortfall. However, almost all of the capacity that the City is relying on is already available for housing production through the state Density Bonus Law, so the City's local alternative is duplicative of existing capacity under the state Density Bonus Law.

The state Density Bonus Law requires local agencies to grant density bonuses under the state law to qualifying projects. (Gov. Code § 65915(a)(1)-(b).)

The FZP would give applicants a local alternative to the state Density Bonus Law called Housing Choice-San Francisco ("HCSF"). Crucially, HCSF does not offer any increase in density beyond what is offered by the state Density Bonus Law in most locations. Moreover, when both the state Density Bonus Law and HCSF are available, applicants can only avail themselves of one.

The state Density Bonus Law is intended as a bonus on *top* of local rules. (Gov. Code § 65915(u)(1).) But the HCSF offers no increase in density beyond what developers are already entitled to under the state Density Bonus Law when a project is eligible for both. Therefore, the HCSF does not create the additional capacity required by the Housing Element Law.

II. The City Fails to Use the Required "Analytical Model" to Determine the Likelihood of Site Development

The FZP fails to use the "analytical model" required by the City's housing element. When a city includes a program in its housing element, the Housing Element Law makes it mandatory to implement the features of those programs. (Gov. Code § 65581(b); Gov. Code § 65583(c)(1); *Hoffmaster v. City of San Diego* (1997) 55 Cal.App.4th 1098.)

Program 7.1.1 of the City's housing element commits the City to implementing a rezoning program that "reasonably account[s] for sites' likelihood of development during the planning period using an analytical model." In addition to the Housing Element Law, which makes it mandatory for the City to use an "analytical model," the City's housing element uses mandatory language, stating that the City "shall" build its rezoning program around such a "probability-of-development" analysis. The FZP, however, fails to use an "analytical model," in violation of the housing element. Instead, the FZP uses three alternative methods to estimate how many housing units the FZP will produce, none of which meets the requirements of Program 7.1.1.

First, the City proposes using a "soft sites" method, which assumes that a site that is already developed with a residential use has a two percent probability of being redeveloped with the FZP's planned residential capacity, and a site that is already developed with a non-residential use has a seventy percent probability of redevelopment with a residential use. This assumption is just that, and not an analytical model. Such rigid calculations based on uniform, citywide assumptions about the odds of development on thousands of very different sites are not an "analytical model" and do not "reasonably account for sites' likelihood of development" as required by Program 7.1.1.

Second, the City assesses the likelihood of a given site being developed under the rezoning proposal using a model that evaluates whether new housing is financially feasible at a given site. The model assumes that two percent of sites currently occupied by residential uses and thirty-five percent of other sites will be redeveloped with economically feasible new housing developments. Again, this is not an "analytical model" that "reasonably account[s] for sites' likelihood of development" as required by Program 7.1.1 because its assumptions are not grounded in historical development standards in San Francisco, and its focus on financial feasibility is a distinct concept from focusing on "the probability of development." It may be financially feasible for a property to be redeveloped, but that same property can have a low likelihood of being redeveloped for a variety of reasons, especially for single-family homes that play a big role in the FZP, and which already contain high-value structures or the property owner faces financial constraints, lack of development experience, or the need to use the property for their own housing. Moreover, even if this method were accurate, it projects only 19,000 new units of housing over the planning period – far below the requirement of 36,282 new units.

The third model that the City relies on involves examining the rate at which units across the City were approved using historical data from 2005-2023 and multiplying that by the theoretical capacity of the sites. This model does not qualify as an "analytical model" because it ignores the fact that much of the development in the City in recent years has taken place on vacant sites or extremely underutilized land. In fact, around 25% of sites that were redeveloped from 2005-2023 had residential uses before redevelopment, while around 84% of sites under the FZP have residential uses. Non-vacant sites already containing residential uses are 70% less likely to be redeveloped according to the City's own analysis, and the FZP errs in assuming that non-vacant and vacant sites will be redeveloped at the same rate. (*See* Housing Element, Appendix B.2, Figure 2.) Since the FZP mostly contains parcels with residential uses, unlike past development, this approach of extrapolating from past development does not correspond to future development predictions.

The areas where housing would be built under the FZP already contain high-value structures, such as single-family homes, where the owners are unlikely or unable to redevelop the site as multi-family housing due to financial constraints, lack of development experience, and the need to use their properties for their own housing.

These areas will have much lower rates of redevelopment, which this model does not take into account. Moreover, this model has unrealistically low estimates of the City's residential zoning capacity in prior years (thus inflating the share of residential zoned capacity that has been built out) and the inclusion of residential projects built under development agreements, which do not correspond to rezonings, and which were separately counted towards the City's pre-existing residential zoned capacity in the housing element. These two reasons disqualify this model from being an "analytical model."

Additionally, the FZP does not create sufficient capacity because it assumes certain large pipeline projects will actually be constructed within the planning period, when in reality such development is exceedingly unlikely – if not impossible. For the Hunters Point/Candlestick project, approximately 3,500 units are located on Navy-owned parcels. The City will not even obtain control of these parcels until the Navy finishes remediation, which is estimated to take at least 11 more years. ("The Navy has recently informed OCII that completion of remediation and conveyance of all portions of the Shipyard Site, excluding Parcel F, to Developer will occur between 2036-2038 . . . ." (Resolution No. 26-2024, available at https://sfocii.org/sites/default/files/2024-08/5.%20RESO%2026-2024_HPS%20Approval%20of%20Amendments%20to%20Redevelopment%20Plan.pdf; *see also* https://www.sfchronicle.com/sf/article/hunters-point-shipyard-radioactive-materials-21129542.php.) Similarly, Treasure Island's phasing includes a maximum of 4,600 units completed before 2031, but the City is counting all 8,000 units toward the pipeline. (*See* https://media.api.sf.gov/documents/Ex._JJ_-_SOP.pdf; Treasure Island Sub-Phase Application 3, Schedule of Performance, Exh. JJ, Appendix B, https://media.api.sf.gov/documents/TI_Sub-Phase_Application_3_Book-Revision_1_-_reduced.pdf.)

Since none of the three models that the City considers qualifies as a reasonable "analytical model," the City is violating its legally binding commitment under Program 7.1.1.

III. The FZP Adds New Constraints On Housing Production and Fails to Analyze the Impact of These Constraints

The FZP adds new constraints on housing development, which were not analyzed in its housing element, in violation of the Housing Element Law and Senate Bill ("SB") 330.

A. The FZP's New Constraints Violate the Housing Element Law

The FZP adds new constraints on housing production, which it fails to analyze as required by the Housing Element Law. When considering rezoning plans, the Housing Element Law requires local governments to analyze new governmental constraints on housing production. (Gov. Code § 65583(a)(5); *see also Californians*

for Homeownership, Inc. v. City of Beverly Hills (2023) Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCP00143, at p. 6, [finding planned rezonings for housing element site inventory must analyze new constraints].)

The FZP adds new constraints on development that were not analyzed by the City's housing element, including caps on dwelling unit size, limits on curb cuts, lower parking maximums, and limits imposed by the City's local alternative to the state Density Bonus Law. As explained above, the FZP imposes new constraints because it deprives applicants of the ability to use the state Density Bonus Law in conjunction with the City's local alternative to the state Density Bonus Law, which reduces the number of units the FZP will produce. Other constraints reduce physical development capacity, e.g., caps on dwelling unit size that cannot accommodate larger families, and reduce the economic feasibility of developing housing. The FZP does *not* analyze the impact of these policies on housing production. The FZP, therefore, violates the Housing Element Law's requirement that local governments analyze new governmental constraints on housing production if they were not analyzed in a housing element. (Gov. Code § 65583(a)(5).)

B. The FZP's New Constraints Violate SB 330's Prohibition Against Rezonings Which Decrease Housing Intensity

The FZP's new constraints on housing violate SB 330's prohibition against rezonings which "lessen the intensity of housing." (Gov. Code § 66300(b)(1)(A).)

SB 330—also known as the Housing Crisis Act—prohibits local governments from enacting a development policy, standard, or condition that would "Chang[e] the general plan land use designation, specific plan land use designation, or zoning of a parcel or parcels of property to a less intensive use or reduc[e] the intensity of land use within an existing general plan land use designation, specific plan land use designation, or zoning district below what was allowed under the land use designation and zoning ordinances of the affected county or affected city, as applicable, as in effect on January 1, 2018[.]" (*Id.*) SB 330 defines "less intensive use" as including situations where a local government imposes reductions to the height, density, or floor area ratio, new or increased open space or lot size requirements, new or increased setback requirements, minimum frontage requirements, maximum lot coverage limitations, or "*any other action that would individually or cumulatively reduce [a] site's residential development capacity*." (*Id.*; emph. added.)

As mentioned above, the FZP contains new constraints on housing, including caps on dwelling unit size, limits on curb cuts, and lower parking maximums, reduces the number of units the FZP will produce. These new constraints run afoul of SB 330 because they reduce the size of units that applicants are able to construct, which physically reduces the intensity of residential use and reduces the financial viability of residential construction. The City has also conducted no analysis to show

that there will be a concurrent increase in intensity of land use to offset the decrease in intensity of land use caused by the FZP. (Gov. Code § 66300(h).)

IV. The FZP Violates the Housing Element Law By Relying on an Overlay for Nonvacant Sites Where Development of Nonresidential Uses Is Permitted

The FZP violates the recent decision in *New Commune v. City of Redondo Beach et al.* (2025) 337 Cal.Rptr.3d 782 that overlays cannot be used to meet minimum density requirements required by rezoning programs if they permit developers to redevelop sites for non-residential uses.

As explained above, when a local government cannot accommodate its RHNA Shortfall for lower-income households with a site inventory, it has to include a rezoning program in its housing element. The Housing Element Law also requires jurisdictions that must develop rezoning programs to ensure that at least 50% of the lower income housing the agency must plan for is "accommodated on sites designated for residential use and for which nonresidential uses or mixed uses are not permitted." (Gov. Code § 65583.2(h)(2).) As the City acknowledges in Program 7.1.1, it is subject to this statutory minimum density requirement.

In *New Commune*, the court ruled that residential "overlays are unlawful when they allow development below the statutory minimum density [required by Gov. Cod § 65583.2(h)(2)]." (*Id*. at 797.) The court in *New Commune* also noted that residential overlays are unlawful whether they are overlaid over a base zoning that permits residential or industrial and commercial uses. (*Id*.)

The FZP runs afoul of the *New Commune* decision and the Housing Element Law's minimum density requirement because it still permits nonresidential redevelopment of sites. The FZP is an overlay because it does not change the base zoning of properties, but is instead overlaid over existing zones, including non-residential zones. For instance, for properties subject to the FZP developers can still use the underlying C-2 and C-3 zoning to construct commercial structures, which would be below the statutory minimum density because no residential units would be constructed. By permitting developers to build nonresidential projects within the overlay, the FZP violates the Housing Element Law as explained by the court in *New Commune*.

V. The FZP Violates the Prohibition against Jurisdictions Forcing Applicants to Waive Their Right to Use the State Density Bonus Law

The FZP primarily relies on a local alternative to the state Density Bonus Law, which developers can only use if they waive their right to use the state Density Bonus Law. This is a violation of the state Density Bonus Law.

Local agencies are prohibited from adopting ordinances that conflict with the state Density Bonus Law or using their local alternative to impose development requirements that are more restrictive than the state Density Bonus Law. (*Schreiber v. City of Los Angeles* (2021) 69 Cal.App.5th 549.) The court in *Schreiber* made it clear that applicants have the right to use the state Density Bonus Law regardless of any local provisions, and that cities cannot deny, limit, or condition the use of the state Density Bonus Law by requiring an applicant to instead use a local alternative.

The FZP creates a local alternative to the state Density Bonus law called Housing Choice-San Francisco ("HCSF"). HCSF—proposed Planning Code Section 206.10(b)(5)—has only one criterion: that applicants agree to "not receive any density or development bonuses or relief from applicable Planning Code standards in any other State or local law or program[.]" HCSF violates the state Density Bonus Law's prohibition that local agencies cannot bar an applicant from using the state Density Bonus Law, regardless of any local provisions. The FZP illegally forces applicants to choose between the state Density Bonus Law and HCSF, which violates the rule that "an otherwise valid local ordinance that conflicts with the state Density Bonus Law is preempted." (*Latinos Unidos Del Valle De Napa Y Solano v. County of Napa* (2013) 217 Cal.App.4th 1160, 1169.) The City must amend the FZP so that the state Density Bonus Law can be used on *top* of the HCSF, which has the potential to create meaningful housing production.

VI. Conclusion

We urge the City to comply with the law and remedy the deficiencies in its rezoning plan. If the City fails to significantly increase its proposed residential capacity, there will be no realistic chance of meeting its RHNA obligations. YIMBY Law is prepared to take legal action to hold the City accountable for these clear violations of state housing law.

PATTERSON & O'NEILL, PC

Ryan J. Patterson
General Counsel for Yes In My Back Yard

CC CA Department of Housing and Community Development
Mayor Daniel Lurie

Encl. September 11, 2025 Letter from Yes In My Back Yard
October 29, 2025 Letter from Yes In My Back Yard
October 29, 2025 Report from the Chief Economist of San Francisco

EXHIBIT A

YIMBY Law

2261 Market Street STE 10416
San Francisco, CA 94114
hello@yimbylaw.org

9/11/2025

San Francisco Planning Commission
400, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

(via email) commissions.secretary@sfgov.org

Re: San Francisco's Draft Housing Rezoning Program and Compliance with State Law

Dear Commissioners,

YIMBY Law is a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization dedicated to ensuring compliance with California's housing laws. We write today to express significant concerns regarding the City's proposed Housing Element Rezoning Program and the accompanying "Housing Choice–San Francisco" local bonus ordinance.

Summary

While the rezoning plan, including the local program, is a good step forward for housing in San Francisco, we are concerned that the plan does not actually fulfill what it promises to do. The city has produced no publicly available reports that show how the plan will be more capable of delivering the housing San Franciscans desperately need than what state laws already allow. While we support density decontrol, we do not believe the city has shown that the handful of incentives that are coupled with it will be enough to produce any more housing than state laws such as the Density Bonus Law already do.

Capacity Projections

San Francisco's Housing Element made a binding commitment to meet its Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) through a rezoning program rooted in a probabilistic analytical model Program 7.1.1. San Francisco did not base its rezoning on a site's inventory, but on the projected housing based on that model. The targets and assumptions it sets are enforced by Program 8.1.5. If San Francisco does not produce sufficient units, Program 8.1.5. applies additional upzoning requirements.

Despite the City's commitments to specific unit production, applying the city's own model used to determine the shortfall on the rezone sites, we can determine that the map would produce around 17k homes by 2031, or 47% of the 36k units promised by Program 7.1.1. That regression analysis was built on different logic than the Housing Element's existing capacity analysis. While the proposal does not clearly make up for the RHNA shortfall, its usefulness is difficult to gauge when it functions by different logic than the original rezoning analysis. In order to be comprehensible, realistic, and enforceable, San Francisco must produce a "realistic capacity" table for the rezoned sites that incorporates the Housing Element' regression analysis.

We understand that the City has conducted its own analysis that disputes these figures, but the methodology and details of this analysis have not been made publicly available; therefore we remain concerned and skeptical about the efficacy of the rezoning program in meeting the city's needed housing requirements under housing element law.

Compliance with State Law

San Francisco's rezoning program would institute a local density bonus program that, theoretically, according to the city's assertions (which are not supported by any publicly available information), would accommodate the City's RHNA shortfall. The practical and legal realities according to our analysis suggest that it would fail to produce housing at the suggested rates, and fail to meet statutory requirements.

The latest staff report associated with the September 11 Planning Commission hearing notes that 77% of parcels in the rezoning plan fall into the form based zoning code and will not have their heights increased, while for "the vast majority of residential sites, these changes are only available for projects opting into the local program."

Some proposed areas not eligible for the state bonus would benefit from San Francisco's local program. However, this local program would be exclusive to California's state density bonus law in all areas where both options are available. Whether or not the local program is superior to state incentives, the one cannot replace the other. State density bonus law is intended as a bonus on top of local rules, and should not be supplanted when it generally offers superior development potential.

San Francisco's density decontrol is generally less feasible than the state program. While we applaud the city for applying a local density bonus program to projects between 2-4 units, which are not otherwise eligible for the state density bonus, as well as allowing alternatives to providing on-site affordable units, such as off-site developments, for the vast majority of the city's proposed "rezoning" program, state density bonus law offers a superior alternative: unlimited waivers from local zoning and development standards,

providing limited discretion for local review. Comparatively, the local program is far more stringent. It contains strict rules about building size, setbacks, open space, dwelling unit exposure, and parking allowances. It contains only a 15% reduction of other development standards. The proposal would allow for greater than 15% reductions if approved by a discretionary process. Even if that expensive, time consuming process doesn't result in universal denials, it renders the project not code compliant, forcing the developer to lose protections under the Housing Accountability Act.

While we support the majority of the proposed staff changes made to the local program, we believe that they do not go far enough to ensure that the local program is a superior alternative to state density bonus law. For example, the proposal to require projects with 5+ units to reserve a minimum of 25% of the units for 2+BR units is a constraint that is not required under state density bonus law that will negatively impact density potential for the local program. Additionally, the proposed local program not only requires applicants to choose to give up their option to pursue waivers and incentives under state density bonus law, but *any other* state program that provides its own bonuses or waivers from local zoning, such as AB 2011, which offers waivers of local side and rear setback requirements when those requirements limit feasibility, limits front setback requirements, and allows 55 foot heights, which are greater than the 40 foot height limits proposed for the majority of the local program's rezoned sites.

This proposal not only replaces state density bonus allowances with a worse option, it places new constraints on any such developments via inclusionary requirements and requiring new wind studies on construction. These constraints were not reviewed in the Housing Element, meaning that they may not be imposed or that San Francisco must amend its Element to account for those constraints. New constraints must be accounted for in the Element, to demonstrate how San Francisco can realistically meet its RHNA requirements.

San Francisco must also analyze how this program would interact with existing land use regulations. Transfer taxes, inclusionary requirements, and impact fees are key drivers of unit loss, but have not been incorporated into any City analyses yet. We encourage the City Economist to incorporate them into any future analysis of this program.

Even if all of these deficiencies are corrected, they cannot make up for the requirement to change the base zoning of parcels, as required by Housing Element law and HCD interpretation. Under the new scheme, San Francisco would not change its zoned capacity, and therefore would not comply with state law. Density bonuses must add capacity on top of that allowed for in the zoning code.

Conclusion

Given the substantial deficiencies in San Francisco's rezoning program and the speculative nature of its local density bonus ordinance, the City's Housing Element certification is at risk. The burden is on San Francisco to demonstrate compliance. The use of analytical models that inflate development probability, the reliance on unproven local bonus mechanisms, and the introduction of new constraints all undermine that burden. In short, the program is not legally defensible as currently drafted, with the limited information supporting the city's conclusions that it exceeds the city's RHNA obligation

YIMBY Law has taken legal action against the City of Los Angeles for a similar failure to deliver a legally compliant rezoning program. We sincerely hope litigation will not be necessary in San Francisco. However, San Francisco will be vulnerable to lawsuits from parties working to ensure that the City complies with state law and delivers a realistic path toward housing affordability and accessibility.

We urge the Board to direct Planning to:

- Re-run the BlueSky regression analysis used for the Housing Element's "existing capacity" estimate on the rezoning proposal to produce a transparent, realistic capacity table that is made publicly available.

- Incorporate the waiver and incentive framework of SDBL into the local bonus program, or ensure that projects can access SDBL concurrently.

- Remove new constraints on development introduced by the ordinance.

- Ensure that the rezoning program meets or exceeds the 36,282-unit requirement via base zoning and that its methodology aligns with Program 7.1.1.

The stakes for San Francisco are high. We urge the City to correct course by allowing the use of density bonus and other state programs in combination with the local program.

Sincerely,

Jack Farrell, Esq.
Research Attorney
YIMBY Law

EXHIBIT B

From:	Jane Natoli
To:	paul.mcdougall@hcd.ca.gov
Cc:	gustavo.velasquez@hcd.ca.gov; melinda.coy@hcd.ca.gov; Zisser, David@HCD; megan.kirkeby@hcd.ca.gov; shannan.west@hcd.ca.gov; Frank, Lisa@HCD; Herrera, Fidel@HCD; matthew.struhar@doj.ca.gov; david.pai@doj.ca.gov; alex.fisch@doj.ca.gov; Annie Fryman; Tanner, Rachael (CPC); Chen, Lisa (CPC); Sonja Trauss; matt@caforhomes.org; senator.wiener@senate.ca.gov; Severiano.Christian@sen.ca.gov; Mohtashemi, Raayan; David Broockman; Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Supervisors; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Bonde, Aly (MYR); Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC)
Subject:	SF YIMBY"s letter on the City Economist"s report
Date:	Wednesday, October 29, 2025 4:13:34 PM
Attachments:	SF YIMBY FZP Letter October 29 2025.pdf

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

Hello,

We are writing to urgently draw your attention to the just released report from the City Economist that shows San Francisco's rezoning will not meet our state housing requirements. Please see our attached letter, and let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you,

--

Jane Natoli (she/her)
San Francisco Organizing Director
415-335-9950

Check out everything we achieved in 2024!

Paul McDougall, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Mayor Daniel Lurie
San Francisco Board of Supervisors (re: file #250700)
October 29, 2025

We write to urgently draw your attention to **an analysis the City of San Francisco ("SF") released that finds that its own rezoning plan would violate state law.** The Family Zoning Plan ("FZP") is a significant step forward, but the city's analysis found that it will not meet the city's Housing Element's 36,282-unit requirement. **According to the city's own numbers, state law requires the city to conduct additional rezoning beyond the FZP.**

As a reminder, in 2022, the California Department of Housing and Community Development ("HCD") suggested that, instead of a traditional sites inventory, SF instead pledge to assess the capacity of its rezoning using the method from its underutilized sites analysis (a model called BlueSky, which estimates the likelihood of development). Housing Element Program 7.1.1 thus committed that SF's rezoning "shall reasonably account for sites' likelihood of development during the planning period using an analytical model."

SF's August submission to HCD revealed that SF still had not done so (see Appendix). HCD thus instructed SF that "As part of Program 7.1.1 and using analytical models to account for a site's likelihood of development in the planning period, the city should continue to explore additional and multiple methods and make adjustments as appropriate."

Today, SF did so: its City Economist reported that he used an updated version of the BlueSky analytical model—the same method HCD originally suggested SF use—to estimate the number of units the FZP will likely develop. **He reported that, in the best case scenario, the City's analytical model finds that the FZP is only likely to develop 14,646 units by 2045, far less than the 36,282 required by 2031** under 7.1.1. In other words, **using the exact method HCD suggested SF use, the City itself has found that its rezoning plan does not meet Program 7.1.1's requirements, and is around 10 times too small.**

Gov. Code § 65588(e)(4)(C)(iii) states, "If a jurisdiction...fails to complete the required rezoning within the time period required, the jurisdiction's adopted housing element shall be subject to" the housing element decertification process. Thus, **if SF fails to expand its plan, HCD will be legally obliged to begin the decertification process**.

We encourage HCD to offer SF guidance about how to bring its proposed rezoning into compliance, building on HCD's recent guidance to the city to "make adjustments as appropriate" when more analysis was made available. For example, using recent changes in state law (e.g., SB 131, SB 79), additional rezoning or policy changes that supplement the FZP (e.g., reduced fees and exactions) could be passed within months. Given the timeline required for decertification, HCD could reasonably offer SF up to six months before the builders' remedy would apply to fully complete its "required rezoning" through such a supplement.

Confirming that SF must rely on the City Economist's updated BlueSky analytical model to assess the rezoning's capacity, as well as the actions taken to satisfy Program 8.1.5 (the "circuit breaker"), would also be consistent with HCD's recent direction to the city to "us[e] conservative assumptions...that facilitate the highest housing outcomes."

SF's actions risk paving a path for other cities to evade state law. In particular, rather than "demonstrat[ing] that the existing use [on each non-vacant site] does not constitute an impediment to additional residential development" (Gov. Code, § 65583.2(g)), cities will be tempted to follow SF: promise in a Housing Element to provide this evidence later in the form of statistical analysis—but then ignore what this evidence shows when rezoning.

Best regards,

Salim Damerdji

Volunteer Lead, San Francisco YIMBY

Jane Natoli

San Francisco Organizing Director,

YIMBY Action

CC: Gustavo Velasquez, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Megan Kirkeby, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Melinda Coy, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Shannan West, California Department of Housing and Community Development
David Zisser, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Lisa Frank, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Fidel Herrera, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Alex Fisch, California Department of Justice
Matthew Struhar, California Department of Justice
David Pai, California Department of Justice
Annie Fryman, SPUR
Aly Bonde, Office of Mayor Daniel Lurie
Sarah Dennis-Phillips, Rachael Tanner, and Lisa Chen, San Francisco Planning
Sonja Trauss, YIMBY Law
Matt Gelfand, Californians for Homeownership
Senator Scott Wiener

Appendix: Why the Planning Department's methods do not satisfy the Housing Element's requirement to "reasonably account for sites' likelihood of development during the planning period using an analytical model"

The San Francisco Planning Department's August 1 submission to HCD contained three analyses of the capacity provided by its rezoning. None of these analyses satisfy Program 7.1.1's commitment to "reasonably account for sites' likelihood of development during the planning period using an analytical model." The below details why each of the Planning Department's methods do not satisfy this requirement. Indeed, a closer look at the Planning Department's analyses suggests conclusions that are in line with the City Economist's finding that the rezoning is insufficient.

"Soft Sites Method"

Under this method, the vast majority of the rezoning's capacity is from sites without existing residential uses (but that largely have other uses). The Planning Department assumes that 70% of these sites will be developed to their maximum capacity during the planning period. This 70% assumption is not "reasonabl[e]" (and certainly not "conservative" like the city claims):

1. In San Francisco, fewer than 70% of entitled projects are ultimately developed — making it implausible that 70% of all sites without residential use will be developed, even those where no interest has been expressed in development or discontinuing existing uses. As another comparison, the Terner Center found that only 8.6% of LA's very best sites are developed over 5 years (versus SF's 70% assumption across a huge number of sites).
2. These sites largely do have other non-residential uses which make their development especially improbable. For example, the first page of SF's parcel list includes 1201-05 Columbus Avenue, a 3-story Travelodge in Fisherman's Wharf. The city assumes there is a 70% chance that properties like this will be redeveloped during the planning period.
3. The city's related assertion that 2% of sites with existing residential uses will be redeveloped during the planning period is similarly made without evidence.

This approach also allows the city to evade complying with GC 65583.2(g)'s requirement that the city provide substantial evidence that existing uses on "lower income" sites are likely to be discontinued during the planning period. The city has not provided site-specific evidence supporting their assertion that most sites with existing non-residential uses will be developed during the planning period. The lack of site-specific evidence would not be a problem if the city had provided statistical evidence (i.e., had statistically estimated what percent of these sites will have their existing use discontinued during the planning period based on historical data, as action 7.1.1 promises). But the Planning Department simply provides no evidence whatsoever that 70% of sites with existing non-residential uses will be developed, either site-specific or

statistical. This 70% figure is simply fabricated — not from “an analytical model,” and it is not at all “reasonable.”

“Citywide Capacity Method”

This method calculates what share of the city’s remaining zoned capacity was developed annually over the last 18 years (2005-2023). It then assumes the new capacity created by the rezoning will be developed at a similar annual rate.

While reasonable in theory, there are several errors and problems with how the Planning Department is implementing this approach that make it not “reasonabl[e]” in practice:

1. The city has two versions of this approach, each with errors:
    a. The primary version (with “exclusions”) divides citywide development by the amount of capacity on only a subset of parcels. This overstates the rate at which capacity historically translates into development because less capacity is considered despite all development being considered. This is like computing the average grades of all students in a class by adding up all students’ grades but then dividing this total by half the number of students there are in the class.
    b. The city describes another version of the method that measures capacity on all parcels but uses Planning entitlements to measure development; during this period there were 90K entitlements but only 53K building permits. Using entitlements to measure development overstates the historical development rate, as in San Francisco many entitlements are never developed (in part due to constraints the city places on development).
2. The city’s statistic that 53K units were constructed citywide 2005-2023 includes development from development agreements (DAs). By counting historical DA development when computing the rate at which historical zoned capacity is developed, the city therefore assumes that the rezoning will produce new DA development during this planning period. This is unreasonable, as DAs do not result from (re)zoning. Furthermore, the city’s housing element already counted expected development from DAs during the planning period in its claims of existing capacity.
3. Parcels where projects have been proposed but have not received permits are excluded from the city’s calculation of its historical capacity; this leads the city to underestimate how much historical capacity it had, and therefore overstate the development rate of its capacity.
4. The new rezoned capacity is also less developable than the existing remaining capacity. Specifically, according to the city’s Bluesky model (the model it used for its underutilized sites analysis), the new capacity is about 20% less likely to be developed. This is because, for example, rezoned capacity is 3x more likely to be on sites with an existing residential use than existing capacity. It’s therefore not entirely reasonable to assume that the city’s historical rate of development will manifest for the new capacity.

5. The Planning Department is relying on its UrbanSim tool to measure its remaining zoned capacity (313K). But the city's housing element (Sites Inventory Appendix B2 p. 4) gives a much larger number for this (572K), as do our own calculations. Insofar as the city is now understating how much capacity it has, it is therefore overstating the rate at which that capacity has been developed. We have asked for data that would help us understand this discrepancy, but the city has indicated that its UrbanSim tool is unable to provide the underlying data that supports this 313K calculation.

When addressing the first four errors and issues above, and when using the city's housing element's estimate that the city has 572K units of capacity remaining (see point 5), the historical development rate is 0.4% and the adjusted capacity of the rezoning is therefore 10K units.

"Financial Feasibility Method"

The Planning Department has contracted with UrbanSim to estimate whether development will be economically feasible on rezoned parcels. While this analysis is welcome, there are several problems with this approach:

1. Totaling the amount of economically feasible development does not "account for sites' likelihood of development." Historically, only a fraction of economically feasible units are actually developed, and some research practitioners have advised us that there is nearly an order of magnitude difference between the two.
2. The Planning Department's economic assumptions are not "reasonabl[e]": the Department assumes that construction costs, interest rates, and developer return expectations will drop without providing evidence. It also assumes rents will jump. The Department justifies these optimistic assumptions by asserting that it is only responsible for making housing feasible to develop under better economic conditions than are likely during this planning period — but action 7.1.1 commits to providing enough capacity to make 36K units likely developed during this planning period. Furthermore, the city's poor economic environment for development reflects the city's constraints on development that Housing Element Law is supposed to remediate. I.e., the fact that the city so heavily constrains development makes more rezoning (and changes to its other policies) necessary, and cannot be ignored when considering the appropriate scope of actions to accommodate development.
3. The Department's submission describes a flawed approach for using UrbanSim's output to account for the likelihood of development: asserting that 2% of economically feasible projects will occur on sites with existing residential uses and 35% of economically feasible projects will occur on sites with other non-residential uses. These assumptions are not based on any evidence and, for the same reasons we described in the context of the "soft sites" method, are not reasonable.
4. After applying this flawed approach for accounting for the likelihood of development, the Planning Department nevertheless finds that only 19K units will be developed during the planning period. This is short of the 36K required by action 7.1.1. The Planning

Department argues that this is acceptable because the method must only demonstrate sufficient capacity for meeting the city's 16K RHNA shortfall in the Moderate and Above-Moderate income categories. But action 7.1.1 makes no reference to separate by-category targets, it simply states that the rezoning must "accommodate… approximately 36,282 new units." Furthermore, the Department's argument is also belied by the Housing Element Law and the No Net Loss Law, both of which contemplate development of market-rate and mixed-income projects on "lower income" sites (GC 65583.2(c) & (h); GC 65863(c)(2)).

EXHIBIT C

Family Zoning Plan: Economic Impact Report

Office of the Controller
Office of Economic Analysis

Items 250700 & 250701
October 29, 2025

Introduction

- Two proposed ordinances would change zoning controls to permit more housing on a large segment of San Francisco, particularly on the western half of the city. They implement changes to the Housing Element of the City's General Plan, a planning document whose revisions were adopted in 2023.
- The Ordinance in file #250700, the Zoning Map Amendment, would generally raise allowable building heights along commercial corridors and transit lines, to permit mid-rise and some high-rise development.
- The Ordinance in file #250701 implements the Housing Choice-San Francisco program, which offers an alternative to the State Density Bonus program.
- The Office of Economic Analysis (OEA) has prepared this report because the proposed legislation may have a material impact on the city's economy. This report uses a model that estimates potential new development, in order to assess economic impact. That model is not a replacement for the City's estimates of realistic capacity under Government Code § 65583.2.

Zoning Map Amendment: Key Provisions

- The Zoning Map Amendment would make changes to allowable building heights and bulk, and/or zoning districts, in over 92,000 parcels in the city.
- The vast majority are residential parcels, whose allowable heights would either remain at 40 feet, or rise to 50 or 65 feet.
- On these and many other rezoned parcels, the Housing Choice San Francisco program (described on the next page) relaxes existing controls on the number of housing units allowed on a parcel.
- Allowable heights are generally increased to 65 to 85 feet along many commercial corridors, with development along wider streets near transit stations or major lines increased to 85 feet.
- Heights above 140 feet are allowed on certain streets that currently allow high-rise development or have larger parcels, at key intersections, and near certain major transit routes and stations. The map on page 5 provides additional details.

Housing Choice San Francisco – Key Provisions

- The Housing Choice San Francisco program, or “Local Program”, gives developers an alternative to the State Density Bonus.
- Many of the rezoned residential parcels are too small to be eligible for the State Density Bonus, but may achieve greater density through the use of the Local Program.
- Local Program users also gain benefits associated with housing unit mix, methods of complying with inclusionary housing requirements, rear-yard and setback requirements, broad code flexibility, and certain process changes.
- The ordinance has several other provisions, including limiting the maximum size of new residential units, reducing allowable parking, and restricting new curb cuts. These policy changes are not considered in this report.
- Additionally, the proposed ordinance gives displaced businesses the right to relocate anywhere in the city where their activity is permitted by zoning, without a conditional use permit, and waives development impact fees associated with the relocation.

Details of the Rezoning



The map to the left, from the City Planning department, indicates which parcels in the city will be rezoned, and to which heights. It reflects the plan as of July.

Gray parcels will be zoned for low-rise, 40-50 feet housing developments. This includes single-family residential zones, within which greater density will be permitted via the Local Program.

Yellow and orange parcels will be upzoned to mid-rise development of 65-105 feet.

Pink and purple parcels will have height limits ranging from 120-180 feet, and the blue and green parcels will be upzoned for high-rise development, of 240 feet or greater.

The Rezoning and the Regional Housing Needs Assessment

- Each jurisdiction in California is required to have its Housing Element be certified by the State's Housing and Community Development Department.
- Certification involves, among other things, ensuring that the City has the zoning capacity to meet the city's obligations under the State's Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA).
- RHNA is a Statewide planning process, in which future needs are forecasted for metropolitan areas, and then allocated to the individual cities and counties that administer land use planning.
- In San Francisco's case, the RHNA obligation requires the City to have realistic capacity for approximately 82,000 new housing units, at different economic levels, within an 8-year planning period ending in 2031.
- Of this 82,000 unit requirement, the City must create capacity for approximately 36,000 units.

Substitutions and Proposed Amendments

- On September 30, a new version of #250700 was substituted by Mayor Lurie, which made relatively minor zoning changes on a number of parcels. This analysis reflects those changes.
- On October 21, Supervisor Melgar proposed an amendment that would prohibit the use of the Local Program on any parcel containing more then two existing housing units, which would involve the demolition of a unit subject to rent control.
- Also on October 21, Supervisor Sauter introduced an amendment that creates incentives for developers to replace lost commercial space.
- As the language of these two amendments was made public less than one week ago, this report does not attempt to model their economic impact.

Economic Impact Factors

- When the City relaxes zoning controls, by reducing density restrictions or increasing allowable heights, more development projects will become financially feasible, and the supply of housing in the city will rise.
- This increased supply will put downward pressure on housing prices in the city. Cheaper housing benefits city residents who move within the city, and also makes San Francisco more affordable for new arrivals.
- The development of new housing also stimulates investment and employment in construction and related industries.
- The population growth associated with new housing also stimulates the local economy, by expanding the numbers of workers and consumers.
- On the other hand, the limited amount of vacant lots in the city means that new housing generally involves the loss of existing buildings, including both residential and commercial properties. This can impose relocation and other costs on residential and commercial tenants.

Estimating the Likelihood of New Housing Development

- The amount of new housing that the rezoning will produce is an important contributor to its economic impact. To estimate this, OEA refined a statistical model that it has used since 2016 to estimate the impact of policy changes on housing production in the city[1].
- The model was the result of statistical analysis of housing production in San Francisco over the 2004-2024 period. Technical details on the model are provided in the Appendix.
- The first part of the model estimates the likelihood that multifamily housing will be developed on a given parcel, in a given year. The statistical analysis found that a parcel is more likely to develop when:
  - it has smaller existing buildings (or is vacant), and is located closer to downtown.
  - its zoning allows for a greater height, makes it eligible for the State Density Bonus, and does not restrict the number of units that may be constructed.
  - housing prices are relatively high, and construction costs are relatively low, compared to other years.

Estimating the Number of Units Produced

- The second part of the model estimates the number of units that will be produced when a parcel does develop housing. Based on past experience, the statistical analysis found that a parcel developing housing will produce more units when:
  - its land area and allowable maximum height are greater;
  - it is eligible for the State Density Bonus;
  - its zoning does not restrict the number of units that may be built.
- The OEA used the first part of the model to estimate the probability that housing will be built on a parcel over the next twenty years[2]. That probability was multiplied by the estimate of housing units from the second part, to create an expected number of housing units generated for each parcel over twenty years. When this is summed across all parcels, a citywide housing total is generated.
- This method was used to create estimates of housing production under the existing zoning, and the proposed rezoning. The difference is the estimate of housing that could be produced as a result of the proposed zoning changes.

Limitations of the Housing Development Model

- The housing development model can forecast future housing development based on the city's past experience, but important caveats must be made.
- Because of data availability, not every factor that affects housing production could be included. Missing data may include features of the parcel itself, or policies that may have changed over the 2004-24 period, or vary within the aggregated zoning designations used by the model.
- Limited data also prevents the analysis of fine-grained policy changes in the proposed rezoning, such as restrictions on unit size and mix.
- Several new City and State policies that were intended to encourage housing production have been enacted in recent years, such as, for example, the City's 2023 Housing Production Ordinance (0248-23). The model may be unable to properly assess the impact of these policies in the future.
- Despite these limitations, the OEA believes this approach is well-suited to estimating housing production, for the purposes of economic impact reporting.

Future Housing Market Scenarios

- As noted earlier, the amount of housing that will be produced as a result of the rezoning, and its economic impact, will depend on future housing market conditions. This creates an additional level of uncertainty in the forecasts.
- Gauging future market conditions is further complicated by changes in the city's housing market since the COVID-19 pandemic, as described on the next page.
- To understand the scope of what could potentially happen, the OEA created two future scenarios for housing prices and costs in San Francisco.
- In a high-growth scenario, San Francisco's housing prices, relative to the U.S., return to pre-COVID levels by 2030, and grow at the city's pre-COVID rate after that. Construction costs are assumed to grow at the same rate as inflation.
- In a low-growth scenario, San Francisco's post-COVID relative housing prices are assumed to represent a "new normal," and housing prices are assumed to grow only at a national average level over the next twenty years. Construction costs are also assumed to grow at the same rate as inflation.

San Francisco and U.S. Housing Price Trends Since 2000



While San Francisco's housing has always been expensive, during the 2010s, average San Francisco condo prices rose much faster than the rest of the U.S., to as much as 5 times the typical U.S. price.

Since 2020, however, San Francisco condo prices have declined, despite rising inflation and rising U.S. condo prices. Adjusted for inflation, typical San Francisco condo prices in 2025 are 25% lower than they were in 2019.

Among other factors, the increase in remote office work during COVID has reduced the value of a residence near large office employment centers like downtown San Francisco.

Source: Zillow. Data retrieved October 1, 2025.

Housing Price Trends Within the City



Source: Zillow. Data retrieved October 1, 2025.

The reduced value of a downtown location has also shifted multifamily price patterns within the city.

Condos in neighborhoods like Downtown and South of Market have experienced inflation-adjusted price drops of more than 40% since 2016, while the Richmond and Sunset have fallen by far less.

Because most multifamily housing in the city is near downtown, but most of the proposed rezoning is not, the use of a citywide average condo price index is inappropriate. This analysis uses an average price across the 10 Zillow neighborhoods most affected by the zoning, which is somewhat higher than the citywide average.

High and Low Growth Scenario Price Forecasts



Our high-growth scenario assumes that San Francisco's housing prices, relative to the U.S., return to pre-pandemic levels by 2030, and then grow at the city's long-term average rate until 2045. This implies a rapid growth in housing prices over the next five years, of over 10% per year.

In the low-growth scenario, the post-COVID housing market represents a new normal, and San Francisco housing prices are assumed to grow only at the U.S. long-term rate at 1.8% per year, in inflation-adjusted dollars. Under this assumption, San Franciso housing prices would not recover to their pre-COVID peak, in inflation-adjusted dollars, until 2041.

Source: Zillow. 10 Neighborhoods are Buena Vista, Polk Gulch, Inner Sunset, Marina, Mission, North Waterfront, Outer Sunset, Outer Richmond, Inner Richmond, and Western Addition.

Construction Cost Trends and Scenarios



Source: Bureau of Economic Analysis; U.S. Census Bureau, "Quarterly Workforce Indicators

The housing development model uses two measures of construction costs: materials cost and local construction industry wages. They are blended into a single index for modeling purposes. Details are in the Appendix.

The cost of construction materials and local wages have grown faster than overall inflation, particularly in the last few years. In 2024, real construction materials costs were 18% higher, and real local wages were 10% higher, than they were in 2016.

In both the high-growth and low-growth scenarios, the blended index is assumed to grow at 0% (after inflation) over the 2026-2045 period. This reflects an assumption that both labor and material costs inflation will revert to the broader rate of inflation in the long term.

Housing Production Forecasts Under Current Zoning

Planning District	Historic, 2000-24	Low-Growth Scenario Forecast, 2026-45	High-Growth Scenario Forecast, 2026-45
Buena Vista	975	43	90
Central	72	192	390
Downtown	289	112	230
Ingleside	0	58	120
Inner Sunset	123	28	59
Marina	131	126	263
Mission	187	197	406
Northeast	449	136	283
Outer Sunset	15	16	33
Richmond	0	23	47
South Central	0	6	11
Western Addition	997	658	1,265
Total	3,238	1,594	3,199

Generally, the housing development model forecasts that the current zoning will produce fewer units in the next 20 years than the numbers of units that were produced in the last 20 years.

The table to the left only covers the portion of each planning district that is in the proposed rezoning area. In total, under the current zoning, the model forecasts 1,594 or 3,199 units under the low- and high-growth forecasts, respectively, while 3,238 units were built in the same areas over the 2000-2024 period.

On the next two pages, the model's forecasts of the additional housing created by the proposed zoning is discussed.

Source: For historic housing production, San Francisco Planning Department

Forecast Net Effect of the Zoning

- As shown in the table below, under the low-growth and high-growth scenarios described earlier, the rezoning would lead to 8,504 and 14,646 additional housing units, beyond what would be produced under current zoning, over the next 20 years.

Low Growth Scenario	**Units**
20-Year Housing Production, Existing Zoning	1,594
20-Year Housing Production, Proposed Rezoning	10,098
Effect of Proposed Rezoning	8,504

High Growth Scenario	**Units**
20-Year Housing Production, Existing Zoning	3,199
20-Year Housing Production, Proposed Rezoning	17,845
Effect of Proposed Rezoning	14,646

Summary by Current Zoning District

		Low-Growth			High-Growth		
Current Zoning[3]	Number of Parcels	Average Housing Likelihood, Current	Average Housing Likelihood, Proposed	Change in Housing Units	Average Housing Likelihood, Current	Average Housing Likelihood, Proposed	Change in Housing Units
RH1	43,009	0.001%	0.205%	798	0.003%	0.446%	1,731
RH2	26,486	0.002%	0.259%	576	0.005%	0.565%	1,250
RH3_RM1	13,741	0.009%	0.347%	547	0.018%	0.756%	1,186
Office/Commercial	114	0.570%	0.780%	48	1.185%	1.639%	104
Public	239	0.060%	1.450%	3,483	0.122%	2.560%	4,814
Density-Restricted Multifamily	7,079	0.336%	0.490%	3,007	0.674%	1.026%	5,467
Form-Based Multifamily	2,053	0.725%	0.725%	46	1.502%	1.502%	94
Total	92,721			8,504			14,646

The table to the left breaks out the results by current zoning. It illustrates how many rezoned parcels are in the RH-1, RH-2, and RH-3 or RM-1 residential zones, primarily in the western side of the city. These areas will see a substantial increase in the likelihood of developing housing over the next 20 years, but the chances are still small, so those 83,000+ parcels are only forecast to produce about additional 4,200 housing units by 2045, in the high growth scenario.

Fewer Public parcels (generally owned by the City or SFUSD) are larger, and more likely to develop housing through the rezoning, though this depends on the owner's decisions.

Estimating the Loss of Existing Residential Units

- To evaluate the economic impact, OEA calculated the net increase in housing units.
- In the low-growth scenario, 463 more units would be lost under the proposed zoning than under current zoning, over the 20-year forecast period. In the high-growth scenario, 1,031 more housing units would be lost. These losses represent a 6-8% of the housing units gained as a result of the rezoning. Amendments proposed on October 20th may reduce these losses, along with overall housing production.
- The loss of existing housing slightly dampens the housing price reductions associated with the rezoning, and may impose financial harms on existing tenants. City and State law heavily restricts, but does not prohibit, the eviction of tenants for the purpose of demolition, or the demolition of rent-controlled housing. These events have been quite rare in recent decades. If this occurs, tenants are entitled to relocation payments.
- Without any way to meaningfully estimate the number of evictions or demolitions of rent-controlled units, or the financial impact on tenants, this report does not attempt to quantify these potential costs.

Impacts on Housing Prices

- The responsiveness of housing prices to increases in housing supply is a function of price elasticities of supply and demand, which the OEA has estimated in past research[4].
- The elasticities imply that the proposed rezoning would lead to a -2.5% to -4.2% change in housing prices in the city, depending on the scenario. For context, those percentages are also expressed in terms of current housing prices and apartment rents.

	Low Growth Scenario	**High Growth Scenario**
Net Change in Housing Supply (units produced less demolitions)	8,041	13,615
Percentage Change in Housing Supply[5]	2.0%	3.4%
Price Elasticity of Demand	-0.7	-0.7
Price Elasticity of Supply	0.1	0.1
Percent change in housing prices	-2.5%	-4.2%
Corresponding change in condo prices[6]	-$24,500	-$41,600
Corresponding change in annual apartment market rents[7]	-$903	-$1,529

Estimating Relocation and Disruption Costs

- To account for the impact on commercial businesses, OEA estimated potential displacement costs. Details are provided in the Appendix.
- Displaced businesses are estimated to occupy commercial space ranging from approximately 1.5 to 2.6 million square feet, depending on the scenario. This displacement would occur over twenty years, and it is highly likely that the rezoning would lead to an increase in the amount of commercial space in the city.
- Annual business disruption and relocation costs range from $16 to $28 million, in today's dollars.

	Low Growth	High Growth
Loss of occupied commercial space (million sf)	1.5	2.6
Disruption-relocation cost/sf	$190	$190
Annual disruption/relocation cost (2025 $ million)	$16	$28

REMI Economic Impact Simulation

- Based on the economic impact factors described earlier, the OEA used the REMI model to measure the net economic impact of the changes associated with the high and low growth scenarios to the city's economy over the 2026-2045 period:
  - An increase in the city's residential capital stock of $8.0 billion (low growth) to $13.5 billion (high growth) in today's dollars, representing the investment associated with the new units forecast under the two scenarios. These figures are calculated by multiplying the net increase in units by average prices.
  - A reduction in citywide housing prices, reaching 2.5% (low growth) and 4.2% (high growth) by 2045.
  - Annual business disruption and relocation costs for retail businesses of $16 million (low growth) and $28 million (high growth) in today's dollars, until 2045.

Economic Impact Assessment

- In the low-growth scenario, the city's GDP would be $560 million larger, in today's dollars, on average over the 2026-45 period. Total employment in the city would be approximately 3,000 more than under the current zoning, on average over the period.
- In the high-growth scenario, the city's GDP growth would be $940 million larger than under current zoning, in 2025 dollars. Employment would be about 5,000 higher.
- Employment gains are expected in every sector, but would be most heavily concentrated in the construction, health care, real estate, and accommodations and food services sectors.
- Despite the displacement of businesses, retail trade is forecast to grow as a result of the population and economic growth created by the proposed rezoning, adding about 210 jobs in the low-growth scenario and about 350 jobs in the high-growth scenario.
- Like most major policies, the proposed rezoning involves benefits and costs. Our analysis suggests the proposed rezoning's positive impact on the city's economy, from lower housing prices and construction, outweighs the negative impact from displaced businesses, by a factor of approximately 22:1.

Conclusions

- The context for housing development in San Francisco has changed profoundly in the past several years. Since 2019, after adjusting for inflation, condo prices in San Francisco have dropped by 25%, while our blended construction cost index has risen by 8%.
- Given this starting point, an expansive rezoning effort, like the proposed Family Zoning plan, will be challenged to match the 2010s levels of new housing development in the city, even under an optimistic high-growth scenario.
- Nevertheless, under both scenarios considered in this report, the proposed rezoning would lead to a significant increase in the city's housing supply, and have broadly positive effects on housing prices and the city's broader economy. The benefits of new residential investments and lower housing prices are projected to outweigh the costs of business interruption and displacement by a factor of roughly 22:1.
- If market conditions were such that the 36,000 unit target was achieved, as a result of the rezoning, the economic impact on the city would likely be significantly more positive than the estimates in this report.

Footnotes

1. See, for example, Inclusionary Housing Working Group: Preliminary Report September 2016.
2. Three large parcels were excluded from the analysis: Laguna Honda Hospital, and the USF Main and Lone Mountain campuses. While all three parcels receive height increases in the proposed rezoning, their size and unique uses makes them unsuitable for the model. If the model could accurately estimate the amount of housing likely to occur on those parcels, the total housing estimate reported in this report would be larger.
3. These are the aggregate zoning classifications used by the model. See the Appendix for details.
4. See Potential Effects of Limiting Market-Rate Housing in the Mission.
5. Assuming 406,000 housing units in the city.
6. Based on Zillow's 2025 average condo prices for San Francisco.
7. Based on 2025 average apartment asking rents, from ApartmentList.

Appendix

- Housing Development Model
  - Methodology
  - Data sources
  - Model coefficients and performance
  - Scenario Inputs
  - Zoning District Classification
  - Logic of Applying the Model to the Proposed Rezoning
- Estimates of Business Interruption and Relocation Costs

Appendix: Housing Development Model: Methodology

- The housing development model is a two-stage step model. The first stage is a logistic regression, covering every parcel in the city, except those subject to a development agreement, over the 2004-2024 period.
- The dependent variable of the logistic regression is 1 if the parcel produced housing in a given year, and 0 otherwise. Parcels that produce housing in a given year were removed from the dataset for subsequent years. Independent variables, reflecting existing land use, market conditions, and zoning, are listed on the next page.
- The second stage is a regression model including all parcels that produced multifamily housing with more than 10 units, over the 2004-24 period. The dependent variable is the number of units produced on the parcel, and the independent variables are the parcel's "building envelope" (its area multiplied by its allowable height), and two interaction variables: the building envelope times a dummy indicating if the parcel was eligible for the State Density Bonus in that year, and the building envelope times a dummy indicating if the parcel was subject to density-restricted zoning in that year. The intercept of the model was fixed at zero.

Appendix: Housing Development Model: Methodology

- The models' coefficients were used in a forecast that calculated the log-likelihood of development for each rezoned parcel, in each of the forecast years 2026-2045, using the site and zoning information, and the price and cost assumptions for each year (shown on the next page). The log-likelihoods were converted into annual probabilities, from which a 20-year probability of development was calculated.
- The model coefficients were also used to calculate a units estimate; the 20-year probability times the units estimate is the expected number of units produced on that parcel in the 20-year forecast period.
- The forecast model was run for both the current and the proposed zoning. See the section "Logic of Applying the Model to the Proposed Rezoning" for more details.
- Three parcels were excluded from the forecast: Laguna Honda Hospital, the University of San Francisco Main Campus, and the University of San Francisco Lone Mountain Campus. While some housing may be built on those parcels in the forecast period, the model is not well-suited for large parcels with unique uses like these.

Appendix: Housing Development Model: Data Sources

Variable Description	Variable	Data Source
Height limit for site in ft	Height_Ft	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Area for lot in 1000 sq ft	Area_1000	Planning Department, Land Use Database 4/16/25
Extisting building square footage in 1000 sq ft	Bldg_SqFt_1000	Planning Department, Land Use Database 4/16/25
Residential Existing Use using ResUnits (Dummy)	Res_Dummy	Planning Department, Land Use Database 4/16/25
Historic Status for Parcel (Dummy)	Historic	Planning Department, Land Use Database 4/16/25
Real Construction Cost Variable, 2 years prior	Construc_Cost_Real	a 60/40 average of Real Construction Materials PPI and Real San Francisco MSA Construction Wages, 2016=100
10-Neighborhood Housing Price Index (Zillow), Real, 2 years prior	Zillow_Price_Real	SF real condo prices per Zillow, 2016=100
Dummy indicating eligibility for State Density Bonus, 2016 forward	SDB_2016_5Plus	Calculated from Zoning Districts
Zoning dummy: Office/Commercial	zp_OfficeComm	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Zoning dummy: Density Restricted Multifamily, RTO = Form Based	zp_DRMulti_RTO	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Zoning dummy: Form Based Multifamily, RTO = form based	zp_FBDMulti_RTO	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Zoning dummy: Industrial / Production, Distribution & Repair	zp_PDRInd	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Zoning dummy: Public/Open Space	zp_Public	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Zoning dummy: Redevelopment Area	zp_Redev	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Zoning dummy: Residential 2-Family (2 Units per Lot)	zp_RH2	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Zoning = Residential 3-Family or Res Mixed (1/800 sqft)	zp_RH3_RM1	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Planning District dummy variables	DIST_<District Name>	Planning District from Assessor's Secured Roll DB

Appendix: Logistic Regression Coefficients

Variable Description	Variable	Coeff	StdErr	WaldChiSq	Prob>Chi Sq
Intercept	Intercept	(1.6226)	1.2829	1.5998	0.2059
Height limit for site in ft	Height_Ft	0.0017	0.0007	4.9693	0.0258
Area for lot in 1000 sq ft	Area_1000	0.0049	0.0009	30.6563	0.0000
Envelope Area in 1000 sq ft (area/1000*ht/10)	Env_1000_Area_Height	0.0002	0.0001	5.0369	0.0248
Extisting building square footage in 1000 sq ft	Bldg_SqFt_1000	(0.0023)	0.0007	10.7241	0.0011
Residential Existing Use using ResUnits (Dummy)	Res_Dummy	(0.8231)	0.1222	45.3669	0.0000
Historic Status for Parcel (Dummy)	Historic	(1.0378)	0.1271	66.6847	0.0000
Real Construction Cost Variable	Construc_Cost_Real	(0.0992)	0.0129	58.8929	0.0000
SF Housing Price Index (Zillow), Real	Zillow_Price_Real	0.0143	0.0053	7.1326	0.0076
Dummy for State Density Bonus, 5+ Unit Sites, 2016 forward	SDB_2016_5Plus	0.6303	0.1608	15.3724	0.0000
Zoning = Office/Commercial	zp_OfficeComm	4.2634	0.4873	76.5337	0.0000
Zoning = Density Restricted Multifamily, RTO = Form Based	zp_DRMulti_RTO	4.2450	0.4523	88.0989	0.0000
Zoning = Form Based Multifamily, RTO = form based	zp_FBDMulti_RTO	5.0508	0.4640	118.4768	0.0000
Zoning = Industrial / Production, Distribution & Repair	zp_PDRInd	3.4115	0.4790	50.7257	0.0000
Zoning = Public/Open Space	zp_Public	1.2491	0.8385	2.2190	0.1363
Zoning = Redevelopment Area	zp_Redev	4.5361	0.4999	82.3213	0.0000
Zoning = Residential 2-Family (2 Units per Lot)	zp_RH2	0.2674	0.6672	0.1607	0.6885
Zoning = Residential 3-Family or Res Mixed (1/800 sqft)	zp_RH3_RM1	1.3187	0.6064	4.7289	0.0297

Appendix: Logistic Regression Coefficients (Continued)

Variable Description	Variable	Coeff	StdErr	WaldChiSq	Prob>Chi Sq
District = South Bayshore	DIST_SBayshore	(1.4824)	0.3179	21.7380	0.0000
District = Bernal Heights	DIST_BernalHts	(1.7011)	0.6087	7.8100	0.0052
District = South Central	DIST_Scentral	(1.7307)	0.3867	20.0267	0.0000
District = Central	DIST_Central	(1.1523)	0.3353	11.8102	0.0006
District = Buena Vista	DIST_BuenaVista	(2.5369)	1.0188	6.2010	0.0128
District = Northeast	DIST_Northeast	(1.4171)	0.2539	31.1439	0.0000
District = Western Addition	DIST_WestAddition	(0.6831)	0.2362	8.3630	0.0038
District = South of Market	DIST_SOMA	(0.0756)	0.1903	0.1579	0.6911
District = Inner Sunset	DIST_InnerSunset	(1.6187)	0.4882	10.9939	0.0009
District = Richmond	DIST_Richmond	(2.8019)	0.5355	27.3716	0.0000
District = Ingleside	DIST_Ingleside	(1.8670)	0.4925	14.3711	0.0002
District = Outer Sunset	DIST_OuterSunset	(2.6147)	0.6098	18.3867	0.0000
District = Marina	DIST_Marina	(1.2492)	0.3253	14.7457	0.0001
District = Mission	DIST_Mission	(1.0938)	0.2380	21.1176	0.0000

Omitted Variables for Groups of Dummy Variables:

Omitted zoning = RH1

Omitted district = Downtown

Appendix: Units Regression Coefficients

Variable Description	Variable	Coeff	St Error	T-Stat
Simple building envelope (area/1000 * ht/10)	Env_1000_Area_Height	0.4252	0.0159	26.72
State Density Bonus * Simple Bldg Envelope (5+ Unit Sites, 2016 forward)	SDB_2016_5Plus_EnvFull	0.4385	0.0389	11.28
Simple Bldg Envelope only if density-restricted	Zoning_DR_EnvFull	(0.1601)	0.0174	(9.22)

Note: Model removes largest 5% (Positive and Negative) residual outliers

Appendix: Model Performance

Logistic Regression	
Number of Observations	3,369,573
Number with Dependent Variable = 1	422
Pseudo R-Square	0.000611
Max Rescaled R-Square	0.244596

Units Regression	
Number of Observations	383
R-Sq	0.867779
Adj R-Sq	0.866735
Dependent Mean Value	81.87206
Standard Error of Regression	48.40184

Appendix: Zoning Classifications

- The table below shows the correspondence between the City's zoning districts, and the aggregate zoning variables in the model.

Zoning Variable	Zoning Districts
zp_RH1	C-2/RH-1(D); RH-1(D)/C-2; C-M/RH-1; M-1/RH-1; NC-1/RH-1; NC-1/RH-1/RH-2; NC-2/RH-1; NC-2/RH-1(D); NC-3/RH-1; NCD/RH-1; NCD/RH-1(D); NC-S/RH-1; NCT-OCEAN/RH-1(D); NCT/RH-1(D); P/P-W/RH-1; P/RH-1; P/RH-1(D); P/RH-1/RH-1(D); P/RH-1/RH-2; RH-1; RH-1(D); RH-1(D)/NC-2; RH-1(D)/RH-1; RH-2/RH-1; RH-2/RH-1(D); RH-1(D)/RH-2; RH-1(D)/RM-1; RH-1(S); RH-1/C-M; RH-1/M-1; RH-1/NC-1; RH-1/NC-2; RH-1/NC-3; RH-1/NC-S; RH-1/RH-1(D); RH-1/RH-2; RH-1/RH-2/RM-1; RH-1/RM-1; RM-1/RH-1; RH-3/RH-1
zp_RH2	NC-1/RH-1/RH-2; P/RH-1/RH-2; RH-2/RH-1; RH-2/RH-1(D); RH-1(D)/RH-2; RH-1/RH-2; RH-1/RH-2/RM-1; M-1/RH-2/RM-1; MUR/RH-2; NC-1/RH-2; NC-2/RH-2; NC-3/RH-2; NCD/RH-2; NC-S/RH-2; NCT-GLEN PARK/RH-2; NCT-OCEAN/RH-2; NCT/RH-2; P/RH-2; P/RM-1/RH-2; RH-2; RH-2/NC-1; RH-2/NC-2; RH-2/NC-3; RH-2/RH-3; RH-2/RM-1; RM-1/RH-2; RH-2/RM-2; RM-2/RH-2; RH-2/RM-3; RM-3/RH-2; RH-3/RH-2
zp_RH3_RM1	RH-1/RH-2/RM-1; M-1/RH-2/RM-1; P/RM-1/RH-2; RH-2/RH-3; RH-2/RM-1; RM-1/RH-2; RH-3/RH-2; RH-1(D)/RM-1; RH-1/RM-1; RM-1/RH-1; RH-3/RH-1; C-2/RH-3; C-2/RM-1; C-2/RM-1/RM-4; C-M/RM-1; HP-RA/RM-1; M-1/RM-1; M-2/RH-3; NC-1/RM-1; RM-1/NC-1; NC-2/RH-3; NC-2/RM-1; NC-3/RH-3; NC-3/RM-1; NCD/RH-3; NCD/RH-3/UPR MARKET; NCD/RH-3/UPR MARK; NCD/RH-3/VALENCIA; NCD/RM-1; NCD/RM-1/SACRAMENTO; NCD/SACRAMENTO ST; NCD/SACRAMENTO/RM-1; NCD/RM-1/SACRAMEN; NCT-DIVISADERO/RH-3; NCT-DIVISADERO/RM-1; NCT/RH-3; NCT/RM-1; P/PM-R/RM-1; P/RH-3; P/RM-1; PM-MU2/PM-OS/PM-R/RM-1; PM-R/RM-1; RH-3; RH-3/C-2; RH-3/HAYES; RH-3/M-2; RH-3/NC-2; RH-3/RM-1; RM-1/RH-3; RH-3/RM-2; RM-2/RH-3; RH-3/RM-3; RM-3/RH-3; RH-3/RSD; RH-3/VALENCIA; RM-1; RM-1/C-M; RM-1/C-M/M-1; RM-1/NC-3; RM-1/RM-2; RM-1/RM-3; RM-1/RM-4; RM-1/SACRAMENTO
zp_OfficeComm	C-2/RH-3; C-2/RM-1; C-2/RM-1/RM-4; C-M/RM-1; RH-3/C-2; RM-1/C-M; RM-1/C-M/M-1; C-2/RH-1(D); RH-1(D)/C-2; C-M/RH-1; RH-1/C-M; C-2; C-2/M-1; C-2/M-1/P; C-2/P; C-3-G; C-3-G/C-3-R; C-3-G/C-M; C-3-G/RC-4; C-3-O; C-3-O(SD); C-3-O(SD)/P; C-3-O(SD)/TB DTR; C-3-O/C-3-O(SD); C-3-O/C-3-R; C-3-O/C-3-S; C-3-O/C-3-S/P; C-3-O/TB DTR; C-3-R; C-3-S; C-3-S/P; C-M; C-M/M-1; CMUO; CMUO/MUR; CMUO/P; MUO; NCD/C-2; P/C-3-R; RM-3/C-2; RM-4/C-2; WMUO

Appendix: Zoning Classifications (Continued)

Zoning Variable	Zoning Districts
zp_DRMulti_RTO	NC-2/P; NC-3/P/RM-3; NCD/P; NC-S/P; P/NC-S; P/NC-2; P/RC-4; P/RM-2; P/RM-3; C-2/RM-1/RM-4; C-3-G/RC-4; NCD/C-2; RM-3/C-2; RM-4/C-2; NC-1/RM-1; RM-1/NC-1; NC-2/RH-3; NC-2/RM-1; NC-3/RH-3; NC-3/RM-1; NCD/RH-3; NCD/RH-3/UPR MARKET; NCD/RH-3/UPR MARK; NCD/RH-3/VALENCIA; NCD/RM-1; NCD/RM-1/SACRAMENTO; NCD/SACRAMENTO ST; NCD/SACRAMENTO/RM-1; NCD/RM-1/SACRAMEN; RH-3/HAYES; RH-3/NC-2; RH-3/RM-2; RM-2/RH-3; RH-3/RM-3; RM-3/RH-3; RH-3/RSD; RH-3/VALENCIA; RM-1/NC-3; RM-1/RM-2; RM-1/RM-3; RM-1/RM-4; RM-1/SACRAMENTO; NC-1/RH-1/RH-2; NC-1/RH-2; NC-2/RH-2; NC-3/RH-2; NCD/RH-2; NC-S/RH-2; RH-2/NC-1; RH-2/NC-2; RH-2/NC-3; RH-2/RM-2; RM-2/RH-2; RH-2/RM-3; RM-3/RH-2; NC-1/RH-1; NC-2/RH-1; NC-2/RH-1(D); NC-3/RH-1; NCD/RH-1; NCD/RH-1(D); NC-S/RH-1; RH-1(D)/NC-2; RH-1/NC-1; RH-1/NC-2; RH-1/NC-3; RH-1/NC-S; 24TH-MISSION; 24TH STREET- NOE VALL; 24TH-NOE; BROADWAY; BROADWAY NEIGHBORHOOD; C-2/RM-4; CASTRO STREET NEIGHBO; CASTRO; CCB; CRNC; CR-NC; CRNC/CVR; CR-NC/CVR; CRNC/RM-4; CVR; DTR/RC-4; FILLMORE; HAIGHT; HAIGHT STREET NEIGHBO; HAYES; HAIGHT STREET NEIGHBO; INNER CLEMENT; INNER CLEMENT STREET; INNER SUNSET; INNER SUNSET NEIGHBOR; M-1/NC-2; M-1/RM-2; M-1/RSD; NC-1; NC-1/RM-2; NC-1/RM-3; NC-2; NC-2/M-1; NC-2/NC-3; NC-3/NC-2; NC-2/RM-3; NC-2/RM-4; NC-3; NC-3/RC-4; NC-3/RM-3; NC-3/RM-4; NCD; NCD/; NCD/24TH STREET- NOE VALL; NCD/24TH STREET-; NCD/24TH-MISSION; NCD/24TH-NOE; NCD/24TH-NOE-VALLE; NCD/24TH-NOE-VALLEY; NCD/BROADWAY; NCD/BROADWAY NEIG; NCD/BROADWAY NEIGHBORHOOD; NCD/CASTRO; NCD/CASTRO STREET; NCD/CASTRO STREET NEIGHBO; NCD/EXCELSIOR OUTER MISSI; NCD/EXCELSIOR OUT; EXCELSIOR OUTER MISSI; NCD/FILLMORE; NCD/HAIGHT; NCD/HAIGHT STREET; NCD/HAIGHT STREET NEIGHBO; NCD/HAYES; NCD/HAYES NCT; NCD/HAYES NCT/RTO; NCD/INNER CLEMENT; NCD/INNER CLEMENT STREET; NCD/INNER SUNSET; NCD/INNER SUNSET NEIGHBOR; NCD/IRVING STREET NEIGHBO; NCD/IRVING STREET; NCD/IRVING; IRVING STREET NEIGHBO; NCD/JAPANTOWN NEIGHBORHOO; NCD/JAPANTOWN NEI; JAPANTOWN NEIGHBORHOO; NCD/JUDAH STREET NEIGHBOR; NCD/JUDAH; NCD/JUDAH STREET; JUDAH STREET NEIGHBOR; NCD/NC-1; NCD/NC-2; NCD/NC-3; NCD/NCT; NCD/NO BEACH; NCD/NORIEGA STREET NEIGHB; NCD/NORIEGA STREE; NCD/NORIEGA; NCD/NORTH BEACH NEIGHBORH; NCD/NORTH BEACH N; NCD/NORTH BEACH; NCD/NORTHBEACH; NCD/NORTH BEACH/RM-1; NCD/NORTHBEACH/RM-1; NCD/OUTER CLEMENT; NCD/OUTER CLEMENT STREET; NCD/OUTER CLEMENT STREET; NCD/PACIFIC; NCD/PACIFIC AVENU; NCD/PACIFIC/RM-3; NCD/PACIFIC;RM-3; NCD/PACIFIC AVENUE NEIGHB; NCD/POLK; NCD/POLK STREET N; NCD/POLK STREET NEIGHBORH; NCD/POLK/RC-3; NCD/POLK/RC-4; NCD/RC-3; NCD/RESIDENTIAL- HOUSE, O; NCD/RESIDENTIAL-; NCD/RM-2; NCD/RM-3; NCD/RM-3/PACIFIC; NCD/RTO; NCD/SACRAMENTO; NCD/SACRAMENTO STREET NEI; NCD/TARAVAL STREET NEIGHB; NCD/TARAVAL STREE; NCD/TARAVAL; NCD/UNION; NCD/UNION STREET; NCD/UNION STREET NEIGHBOR; NCD/UPPER FILLMORE NEIGHB; NCD/UPPER FILLMOR; NCD/UPPER FILLMORE; NCD/UPPERFILLMORE; NCD/UPPER MARKET STREET N; NCD/UPPER MARKET; NCD/UPR MARKET NC; NCD/UPR MARKET; NCD/UPR MARKET NCT; NCD/UPR MARKET NCT/; NCD/VALENCIA; NCD/WEST PORTAL; NCD/WEST PORTAL A; NCD/WEST PORTAL AVENUE NE; NCD/BAYVIEW; NCD/COLE VALLEY; NCD/CORTLAND AVENUE; NCD/GEARY BOULEVARD; NCD/GEARY BOULEVA; NCD/GEARY BOULEVARD/RH-2; NCD/GEARY BOULEVARD/RM-1; NCD/INNER BALBOA STREET; NCD/INNER BALBOA S; NCD/OUTER BALBOA STREET; NCD/ OUTER BALBOA STREET; NCD/OUTER BALBOA S; NCD/LOWER HAIGHT STREET; NCD/LOWER HAIGHT S; NCD/LOWER HAIGHT STREET/RH-3; NCD/LOWER POLK STREET; NCD/MISSION BERNAL; NCD/INNER TARAVAL STREET; NCD/INNER TARAVAL; NCD/SAN BRUNO AVENUE; NCD/LAKESIDE VILLAGE; NCD/LAKESIDE VILLAG; NC-S; NC-S/PM-R; NC-S/RM-3; NCT-DIVISADERO/RM-3; NCT/RM-3; NCT/RM-4; NO BEACH; OUTER CLEMENT; POLK; RC-3; RC-3/POLK; RC-3/RM-3; RC-4; RC-4/NC-3; RC-4/RH DTR; RC-4/RM-4; RED/SLR; RM-2; RM-2/M-1; RM-2/NC-1; RM-2/NC-2; RM-2/NO BEACH; RM-2/RM-3; RM-2/RM-4; RM-3; RM-3/NC-1; RM-3/NC-2; RM-3/NC-3; RM-3/NC-S; RM-3/RC-3; RM-3/RM-4; RM-4; RM-4/CR-NC; RM-4/NC-2; RM-4/NC-3; RM-4/RC-4; RSD; RSD/SLR; SACRAMENTO; SLR; SSO; UNION; UPR MARKET; VALENCIA; WEST PORTAL

Appendix: Zoning Classifications (Continued)

Zoning Variable	Zoning Districts
zp_Public	C-2/M-1/P; C-2/P; C-3-O(SD)/P; C-3-O/C-3-S/P; C-3-S/P; CMUO/P; P/C-3-R; P/RM-1/RH-2; P/PM-R/RM-1; P/RH-3; P/RM-1; PM-MU2/PM-OS/PM-R/RM-1; P/RH-1/RH-2; P/RH-2; P/P-W/RH-1; P/RH-1; P/RH-1(D); P/RH-1/RH-1(D); Remove; HP-RA/M-1/M-2/P; HP-RA/M-2/P; M-1/M-2/P; M-1/P; M-2/MB-OS; M-2/MB-RA/P; M-2/P; MB-O; MB-O/MB-RA; MB-OS; MB-RA/P; MUG/P; NC-2/P; NC-3/P/RM-3; NCD/P; NC-S/P; NCT/P; NCT-3/P; NCT-3/RTO; P; P/C-3-O(SD); P/M-1; P/M-2; P/MISS BAY S PL; P/MISS BAY S PLN; P/MUR; P/NC-S; P/NC-2; P/PDR-2; P/PM-OS; P/PM-OS/PM-R; P/P-W; P/RC-4; P/RM-2; P/RM-3; P/TB DTR; P/RTO-C; P, RTO-C; PM-CF; PM-CF/PM-OS; PM-CF/PM-OS/PM-R; PM-MU1/PM-OS; PM-MU2/PM-OS/PM-R; PM-OS; PM-OS/PM-R; PM-OS/PM-R/PM-S; PM-OS/PM-S; Public
zp_FBDMulti_RTO	DTR/RC-4; NCD/HAYES NCT; NCD/HAYES NCT/RTO; NCD/NCT; NCD/RTO; NCD/UPR MARKET NCT; NCD/UPR MARKET NCT/; NC-S/PM-R; NCT-DIVISADERO/RM-3; NCT/RM-3; NCT/RM-4; RC-4/RH DTR; RED/SLR; P/PM-R/RM-1; PM-MU2/PM-OS/PM-R/RM-1; MUG/P; NCT/P; NCT-3/P; NCT-3/RTO; P/MUR; P/PM-OS/PM-R; P/TB DTR; P/RTO-C; P, RTO-C; PM-CF/PM-OS/PM-R; PM-MU1/PM-OS; PM-MU2/PM-OS/PM-R; PM-OS/PM-R; PM-OS/PM-R/PM-S; C-3-O(SD)/TB DTR; C-3-O/TB DTR; CMUO/MUR; NCT-DIVISADERO/RH-3; NCT-DIVISADERO/RM-1; NCT/RH-3; NCT/RM-1; PM-R/RM-1; MUR/RH-2; NCT-GLEN PARK/RH-2; NCT-OCEAN/RH-2; NCT/RH-2; NCT-OCEAN/RH-1(D); NCT/RH-1(D); DTR; DTR/M-1; M-1/RH DTR; M-2/MR-MU; M-2/P70-MU; MB-RA/MR-MU; MR-MU; MUG; MUG/RED; MUR; NCT; NCT-DIVISADERO; NCT-FOLSOM; NCT-GLEN PARK; NCT-HAYES; NCT-HAYES/RTO; NCT-HAYES/RTO-1; NCT-MISSION; NCT-UPPER MARKET; NCT-UPPER MARKET;; NCT-UPPER MARKET/RH-2; NCT-UPPER MARKET/RH-3; NCT-OCEAN; NCT-SOMA; NCT/NCT-3; NCT/RCD; NCT/RED-MX; NCT/RTO; NCT/RTO-M; NCT/UMU; NCT-1; NCT-2; NCT-3; NCT-3/NCT-HAYES; RTO-1/NCT-3; RTO/NCT-3; P70-MU; PDR-1-D/UMU; PDR-1-G/UMU; PM-MU1; PM-MU1/PM-R; PM-MU2/PM-R; PM-MU2; PM-R; RCD; RED; RED-MX; RED-MX/WMUG; RH DTR; RH DTR/SB-DTR; RH DTR/TB DTR; RTO; RTO-1; RTO/NCT; RTO-1/RTO-C; RTO-C; RTO-M; SB-DTR; SPD; TB DTR; UMU; WMUG
zp_PDRInd	DTR/M-1; M-1/RH DTR; M-2/MR-MU; M-2/P70-MU; PDR-1-D/UMU; PDR-1-G/UMU; M-1/NC-2; M-1/RM-2; M-1/RSD; NC-2/M-1; RM-2/M-1; C-2/M-1/P; HP-RA/M-1/M-2/P; HP-RA/M-2/P; M-1/M-2/P; M-1/P; M-2/MB-OS; M-2/MB-RA/P; M-2/P; P/M-1; P/M-2; P/PDR-2; C-2/M-1; C-M/M-1; RH-1/RH-2/RM-1; M-1/RH-2/RM-1; M-1/RM-1; M-2/RH-3; RH-3/M-2; M-1/RH-1; RH-1/M-1; HP-RA/M-1; HP-RA/M-2; M-1; M-1/M-1; M-1/M-2; M-1/PDR-1-B; M-1/PDR-2; M-2; M-2 (MB); M-2/MB-RA; M-2/PDR-2; M-2/SLI; MISS BAY S PLN/M-2; MISS BAY S PL; MISS BAY S PLN; MISS BAY S PLN/M-; PDR-1; PDR-1/PDR-2; PDR-1-B; PDR-1-B/PDR-2; PDR-1-D; PDR-1-G; PDR-2; SALI; SLI; SLI/M-2
zp_Redev	HP-RA/M-1/M-2/P; HP-RA/M-2/P; M-2/MB-RA/P; HP-RA/M-1; HP-RA/M-2; M-2/MB-RA; MISS BAY S PLN/M-2; MISS BAY S PL; MISS BAY S PLN; MISS BAY S PLN/M-; MB-RA/MR-MU; MB-O/MB-RA; MB-RA/P; P/MISS BAY S PL; P/MISS BAY S PLN; HP-RA/RM-1; HP-RA; MB-RA; MISS BAY N RED; MISS BAY N RED PLN; MISS BAY N RED PL; MISS BAY S RED; MISS BAY S RED PLN; MISS BAY S RED PL

Appendix: Logic of Applying the Model

- This section of the appendix describes in more detail how the model was used to produce estimates of future housing production.
- For the existing zoning ("baseline"), the application of the model is straightforward. Current zoning was encoded using the zoning classification on the previous page, and current allowable height was used as the height variable in the logistic regression, and to calculate building envelope in the units regression.
- For the proposed rezoning ("policy"), the logic used was as follows: based on the units regression, each 1000 square feet of building envelope results in 0.42 units. The State Density Bonus adds an additional 0.44 units. Parcels that elect to use the Local Program therefore need to accommodate at least 0.44 additional units per 1000 square feet of envelope if developers are to choose this option. For parcels where the Local Program was more desirable, and on parcels that are ineligible for the SDB, because their zoning and size prevents them from building more than 5 units, the Local Program was applied. For all other parcels the SDB was used.

Appendix: Logic of Applying the Model (Continued)

- Probabilities and units for any parcel using the State Density Bonus were calculated by:
  - In the logistic regression, using the first new height in the rezoning table for Height_Ft and in the Env_1000_Area_Height calculation.
  - In the units regression, using the first new height in the rezoning table to calculate Env_1000_Area_Height;
  - Incorporating the SDB_2016_5Plus_EnvFull effect;
  - Incorporating the Zoning_DR_EnvFull if applicable (i.e. the parcel is density-restricted.

Appendix: Logic of Applying the Model (Continued)

- Probabilities and units for any parcel using the Local Program were calculated by:
  - In the logistic regression, setting zp_FBDMulti_RTO = 1, to account for the relaxation of density controls in the Local Program;
  - In the logistic regression, using the second new height in the rezoning table for Height_Ft and in the Env_1000_Area_Height calculation.
  - In the units regression, using the second new height in the rezoning table to calculate Env_1000_Area_Height;
  - In the units regression, removing the SDB_2016_5Plus_EnvFull effect;
  - In the units regression, removing the Zoning_DR_EnvFull effect.

Appendix: Business Disruption / Relocation Costs

- The analysis makes the following assumptions about business disruption and relocation costs:
  - Lost space will be 10% vacant, so 90% of the loss represents the loss of occupied space.
  - Lost business net income (for 6 months of disruption): $5/occupied square foot.
  - Fixed labor costs (for 6 months): $10/occupied square foot.
  - Moving costs and build-out of space at new premises: $175/occupied square foot

Staff Contact

Ted Egan, Ph.D., Chief Economist ted.egan@sfgov.org

From: Deldelp Medina
To: Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject: Without rent control I would be pushed out of the city
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 2:49:32 PM

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

Mr. Carroll,

I wanted to share with you my experiences and reality. I have been living in San Francisco for the last fifteen years, thanks to rent control. Without being able to live in locally owned apartments, I would not have been able to raise my family here. When new housing is built, it shouldn't be at the expense of units that are keeping folks rooted to their neighborhood. I support incentives to have folks build without displacing those of us who have created homes and communities.

Best,

Deldelp

--
Deldelp Medina
She/Her/Ella
My schedule/Mi Horario: Calendly_Deldelp

From:	Devon Bolla
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	Ryan Patterson; Ephraim Margolin; Sonja Trauss
Subject:	Proposed Family Zoning Plan and Housing Element Implementation: File Nos. 250700, 250701, 251071, 251073, 250985, and 250966
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 2:44:12 PM
Attachments:	2025.11.17 Ltr re SF Family Zoning Plan - RJP.pdf

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

Good afternoon,

Attached for your review is a memo regarding a proposed family zoning plan and housing element implementation.

Thank you,

Devon J. Bolla
(she/her)
Paralegal
Patterson & O'Neill, PC
Office: (415) 907-9110
Direct: (415) 907-7703
Fax: (415) 907-7704
235 Montgomery Street, Suite 950
San Francisco, CA 94104
devon@pattersononeill.com
www.pattersononeill.com

This email may contain privileged or confidential material for the sole use of the intended recipient. Review or distribution by others is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the original sender and delete all copies. Nothing in this email or any attachments should be regarded as tax advice unless expressly stated.

PATTERSON & O'NEILL, PC

235 Montgomery Street, Suite 950
San Francisco, CA 94104
Telephone: (415) 907-9110
Facsimile: (415) 907-7704

November 17, 2025

VIA EMAIL

Chair Myrna Melgar
Land Use and Transportation Committee
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
49 South Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94103
john.carroll@sfgov.org
Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Proposed Family Zoning Plan and Housing Element Implementation
File Nos. 250700, 250701, 251071, 251073, 250985, and 250966

Dear Chair Melgar and Honorable Supervisors:

Our office represents Yes In My Back Yard ("YIMBY Law"), a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization whose mission is to enforce state housing laws. We write to share our concerns regarding San Francisco's proposed Family Zoning Plan ("FZP"). Our comments incorporate the comments of YIMBY Action and its members, including the attached letters dated September 11, 2025 and October 29, 2025.

I. The City Will Violate the Housing Element Law if it Adopts the FZP Knowing that it Will Not Produce the Required Housing Units

The City's 6th cycle housing element noted that the City was unable to identify enough sites to accommodate the number of units for lower- and moderate-income households, including a 15% buffer, that it was assigned to plan for during its 6th cycle ("RHNA Shortfall"). The Department of Housing and Community Development, therefore, directed the City to include a program in its housing element identifying sites for rezoning to accommodate these units as mandated by the Housing Element Law. (Gov. Code § 65584.09(a)-(b); Gov. Code § 65583(c)(1); *Martinez v. City of Clovis* (2023) 90 Cal. App. 5th 193, 225.) However, the City's proposed rezoning program—Program 7.1.1— and the FZP, which implements Program 7.1.1, are inadequate because (1) the City's own analysis found that the FZP will not create enough units for the City to meet its RHNA Shortfall; (2) the FZP will not create sufficient capacity because it relies on density decontrol in residential neighborhoods without corresponding changes in development standards; and (3) the FZP's local alternative to the state Density Bonus Law will not increase

density because it is duplicative of existing capacity under the state Density Bonus Law.

A. The Chief Economist's Report Confirms that the FZP Will Not Create Enough Units for the City to Meet its RHNA Shortfall

On October 29, 2025, the City's Chief Economist published a report, which found that the FZP will produce **less than half** the number of housing units that the City is required to plan for to meet its RHNA Shortfall – in more than double the time allowed. The report concluded that in a best-case scenario, the FZP would only produce around 14,600 additional units over the next 20 years, representing just 40% of the 36,282 units the City is required to plan for over the next eight years. Under a low-growth scenario, the FZP would only produce 8,504 units over 20 years. Either scenario is inadequate and would be a spectacular failure of the City to comply with the Housing Element Law, which requires local governments to plan to meet their RHNA shortfall through rezoning programs. (Gov. Code § 65583(c)(1) and Gov. Code § 65583.2(h).)

B. The FZP Will Not Create Sufficient Capacity Because it Relies on Density Decontrol in Single-Family Neighborhoods But Does Not Create Room for Additional Density

The FZP uses form-based zoning without corresponding changes in development standards in single-family neighborhoods, which means developers cannot build in these areas. Therefore, the FZP does not actually increase capacity in these neighborhoods.

The FZP uses form-based zoning (also called density decontrol), which regulates the allowed density on a site by setting limits on height, bulk, setbacks, and other features (rather than setting numerical density limits). And while the City claims that the change from the existing numerical density limits to form-based zoning will produce additional units, its refusal to ease the existing limitations on height, bulk, and other standards that limit the buildable envelope for construction in these neighborhoods means there is no actual capacity to build additional units. For example, a lot with an existing single-family home that occupies most or all of the buildable area is unlikely to be redeveloped into multifamily housing because without easing height limits, setbacks, parking minimums, and the like, there will be no place to build the additional units.

The FZP promises to increase density, but its use of form-based density without easing height limits, setbacks, parking minimums, and other development standards will prevent building in the City's highest-resourced neighborhoods.

C. The FZP's Alternative to the State Density Bonus Law Does Not Add Sufficient Density

The City contends that its local alternative to the state Density Bonus Law will create additional capacity for housing production, and it relies on that claim to meet its RHNA shortfall. However, almost all of the capacity that the City is relying on is already available for housing production through the state Density Bonus Law, so the City's local alternative is duplicative of existing capacity under the state Density Bonus Law.

The state Density Bonus Law requires local agencies to grant density bonuses under the state law to qualifying projects. (Gov. Code § 65915(a)(1)-(b).)

The FZP would give applicants a local alternative to the state Density Bonus Law called Housing Choice-San Francisco ("HCSF"). Crucially, HCSF does not offer any increase in density beyond what is offered by the state Density Bonus Law in most locations. Moreover, when both the state Density Bonus Law and HCSF are available, applicants can only avail themselves of one.

The state Density Bonus Law is intended as a bonus on *top* of local rules. (Gov. Code § 65915(u)(1).) But the HCSF offers no increase in density beyond what developers are already entitled to under the state Density Bonus Law when a project is eligible for both. Therefore, the HCSF does not create the additional capacity required by the Housing Element Law.

II. The City Fails to Use the Required "Analytical Model" to Determine the Likelihood of Site Development

The FZP fails to use the "analytical model" required by the City's housing element. When a city includes a program in its housing element, the Housing Element Law makes it mandatory to implement the features of those programs. (Gov. Code § 65581(b); Gov. Code § 65583(c)(1); *Hoffmaster v. City of San Diego* (1997) 55 Cal.App.4th 1098.)

Program 7.1.1 of the City's housing element commits the City to implementing a rezoning program that "reasonably account[s] for sites' likelihood of development during the planning period using an analytical model." In addition to the Housing Element Law, which makes it mandatory for the City to use an "analytical model," the City's housing element uses mandatory language, stating that the City "shall" build its rezoning program around such a "probability-of-development" analysis. The FZP, however, fails to use an "analytical model," in violation of the housing element. Instead, the FZP uses three alternative methods to estimate how many housing units the FZP will produce, none of which meets the requirements of Program 7.1.1.

First, the City proposes using a "soft sites" method, which assumes that a site that is already developed with a residential use has a two percent probability of being redeveloped with the FZP's planned residential capacity, and a site that is already developed with a non-residential use has a seventy percent probability of redevelopment with a residential use. This assumption is just that, and not an analytical model. Such rigid calculations based on uniform, citywide assumptions about the odds of development on thousands of very different sites are not an "analytical model" and do not "reasonably account for sites' likelihood of development" as required by Program 7.1.1.

Second, the City assesses the likelihood of a given site being developed under the rezoning proposal using a model that evaluates whether new housing is financially feasible at a given site. The model assumes that two percent of sites currently occupied by residential uses and thirty-five percent of other sites will be redeveloped with economically feasible new housing developments. Again, this is not an "analytical model" that "reasonably account[s] for sites' likelihood of development" as required by Program 7.1.1 because its assumptions are not grounded in historical development standards in San Francisco, and its focus on financial feasibility is a distinct concept from focusing on "the probability of development." It may be financially feasible for a property to be redeveloped, but that same property can have a low likelihood of being redeveloped for a variety of reasons, especially for single-family homes that play a big role in the FZP, and which already contain high-value structures or the property owner faces financial constraints, lack of development experience, or the need to use the property for their own housing. Moreover, even if this method were accurate, it projects only 19,000 new units of housing over the planning period – far below the requirement of 36,282 new units.

The third model that the City relies on involves examining the rate at which units across the City were approved using historical data from 2005-2023 and multiplying that by the theoretical capacity of the sites. This model does not qualify as an "analytical model" because it ignores the fact that much of the development in the City in recent years has taken place on vacant sites or extremely underutilized land. In fact, around 25% of sites that were redeveloped from 2005-2023 had residential uses before redevelopment, while around 84% of sites under the FZP have residential uses. Non-vacant sites already containing residential uses are 70% less likely to be redeveloped according to the City's own analysis, and the FZP errs in assuming that non-vacant and vacant sites will be redeveloped at the same rate. (*See* Housing Element, Appendix B.2, Figure 2.) Since the FZP mostly contains parcels with residential uses, unlike past development, this approach of extrapolating from past development does not correspond to future development predictions.

The areas where housing would be built under the FZP already contain high-value structures, such as single-family homes, where the owners are unlikely or unable to redevelop the site as multi-family housing due to financial constraints, lack of development experience, and the need to use their properties for their own housing.

These areas will have much lower rates of redevelopment, which this model does not take into account. Moreover, this model has unrealistically low estimates of the City's residential zoning capacity in prior years (thus inflating the share of residential zoned capacity that has been built out) and the inclusion of residential projects built under development agreements, which do not correspond to rezonings, and which were separately counted towards the City's pre-existing residential zoned capacity in the housing element. These two reasons disqualify this model from being an "analytical model."

Additionally, the FZP does not create sufficient capacity because it assumes certain large pipeline projects will actually be constructed within the planning period, when in reality such development is exceedingly unlikely – if not impossible. For the Hunters Point/Candlestick project, approximately 3,500 units are located on Navy-owned parcels. The City will not even obtain control of these parcels until the Navy finishes remediation, which is estimated to take at least 11 more years. ("The Navy has recently informed OCII that completion of remediation and conveyance of all portions of the Shipyard Site, excluding Parcel F, to Developer will occur between 2036-2038 . . . ." (Resolution No. 26-2024, available at https://sfocii.org/sites/default/files/2024-08/5.%20RESO%2026-2024_HPS%20Approval%20of%20Amendments%20to%20Redevelopment%20Plan.pdf; *see also* https://www.sfchronicle.com/sf/article/hunters-point-shipyard-radioactive-materials-21129542.php.) Similarly, Treasure Island's phasing includes a maximum of 4,600 units completed before 2031, but the City is counting all 8,000 units toward the pipeline. (*See* https://media.api.sf.gov/documents/Ex._JJ_-_SOP.pdf; Treasure Island Sub-Phase Application 3, Schedule of Performance, Exh. JJ, Appendix B, https://media.api.sf.gov/documents/TI_Sub-Phase_Application_3_Book-Revision_1_-_reduced.pdf.)

Since none of the three models that the City considers qualifies as a reasonable "analytical model," the City is violating its legally binding commitment under Program 7.1.1.

III. The FZP Adds New Constraints On Housing Production and Fails to Analyze the Impact of These Constraints

The FZP adds new constraints on housing development, which were not analyzed in its housing element, in violation of the Housing Element Law and Senate Bill ("SB") 330.

A. The FZP's New Constraints Violate the Housing Element Law

The FZP adds new constraints on housing production, which it fails to analyze as required by the Housing Element Law. When considering rezoning plans, the Housing Element Law requires local governments to analyze new governmental constraints on housing production. (Gov. Code § 65583(a)(5); *see also Californians*

for Homeownership, Inc. v. City of Beverly Hills (2023) Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCP00143, at p. 6, [finding planned rezonings for housing element site inventory must analyze new constraints].)

The FZP adds new constraints on development that were not analyzed by the City's housing element, including caps on dwelling unit size, limits on curb cuts, lower parking maximums, and limits imposed by the City's local alternative to the state Density Bonus Law. As explained above, the FZP imposes new constraints because it deprives applicants of the ability to use the state Density Bonus Law in conjunction with the City's local alternative to the state Density Bonus Law, which reduces the number of units the FZP will produce. Other constraints reduce physical development capacity, e.g., caps on dwelling unit size that cannot accommodate larger families, and reduce the economic feasibility of developing housing. The FZP does *not* analyze the impact of these policies on housing production. The FZP, therefore, violates the Housing Element Law's requirement that local governments analyze new governmental constraints on housing production if they were not analyzed in a housing element. (Gov. Code § 65583(a)(5).)

B. The FZP's New Constraints Violate SB 330's Prohibition Against Rezonings Which Decrease Housing Intensity

The FZP's new constraints on housing violate SB 330's prohibition against rezonings which "lessen the intensity of housing." (Gov. Code § 66300(b)(1)(A).)

SB 330—also known as the Housing Crisis Act—prohibits local governments from enacting a development policy, standard, or condition that would "Chang[e] the general plan land use designation, specific plan land use designation, or zoning of a parcel or parcels of property to a less intensive use or reduc[e] the intensity of land use within an existing general plan land use designation, specific plan land use designation, or zoning district below what was allowed under the land use designation and zoning ordinances of the affected county or affected city, as applicable, as in effect on January 1, 2018[.]" (*Id.*) SB 330 defines "less intensive use" as including situations where a local government imposes reductions to the height, density, or floor area ratio, new or increased open space or lot size requirements, new or increased setback requirements, minimum frontage requirements, maximum lot coverage limitations, or "*any other action that would individually or cumulatively reduce [a] site's residential development capacity*." (*Id.*; emph. added.)

As mentioned above, the FZP contains new constraints on housing, including caps on dwelling unit size, limits on curb cuts, and lower parking maximums, reduces the number of units the FZP will produce. These new constraints run afoul of SB 330 because they reduce the size of units that applicants are able to construct, which physically reduces the intensity of residential use and reduces the financial viability of residential construction. The City has also conducted no analysis to show

that there will be a concurrent increase in intensity of land use to offset the decrease in intensity of land use caused by the FZP. (Gov. Code § 66300(h).)

IV. The FZP Violates the Housing Element Law By Relying on an Overlay for Nonvacant Sites Where Development of Nonresidential Uses Is Permitted

The FZP violates the recent decision in *New Commune v. City of Redondo Beach et al.* (2025) 337 Cal.Rptr.3d 782 that overlays cannot be used to meet minimum density requirements required by rezoning programs if they permit developers to redevelop sites for non-residential uses.

As explained above, when a local government cannot accommodate its RHNA Shortfall for lower-income households with a site inventory, it has to include a rezoning program in its housing element. The Housing Element Law also requires jurisdictions that must develop rezoning programs to ensure that at least 50% of the lower income housing the agency must plan for is "accommodated on sites designated for residential use and for which nonresidential uses or mixed uses are not permitted." (Gov. Code § 65583.2(h)(2).) As the City acknowledges in Program 7.1.1, it is subject to this statutory minimum density requirement.

In *New Commune*, the court ruled that residential "overlays are unlawful when they allow development below the statutory minimum density [required by Gov. Cod § 65583.2(h)(2)]." (*Id*. at 797.) The court in *New Commune* also noted that residential overlays are unlawful whether they are overlaid over a base zoning that permits residential or industrial and commercial uses. (*Id*.)

The FZP runs afoul of the *New Commune* decision and the Housing Element Law's minimum density requirement because it still permits nonresidential redevelopment of sites. The FZP is an overlay because it does not change the base zoning of properties, but is instead overlaid over existing zones, including non-residential zones. For instance, for properties subject to the FZP developers can still use the underlying C-2 and C-3 zoning to construct commercial structures, which would be below the statutory minimum density because no residential units would be constructed. By permitting developers to build nonresidential projects within the overlay, the FZP violates the Housing Element Law as explained by the court in *New Commune*.

V. The FZP Violates the Prohibition against Jurisdictions Forcing Applicants to Waive Their Right to Use the State Density Bonus Law

The FZP primarily relies on a local alternative to the state Density Bonus Law, which developers can only use if they waive their right to use the state Density Bonus Law. This is a violation of the state Density Bonus Law.

Local agencies are prohibited from adopting ordinances that conflict with the state Density Bonus Law or using their local alternative to impose development requirements that are more restrictive than the state Density Bonus Law. (*Schreiber v. City of Los Angeles* (2021) 69 Cal.App.5th 549.) The court in *Schreiber* made it clear that applicants have the right to use the state Density Bonus Law regardless of any local provisions, and that cities cannot deny, limit, or condition the use of the state Density Bonus Law by requiring an applicant to instead use a local alternative.

The FZP creates a local alternative to the state Density Bonus law called Housing Choice-San Francisco ("HCSF"). HCSF—proposed Planning Code Section 206.10(b)(5)—has only one criterion: that applicants agree to "not receive any density or development bonuses or relief from applicable Planning Code standards in any other State or local law or program[.]" HCSF violates the state Density Bonus Law's prohibition that local agencies cannot bar an applicant from using the state Density Bonus Law, regardless of any local provisions. The FZP illegally forces applicants to choose between the state Density Bonus Law and HCSF, which violates the rule that "an otherwise valid local ordinance that conflicts with the state Density Bonus Law is preempted." (*Latinos Unidos Del Valle De Napa Y Solano v. County of Napa* (2013) 217 Cal.App.4th 1160, 1169.) The City must amend the FZP so that the state Density Bonus Law can be used on *top* of the HCSF, which has the potential to create meaningful housing production.

VI. Conclusion

We urge the City to comply with the law and remedy the deficiencies in its rezoning plan. If the City fails to significantly increase its proposed residential capacity, there will be no realistic chance of meeting its RHNA obligations. YIMBY Law is prepared to take legal action to hold the City accountable for these clear violations of state housing law.

PATTERSON & O'NEILL, PC

Ryan J. Patterson
General Counsel for Yes In My Back Yard

CC CA Department of Housing and Community Development
Mayor Daniel Lurie

Encl. September 11, 2025 Letter from Yes In My Back Yard
October 29, 2025 Letter from Yes In My Back Yard
October 29, 2025 Report from the Chief Economist of San Francisco

EXHIBIT A

YIMBY Law

2261 Market Street STE 10416
San Francisco, CA 94114
hello@yimbylaw.org

9/11/2025

San Francisco Planning Commission
400, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

(via email) commissions.secretary@sfgov.org

Re: San Francisco's Draft Housing Rezoning Program and Compliance with State Law

Dear Commissioners,

YIMBY Law is a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization dedicated to ensuring compliance with California's housing laws. We write today to express significant concerns regarding the City's proposed Housing Element Rezoning Program and the accompanying "Housing Choice–San Francisco" local bonus ordinance.

Summary

While the rezoning plan, including the local program, is a good step forward for housing in San Francisco, we are concerned that the plan does not actually fulfill what it promises to do. The city has produced no publicly available reports that show how the plan will be more capable of delivering the housing San Franciscans desperately need than what state laws already allow. While we support density decontrol, we do not believe the city has shown that the handful of incentives that are coupled with it will be enough to produce any more housing than state laws such as the Density Bonus Law already do.

Capacity Projections

San Francisco's Housing Element made a binding commitment to meet its Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) through a rezoning program rooted in a probabilistic analytical model Program 7.1.1. San Francisco did not base its rezoning on a site's inventory, but on the projected housing based on that model. The targets and assumptions it sets are enforced by Program 8.1.5. If San Francisco does not produce sufficient units, Program 8.1.5. applies additional upzoning requirements.

Despite the City's commitments to specific unit production, applying the city's own model used to determine the shortfall on the rezone sites, we can determine that the map would produce around 17k homes by 2031, or 47% of the 36k units promised by Program 7.1.1. That regression analysis was built on different logic than the Housing Element's existing capacity analysis. While the proposal does not clearly make up for the RHNA shortfall, its usefulness is difficult to gauge when it functions by different logic than the original rezoning analysis. In order to be comprehensible, realistic, and enforceable, San Francisco must produce a "realistic capacity" table for the rezoned sites that incorporates the Housing Element' regression analysis.

We understand that the City has conducted its own analysis that disputes these figures, but the methodology and details of this analysis have not been made publicly available; therefore we remain concerned and skeptical about the efficacy of the rezoning program in meeting the city's needed housing requirements under housing element law.

Compliance with State Law

San Francisco's rezoning program would institute a local density bonus program that, theoretically, according to the city's assertions (which are not supported by any publicly available information), would accommodate the City's RHNA shortfall. The practical and legal realities according to our analysis suggest that it would fail to produce housing at the suggested rates, and fail to meet statutory requirements.

The latest staff report associated with the September 11 Planning Commission hearing notes that 77% of parcels in the rezoning plan fall into the form based zoning code and will not have their heights increased, while for "the vast majority of residential sites, these changes are only available for projects opting into the local program."

Some proposed areas not eligible for the state bonus would benefit from San Francisco's local program. However, this local program would be exclusive to California's state density bonus law in all areas where both options are available. Whether or not the local program is superior to state incentives, the one cannot replace the other. State density bonus law is intended as a bonus on top of local rules, and should not be supplanted when it generally offers superior development potential.

San Francisco's density decontrol is generally less feasible than the state program. While we applaud the city for applying a local density bonus program to projects between 2-4 units, which are not otherwise eligible for the state density bonus, as well as allowing alternatives to providing on-site affordable units, such as off-site developments, for the vast majority of the city's proposed "rezoning" program, state density bonus law offers a superior alternative: unlimited waivers from local zoning and development standards,

providing limited discretion for local review. Comparatively, the local program is far more stringent. It contains strict rules about building size, setbacks, open space, dwelling unit exposure, and parking allowances. It contains only a 15% reduction of other development standards. The proposal would allow for greater than 15% reductions if approved by a discretionary process. Even if that expensive, time consuming process doesn't result in universal denials, it renders the project not code compliant, forcing the developer to lose protections under the Housing Accountability Act.

While we support the majority of the proposed staff changes made to the local program, we believe that they do not go far enough to ensure that the local program is a superior alternative to state density bonus law. For example, the proposal to require projects with 5+ units to reserve a minimum of 25% of the units for 2+BR units is a constraint that is not required under state density bonus law that will negatively impact density potential for the local program. Additionally, the proposed local program not only requires applicants to choose to give up their option to pursue waivers and incentives under state density bonus law, but *any other* state program that provides its own bonuses or waivers from local zoning, such as AB 2011, which offers waivers of local side and rear setback requirements when those requirements limit feasibility, limits front setback requirements, and allows 55 foot heights, which are greater than the 40 foot height limits proposed for the majority of the local program's rezoned sites.

This proposal not only replaces state density bonus allowances with a worse option, it places new constraints on any such developments via inclusionary requirements and requiring new wind studies on construction. These constraints were not reviewed in the Housing Element, meaning that they may not be imposed or that San Francisco must amend its Element to account for those constraints. New constraints must be accounted for in the Element, to demonstrate how San Francisco can realistically meet its RHNA requirements.

San Francisco must also analyze how this program would interact with existing land use regulations. Transfer taxes, inclusionary requirements, and impact fees are key drivers of unit loss, but have not been incorporated into any City analyses yet. We encourage the City Economist to incorporate them into any future analysis of this program.

Even if all of these deficiencies are corrected, they cannot make up for the requirement to change the base zoning of parcels, as required by Housing Element law and HCD interpretation. Under the new scheme, San Francisco would not change its zoned capacity, and therefore would not comply with state law. Density bonuses must add capacity on top of that allowed for in the zoning code.

Conclusion

Given the substantial deficiencies in San Francisco's rezoning program and the speculative nature of its local density bonus ordinance, the City's Housing Element certification is at risk. The burden is on San Francisco to demonstrate compliance. The use of analytical models that inflate development probability, the reliance on unproven local bonus mechanisms, and the introduction of new constraints all undermine that burden. In short, the program is not legally defensible as currently drafted, with the limited information supporting the city's conclusions that it exceeds the city's RHNA obligation

YIMBY Law has taken legal action against the City of Los Angeles for a similar failure to deliver a legally compliant rezoning program. We sincerely hope litigation will not be necessary in San Francisco. However, San Francisco will be vulnerable to lawsuits from parties working to ensure that the City complies with state law and delivers a realistic path toward housing affordability and accessibility.

We urge the Board to direct Planning to:

- Re-run the BlueSky regression analysis used for the Housing Element's "existing capacity" estimate on the rezoning proposal to produce a transparent, realistic capacity table that is made publicly available.

- Incorporate the waiver and incentive framework of SDBL into the local bonus program, or ensure that projects can access SDBL concurrently.

- Remove new constraints on development introduced by the ordinance.

- Ensure that the rezoning program meets or exceeds the 36,282-unit requirement via base zoning and that its methodology aligns with Program 7.1.1.

The stakes for San Francisco are high. We urge the City to correct course by allowing the use of density bonus and other state programs in combination with the local program.

Sincerely,

Jack Farrell, Esq.
Research Attorney
YIMBY Law

EXHIBIT B

From:	Jane Natoli
To:	paul.mcdougall@hcd.ca.gov
Cc:	gustavo.velasquez@hcd.ca.gov; melinda.coy@hcd.ca.gov; Zisser, David@HCD; megan.kirkeby@hcd.ca.gov; shannan.west@hcd.ca.gov; Frank, Lisa@HCD; Herrera, Fidel@HCD; matthew.struhar@doj.ca.gov; david.pai@doj.ca.gov; alex.fisch@doj.ca.gov; Annie Fryman; Tanner, Rachael (CPC); Chen, Lisa (CPC); Sonja Trauss; matt@caforhomes.org; senator.wiener@senate.ca.gov; Severiano.Christian@sen.ca.gov; Mohtashemi, Raayan; David Broockman; Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Supervisors; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Bonde, Aly (MYR); Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC)
Subject:	SF YIMBY"s letter on the City Economist"s report
Date:	Wednesday, October 29, 2025 4:13:34 PM
Attachments:	SF YIMBY FZP Letter October 29 2025.pdf

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

Hello,

We are writing to urgently draw your attention to the just released report from the City Economist that shows San Francisco's rezoning will not meet our state housing requirements. Please see our attached letter, and let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you,

--

Jane Natoli (she/her)
San Francisco Organizing Director
415-335-9950

Check out everything we achieved in 2024!

Paul McDougall, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Mayor Daniel Lurie
San Francisco Board of Supervisors (re: file #250700)
October 29, 2025

We write to urgently draw your attention to **an analysis the City of San Francisco ("SF") released that finds that its own rezoning plan would violate state law.** The Family Zoning Plan ("FZP") is a significant step forward, but the city's analysis found that it will not meet the city's Housing Element's 36,282-unit requirement. **According to the city's own numbers, state law requires the city to conduct additional rezoning beyond the FZP.**

As a reminder, in 2022, the California Department of Housing and Community Development ("HCD") suggested that, instead of a traditional sites inventory, SF instead pledge to assess the capacity of its rezoning using the method from its underutilized sites analysis (a model called BlueSky, which estimates the likelihood of development). Housing Element Program 7.1.1 thus committed that SF's rezoning "shall reasonably account for sites' likelihood of development during the planning period using an analytical model."

SF's August submission to HCD revealed that SF still had not done so (see Appendix). HCD thus instructed SF that "As part of Program 7.1.1 and using analytical models to account for a site's likelihood of development in the planning period, the city should continue to explore additional and multiple methods and make adjustments as appropriate."

Today, SF did so: its City Economist reported that he used an updated version of the BlueSky analytical model—the same method HCD originally suggested SF use—to estimate the number of units the FZP will likely develop. **He reported that, in the best case scenario, the City's analytical model finds that the FZP is only likely to develop 14,646 units by 2045, far less than the 36,282 required by 2031** under 7.1.1. In other words, **using the exact method HCD suggested SF use, the City itself has found that its rezoning plan does not meet Program 7.1.1's requirements, and is around 10 times too small.**

Gov. Code § 65588(e)(4)(C)(iii) states, "If a jurisdiction...fails to complete the required rezoning within the time period required, the jurisdiction's adopted housing element shall be subject to" the housing element decertification process. Thus, **if SF fails to expand its plan, HCD will be legally obliged to begin the decertification process**.

We encourage HCD to offer SF guidance about how to bring its proposed rezoning into compliance, building on HCD's recent guidance to the city to "make adjustments as appropriate" when more analysis was made available. For example, using recent changes in state law (e.g., SB 131, SB 79), additional rezoning or policy changes that supplement the FZP (e.g., reduced fees and exactions) could be passed within months. Given the timeline required for decertification, HCD could reasonably offer SF up to six months before the builders' remedy would apply to fully complete its "required rezoning" through such a supplement.

Confirming that SF must rely on the City Economist's updated BlueSky analytical model to assess the rezoning's capacity, as well as the actions taken to satisfy Program 8.1.5 (the "circuit breaker"), would also be consistent with HCD's recent direction to the city to "us[e] conservative assumptions...that facilitate the highest housing outcomes."

SF's actions risk paving a path for other cities to evade state law. In particular, rather than "demonstrat[ing] that the existing use [on each non-vacant site] does not constitute an impediment to additional residential development" (Gov. Code, § 65583.2(g)), cities will be tempted to follow SF: promise in a Housing Element to provide this evidence later in the form of statistical analysis—but then ignore what this evidence shows when rezoning.

Best regards,

Salim Damerdji

Volunteer Lead, San Francisco YIMBY

Jane Natoli

San Francisco Organizing Director,

YIMBY Action

CC: Gustavo Velasquez, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Megan Kirkeby, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Melinda Coy, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Shannan West, California Department of Housing and Community Development
David Zisser, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Lisa Frank, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Fidel Herrera, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Alex Fisch, California Department of Justice
Matthew Struhar, California Department of Justice
David Pai, California Department of Justice
Annie Fryman, SPUR
Aly Bonde, Office of Mayor Daniel Lurie
Sarah Dennis-Phillips, Rachael Tanner, and Lisa Chen, San Francisco Planning
Sonja Trauss, YIMBY Law
Matt Gelfand, Californians for Homeownership
Senator Scott Wiener

Appendix: Why the Planning Department's methods do not satisfy the Housing Element's requirement to "reasonably account for sites' likelihood of development during the planning period using an analytical model"

The San Francisco Planning Department's August 1 submission to HCD contained three analyses of the capacity provided by its rezoning. None of these analyses satisfy Program 7.1.1's commitment to "reasonably account for sites' likelihood of development during the planning period using an analytical model." The below details why each of the Planning Department's methods do not satisfy this requirement. Indeed, a closer look at the Planning Department's analyses suggests conclusions that are in line with the City Economist's finding that the rezoning is insufficient.

"Soft Sites Method"

Under this method, the vast majority of the rezoning's capacity is from sites without existing residential uses (but that largely have other uses). The Planning Department assumes that 70% of these sites will be developed to their maximum capacity during the planning period. This 70% assumption is not "reasonabl[e]" (and certainly not "conservative" like the city claims):

1. In San Francisco, fewer than 70% of entitled projects are ultimately developed — making it implausible that 70% of all sites without residential use will be developed, even those where no interest has been expressed in development or discontinuing existing uses. As another comparison, the Terner Center found that only 8.6% of LA's very best sites are developed over 5 years (versus SF's 70% assumption across a huge number of sites).
2. These sites largely do have other non-residential uses which make their development especially improbable. For example, the first page of SF's parcel list includes 1201-05 Columbus Avenue, a 3-story Travelodge in Fisherman's Wharf. The city assumes there is a 70% chance that properties like this will be redeveloped during the planning period.
3. The city's related assertion that 2% of sites with existing residential uses will be redeveloped during the planning period is similarly made without evidence.

This approach also allows the city to evade complying with GC 65583.2(g)'s requirement that the city provide substantial evidence that existing uses on "lower income" sites are likely to be discontinued during the planning period. The city has not provided site-specific evidence supporting their assertion that most sites with existing non-residential uses will be developed during the planning period. The lack of site-specific evidence would not be a problem if the city had provided statistical evidence (i.e., had statistically estimated what percent of these sites will have their existing use discontinued during the planning period based on historical data, as action 7.1.1 promises). But the Planning Department simply provides no evidence whatsoever that 70% of sites with existing non-residential uses will be developed, either site-specific or

statistical. This 70% figure is simply fabricated — not from “an analytical model,” and it is not at all “reasonable.”

“Citywide Capacity Method”

This method calculates what share of the city’s remaining zoned capacity was developed annually over the last 18 years (2005-2023). It then assumes the new capacity created by the rezoning will be developed at a similar annual rate.

While reasonable in theory, there are several errors and problems with how the Planning Department is implementing this approach that make it not “reasonabl[e]” in practice:

1. The city has two versions of this approach, each with errors:
    a. The primary version (with “exclusions”) divides citywide development by the amount of capacity on only a subset of parcels. This overstates the rate at which capacity historically translates into development because less capacity is considered despite all development being considered. This is like computing the average grades of all students in a class by adding up all students’ grades but then dividing this total by half the number of students there are in the class.
    b. The city describes another version of the method that measures capacity on all parcels but uses Planning entitlements to measure development; during this period there were 90K entitlements but only 53K building permits. Using entitlements to measure development overstates the historical development rate, as in San Francisco many entitlements are never developed (in part due to constraints the city places on development).
2. The city’s statistic that 53K units were constructed citywide 2005-2023 includes development from development agreements (DAs). By counting historical DA development when computing the rate at which historical zoned capacity is developed, the city therefore assumes that the rezoning will produce new DA development during this planning period. This is unreasonable, as DAs do not result from (re)zoning. Furthermore, the city’s housing element already counted expected development from DAs during the planning period in its claims of existing capacity.
3. Parcels where projects have been proposed but have not received permits are excluded from the city’s calculation of its historical capacity; this leads the city to underestimate how much historical capacity it had, and therefore overstate the development rate of its capacity.
4. The new rezoned capacity is also less developable than the existing remaining capacity. Specifically, according to the city’s Bluesky model (the model it used for its underutilized sites analysis), the new capacity is about 20% less likely to be developed. This is because, for example, rezoned capacity is 3x more likely to be on sites with an existing residential use than existing capacity. It’s therefore not entirely reasonable to assume that the city’s historical rate of development will manifest for the new capacity.

5. The Planning Department is relying on its UrbanSim tool to measure its remaining zoned capacity (313K). But the city's housing element (Sites Inventory Appendix B2 p. 4) gives a much larger number for this (572K), as do our own calculations. Insofar as the city is now understating how much capacity it has, it is therefore overstating the rate at which that capacity has been developed. We have asked for data that would help us understand this discrepancy, but the city has indicated that its UrbanSim tool is unable to provide the underlying data that supports this 313K calculation.

When addressing the first four errors and issues above, and when using the city's housing element's estimate that the city has 572K units of capacity remaining (see point 5), the historical development rate is 0.4% and the adjusted capacity of the rezoning is therefore 10K units.

"Financial Feasibility Method"

The Planning Department has contracted with UrbanSim to estimate whether development will be economically feasible on rezoned parcels. While this analysis is welcome, there are several problems with this approach:

1. Totaling the amount of economically feasible development does not "account for sites' likelihood of development." Historically, only a fraction of economically feasible units are actually developed, and some research practitioners have advised us that there is nearly an order of magnitude difference between the two.
2. The Planning Department's economic assumptions are not "reasonabl[e]": the Department assumes that construction costs, interest rates, and developer return expectations will drop without providing evidence. It also assumes rents will jump. The Department justifies these optimistic assumptions by asserting that it is only responsible for making housing feasible to develop under better economic conditions than are likely during this planning period — but action 7.1.1 commits to providing enough capacity to make 36K units likely developed during this planning period. Furthermore, the city's poor economic environment for development reflects the city's constraints on development that Housing Element Law is supposed to remediate. I.e., the fact that the city so heavily constrains development makes more rezoning (and changes to its other policies) necessary, and cannot be ignored when considering the appropriate scope of actions to accommodate development.
3. The Department's submission describes a flawed approach for using UrbanSim's output to account for the likelihood of development: asserting that 2% of economically feasible projects will occur on sites with existing residential uses and 35% of economically feasible projects will occur on sites with other non-residential uses. These assumptions are not based on any evidence and, for the same reasons we described in the context of the "soft sites" method, are not reasonable.
4. After applying this flawed approach for accounting for the likelihood of development, the Planning Department nevertheless finds that only 19K units will be developed during the planning period. This is short of the 36K required by action 7.1.1. The Planning

Department argues that this is acceptable because the method must only demonstrate sufficient capacity for meeting the city's 16K RHNA shortfall in the Moderate and Above-Moderate income categories. But action 7.1.1 makes no reference to separate by-category targets, it simply states that the rezoning must "accommodate… approximately 36,282 new units." Furthermore, the Department's argument is also belied by the Housing Element Law and the No Net Loss Law, both of which contemplate development of market-rate and mixed-income projects on "lower income" sites (GC 65583.2(c) & (h); GC 65863(c)(2)).

EXHIBIT C

Family Zoning Plan: Economic Impact Report

Office of the Controller
Office of Economic Analysis

Items 250700 & 250701
October 29, 2025

Introduction

- Two proposed ordinances would change zoning controls to permit more housing on a large segment of San Francisco, particularly on the western half of the city. They implement changes to the Housing Element of the City's General Plan, a planning document whose revisions were adopted in 2023.
- The Ordinance in file #250700, the Zoning Map Amendment, would generally raise allowable building heights along commercial corridors and transit lines, to permit mid-rise and some high-rise development.
- The Ordinance in file #250701 implements the Housing Choice-San Francisco program, which offers an alternative to the State Density Bonus program.
- The Office of Economic Analysis (OEA) has prepared this report because the proposed legislation may have a material impact on the city's economy. This report uses a model that estimates potential new development, in order to assess economic impact. That model is not a replacement for the City's estimates of realistic capacity under Government Code § 65583.2.

Zoning Map Amendment: Key Provisions

- The Zoning Map Amendment would make changes to allowable building heights and bulk, and/or zoning districts, in over 92,000 parcels in the city.
- The vast majority are residential parcels, whose allowable heights would either remain at 40 feet, or rise to 50 or 65 feet.
- On these and many other rezoned parcels, the Housing Choice San Francisco program (described on the next page) relaxes existing controls on the number of housing units allowed on a parcel.
- Allowable heights are generally increased to 65 to 85 feet along many commercial corridors, with development along wider streets near transit stations or major lines increased to 85 feet.
- Heights above 140 feet are allowed on certain streets that currently allow high-rise development or have larger parcels, at key intersections, and near certain major transit routes and stations. The map on page 5 provides additional details.

Housing Choice San Francisco – Key Provisions

- The Housing Choice San Francisco program, or “Local Program”, gives developers an alternative to the State Density Bonus.
- Many of the rezoned residential parcels are too small to be eligible for the State Density Bonus, but may achieve greater density through the use of the Local Program.
- Local Program users also gain benefits associated with housing unit mix, methods of complying with inclusionary housing requirements, rear-yard and setback requirements, broad code flexibility, and certain process changes.
- The ordinance has several other provisions, including limiting the maximum size of new residential units, reducing allowable parking, and restricting new curb cuts. These policy changes are not considered in this report.
- Additionally, the proposed ordinance gives displaced businesses the right to relocate anywhere in the city where their activity is permitted by zoning, without a conditional use permit, and waives development impact fees associated with the relocation.

Details of the Rezoning



The map to the left, from the City Planning department, indicates which parcels in the city will be rezoned, and to which heights. It reflects the plan as of July.

Gray parcels will be zoned for low-rise, 40-50 feet housing developments. This includes single-family residential zones, within which greater density will be permitted via the Local Program.

Yellow and orange parcels will be upzoned to mid-rise development of 65-105 feet.

Pink and purple parcels will have height limits ranging from 120-180 feet, and the blue and green parcels will be upzoned for high-rise development, of 240 feet or greater.

The Rezoning and the Regional Housing Needs Assessment

- Each jurisdiction in California is required to have its Housing Element be certified by the State's Housing and Community Development Department.
- Certification involves, among other things, ensuring that the City has the zoning capacity to meet the city's obligations under the State's Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA).
- RHNA is a Statewide planning process, in which future needs are forecasted for metropolitan areas, and then allocated to the individual cities and counties that administer land use planning.
- In San Francisco's case, the RHNA obligation requires the City to have realistic capacity for approximately 82,000 new housing units, at different economic levels, within an 8-year planning period ending in 2031.
- Of this 82,000 unit requirement, the City must create capacity for approximately 36,000 units.

Substitutions and Proposed Amendments

- On September 30, a new version of #250700 was substituted by Mayor Lurie, which made relatively minor zoning changes on a number of parcels. This analysis reflects those changes.
- On October 21, Supervisor Melgar proposed an amendment that would prohibit the use of the Local Program on any parcel containing more then two existing housing units, which would involve the demolition of a unit subject to rent control.
- Also on October 21, Supervisor Sauter introduced an amendment that creates incentives for developers to replace lost commercial space.
- As the language of these two amendments was made public less than one week ago, this report does not attempt to model their economic impact.

Economic Impact Factors

- When the City relaxes zoning controls, by reducing density restrictions or increasing allowable heights, more development projects will become financially feasible, and the supply of housing in the city will rise.
- This increased supply will put downward pressure on housing prices in the city. Cheaper housing benefits city residents who move within the city, and also makes San Francisco more affordable for new arrivals.
- The development of new housing also stimulates investment and employment in construction and related industries.
- The population growth associated with new housing also stimulates the local economy, by expanding the numbers of workers and consumers.
- On the other hand, the limited amount of vacant lots in the city means that new housing generally involves the loss of existing buildings, including both residential and commercial properties. This can impose relocation and other costs on residential and commercial tenants.

Estimating the Likelihood of New Housing Development

- The amount of new housing that the rezoning will produce is an important contributor to its economic impact. To estimate this, OEA refined a statistical model that it has used since 2016 to estimate the impact of policy changes on housing production in the city[1].
- The model was the result of statistical analysis of housing production in San Francisco over the 2004-2024 period. Technical details on the model are provided in the Appendix.
- The first part of the model estimates the likelihood that multifamily housing will be developed on a given parcel, in a given year. The statistical analysis found that a parcel is more likely to develop when:
  - it has smaller existing buildings (or is vacant), and is located closer to downtown.
  - its zoning allows for a greater height, makes it eligible for the State Density Bonus, and does not restrict the number of units that may be constructed.
  - housing prices are relatively high, and construction costs are relatively low, compared to other years.

Estimating the Number of Units Produced

- The second part of the model estimates the number of units that will be produced when a parcel does develop housing. Based on past experience, the statistical analysis found that a parcel developing housing will produce more units when:
  - its land area and allowable maximum height are greater;
  - it is eligible for the State Density Bonus;
  - its zoning does not restrict the number of units that may be built.
- The OEA used the first part of the model to estimate the probability that housing will be built on a parcel over the next twenty years[2]. That probability was multiplied by the estimate of housing units from the second part, to create an expected number of housing units generated for each parcel over twenty years. When this is summed across all parcels, a citywide housing total is generated.
- This method was used to create estimates of housing production under the existing zoning, and the proposed rezoning. The difference is the estimate of housing that could be produced as a result of the proposed zoning changes.

Limitations of the Housing Development Model

- The housing development model can forecast future housing development based on the city's past experience, but important caveats must be made.
- Because of data availability, not every factor that affects housing production could be included. Missing data may include features of the parcel itself, or policies that may have changed over the 2004-24 period, or vary within the aggregated zoning designations used by the model.
- Limited data also prevents the analysis of fine-grained policy changes in the proposed rezoning, such as restrictions on unit size and mix.
- Several new City and State policies that were intended to encourage housing production have been enacted in recent years, such as, for example, the City's 2023 Housing Production Ordinance (0248-23). The model may be unable to properly assess the impact of these policies in the future.
- Despite these limitations, the OEA believes this approach is well-suited to estimating housing production, for the purposes of economic impact reporting.

Future Housing Market Scenarios

- As noted earlier, the amount of housing that will be produced as a result of the rezoning, and its economic impact, will depend on future housing market conditions. This creates an additional level of uncertainty in the forecasts.
- Gauging future market conditions is further complicated by changes in the city's housing market since the COVID-19 pandemic, as described on the next page.
- To understand the scope of what could potentially happen, the OEA created two future scenarios for housing prices and costs in San Francisco.
- In a high-growth scenario, San Francisco's housing prices, relative to the U.S., return to pre-COVID levels by 2030, and grow at the city's pre-COVID rate after that. Construction costs are assumed to grow at the same rate as inflation.
- In a low-growth scenario, San Francisco's post-COVID relative housing prices are assumed to represent a "new normal," and housing prices are assumed to grow only at a national average level over the next twenty years. Construction costs are also assumed to grow at the same rate as inflation.

San Francisco and U.S. Housing Price Trends Since 2000



While San Francisco's housing has always been expensive, during the 2010s, average San Francisco condo prices rose much faster than the rest of the U.S., to as much as 5 times the typical U.S. price.

Since 2020, however, San Francisco condo prices have declined, despite rising inflation and rising U.S. condo prices. Adjusted for inflation, typical San Francisco condo prices in 2025 are 25% lower than they were in 2019.

Among other factors, the increase in remote office work during COVID has reduced the value of a residence near large office employment centers like downtown San Francisco.

Source: Zillow. Data retrieved October 1, 2025.

Housing Price Trends Within the City



Source: Zillow. Data retrieved October 1, 2025.

The reduced value of a downtown location has also shifted multifamily price patterns within the city.

Condos in neighborhoods like Downtown and South of Market have experienced inflation-adjusted price drops of more than 40% since 2016, while the Richmond and Sunset have fallen by far less.

Because most multifamily housing in the city is near downtown, but most of the proposed rezoning is not, the use of a citywide average condo price index is inappropriate. This analysis uses an average price across the 10 Zillow neighborhoods most affected by the zoning, which is somewhat higher than the citywide average.

High and Low Growth Scenario Price Forecasts



Our high-growth scenario assumes that San Francisco's housing prices, relative to the U.S., return to pre-pandemic levels by 2030, and then grow at the city's long-term average rate until 2045. This implies a rapid growth in housing prices over the next five years, of over 10% per year.

In the low-growth scenario, the post-COVID housing market represents a new normal, and San Francisco housing prices are assumed to grow only at the U.S. long-term rate at 1.8% per year, in inflation-adjusted dollars. Under this assumption, San Franciso housing prices would not recover to their pre-COVID peak, in inflation-adjusted dollars, until 2041.

Source: Zillow. 10 Neighborhoods are Buena Vista, Polk Gulch, Inner Sunset, Marina, Mission, North Waterfront, Outer Sunset, Outer Richmond, Inner Richmond, and Western Addition.

Construction Cost Trends and Scenarios



Source: Bureau of Economic Analysis; U.S. Census Bureau, "Quarterly Workforce Indicators

The housing development model uses two measures of construction costs: materials cost and local construction industry wages. They are blended into a single index for modeling purposes. Details are in the Appendix.

The cost of construction materials and local wages have grown faster than overall inflation, particularly in the last few years. In 2024, real construction materials costs were 18% higher, and real local wages were 10% higher, than they were in 2016.

In both the high-growth and low-growth scenarios, the blended index is assumed to grow at 0% (after inflation) over the 2026-2045 period. This reflects an assumption that both labor and material costs inflation will revert to the broader rate of inflation in the long term.

Housing Production Forecasts Under Current Zoning

Planning District	Historic, 2000-24	Low-Growth Scenario Forecast, 2026-45	High-Growth Scenario Forecast, 2026-45
Buena Vista	975	43	90
Central	72	192	390
Downtown	289	112	230
Ingleside	0	58	120
Inner Sunset	123	28	59
Marina	131	126	263
Mission	187	197	406
Northeast	449	136	283
Outer Sunset	15	16	33
Richmond	0	23	47
South Central	0	6	11
Western Addition	997	658	1,265
Total	3,238	1,594	3,199

Generally, the housing development model forecasts that the current zoning will produce fewer units in the next 20 years than the numbers of units that were produced in the last 20 years.

The table to the left only covers the portion of each planning district that is in the proposed rezoning area. In total, under the current zoning, the model forecasts 1,594 or 3,199 units under the low- and high-growth forecasts, respectively, while 3,238 units were built in the same areas over the 2000-2024 period.

On the next two pages, the model's forecasts of the additional housing created by the proposed zoning is discussed.

Source: For historic housing production, San Francisco Planning Department

Forecast Net Effect of the Zoning

- As shown in the table below, under the low-growth and high-growth scenarios described earlier, the rezoning would lead to 8,504 and 14,646 additional housing units, beyond what would be produced under current zoning, over the next 20 years.

Low Growth Scenario	**Units**
20-Year Housing Production, Existing Zoning	1,594
20-Year Housing Production, Proposed Rezoning	10,098
Effect of Proposed Rezoning	8,504

High Growth Scenario	**Units**
20-Year Housing Production, Existing Zoning	3,199
20-Year Housing Production, Proposed Rezoning	17,845
Effect of Proposed Rezoning	14,646

Summary by Current Zoning District

		Low-Growth			High-Growth		
Current Zoning[3]	Number of Parcels	Average Housing Likelihood, Current	Average Housing Likelihood, Proposed	Change in Housing Units	Average Housing Likelihood, Current	Average Housing Likelihood, Proposed	Change in Housing Units
RH1	43,009	0.001%	0.205%	798	0.003%	0.446%	1,731
RH2	26,486	0.002%	0.259%	576	0.005%	0.565%	1,250
RH3_RM1	13,741	0.009%	0.347%	547	0.018%	0.756%	1,186
Office/Commercial	114	0.570%	0.780%	48	1.185%	1.639%	104
Public	239	0.060%	1.450%	3,483	0.122%	2.560%	4,814
Density-Restricted Multifamily	7,079	0.336%	0.490%	3,007	0.674%	1.026%	5,467
Form-Based Multifamily	2,053	0.725%	0.725%	46	1.502%	1.502%	94
Total	92,721			8,504			14,646

The table to the left breaks out the results by current zoning. It illustrates how many rezoned parcels are in the RH-1, RH-2, and RH-3 or RM-1 residential zones, primarily in the western side of the city. These areas will see a substantial increase in the likelihood of developing housing over the next 20 years, but the chances are still small, so those 83,000+ parcels are only forecast to produce about additional 4,200 housing units by 2045, in the high growth scenario.

Fewer Public parcels (generally owned by the City or SFUSD) are larger, and more likely to develop housing through the rezoning, though this depends on the owner's decisions.

Estimating the Loss of Existing Residential Units

- To evaluate the economic impact, OEA calculated the net increase in housing units.
- In the low-growth scenario, 463 more units would be lost under the proposed zoning than under current zoning, over the 20-year forecast period. In the high-growth scenario, 1,031 more housing units would be lost. These losses represent a 6-8% of the housing units gained as a result of the rezoning. Amendments proposed on October 20th may reduce these losses, along with overall housing production.
- The loss of existing housing slightly dampens the housing price reductions associated with the rezoning, and may impose financial harms on existing tenants. City and State law heavily restricts, but does not prohibit, the eviction of tenants for the purpose of demolition, or the demolition of rent-controlled housing. These events have been quite rare in recent decades. If this occurs, tenants are entitled to relocation payments.
- Without any way to meaningfully estimate the number of evictions or demolitions of rent-controlled units, or the financial impact on tenants, this report does not attempt to quantify these potential costs.

Impacts on Housing Prices

- The responsiveness of housing prices to increases in housing supply is a function of price elasticities of supply and demand, which the OEA has estimated in past research[4].
- The elasticities imply that the proposed rezoning would lead to a -2.5% to -4.2% change in housing prices in the city, depending on the scenario. For context, those percentages are also expressed in terms of current housing prices and apartment rents.

	Low Growth Scenario	**High Growth Scenario**
Net Change in Housing Supply (units produced less demolitions)	8,041	13,615
Percentage Change in Housing Supply[5]	2.0%	3.4%
Price Elasticity of Demand	-0.7	-0.7
Price Elasticity of Supply	0.1	0.1
Percent change in housing prices	-2.5%	-4.2%
Corresponding change in condo prices[6]	-$24,500	-$41,600
Corresponding change in annual apartment market rents[7]	-$903	-$1,529

Estimating Relocation and Disruption Costs

- To account for the impact on commercial businesses, OEA estimated potential displacement costs. Details are provided in the Appendix.
- Displaced businesses are estimated to occupy commercial space ranging from approximately 1.5 to 2.6 million square feet, depending on the scenario. This displacement would occur over twenty years, and it is highly likely that the rezoning would lead to an increase in the amount of commercial space in the city.
- Annual business disruption and relocation costs range from $16 to $28 million, in today's dollars.

	Low Growth	High Growth
Loss of occupied commercial space (million sf)	1.5	2.6
Disruption-relocation cost/sf	$190	$190
Annual disruption/relocation cost (2025 $ million)	$16	$28

REMI Economic Impact Simulation

- Based on the economic impact factors described earlier, the OEA used the REMI model to measure the net economic impact of the changes associated with the high and low growth scenarios to the city's economy over the 2026-2045 period:
  - An increase in the city's residential capital stock of $8.0 billion (low growth) to $13.5 billion (high growth) in today's dollars, representing the investment associated with the new units forecast under the two scenarios. These figures are calculated by multiplying the net increase in units by average prices.
  - A reduction in citywide housing prices, reaching 2.5% (low growth) and 4.2% (high growth) by 2045.
  - Annual business disruption and relocation costs for retail businesses of $16 million (low growth) and $28 million (high growth) in today's dollars, until 2045.

Economic Impact Assessment

- In the low-growth scenario, the city's GDP would be $560 million larger, in today's dollars, on average over the 2026-45 period. Total employment in the city would be approximately 3,000 more than under the current zoning, on average over the period.
- In the high-growth scenario, the city's GDP growth would be $940 million larger than under current zoning, in 2025 dollars. Employment would be about 5,000 higher.
- Employment gains are expected in every sector, but would be most heavily concentrated in the construction, health care, real estate, and accommodations and food services sectors.
- Despite the displacement of businesses, retail trade is forecast to grow as a result of the population and economic growth created by the proposed rezoning, adding about 210 jobs in the low-growth scenario and about 350 jobs in the high-growth scenario.
- Like most major policies, the proposed rezoning involves benefits and costs. Our analysis suggests the proposed rezoning's positive impact on the city's economy, from lower housing prices and construction, outweighs the negative impact from displaced businesses, by a factor of approximately 22:1.

Conclusions

- The context for housing development in San Francisco has changed profoundly in the past several years. Since 2019, after adjusting for inflation, condo prices in San Francisco have dropped by 25%, while our blended construction cost index has risen by 8%.
- Given this starting point, an expansive rezoning effort, like the proposed Family Zoning plan, will be challenged to match the 2010s levels of new housing development in the city, even under an optimistic high-growth scenario.
- Nevertheless, under both scenarios considered in this report, the proposed rezoning would lead to a significant increase in the city's housing supply, and have broadly positive effects on housing prices and the city's broader economy. The benefits of new residential investments and lower housing prices are projected to outweigh the costs of business interruption and displacement by a factor of roughly 22:1.
- If market conditions were such that the 36,000 unit target was achieved, as a result of the rezoning, the economic impact on the city would likely be significantly more positive than the estimates in this report.

Footnotes

1. See, for example, Inclusionary Housing Working Group: Preliminary Report September 2016.
2. Three large parcels were excluded from the analysis: Laguna Honda Hospital, and the USF Main and Lone Mountain campuses. While all three parcels receive height increases in the proposed rezoning, their size and unique uses makes them unsuitable for the model. If the model could accurately estimate the amount of housing likely to occur on those parcels, the total housing estimate reported in this report would be larger.
3. These are the aggregate zoning classifications used by the model. See the Appendix for details.
4. See Potential Effects of Limiting Market-Rate Housing in the Mission.
5. Assuming 406,000 housing units in the city.
6. Based on Zillow's 2025 average condo prices for San Francisco.
7. Based on 2025 average apartment asking rents, from ApartmentList.

Appendix

- Housing Development Model
  - Methodology
  - Data sources
  - Model coefficients and performance
  - Scenario Inputs
  - Zoning District Classification
  - Logic of Applying the Model to the Proposed Rezoning
- Estimates of Business Interruption and Relocation Costs

Appendix: Housing Development Model: Methodology

- The housing development model is a two-stage step model. The first stage is a logistic regression, covering every parcel in the city, except those subject to a development agreement, over the 2004-2024 period.
- The dependent variable of the logistic regression is 1 if the parcel produced housing in a given year, and 0 otherwise. Parcels that produce housing in a given year were removed from the dataset for subsequent years. Independent variables, reflecting existing land use, market conditions, and zoning, are listed on the next page.
- The second stage is a regression model including all parcels that produced multifamily housing with more than 10 units, over the 2004-24 period. The dependent variable is the number of units produced on the parcel, and the independent variables are the parcel's "building envelope" (its area multiplied by its allowable height), and two interaction variables: the building envelope times a dummy indicating if the parcel was eligible for the State Density Bonus in that year, and the building envelope times a dummy indicating if the parcel was subject to density-restricted zoning in that year. The intercept of the model was fixed at zero.

Appendix: Housing Development Model: Methodology

- The models' coefficients were used in a forecast that calculated the log-likelihood of development for each rezoned parcel, in each of the forecast years 2026-2045, using the site and zoning information, and the price and cost assumptions for each year (shown on the next page). The log-likelihoods were converted into annual probabilities, from which a 20-year probability of development was calculated.
- The model coefficients were also used to calculate a units estimate; the 20-year probability times the units estimate is the expected number of units produced on that parcel in the 20-year forecast period.
- The forecast model was run for both the current and the proposed zoning. See the section "Logic of Applying the Model to the Proposed Rezoning" for more details.
- Three parcels were excluded from the forecast: Laguna Honda Hospital, the University of San Francisco Main Campus, and the University of San Francisco Lone Mountain Campus. While some housing may be built on those parcels in the forecast period, the model is not well-suited for large parcels with unique uses like these.

Appendix: Housing Development Model: Data Sources

Variable Description	Variable	Data Source
Height limit for site in ft	Height_Ft	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Area for lot in 1000 sq ft	Area_1000	Planning Department, Land Use Database 4/16/25
Extisting building square footage in 1000 sq ft	Bldg_SqFt_1000	Planning Department, Land Use Database 4/16/25
Residential Existing Use using ResUnits (Dummy)	Res_Dummy	Planning Department, Land Use Database 4/16/25
Historic Status for Parcel (Dummy)	Historic	Planning Department, Land Use Database 4/16/25
Real Construction Cost Variable, 2 years prior	Construc_Cost_Real	a 60/40 average of Real Construction Materials PPI and Real San Francisco MSA Construction Wages, 2016=100
10-Neighborhood Housing Price Index (Zillow), Real, 2 years prior	Zillow_Price_Real	SF real condo prices per Zillow, 2016=100
Dummy indicating eligibility for State Density Bonus, 2016 forward	SDB_2016_5Plus	Calculated from Zoning Districts
Zoning dummy: Office/Commercial	zp_OfficeComm	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Zoning dummy: Density Restricted Multifamily, RTO = Form Based	zp_DRMulti_RTO	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Zoning dummy: Form Based Multifamily, RTO = form based	zp_FBDMulti_RTO	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Zoning dummy: Industrial / Production, Distribution & Repair	zp_PDRInd	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Zoning dummy: Public/Open Space	zp_Public	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Zoning dummy: Redevelopment Area	zp_Redev	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Zoning dummy: Residential 2-Family (2 Units per Lot)	zp_RH2	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Zoning = Residential 3-Family or Res Mixed (1/800 sqft)	zp_RH3_RM1	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Planning District dummy variables	DIST_<District Name>	Planning District from Assessor's Secured Roll DB

Appendix: Logistic Regression Coefficients

Variable Description	Variable	Coeff	StdErr	WaldChiSq	Prob>Chi Sq
Intercept	Intercept	(1.6226)	1.2829	1.5998	0.2059
Height limit for site in ft	Height_Ft	0.0017	0.0007	4.9693	0.0258
Area for lot in 1000 sq ft	Area_1000	0.0049	0.0009	30.6563	0.0000
Envelope Area in 1000 sq ft (area/1000*ht/10)	Env_1000_Area_Height	0.0002	0.0001	5.0369	0.0248
Extisting building square footage in 1000 sq ft	Bldg_SqFt_1000	(0.0023)	0.0007	10.7241	0.0011
Residential Existing Use using ResUnits (Dummy)	Res_Dummy	(0.8231)	0.1222	45.3669	0.0000
Historic Status for Parcel (Dummy)	Historic	(1.0378)	0.1271	66.6847	0.0000
Real Construction Cost Variable	Construc_Cost_Real	(0.0992)	0.0129	58.8929	0.0000
SF Housing Price Index (Zillow), Real	Zillow_Price_Real	0.0143	0.0053	7.1326	0.0076
Dummy for State Density Bonus, 5+ Unit Sites, 2016 forward	SDB_2016_5Plus	0.6303	0.1608	15.3724	0.0000
Zoning = Office/Commercial	zp_OfficeComm	4.2634	0.4873	76.5337	0.0000
Zoning = Density Restricted Multifamily, RTO = Form Based	zp_DRMulti_RTO	4.2450	0.4523	88.0989	0.0000
Zoning = Form Based Multifamily, RTO = form based	zp_FBDMulti_RTO	5.0508	0.4640	118.4768	0.0000
Zoning = Industrial / Production, Distribution & Repair	zp_PDRInd	3.4115	0.4790	50.7257	0.0000
Zoning = Public/Open Space	zp_Public	1.2491	0.8385	2.2190	0.1363
Zoning = Redevelopment Area	zp_Redev	4.5361	0.4999	82.3213	0.0000
Zoning = Residential 2-Family (2 Units per Lot)	zp_RH2	0.2674	0.6672	0.1607	0.6885
Zoning = Residential 3-Family or Res Mixed (1/800 sqft)	zp_RH3_RM1	1.3187	0.6064	4.7289	0.0297

Appendix: Logistic Regression Coefficients (Continued)

Variable Description	Variable	Coeff	StdErr	WaldChiSq	Prob>Chi Sq
District = South Bayshore	DIST_SBayshore	(1.4824)	0.3179	21.7380	0.0000
District = Bernal Heights	DIST_BernalHts	(1.7011)	0.6087	7.8100	0.0052
District = South Central	DIST_Scentral	(1.7307)	0.3867	20.0267	0.0000
District = Central	DIST_Central	(1.1523)	0.3353	11.8102	0.0006
District = Buena Vista	DIST_BuenaVista	(2.5369)	1.0188	6.2010	0.0128
District = Northeast	DIST_Northeast	(1.4171)	0.2539	31.1439	0.0000
District = Western Addition	DIST_WestAddition	(0.6831)	0.2362	8.3630	0.0038
District = South of Market	DIST_SOMA	(0.0756)	0.1903	0.1579	0.6911
District = Inner Sunset	DIST_InnerSunset	(1.6187)	0.4882	10.9939	0.0009
District = Richmond	DIST_Richmond	(2.8019)	0.5355	27.3716	0.0000
District = Ingleside	DIST_Ingleside	(1.8670)	0.4925	14.3711	0.0002
District = Outer Sunset	DIST_OuterSunset	(2.6147)	0.6098	18.3867	0.0000
District = Marina	DIST_Marina	(1.2492)	0.3253	14.7457	0.0001
District = Mission	DIST_Mission	(1.0938)	0.2380	21.1176	0.0000

Omitted Variables for Groups of Dummy Variables:

Omitted zoning = RH1

Omitted district = Downtown

Appendix: Units Regression Coefficients

Variable Description	Variable	Coeff	St Error	T-Stat
Simple building envelope (area/1000 * ht/10)	Env_1000_Area_Height	0.4252	0.0159	26.72
State Density Bonus * Simple Bldg Envelope (5+ Unit Sites, 2016 forward)	SDB_2016_5Plus_EnvFull	0.4385	0.0389	11.28
Simple Bldg Envelope only if density-restricted	Zoning_DR_EnvFull	(0.1601)	0.0174	(9.22)

Note: Model removes largest 5% (Positive and Negative) residual outliers

Appendix: Model Performance

Logistic Regression	
Number of Observations	3,369,573
Number with Dependent Variable = 1	422
Pseudo R-Square	0.000611
Max Rescaled R-Square	0.244596

Units Regression	
Number of Observations	383
R-Sq	0.867779
Adj R-Sq	0.866735
Dependent Mean Value	81.87206
Standard Error of Regression	48.40184

Appendix: Zoning Classifications

- The table below shows the correspondence between the City's zoning districts, and the aggregate zoning variables in the model.

Zoning Variable	Zoning Districts
zp_RH1	C-2/RH-1(D); RH-1(D)/C-2; C-M/RH-1; M-1/RH-1; NC-1/RH-1; NC-1/RH-1/RH-2; NC-2/RH-1; NC-2/RH-1(D); NC-3/RH-1; NCD/RH-1; NCD/RH-1(D); NC-S/RH-1; NCT-OCEAN/RH-1(D); NCT/RH-1(D); P/P-W/RH-1; P/RH-1; P/RH-1(D); P/RH-1/RH-1(D); P/RH-1/RH-2; RH-1; RH-1(D); RH-1(D)/NC-2; RH-1(D)/RH-1; RH-2/RH-1; RH-2/RH-1(D); RH-1(D)/RH-2; RH-1(D)/RM-1; RH-1(S); RH-1/C-M; RH-1/M-1; RH-1/NC-1; RH-1/NC-2; RH-1/NC-3; RH-1/NC-S; RH-1/RH-1(D); RH-1/RH-2; RH-1/RH-2/RM-1; RH-1/RM-1; RM-1/RH-1; RH-3/RH-1
zp_RH2	NC-1/RH-1/RH-2; P/RH-1/RH-2; RH-2/RH-1; RH-2/RH-1(D); RH-1(D)/RH-2; RH-1/RH-2; RH-1/RH-2/RM-1; M-1/RH-2/RM-1; MUR/RH-2; NC-1/RH-2; NC-2/RH-2; NC-3/RH-2; NCD/RH-2; NC-S/RH-2; NCT-GLEN PARK/RH-2; NCT-OCEAN/RH-2; NCT/RH-2; P/RH-2; P/RM-1/RH-2; RH-2; RH-2/NC-1; RH-2/NC-2; RH-2/NC-3; RH-2/RH-3; RH-2/RM-1; RM-1/RH-2; RH-2/RM-2; RM-2/RH-2; RH-2/RM-3; RM-3/RH-2; RH-3/RH-2
zp_RH3_RM1	RH-1/RH-2/RM-1; M-1/RH-2/RM-1; P/RM-1/RH-2; RH-2/RH-3; RH-2/RM-1; RM-1/RH-2; RH-3/RH-2; RH-1(D)/RM-1; RH-1/RM-1; RM-1/RH-1; RH-3/RH-1; C-2/RH-3; C-2/RM-1; C-2/RM-1/RM-4; C-M/RM-1; HP-RA/RM-1; M-1/RM-1; M-2/RH-3; NC-1/RM-1; RM-1/NC-1; NC-2/RH-3; NC-2/RM-1; NC-3/RH-3; NC-3/RM-1; NCD/RH-3; NCD/RH-3/UPR MARKET; NCD/RH-3/UPR MARK; NCD/RH-3/VALENCIA; NCD/RM-1; NCD/RM-1/SACRAMENTO; NCD/SACRAMENTO ST; NCD/SACRAMENTO/RM-1; NCD/RM-1/SACRAMEN; NCT-DIVISADERO/RH-3; NCT-DIVISADERO/RM-1; NCT/RH-3; NCT/RM-1; P/PM-R/RM-1; P/RH-3; P/RM-1; PM-MU2/PM-OS/PM-R/RM-1; PM-R/RM-1; RH-3; RH-3/C-2; RH-3/HAYES; RH-3/M-2; RH-3/NC-2; RH-3/RM-1; RM-1/RH-3; RH-3/RM-2; RM-2/RH-3; RH-3/RM-3; RM-3/RH-3; RH-3/RSD; RH-3/VALENCIA; RM-1; RM-1/C-M; RM-1/C-M/M-1; RM-1/NC-3; RM-1/RM-2; RM-1/RM-3; RM-1/RM-4; RM-1/SACRAMENTO
zp_OfficeComm	C-2/RH-3; C-2/RM-1; C-2/RM-1/RM-4; C-M/RM-1; RH-3/C-2; RM-1/C-M; RM-1/C-M/M-1; C-2/RH-1(D); RH-1(D)/C-2; C-M/RH-1; RH-1/C-M; C-2; C-2/M-1; C-2/M-1/P; C-2/P; C-3-G; C-3-G/C-3-R; C-3-G/C-M; C-3-G/RC-4; C-3-O; C-3-O(SD); C-3-O(SD)/P; C-3-O(SD)/TB DTR; C-3-O/C-3-O(SD); C-3-O/C-3-R; C-3-O/C-3-S; C-3-O/C-3-S/P; C-3-O/TB DTR; C-3-R; C-3-S; C-3-S/P; C-M; C-M/M-1; CMUO; CMUO/MUR; CMUO/P; MUO; NCD/C-2; P/C-3-R; RM-3/C-2; RM-4/C-2; WMUO

Appendix: Zoning Classifications (Continued)

Zoning Variable	Zoning Districts
zp_DRMulti_RTO	NC-2/P; NC-3/P/RM-3; NCD/P; NC-S/P; P/NC-S; P/NC-2; P/RC-4; P/RM-2; P/RM-3; C-2/RM-1/RM-4; C-3-G/RC-4; NCD/C-2; RM-3/C-2; RM-4/C-2; NC-1/RM-1; RM-1/NC-1; NC-2/RH-3; NC-2/RM-1; NC-3/RH-3; NC-3/RM-1; NCD/RH-3; NCD/RH-3/UPR MARKET; NCD/RH-3/UPR MARK; NCD/RH-3/VALENCIA; NCD/RM-1; NCD/RM-1/SACRAMENTO; NCD/SACRAMENTO ST; NCD/SACRAMENTO/RM-1; NCD/RM-1/SACRAMEN; RH-3/HAYES; RH-3/NC-2; RH-3/RM-2; RM-2/RH-3; RH-3/RM-3; RM-3/RH-3; RH-3/RSD; RH-3/VALENCIA; RM-1/NC-3; RM-1/RM-2; RM-1/RM-3; RM-1/RM-4; RM-1/SACRAMENTO; NC-1/RH-1/RH-2; NC-1/RH-2; NC-2/RH-2; NC-3/RH-2; NCD/RH-2; NC-S/RH-2; RH-2/NC-1; RH-2/NC-2; RH-2/NC-3; RH-2/RM-2; RM-2/RH-2; RH-2/RM-3; RM-3/RH-2; NC-1/RH-1; NC-2/RH-1; NC-2/RH-1(D); NC-3/RH-1; NCD/RH-1; NCD/RH-1(D); NC-S/RH-1; RH-1(D)/NC-2; RH-1/NC-1; RH-1/NC-2; RH-1/NC-3; RH-1/NC-S; 24TH-MISSION; 24TH STREET- NOE VALL; 24TH-NOE; BROADWAY; BROADWAY NEIGHBORHOOD; C-2/RM-4; CASTRO STREET NEIGHBO; CASTRO; CCB; CRNC; CR-NC; CRNC/CVR; CR-NC/CVR; CRNC/RM-4; CVR; DTR/RC-4; FILLMORE; HAIGHT; HAIGHT STREET NEIGHBO; HAYES; HAIGHT STREET NEIGHBO; INNER CLEMENT; INNER CLEMENT STREET; INNER SUNSET; INNER SUNSET NEIGHBOR; M-1/NC-2; M-1/RM-2; M-1/RSD; NC-1; NC-1/RM-2; NC-1/RM-3; NC-2; NC-2/M-1; NC-2/NC-3; NC-3/NC-2; NC-2/RM-3; NC-2/RM-4; NC-3; NC-3/RC-4; NC-3/RM-3; NC-3/RM-4; NCD; NCD/; NCD/24TH STREET- NOE VALL; NCD/24TH STREET-; NCD/24TH-MISSION; NCD/24TH-NOE; NCD/24TH-NOE-VALLE; NCD/24TH-NOE-VALLEY; NCD/BROADWAY; NCD/BROADWAY NEIG; NCD/BROADWAY NEIGHBORHOOD; NCD/CASTRO; NCD/CASTRO STREET; NCD/CASTRO STREET NEIGHBO; NCD/EXCELSIOR OUTER MISSI; NCD/EXCELSIOR OUT; EXCELSIOR OUTER MISSI; NCD/FILLMORE; NCD/HAIGHT; NCD/HAIGHT STREET; NCD/HAIGHT STREET NEIGHBO; NCD/HAYES; NCD/HAYES NCT; NCD/HAYES NCT/RTO; NCD/INNER CLEMENT; NCD/INNER CLEMENT STREET; NCD/INNER SUNSET; NCD/INNER SUNSET NEIGHBOR; NCD/IRVING STREET NEIGHBO; NCD/IRVING STREET; NCD/IRVING; IRVING STREET NEIGHBO; NCD/JAPANTOWN NEIGHBORHOO; NCD/JAPANTOWN NEI; JAPANTOWN NEIGHBORHOO; NCD/JUDAH STREET NEIGHBOR; NCD/JUDAH; NCD/JUDAH STREET; JUDAH STREET NEIGHBOR; NCD/NC-1; NCD/NC-2; NCD/NC-3; NCD/NCT; NCD/NO BEACH; NCD/NORIEGA STREET NEIGHB; NCD/NORIEGA STREE; NCD/NORIEGA; NCD/NORTH BEACH NEIGHBORH; NCD/NORTH BEACH N; NCD/NORTH BEACH; NCD/NORTHBEACH; NCD/NORTH BEACH/RM-1; NCD/NORTHBEACH/RM-1; NCD/OUTER CLEMENT; NCD/OUTER CLEMENT STREET; NCD/OUTER CLEMENT STREET; NCD/PACIFIC; NCD/PACIFIC AVENU; NCD/PACIFIC/RM-3; NCD/PACIFIC;RM-3; NCD/PACIFIC AVENUE NEIGHB; NCD/POLK; NCD/POLK STREET N; NCD/POLK STREET NEIGHBORH; NCD/POLK/RC-3; NCD/POLK/RC-4; NCD/RC-3; NCD/RESIDENTIAL- HOUSE, O; NCD/RESIDENTIAL-; NCD/RM-2; NCD/RM-3; NCD/RM-3/PACIFIC; NCD/RTO; NCD/SACRAMENTO; NCD/SACRAMENTO STREET NEI; NCD/TARAVAL STREET NEIGHB; NCD/TARAVAL STREE; NCD/TARAVAL; NCD/UNION; NCD/UNION STREET; NCD/UNION STREET NEIGHBOR; NCD/UPPER FILLMORE NEIGHB; NCD/UPPER FILLMOR; NCD/UPPER FILLMORE; NCD/UPPERFILLMORE; NCD/UPPER MARKET STREET N; NCD/UPPER MARKET; NCD/UPR MARKET NC; NCD/UPR MARKET; NCD/UPR MARKET NCT; NCD/UPR MARKET NCT/; NCD/VALENCIA; NCD/WEST PORTAL; NCD/WEST PORTAL A; NCD/WEST PORTAL AVENUE NE; NCD/BAYVIEW; NCD/COLE VALLEY; NCD/CORTLAND AVENUE; NCD/GEARY BOULEVARD; NCD/GEARY BOULEVA; NCD/GEARY BOULEVARD/RH-2; NCD/GEARY BOULEVARD/RM-1; NCD/INNER BALBOA STREET; NCD/INNER BALBOA S; NCD/OUTER BALBOA STREET; NCD/ OUTER BALBOA STREET; NCD/OUTER BALBOA S; NCD/LOWER HAIGHT STREET; NCD/LOWER HAIGHT S; NCD/LOWER HAIGHT STREET/RH-3; NCD/LOWER POLK STREET; NCD/MISSION BERNAL; NCD/INNER TARAVAL STREET; NCD/INNER TARAVAL; NCD/SAN BRUNO AVENUE; NCD/LAKESIDE VILLAGE; NCD/LAKESIDE VILLAG; NC-S; NC-S/PM-R; NC-S/RM-3; NCT-DIVISADERO/RM-3; NCT/RM-3; NCT/RM-4; NO BEACH; OUTER CLEMENT; POLK; RC-3; RC-3/POLK; RC-3/RM-3; RC-4; RC-4/NC-3; RC-4/RH DTR; RC-4/RM-4; RED/SLR; RM-2; RM-2/M-1; RM-2/NC-1; RM-2/NC-2; RM-2/NO BEACH; RM-2/RM-3; RM-2/RM-4; RM-3; RM-3/NC-1; RM-3/NC-2; RM-3/NC-3; RM-3/NC-S; RM-3/RC-3; RM-3/RM-4; RM-4; RM-4/CR-NC; RM-4/NC-2; RM-4/NC-3; RM-4/RC-4; RSD; RSD/SLR; SACRAMENTO; SLR; SSO; UNION; UPR MARKET; VALENCIA; WEST PORTAL

Appendix: Zoning Classifications (Continued)

Zoning Variable	Zoning Districts
zp_Public	C-2/M-1/P; C-2/P; C-3-O(SD)/P; C-3-O/C-3-S/P; C-3-S/P; CMUO/P; P/C-3-R; P/RM-1/RH-2; P/PM-R/RM-1; P/RH-3; P/RM-1; PM-MU2/PM-OS/PM-R/RM-1; P/RH-1/RH-2; P/RH-2; P/P-W/RH-1; P/RH-1; P/RH-1(D); P/RH-1/RH-1(D); Remove; HP-RA/M-1/M-2/P; HP-RA/M-2/P; M-1/M-2/P; M-1/P; M-2/MB-OS; M-2/MB-RA/P; M-2/P; MB-O; MB-O/MB-RA; MB-OS; MB-RA/P; MUG/P; NC-2/P; NC-3/P/RM-3; NCD/P; NC-S/P; NCT/P; NCT-3/P; NCT-3/RTO; P; P/C-3-O(SD); P/M-1; P/M-2; P/MISS BAY S PL; P/MISS BAY S PLN; P/MUR; P/NC-S; P/NC-2; P/PDR-2; P/PM-OS; P/PM-OS/PM-R; P/P-W; P/RC-4; P/RM-2; P/RM-3; P/TB DTR; P/RTO-C; P, RTO-C; PM-CF; PM-CF/PM-OS; PM-CF/PM-OS/PM-R; PM-MU1/PM-OS; PM-MU2/PM-OS/PM-R; PM-OS; PM-OS/PM-R; PM-OS/PM-R/PM-S; PM-OS/PM-S; Public
zp_FBDMulti_RTO	DTR/RC-4; NCD/HAYES NCT; NCD/HAYES NCT/RTO; NCD/NCT; NCD/RTO; NCD/UPR MARKET NCT; NCD/UPR MARKET NCT/; NC-S/PM-R; NCT-DIVISADERO/RM-3; NCT/RM-3; NCT/RM-4; RC-4/RH DTR; RED/SLR; P/PM-R/RM-1; PM-MU2/PM-OS/PM-R/RM-1; MUG/P; NCT/P; NCT-3/P; NCT-3/RTO; P/MUR; P/PM-OS/PM-R; P/TB DTR; P/RTO-C; P, RTO-C; PM-CF/PM-OS/PM-R; PM-MU1/PM-OS; PM-MU2/PM-OS/PM-R; PM-OS/PM-R; PM-OS/PM-R/PM-S; C-3-O(SD)/TB DTR; C-3-O/TB DTR; CMUO/MUR; NCT-DIVISADERO/RH-3; NCT-DIVISADERO/RM-1; NCT/RH-3; NCT/RM-1; PM-R/RM-1; MUR/RH-2; NCT-GLEN PARK/RH-2; NCT-OCEAN/RH-2; NCT/RH-2; NCT-OCEAN/RH-1(D); NCT/RH-1(D); DTR; DTR/M-1; M-1/RH DTR; M-2/MR-MU; M-2/P70-MU; MB-RA/MR-MU; MR-MU; MUG; MUG/RED; MUR; NCT; NCT-DIVISADERO; NCT-FOLSOM; NCT-GLEN PARK; NCT-HAYES; NCT-HAYES/RTO; NCT-HAYES/RTO-1; NCT-MISSION; NCT-UPPER MARKET; NCT-UPPER MARKET;; NCT-UPPER MARKET/RH-2; NCT-UPPER MARKET/RH-3; NCT-OCEAN; NCT-SOMA; NCT/NCT-3; NCT/RCD; NCT/RED-MX; NCT/RTO; NCT/RTO-M; NCT/UMU; NCT-1; NCT-2; NCT-3; NCT-3/NCT-HAYES; RTO-1/NCT-3; RTO/NCT-3; P70-MU; PDR-1-D/UMU; PDR-1-G/UMU; PM-MU1; PM-MU1/PM-R; PM-MU2/PM-R; PM-MU2; PM-R; RCD; RED; RED-MX; RED-MX/WMUG; RH DTR; RH DTR/SB-DTR; RH DTR/TB DTR; RTO; RTO-1; RTO/NCT; RTO-1/RTO-C; RTO-C; RTO-M; SB-DTR; SPD; TB DTR; UMU; WMUG
zp_PDRInd	DTR/M-1; M-1/RH DTR; M-2/MR-MU; M-2/P70-MU; PDR-1-D/UMU; PDR-1-G/UMU; M-1/NC-2; M-1/RM-2; M-1/RSD; NC-2/M-1; RM-2/M-1; C-2/M-1/P; HP-RA/M-1/M-2/P; HP-RA/M-2/P; M-1/M-2/P; M-1/P; M-2/MB-OS; M-2/MB-RA/P; M-2/P; P/M-1; P/M-2; P/PDR-2; C-2/M-1; C-M/M-1; RH-1/RH-2/RM-1; M-1/RH-2/RM-1; M-1/RM-1; M-2/RH-3; RH-3/M-2; M-1/RH-1; RH-1/M-1; HP-RA/M-1; HP-RA/M-2; M-1; M-1/M-1; M-1/M-2; M-1/PDR-1-B; M-1/PDR-2; M-2; M-2 (MB); M-2/MB-RA; M-2/PDR-2; M-2/SLI; MISS BAY S PLN/M-2; MISS BAY S PL; MISS BAY S PLN; MISS BAY S PLN/M-; PDR-1; PDR-1/PDR-2; PDR-1-B; PDR-1-B/PDR-2; PDR-1-D; PDR-1-G; PDR-2; SALI; SLI; SLI/M-2
zp_Redev	HP-RA/M-1/M-2/P; HP-RA/M-2/P; M-2/MB-RA/P; HP-RA/M-1; HP-RA/M-2; M-2/MB-RA; MISS BAY S PLN/M-2; MISS BAY S PL; MISS BAY S PLN; MISS BAY S PLN/M-; MB-RA/MR-MU; MB-O/MB-RA; MB-RA/P; P/MISS BAY S PL; P/MISS BAY S PLN; HP-RA/RM-1; HP-RA; MB-RA; MISS BAY N RED; MISS BAY N RED PLN; MISS BAY N RED PL; MISS BAY S RED; MISS BAY S RED PLN; MISS BAY S RED PL

Appendix: Logic of Applying the Model

- This section of the appendix describes in more detail how the model was used to produce estimates of future housing production.
- For the existing zoning ("baseline"), the application of the model is straightforward. Current zoning was encoded using the zoning classification on the previous page, and current allowable height was used as the height variable in the logistic regression, and to calculate building envelope in the units regression.
- For the proposed rezoning ("policy"), the logic used was as follows: based on the units regression, each 1000 square feet of building envelope results in 0.42 units. The State Density Bonus adds an additional 0.44 units. Parcels that elect to use the Local Program therefore need to accommodate at least 0.44 additional units per 1000 square feet of envelope if developers are to choose this option. For parcels where the Local Program was more desirable, and on parcels that are ineligible for the SDB, because their zoning and size prevents them from building more than 5 units, the Local Program was applied. For all other parcels the SDB was used.

Appendix: Logic of Applying the Model (Continued)

- Probabilities and units for any parcel using the State Density Bonus were calculated by:
  - In the logistic regression, using the first new height in the rezoning table for Height_Ft and in the Env_1000_Area_Height calculation.
  - In the units regression, using the first new height in the rezoning table to calculate Env_1000_Area_Height;
  - Incorporating the SDB_2016_5Plus_EnvFull effect;
  - Incorporating the Zoning_DR_EnvFull if applicable (i.e. the parcel is density-restricted.

Appendix: Logic of Applying the Model (Continued)

- Probabilities and units for any parcel using the Local Program were calculated by:
  - In the logistic regression, setting zp_FBDMulti_RTO = 1, to account for the relaxation of density controls in the Local Program;
  - In the logistic regression, using the second new height in the rezoning table for Height_Ft and in the Env_1000_Area_Height calculation.
  - In the units regression, using the second new height in the rezoning table to calculate Env_1000_Area_Height;
  - In the units regression, removing the SDB_2016_5Plus_EnvFull effect;
  - In the units regression, removing the Zoning_DR_EnvFull effect.

Appendix: Business Disruption / Relocation Costs

- The analysis makes the following assumptions about business disruption and relocation costs:
  - Lost space will be 10% vacant, so 90% of the loss represents the loss of occupied space.
  - Lost business net income (for 6 months of disruption): $5/occupied square foot.
  - Fixed labor costs (for 6 months): $10/occupied square foot.
  - Moving costs and build-out of space at new premises: $175/occupied square foot

Staff Contact

Ted Egan, Ph.D., Chief Economist ted.egan@sfgov.org

From:	Carroll, John (BOS)
To:	Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Sciammas, Charlie (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Cooper, Raynell (BOS)
Cc:	stephenjontorres@gmail.com
Subject:	FW: Letter for today"s (11/17) agenda
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 2:06:00 PM
Attachments:	2025.11.17 Letter to BoS Land Use and Transpo Committee Re_ TPO and Decontrol Ammendments.pdf

---

From: Stephen Torres <stephenjontorres@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 17, 2025 2:05 PM
To: Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>
Subject: Letter for today's (11/17) agenda

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

Hello Clerk Carroll,

Please see the attached letter.

Best,

Stephen Torres

Stephen Torres
Mission District, San Francisco

November 17, 2025

The Land Use & Transportation Committee of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Room 250
City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Chairperson Melgar and Members of the Land Use and Transportation Committee,

I am writing to you to strongly urge that you move forward the amendments submitted by Supervisors Chan and Chen.

There has been a lot of time given to the obligations that our city has to the State and the mandates it has imposed on San Francisco and other municipalities across the state. Mandates that should have been challenged by the Board as other municipalities have. What has not been given appropriate consideration, however, is the obligations that the State has to this City. The obligations to meet the housing affordability crisis that continue to strangle average working class and vulnerable populations out of San Francisco.

Instead we are entertaining conversations about attracting new “vibrant” residents to replace the ones we have. The seniors who have worked their entire lives to age in place in the city they love. The working poor who continue to try and hold on even as hours decrease and jobs dry up. Even those of us that live in subsidized housing face higher rents and less wages with no protections because we have no rent control or tenants protections.

The idea that any San Franciscan is expendable in order to build housing with no guarantees on affordability or sustainability is unconscionable. This body, and by extension, the Board of Supervisors must ensure that all rent-controlled housing is exempt and push back against the State if need be. If we are to be accountable to the State, they and all theiragencies must likwise be accountable to us in full transparency.

You have been elected to represent the interests of your constituents and their future, but not at the expense of their present.

Sincerely,

Stephen Torres
Resident, District 9
Worker, Districts 8 & 9

From: Paul Wermer
To: Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject: FILE NO. 250701, Family Zoning Plan (2025-11 -17):
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 12:09:44 PM

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

17 November 2025

To: Land Use and Transportation Committee

From: Paul Wermer

Subject: FILE NO. 250701, Family Zoning Plan

I am concerned that the current up zoning plan inadvertently encourages the development of luxury flats in projects for fewer than 9 residential units. If the Residential Nexus study is correct, this will create a demand for 30-40% of the number of BMR Units – with no inclusionary housing provided.

This would aggravate the actual housing shortage and affordability crisis for over 70% of San Franciscan household incomes.

To prevent this, any upzoning must require an inclusionary housing component, and it must be a more meaningful contribution than the current $249.50/sf in-lieu fee. (That covers less than half the cost of a BMR unit)

Background: I have asked Planning staff about this and have received no response so far:

As I read the Family Zoning Plan (version 5 -12, BOS File 25071), my understanding is as follows:

a) Any project complying with the proposed HC-SF (206.10) and Height Limits (sec 263.19 (b)) qualifies for the local program height bonus. It only needs to add one or more units to a building with at least one existing residential unit.

b) By purchasing a 1 or 2 residential unit building (exempt for rent control protections) I could then take a currently zoned RH-2/40 ft height and by adding one additional unit to the project qualify for an 85' structure on a 25x 100 lot, with 18% rear yard, leaving me with at least 1500 sq ft of buildable lot area. At 85 ft height, that would allow 3 luxury units of 3500 - 4000 sq ft. (Condos and TICs, not being rent controlled units, means that multi unit buildings on larger lots are vulnerable as well)

c) There is no inclusionary housing requirement. Given the Residential Nexus report (2016), 3 luxury units would create a demand for somewhere between 0.9 - 1.2 BMR units.

If so, there is a risk of large numbers of projects for fewer than 10 units targeting the top 10% of incomes - which means that this "plan" will actually increase the already unmet demand for units affordable to the wide range of household incomes below $200K, aggravating

availability and affordability.

Has there been any analysis to look at exactly how many lots might be vulnerable to this incentive? This is especially an issue for lots in desirable locations – for example, Lincoln or Fulton with views of Golden Gate Park, and sites with views of the Bay or Ocean.

I should note that I am concerned that 4000 sq ft limit on qualifying residential units is also easily subverted by clever designs.

--
Paul Wermer
San Francisco,CA 94115

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations; BOS Legislation, (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject:	152 Letters regarding Zoning
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 12:02:13 PM
Attachments:	152 Letters regarding Zoning.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached for 152 letters regarding zoning.

File No. 250966, LUT Item No. 4: General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 250700, LUT Item No. 5: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan (Mayor, Sauter, Mahmood, Dorsey)

File No. 251071, LUT Item No. 6: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan (Mayor, Sauter, Mahmood, Dorsey)

File No. 250701, LUT Item No. 7: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan (Mayor)

File No. 251073, LUT Item No. 8: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations, Administrative Codes - Family Zoning Plan (Mayor)

File No. 251072: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan (Mayor)

Sincerely,

Joe Adkins
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From:	Nick Ferris
To:	Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS)
Cc:	Chan, Connie (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Re: Support for Chan and Chen Amendments to the Family Zoning Plan Land Use and Transportation Committee Agenda Items 4-7, November 17, 2025
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 8:24:17 AM
Attachments:	THD LUC Upzoning Plan 11.17.25.pdf

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

My apologies. I am adding correct email for President Mandelman.

Nick Ferris
President, Telegraph Hill Dwellers

On Mon, Nov 17, 2025 at 8:15 AM Nick Ferris <nicholashferris@gmail.com> wrote:

> Dear President Mandelman, Chair Melgar, and Members of the Land Use and Transportation Committee,
>
> The Telegraph Hill Dwellers (THD) continues to oppose the proposed Family Zoning Plan ("Upzoning Plan"), but we implore you to adopt the amendments offered by Supervisors Chan and Chen that will help to prevent the displacement of tenants and small businesses and provide a plan for development of the 100% affordable housing we so desperately need. We also continue to urge the Committee and Board of Supervisors to reverse the inclusion of Telegraph Hill, North Beach, and the Northern Waterfront in the Upzoning Plan, which was not contemplated in the 2022 Housing Element or Mayor Breed's zoning proposal.
>
> **President Mandelman, we urge you to please schedule a "Committee of the Whole" to consider all of the proposed amendments.** We are concerned that the Land Use and Transportation Committee may consider tabling and killing the Chan and Chen amendments in committee. We hope not. But, if so, you will have abdicated your responsibility to the democratic process. The full Board of Supervisors deserves a chance to consider these amendments. And, the public deserves to know where each supervisor stands.
>
> In any event, a vote to approve the Upzoning Plan is premature until you have full analysis and clarity on the implications of SB 79 for the Upzoning Plan, not just the 5-page fact-sheet summary prepared by the Planning Department.
>
> If you move forward with this Upzoning Plan, please adopt the following amendments:
>
> 1. **Approve Supervisors Chan's and Chen's Proposed Amendments:**
> - **Exclude all historic resources,** including local historic districts and those eligible for the California and National Registers, from the Upzoning Plan (Chan File No. 251073).
> - **Exclude All Existing Residential Units, including all rent-controlled units** from the Upzoning Plan (Chan File No. 251073).
> - **Remove the Planning Equity Geography Special Use District** ("PEG SUD") from the Upzoning Plan (Chen File No. 251071).
> - **Remove the Coastal Zone** from the Upzoning Plan (Chan File No. 251071).

- **Remove Form-Based Density in the Base Zoning in All Districts** (Chan File No. 251073).
- **Adopt a Progress Requirement** for obtaining a building permit within a time certain of project approval – "Use it or Lose It" (Chan File No. 251073)
- **Require Inclusionary Affordable Housing Within 1⁄2 Mile** of the development (Chan File No. 251073).

2. Amend Supervisor Melgar's Legislation to Remove All Rent-Controlled Housing
We appreciate Supervisor Melgar's amendment removing rent-controlled housing with three or more units but urge her to expand this amendment to exclude **all** rent-controlled housing with two or more units, not just three or more.

3. Approve Supervisor Chan's Legacy Business Controls
THD joins with Small Business Forward to support Supervisor Chan's legislation to extend the requirement for a Conditional Use Authorization for sites where a Legacy Business has been displaced. In absence of having any other tools available or financial resources to support the successful relocation of a Legacy Business within the community, the Conditional Use is an imperfect but necessary mechanism to discourage displacement of Legacy Businesses in the first place. That is why Small Business Forward supports the extension of the CU legislation until other more effective protection measures are in place, such as commercial rent control, the right of return, and adequate relocation assistance.

4. Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District and Funding Strategy.
We join with REP-SF and the Council of Community Housing Organizations (CCHO) to demand that the SFMTA-SUD be revised to provide that these publicly owned parcels be developed for 100% affordable and social housing. Under San Francisco's state-approved Housing Element, as mandated by the state, 57% of the 36,200 new housing units proposed to be developed under the Upzoning Plan—more than 20,000 units—must be affordable to low- and very-low-income households. Yet the Upzoning Plan has no funding strategy or realistic plan to produce those affordable homes. It risks satisfying Sacramento's procedural checklist while abandoning the substance of the law: to build housing for the people who need it most.

5. Remove North Beach, Telegraph Hill, and the Northern Waterfront from the Upzoning Plan.
THD continues to strongly oppose the late inclusion in the Upzoning Plan of major portions of Telegraph Hill, North Beach, and the Northern Waterfront, areas that were not included in the 2022 Adopted Housing Element ("2022 Housing Element") or considered in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR). These areas represent one of the densest neighborhoods in San Francisco, with roughly 82% of our residents currently living in existing pre-1979 multi-family, rent-controlled buildings housing our City's workforce and seniors, including a large immigrant Asian population. Based on the City's profiles of neighborhoods in San Francisco, there are **37,156** people per square mile in North Beach as compared to **17,325** people per square mile in San Francisco. The Planning Department's own data shows that rent-controlled buildings in District 3 (built before 1979 with 2+ units, excluding condos) represent approximately 32,340 individual units, 13,983 of which are located in the current version of the Upzoning Plan. **In other words, tenants occupying 13,983 units will be subject to potential eviction and displacement.**

And, although the 2022 Housing Element and EIR assumed that the Northeast Planning

District would provide net new housing units of only *800 units* by 2050, the Upzoning Plan suddenly increased that figure to *5,900 units*, a stunning *650% increase*. This is a far greater percentage increase than any other area in the City. The height and density increases represented by this increase will significantly impact existing tenants, small businesses, historic resources, parks and open spaces, and the diverse culture of District 3.

* * * * * * * *

In conclusion, THD believes that the Upzoning Plan, as proposed, threatens tenants and small businesses, pits neighborhoods against each other, and disregards decades of community-based policymaking that has built San Francisco into a resilient, vibrant city through a network of strong neighborhoods.

The proposed amendments from Supervisors Chan and Chen address these concerns by focusing on protecting tenants and rent-controlled housing citywide, supporting small businesses, and prioritizing the development of affordable housing. We urge this Committee to move these critical elements forward.

Sincerely,
Nick Ferris, President

November 16, 2025
Via Email

President Rafael Mandelman and
Members of the Land Use and Transportation Committee
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Rafael Mandelman – *Rafael.Mandleman@sfgov.org*
Myrna Melgar, Chair - *Myrna.Melgar@sfgov.org*
Chyanne Chen, Vice-Chair - *Chyanne.Chen@sfgov.org*
Bilal Mahmood, Member - *Bilal.Mahmood@sfgov.org*

RE: Support for Chan and Chen Amendments to the Family Zoning Plan
Land Use and Transportation Committee Agenda Items 4-7, November 17, 2025

Dear President Mandelman, Chair Melgar, and Members of the Land Use and Transportation Committee,

The Telegraph Hill Dwellers (THD) continues to oppose the proposed Family Zoning Plan ("Upzoning Plan"), but we implore you to adopt the amendments offered by Supervisors Chan and Chen that will help to prevent the displacement of tenants and small businesses and provide a plan for development of the 100% affordable housing we so desperately need. We also continue to urge the Committee and Board of Supervisors to reverse the inclusion of Telegraph Hill, North Beach, and the Northern Waterfront in the Upzoning Plan, which was not contemplated in the 2022 Housing Element or Mayor Breed's zoning proposal.

President Mandelman, we urge you to please schedule a "Committee of the Whole" to consider all of the proposed amendments. We are concerned that the Land Use and Transportation Committee may consider tabling and killing the Chan and Chen amendments in committee. We hope not. But, if so, you will have abdicated your responsibility to the democratic process. The full Board of Supervisors deserves a chance to consider these amendments. And, the public deserves to know where each supervisor stands.

In any event, a vote to approve the Upzoning Plan is premature until you have full analysis and clarity on the implications of SB 79 for the Upzoning Plan, not just the 5-page fact-sheet summary prepared by the Planning Department.

If you move forward with this Upzoning Plan, please adopt the following amendments:

1. **Approve Supervisors Chan's and Chen's Proposed Amendments:**

    - **Exclude all historic resources**, including local historic districts and those eligible for the California and National Registers, from the Upzoning Plan (Chan File No. 251073).

    - **Exclude All Existing Residential Units, including all rent-controlled units** from the Upzoning Plan (Chan File No. 251073).

- **Remove the Planning Equity Geography Special Use District** ("PEG SUD") from the Upzoning Plan (Chen File No. 251071).
- **Remove the Coastal Zone** from the Upzoning Plan (Chan File No. 251071).
- **Remove Form-Based Density in the Base Zoning in All Districts** (Chan File No. 251073).
- **Adopt a Progress Requirement** for obtaining a building permit within a time certain of project approval – "*Use it or Lose It*" (Chan File No. 251073)
- **Require Inclusionary Affordable Housing Within ½ Mile** of the development (Chan File No. 251073).

2. **Amend Supervisor Melgar's Legislation to Remove All Rent-Controlled Housing**

We appreciate Supervisor Melgar's amendment removing rent-controlled housing with three or more units but urge her to expand this amendment to exclude ***all*** rent-controlled housing with two or more units, not just three or more.

3. **Approve Supervisor Chan's Legacy Business Controls**

THD joins with Small Business Forward to support Supervisor Chan's legislation to extend the requirement for a Conditional Use Authorization for sites where a Legacy Business has been displaced. In absence of having any other tools available or financial resources to support the successful relocation of a Legacy Business within the community, the Conditional Use is an imperfect but necessary mechanism to discourage displacement of Legacy Businesses in the first place. That is why Small Business Forward supports the extension of the CU legislation until other more effective protection measures are in place, such as commercial rent control, the right of return, and adequate relocation assistance.

4. **Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District and Funding Strategy.**

We join with REP-SF and the Council of Community Housing Organizations (CCHO) to demand that the SFMTA-SUD be revised to provide that these publicly owned parcels be developed for 100% affordable and social housing. Under San Francisco's state-approved Housing Element, as mandated by the state, 57% of the 36,200 new housing units proposed to be developed under the Upzoning Plan—more than 20,000 units—must be affordable to low- and very-low-income households. Yet the Upzoning Plan has no funding strategy or realistic plan to produce those affordable homes. It risks satisfying Sacramento's procedural checklist while abandoning the substance of the law: to build housing for the people who need it most.

5. **Remove North Beach, Telegraph Hill, and the Northern Waterfront from the Upzoning Plan.**

THD continues to strongly oppose the late inclusion in the Upzoning Plan of major portions of Telegraph Hill, North Beach, and the Northern Waterfront, areas that were not included in the 2022 Adopted Housing Element ("2022 Housing Element") or considered in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR). These areas represent one of the densest neighborhoods in San Francisco, with roughly 82% of our residents currently living in existing pre-1979 multi-family, rent-controlled buildings housing our City's workforce and seniors, including a large immigrant Asian population. Based on the City's profiles of neighborhoods in San Francisco, there are **37,156** people per square mile in North Beach as compared to **17,325** people per square mile in San Francisco.[1] The Planning Department's own data shows that rent-controlled buildings in District 3 (built before 1979 with 2+ units, excluding condos) represent approximately 32,340 individual units, 13,983 of which are located in the current version of the Upzoning Plan. **In other words, tenants occupying 13,983 units will be subject to potential eviction and displacement.**

And, although the 2022 Housing Element and EIR assumed that the Northeast Planning District would provide net new housing units of only *800 units* by 2050, the Upzoning Plan suddenly increased that figure to *5,900 units*, a stunning *650% increase*. This is a far greater percentage increase than any other area in the City. The height and density increases represented by this increase will significantly impact existing tenants, small businesses, historic resources, parks and open spaces, and the diverse culture of District 3.

* * * * * * * *

In conclusion, THD believes that the Upzoning Plan, as proposed, threatens tenants and small businesses, pits neighborhoods against each other, and disregards decades of community-based policymaking that has built San Francisco into a resilient, vibrant city through a network of strong neighborhoods.

The proposed amendments from Supervisors Chan and Chen address these concerns by focusing on protecting tenants and rent-controlled housing citywide, supporting small businesses, and prioritizing the development of affordable housing. We urge this Committee to move these critical elements forward.

Sincerely,

Nick Ferris, President

ccs: Supervisor Connie Chan – *connie.chan@sfgov.org*
Clerk John Carroll - *John.Carroll@sfgov.org*
Members, San Francisco Board of Supervisors - *Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org*

[1] https://www.city-data.com/neighborhood/North-Beach-San-Francisco-CA.html

From:	Neighborhoods United SF
To:	MelgarStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; ChenStaff
Cc:	Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Segal, Ned (MYR); Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC); Tanner, Rachael (CPC); Switzky, Joshua (CPC); Chen, Lisa (CPC); So, Lydia (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Braun, Derek (CPC); Campbell, Amy (CPC); Imperial, Theresa (CPC); Mcgarry, Sean (CPC); Williams, Gilbert A (CPC); Ionin, Jonas (CPC); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); FielderStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS); Neighborhoods United - SF
Subject:	Support for Chan and Chen Amendments; Request for Pause, and HCD Oversight on Family Zoning Plan [Board File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966, "Family Zoning Plan"]
Date:	Saturday, November 15, 2025 10:03:21 AM
Attachments:	NUSF Letter to LUT_Support for Chan and Chen Amendments and Request for Pause and HCD Oversight on the Family Zoning Plan.pdf

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

Dear Chairperson and Members of the LUT Committee,

On behalf of Neighborhoods United SF, we respectfully urge the Land Use and Transportation (LUT) Committee to take the following actions regarding Mayor Lurie's proposed Family Zoning Plan:

1. **Adopt the amendments** introduced by Supervisors Connie Chan and Chyanne Chen.
2. **Place a pause** on the process given the extraordinary and unsettled circumstances in District 4.
3. **Recommend a "Committee of the Whole"** session before forwarding this legislation to the full Board of Supervisors.
4. **Request an extension** from the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) to allow for full review, transparency, and participation.
5. **Require HCD leadership to attend** Land Use and Transportation hearings, the Committee of the Whole, and full Board meetings to provide clear, direct answers on state compliance criteria and housing capacity calculations.

Below is further context for each request:

1. Adopt the Chan and Chen Amendments
These amendments take essential steps to protect sound housing, historic resources, and

our shoreline, while helping ensure that new development truly serves working families and essential workers.

2. Pause the Process in Light of District 4 Circumstances
Given the extraordinary and unsettled conditions in District 4, including the lack of representation and multiple unresolved planning and mapping inconsistencies, it is imperative that the City pause the process. Proceeding without full district representation would be premature and would further erode public confidence in the City's planning process.

3. Convene a Committee of the Whole Session
We urge the LUT Committee to recommend a 'Committee of the Whole' session before the legislation advances to the full Board. This will allow all Supervisors to hear public testimony, fully deliberate the proposal, and give time for Mayor Lurie to appoint a new District 4 Supervisor, ensuring every district has representation before a citywide rezoning plan of this scale moves forward.

4. Request an Extension from HCD
We further request that the City seek an extension from the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) to allow adequate time for proper environmental review, public engagement, and a full evaluation of the proposed amendments' impacts on existing neighborhoods and housing capacity calculations. Transparency and thorough review should take precedence over arbitrary timelines.

5. Require HCD's Direct Participation
As you deliberate on the City's Family Zoning Plan and its relationship to the certified Housing Element, HCD leadership should be required to attend LUT hearings, Committee of the Whole, and the full Board meeting. Their participation is critical so that Supervisors and the public can receive direct, transparent answers on how housing capacity is being calculated, how compliance with state mandates is determined, and how proposed amendments will affect San Francisco's standing with the State.

While we support more housing through thoughtful, responsible planning, Neighborhoods United SF is firmly opposed to the Family Zoning Plan in its current form. The proposal goes far beyond what was envisioned in the certified Housing Element and would irreversibly reshape our city without delivering the affordability or equity it promises.

San Franciscans deserve clarity, accountability, and responsible planning, not conflicting interpretations of state requirements or exaggerated capacity figures that could reshape our city for generations.

Thank you for your leadership and commitment to transparent decision-making on behalf of the residents of San Francisco.

Sincerely,
Lori Brooke
Co-Founder, Neighborhoods United SF
neighborhoodsunitedsf.org

cc:
Mayor Daniel Lurie
Ned Segal, Chief of Housing and Economic Development
SF Planning Commission
SF Board of Supervisors
Sarah Dennis Phillips, Director, Planning Department
Rachael Tanner, Director of Citywide Planning, Planning Department
Joshua Switzky, Deputy Director of Citywide Policy, Planning Department
Lisa Chen, Principal Planner, Planning Department

Neighborhoods United SF Partner Organizations:

Aquatic Park Neighbors
Barbary Coast Neighborhood Association
Catalysts for Local Control
Cathedral Hill Neighborhood Association
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Cole Valley Improvement Association
Corbett Heights Neighbors
Cow Hollow Association
Cow Hollow-Marina Neighbors and Merchants
D2 United
D4ward
Diamond Heights Community Association
Dolores Heights Improvement Club
East Mission Improvement Association
Excelsior District Improvement Association
Forest Hill Association
Francisco Park Conservancy
Geary Boulevard Merchants and Property Owners Association
Golden Gate Heights Neighborhood Association
Golden Gate Valley Neighborhood Association
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council
Ingleside Terrace Homeowners Assoc
Jordan Park Improvement Association
Lakeside Property Owners Association
La Playa Park Coalition
La Playa Village

Laurel Heights Neighborhood Association
Lombard Hill Improvement Association
Marina - Cow Hollow Neighbors and Merchants
Marina Community Association
Mid-Sunset Neighborhood Association
Midtown Terrace Homeowners Association
Miraloma Park Improvement Club
Mission Dolores Neighborhood Association
Noe Valley Council
North Beach Tenants Committee
Oceanview/Merced Heights/Ingleside - Neighbors in Action
Our Neighborhood Voices
Pacific Avenue Neighborhood Association
Parkmerced Action Coalition
Planning Association for the Richmond
Rincon Point Neighborhood Association
Russian Hill Community Association
Russian Hill Improvement Association
San Francisco Land Use Coalition
San Francisco Tenants Union
Save Our Amazing Richmond
Save Our Neighborhoods SF
Sensible D7
St. Francis Homes Association
Small Business Forward
Sunset Heights Association of Responsible People
Sunset-Parkside Education & Action Committee
Sunset United Neighbors
Telegraph Hill Dwellers
University Terrace Association
Waterfront Action Committee
Westwood Park Association

November 15, 2025

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Land Use and Transportation Committee
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Support for Chan and Chen Amendments and Request for Pause and HCD Oversight on the Family Zoning Plan

Land Use and Transportation Committee Agenda Items 4-7, November 17, 2025, Board File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966, "Family Zoning Plan"

Dear Chairperson and Members of the Committee,

On behalf of Neighborhoods United SF, we respectfully urge the Land Use and Transportation (LUT) Committee to take the following actions regarding Mayor Lurie's proposed Family Zoning Plan:

1. **Adopt the amendments** introduced by Supervisors Connie Chan and Chyanne Chen.
2. **Place a pause** on the process given the extraordinary and unsettled circumstances in District 4.
3. **Recommend a "Committee of the Whole"** session before forwarding this legislation to the full Board of Supervisors.
4. **Request an extension** from the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) to allow for full review, transparency, and participation.
5. **Require HCD leadership to attend** Land Use and Transportation hearings, the Committee of the Whole, and full Board meetings to provide clear, direct answers on state compliance criteria and housing capacity calculations.

Below is further context for each request:

1. Adopt the Chan and Chen Amendments
These amendments take essential steps to protect sound housing, historic resources, and our shoreline, while helping ensure that new development truly serves working families and essential workers, not luxury developers.

2. Pause the Process in Light of District 4 Circumstances
Given the extraordinary and unsettled conditions in District 4, including the lack of representation and multiple unresolved planning and mapping inconsistencies, it is imperative that the City pause the process. Proceeding without full district representation would be premature and would further erode public confidence in the City's planning process.

3. Convene a Committee of the Whole Session
We urge the LUT Committee to recommend a 'Committee of the Whole' session before the legislation advances to the full Board. This will allow all Supervisors to hear public testimony, fully deliberate the proposal, and give time for Mayor Lurie to appoint a new District 4 Supervisor, ensuring every district has representation before a citywide rezoning plan of this scale moves forward.

4. Request an Extension from HCD
We further request that the City seek an extension from the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) to allow adequate time for proper environmental review, public engagement, and a full evaluation of the proposed amendments' impacts on existing neighborhoods and housing capacity calculations. Transparency and thorough review should take precedence over arbitrary timelines.

5. Require HCD's Direct Participation
As you deliberate on the City's Family Zoning Plan and its relationship to the certified Housing Element, HCD leadership should be required to attend LUT hearings, Committee of the Whole, and the full Board meeting. Their participation is critical so that Supervisors and the public can receive direct, transparent answers on how housing capacity is being calculated, how compliance with state mandates is determined, and how proposed amendments will affect San Francisco's standing with the State.

While we support more housing through thoughtful, responsible planning, Neighborhoods United SF is firmly opposed to the Family Zoning Plan in its current form. The proposal goes far beyond what was envisioned in the certified Housing Element and would irreversibly reshape our city without delivering the affordability or equity it promises.

San Franciscans deserve clarity, accountability, and responsible planning, not conflicting interpretations of state requirements or exaggerated capacity figures that could reshape our city for generations.

Thank you for your leadership and commitment to transparent decision-making on behalf of the residents of San Francisco.

Sincerely,
Lori Brooke
Co-Founder, Neighborhoods United SF
neighborhoodsunitedsf.org

cc:
Mayor Daniel Lurie
Ned Segal, Chief of Housing and Economic Development
SF Planning Commission
SF Board of Supervisors
Jonas P. Ionin, Commission Secretary, Planning Department

Sarah Dennis Phillips, Director, Planning Department
Rachael Tanner, Director of Citywide Planning, Planning Department
Joshua Switzky, Deputy Director of Citywide Policy, Planning Department
Lisa Chen, Principal Planner, Planning Department

Neighborhoods United SF Partner Organizations:
Aquatic Park Neighbors
Barbary Coast Neighborhood Association
Catalysts for Local Control
Cathedral Hill Neighborhood Association
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Cole Valley Improvement Association
Corbett Heights Neighbors
Cow Hollow Association
Cow Hollow-Marina Neighbors and Merchants
D2 United
D4ward
Diamond Heights Community Association
Dolores Heights Improvement Club
East Mission Improvement Association
Excelsior District Improvement Association
Forest Hill Association
Francisco Park Conservancy
Geary Boulevard Merchants and Property Owners Association
Golden Gate Heights Neighborhood Association
Golden Gate Valley Neighborhood Association
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council
Ingleside Terrace Homeowners Assoc
Jordan Park Improvement Association
Lakeside Property Owners Association
La Playa Park Coalition
La Playa Village
Laurel Heights Neighborhood Association
Lombard Hill Improvement Association
Marina - Cow Hollow Neighbors and Merchants
Marina Community Association
Mid-Sunset Neighborhood Association
Midtown Terrace Homeowners Association
Miraloma Park Improvement Club
Mission Dolores Neighborhood Association
Noe Valley Council
North Beach Tenants Committee
Oceanview/Merced Heights/Ingleside - Neighbors in Action

Our Neighborhood Voices
Pacific Avenue Neighborhood Association
Parkmerced Action Coalition
Planning Association for the Richmond
Rincon Point Neighborhood Association
Russian Hill Community Association
Russian Hill Improvement Association
San Francisco Land Use Coalition
San Francisco Tenants Union
Save Our Amazing Richmond
Save Our Neighborhoods SF
Sensible D7
St. Francis Homes Association
Small Business Forward
Sunset Heights Association of Responsible People
Sunset-Parkside Education & Action Committee
Sunset United Neighbors
Telegraph Hill Dwellers
University Terrace Association
Waterfront Action Committee
Westwood Park Association

From: molliespack@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Leslie Wong
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Friday, November 14, 2025 9:58:16 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am a resident of Distsrict 1 and support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers. The upzoning of areas like my district would be adversely affected by the proposed upzoning. Building up would ruin the community and unique character of our neighborhoods as well as straining the resources and infrastructure. There are other, more effective ways to provide more housing without destroying our neighborhoods.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Sincerely,
Leslie Wong
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: troymcmahan22@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Troy McMahan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Friday, November 14, 2025 8:28:21 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Troy McMahan
San Francisco, CA 94115

From: sf.lorna@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lorna Walker
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Friday, November 14, 2025 8:27:19 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments: I live on Bush Street and I'm not sure why your carved out my block as one of the few to be upsized. That is discrimination and clearly because we are in the poor part of District 2. It's. It fair to target the poor and protect the rich neighborhoods of Pacific Heights.

Sincerely,
Lorna Walker
San Francisco, CA 94115

From: Melissa Hernandez
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, November 14, 2025 8:05:10 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I write this as someone who lives in two-unit rent controlled housing! My neighbors and I don't want to be displaced. We live living in SF and in our neighborhood.

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the

private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Melissa

Melissa Hernandez
mghernandez117@gmail.com
256 Brighton Ave
San Francisco, California 94112

From: Kristi Dowler
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, November 14, 2025 7:59:37 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Kristi Dowler
kristdowler@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94123

From: Bunny McFadden
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, November 14, 2025 7:50:14 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Bunny McFadden
residue.wooden0h@icloud.com

San Francisco, California 94102

From: Myra Krieger
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: The Up Zoning in Russian Hill Alleys - Pls. Vote NO
Date: Friday, November 14, 2025 5:56:06 PM

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

Please Retain the 40 Foot

Height Limit on our ALLEYS.

If you allow Six Stories, then Prohibit On Street Parking for new Alley construction .

--
Myra Krieger, Staff Reporter
San Francisco Senior Beat
kriegermyra@gmail.com
415-776-7857

From: peter.yedidia@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Peter Yedidia
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Friday, November 14, 2025 5:42:49 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm proud to have lived in San Francisco for 50 years, presently in District 3, zip 94133. I dearly love our city and am passionate about the need for more affordable housing. Unfortunately, as written, the Mayor's "Family" upzoning plan will not make housing more affordable and will irreparably harm our name treasured neighborhoods.

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

Finally, remove North Beach and Fisherman's Wharf from the upzoning map. They were not in the Housing Element and were surprisingly added at the last minute without consultation with neighborhood groups.

Respectfully, San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Sincerely,
Peter Yedidia
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: manduin@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Morgan Weiss
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Friday, November 14, 2025 5:34:49 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

These changes are not yet well vetted, or if they are, then residents don't know enough about it. Understanding that there are some state level requirements, I am sure that with all the bureaucracy in our world there is room for a petition to the governor to limit, or at least delay, requirements until they are fully justified. These expensive projects do not demonstrably close the affordable housing gap. That cost is not just in money, but it is also in irreplaceable space, which, once made available to developers, will be virtually impossible to restore.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Morgan Weiss
San Francisco, CA 94110

From: Leah Higgins
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, November 14, 2025 5:33:45 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Leah Higgins
leaheloise@yahoo.com
524 Haight Street
San Francisco, 94117

From: Sachiel Rosen
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, November 14, 2025 5:33:07 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Sachiel Rosen
bagghead1@gmail.com
670 34TH AVE
San Francisco, California 94121

From: Samantha Malpiedi
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, November 14, 2025 5:00:32 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent in District 8, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Samantha Malpiedi
samantha.malpiedi@gmail.com
952 Guerrero Street
San Francisco, California 94110

From: kittym@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kitty Margolis
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Friday, November 14, 2025 4:57:01 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a North Beach lifer who has been both a renter and a property owner, I support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

I also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions. We do not deserve to have thoughtless "non-plans" rammed down our throats.

North Beach, a historically important community that was added in at the very last minute, shouldn't even be part of this upzoning conversation. There was no opportunity for community input. Please slow down!

Sincerely,
Kitty Margolis
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: Madison Steinke
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, November 14, 2025 4:55:30 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am begging you to please support Connie Chan's amendment and protect our beautiful city and its wonderful residents.
The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more

than ever!

Sincerely,

Madison Steinke
madisteinke@gmail.com
1251 24TH AVE
San Francisco, California 94122

From: Talia Banarie
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, November 14, 2025 4:10:10 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Talia Banarie
tbanarie@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94110

From: bridget.maley@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Bridget Maley
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Friday, November 14, 2025 3:46:17 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Bridget Maley
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: nuptial.51.boxes@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of stephanie de maria
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Friday, November 14, 2025 3:42:05 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:

North Beach and Fisherman's wharf are SF Historical neighborhoods and have had that designation for years, in addition North Beach is the densest neighbor in San Francisco and home to many San Franciscans on rent control. Please support Supervisor Chan's ammendment and insist on HCD participation.

Sincerely,
stephanie de maria
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: mark_keleher@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mark Keleher
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Friday, November 14, 2025 3:32:03 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Mark Keleher
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: juliedearborn@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Julie Dearborn
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Friday, November 14, 2025 12:59:02 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:

I am a retired teachers living in a rent controlled apartment in the Richmond District. If I lose this apartment, I will not be able to afford another at market rate prices. Please support the Chan and Chen amendments. A plan to create housing should not displace people who have housing. I agree that some form of upzoning needs to happen, but it shouldn't threaten the homes of long term residents.

Sincerely,
Julie Dearborn
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: editorial@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Harry Pariser
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Friday, November 14, 2025 12:10:18 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Please support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

Without an amendment prohibiting demolition of ALL rent controlled housing, many tenants and small businesses will be dislocated, neighborhood character all over SF will decline, but no truly affordable housing will be constructed!

Support the Chan and Chen amendments

Sincerely,
Harry Pariser
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: gb_andrews@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Gandhia Andrews
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Friday, November 14, 2025 11:26:59 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Don't let this city be run over by a Weiner who is only trying to be another useless career politician. We have self governance laws that allow the city to regulate itself and not be bullied by the state or a Weiner.

Sincerely,
Gandhia Andrews
San Francisco, CA 94132

From: amy7w2m@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Amy Meyer
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Friday, November 14, 2025 11:26:00 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I live in Lincoln Manor on Clement Street. It is a planned development more than 100 years old. Like several families living here, I have a member of my extended family living with me. I am 92 years old and it makes my living here secure and happy. Otherwise I would have to go into a nursing home. It gives my young family member a place to live while she develops her career.

This neighborhood helped to get the Golden Gate National Recreation Area, a campaign in which I was a leader. It starts a few blocks from here. Neighbors did everything from testifying at hearings to typing the required letters to contributing funds for the campaign.

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Sincerely,
Amy Meyer
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: marymmoc@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mary OConnell
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Friday, November 14, 2025 10:50:18 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Everyone knows the city needs more housing, but this just gives developers over the top concessions. This can be done in a much more thoughtful manner. I hear calls from lots of people in the city, including the entertainment commission, calling for looser regulations so that San Francisco can be a world-class city, like New York. The thing that makes San Francisco so very special is that it's a livable city. Don't screw it up now

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Mary OConnell
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: jvmahoney67@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Mahoney
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Friday, November 14, 2025 9:05:26 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
John Mahoney
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: theharveysofsf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Thomas Harvey
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Friday, November 14, 2025 8:52:15 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments: I have written before with no changes; East of 15th avenue and Taraval are no buses or streetcars, however, the 65' proposed new height limits include three blocks East to Forest Side avenue.
The block between Funston Avenue and Forest Side Avenue should definitely not be included as it is well over 500' from MUNI.
Please respond.
My other comment is along 15th avenue from Ulloa to Taraval will completely block views for those East of 15th avenue looking West. The beautiful sunsets and seeing the ocean including Fort Funston will be gone.
With no additional infrastructure, all utilities and roads will make this area non-livable and unsafe, not where someone wants to raise a family.

Sincerely,
Thomas Harvey
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: cjverb1@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Carol Verburg
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Friday, November 14, 2025 8:35:52 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Greetings from a San Francisco resident who first moved here in 1971 and has lived in the Sunset, Pacific Heights, and Russian Hill before settling in North Beach 29 years ago.

I have learned a great deal about the now very-much-outdated State Housing Mandate at neighborhood meetings around the City, and have continued to attend hearings at City Hall despite the conspicuous disappearance of the Land Use & Transportation members during public comment, because the absurd upzoning proposals being rammed down our throats by the Wiener-Lurie-Sauter group and their profiteering backers threaten to destroy the very assets that make SF so popular with the tech-bro crowd seeking new high-end housing, at the expense of the 700,000-plus residents who currently live and work here and love this City as it is.

This is to urge you to:

1. Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

2. Demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

3. In making decisions that will change San Francisco forever, base them on what kind of city works best for its residents, not on pandering or potential personal gain.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Sincerely,
Carol Verburg
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: litagent@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Cherie Fehrman
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Friday, November 14, 2025 7:32:53 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:
Protect the unique nature of our residential neighborhoods without rushing into changes that will forever alter San Francisco. Listen to what the people want. Let's not destroy historic structures for concrete and glass towers of questionable architectural value. More affordable housing may be needed but let's not throw out the baby with the bath water. In the past, many unfortunate changes were made which could have been avoided with a little more thought. Let's not make affordable housing forever change the character of our neighborhoods.

Sincerely,
Cherie Fehrman
San Francisco, CA 94118

From: mdarnton@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Margaret Blodgett
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Friday, November 14, 2025 2:14:03 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:

I live in a in clutch of historic homes called Lincoln Manor spanning a few blocks in the far Outer Richmond between Clement and Geary, 36th-38th Avenues. We host annual block parties and our children zip between the little grid our houses form, sometimes in bare feet, sometimes wobbling on their bikes. It's quiet and clean and safe enough for them to explore their independence as they learn to navigate the city. The stretch of Clement on the north end of our neighborhood is a dedicated bike lane and runs along a green corridor that used to be a Chinese cemetery, now a public golf course that occasionally chucks balls into our back yards. My children collect them and trade the brightly colored ones, which are by far the most coveted. We've set up lemonade stands at the golf course where my son and his best friend, who lives ten houses away within Lincoln Manor, sell used balls for 50 cents and Arnold Palmers - they donate the proceeds to charity and we reward them for their community service with Legos and Rice Crispy treats the size of their fists from Anne at the Garden House Cafe just down the block. We know our neighbors and throw their newspapers a little closer to their front doors, let their dogs out when they're stuck at work, water their plants when they travel... in other words, we've carved out a little slice of sweet, settled, civic life in this bustling, often anonymous and transient city. I cannot imagine how this will change once single family homes are boxed out by multi unit buildings and our little streets are choked with cars. Our backyards won't get sunlight, our children won't know their neighbors, and they won't feel safe practicing biking or dog walking amid the congestion and chaos. This city has many vacant apartments and homes and businesses. There are ample corridors suited for greater development untapped and unrealized - why alter the character and charm of some of San Francisco's little pocket communities just to meet some arbitrary development quota? This is the sort of action that forces young families, especially those that have a tenuous but faithful toehold, out of the city. We are voters and tax payers and community builders. We made the choice to live in this far flung, sleepy corner of the city and we beseech you to respect its integrity and character. Please don't box us out of a life we love.

Sincerely,
Margaret Blodgett
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: emailamr@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Ann Rubin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Friday, November 14, 2025 1:15:16 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments: We are going to look back on this as another era of Urban Renewal. We need to do better.

Sincerely,
Ann Rubin
Los Angeles, CA 90048

From: marycmcf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mary McFadden
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Friday, November 14, 2025 12:00:19 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

We cannot build our way out of an affordability crisis created by wealth disparity. Those who work for wages, who need mortgages to buy homes, cannot compete with billionaires who view property as houses as investment portfolios. Upzoning does not lower home prices, it raises them because the land value increases proportionately to the investment.

If a home is worth $1m, when that space is rezoned for 8 units (each worth $1m), that land, not eh home, becomes worth more than $8m. The highest bidder gets the land. Those who want homes are thrown out of the equation, thrown out of the city.

We who built this place, who made San Francisco are now being told to get out, to sell to the richest of the rich. As public servants, your job is to serve residents, not cowtow to international investment groups.

Sincerely,
Mary McFadden
San Francisco, CA 94115

From: molliespack@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Leslie Wong
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 9:40:33 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am a resident of District Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Leslie Wong
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: l_bluestone@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Louise Bluestone
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 9:22:33 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Louise Bluestone
San Francisco, CA 94115

From: vozalegre@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of L. Diaz
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 9:21:21 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
L. Diaz
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: dede.estey@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Deidre Estey
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 9:00:23 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments: I live in the Richmond ,near Fulton street alongside the Park.Huge high rises and tower aptments full of small 1 bedrooms will cause the whole area to change with little parking,already full buses during rush hours with a lot of standing already. The problem of destruction to glorious Edwardian homes alongside the park will will horrible! I chose the Richmond for a quiet,residential neighborhood,full of families, and good schools. The beauty of the natural environment will be forever changed and needs,Affordable family accommodations, not million dollar high rises ruining the sun/shade ratio along our streets.

Sincerely,
Deidre Estey
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: tevisajones@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Tevis Jones
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 7:33:36 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

PLEASE support the Chan and Chen amendments to PROTECT existing housing, PRESERVE San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of WORKING FAMILIES, NOT the wealthy citizens who have their hands in the $$pockets of Big Real Estate and always seem to win against the humble residents of San Francisco.

HCD leadership must appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how their housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance and benefit ALL residents of San Francisco, not just the wealthy scions who protect their wealth via real estate. The City of San Francisco (NOW SPONSORED BY PREDATORS) is using inaccurate data to force the working families of San Francisco's Westside to bend the knee to wealthy real estate political actors. HCD must justify their (faulty) numbers or the City will face a middle-class revolt against the wealthy San Francisco political class. (Take note, the hapless NON-Sunset millionaires who squandered big bucks to back Engardio.) This is a struggle for justice between San Francisco's middle class and the ruling oligarchy class of San Francisco for the true spirit of our city, and we're focused on activating justice for EVERYONE in this city, something that has been missing from San Francisco for a long time as it's sunk into cronyism and oligarchy.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions. DO NOT DESTROY THE REMAINING MIDDLE-CLASS OF SAN FRANCISCO IN THE WESTERN NEIGHBORHOODS!

Additional comments: I've lived in the Sunset for 30 years, and we've already been subjected to outsize housing with no onsite parking on a toxic site that San Francisco refused to deal with properly, plus City government threats of more community destruction. I do not trust San Francisco city government - it has become a creature of the bicycle coalition and the wealthy residents who are as undemocratic as the BOS in their attempts to manipulate middle class neighborhoods. San Francisco is completely disrespectful of the Sunset & the Richmond (is it due to our lack of wealth and/or your racism??)
**Thank you so much to Supervisors Connie Chan & Chyanne Chen, who respect & value San Francisco's diverse middle class and who refuse to bend the knee to the wealth-powered citizens of San Francisco & beyond (including the bicycle coalition & almost all elements of city government including sfrecpark) that are corruptly partnering with real estate magnates & wealthy parties to destroy the Western Neighborhoods where the remaining SF middle class resides. THIS is what the proliferation of aggressive coercive forcible housing actions (using maga tactics to bludgeon the middle class on the Westside) will create: the destruction of the middle class in San Francisco's Western Neighborhoods, and then the city that once stood on an alabaster hilll will lose sadly but justly its heart.

Sincerely,
Tevis Jones
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: r9dennis@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Dennis Shiraki
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 6:50:25 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Dennis Shiraki
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: susanmackowski@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Susan Mackowski
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 6:34:05 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Susan Mackowski
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: em-s@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Emi Miyoshi-Shiraki
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 6:32:10 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Emi Miyoshi-Shiraki
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: jmmackowski@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Matthew Mackowski
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 6:09:59 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

For decades San Francisco has withstood attempts by developers to ruin the character of its neighborhoods in the pursuit of profit. Why now are you sacrificing the essence of what makes San Francisco unique? You can achieve more functional housing by working within existing zoning but removing regulation and delay that makes construction unnecessarily expensive.

I call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
John Matthew Mackowski
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: homeagain@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Michael Mazgai
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 6:09:24 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Michael Mazgai
San Francisco, CA 94117

From: jmmackowski@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Matthew Mackowski
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 5:52:34 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

The upzoning plan as presented will destroy the character of San Francisco's north waterfront surrounding Telegraph Hill, North Beach and Russian Hill. It is a giveaway to developers at the expense of residents who pay the taxes that support city government.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Sincerely,
John Matthew Mackowski
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: ferrante.lynn@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lynn Ferrante
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 5:44:13 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments: I am strongly opposed to making the Van Ness corridor into a Miami like setting with huge high rises. . This zoning is way too high and will ruin neighborhoods adjacent. Spread out in other areas instead of putting the majority of the burden on Van ness please.

Sincerely,
Lynn Ferrante
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: kielygomes@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Karen Schwartz
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 5:39:11 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Karen Schwartz
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: bdethiers@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Bernard Dethiers
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 5:30:54 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a long term North Beach resident, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Bernard Dethiers
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: natashjadewolf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Natashja Dewolfe
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 5:11:39 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I have lived in the Inner Sunset for 45 years, and in San Francisco for 54 years. I think this is a very wrong headed plan. Why not start with building by retrofitting the empty buildings downtown first? And start with empty spaces first?? I am really afraid I won't recognize not just my neighborhood, but my City!!

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments: Please rethink this. We need to prioritize rent controlled buildings and long term tenants!

Sincerely,
Natashja Dewolfe
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: Mikalis.Faklys@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Michael Faklis
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 4:59:58 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Michael Faklis
San Francisco, CA 94111

From: lehr.david@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Dave Lehr
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 4:40:31 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Please demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Thank you!

Sincerely,
Dave Lehr
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: vandana1@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Vandana Di Scala
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 4:39:03 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Sincerely,
Vandana Di Scala
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: shoshod5623@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of shoshanah dobry
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 4:29:49 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Dear Mayor Lurie, Board of Supervisors & the Planning Comission:

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

This plan doesn't seem to have any basis in the needs of the whole population of San Francisco. Once we have common sense planned buildings completed to meet the current needs of San Francisco then, we as a city, can look toward other building that might look toward the future and what the population might look like. We don't want to end up as a city like those around Lake Tahoe or others in Silicon Valley that don't have the housing to support all of the different "classes" of people needed to keep the city alive and thriving.

Thank you for reading my thoughts.

Sincerely,
shoshanah dobry
San Francisco, CA 94124

From: ferrante.lynn@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lynn Ferrante
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 4:28:22 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps.
- Reconsider the proposed height of buildings along Van Ness. I am especially concerned that this plan will result in YEARS of destruction and construction in the Van Ness corridor already having had construction destroy businesses for the new bus lane. There are neighborhoods adjacent to the Van Ness corridor that will be destroyed by the excessive height of the buildings along Van Ness and stretching up the adjacent streets
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised

Sincerely,
Lynn Ferrante
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: scoopfoggy@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Shirley Fogarino
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 4:16:57 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Shirley Fogarino
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: dj@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Diane Josephs
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 4:15:15 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

I am concerned in general that upzoning is inequitable. The western Russian Hill Neighbors, will be drastically impacted and were never informed by planningn and still are unaware. it is no surprise that this occurred as this may be related to the fact that the extreme zoning has been dumped on our area. On 11/3 I submitted some of the names, addresses, phone numbers or emails to no avail.

Sincerely,
Diane Josephs
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: ThomasWeed@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Thomas Weed
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 4:03:17 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Thomas Weed

From: sfamc2@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Arnold Cohn
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 3:59:14 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

How would you feel if an eight story apartment building became your next door neighbor?

Protect existing San Francisco housing.

Sincerely,
Arnold Cohn

From: pattired12@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Patti McMahon
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 3:56:57 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:
Bringing more housing into the downtown San Francisco area is more realistic. High rise buildings
Are here and people living in the area are needed to make it more like New York City .

Sincerely,
Patti McMahon
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: tessa_oleary@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of tessa oleary
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 3:56:29 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
tessa oleary
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: audreycrls@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Audrey Carlson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 3:54:51 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance. I am extremely concerned that our State Senator Scott Weiner will continue to layer additional bonus floors to what SF Planning says will be the highest building heights.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Audrey Carlson
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: ratt57@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Doug McKirahan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 3:54:36 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Doug McKirahan
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: timepuzzle@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Robert Smith
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 3:52:05 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
John Robert Smith
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: noguera@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Hatun Noguera
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 3:50:29 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Hatun Noguera
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: john33sf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Nulty
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 3:48:14 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Sincerely,
John Nulty
San Francisco, CA 94142

From: don.ayers@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Don Ayers
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 3:47:12 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Please support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Sincerely,
Don Ayers

From: kcdegnan@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of KC Degnan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Saturday, November 15, 2025 9:47:35 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Dear Mayor Lurie and San Francisco Supervisors:

There is a heart-breaking exhibit at the Museum of San Francisco (Commercial Street) about the "urban renewal" project that destroyed the Western Addition and Japantown in the 1960s in the name of "progress." Please, please do not make the same irreparable mistake again with a misguided (however well intentioned) "up zoning" plan that is not transparent or well thought-through. What has been proposed will not address the housing issue allegedly at stake. Listen to your constituents who will be impacted by this ill-conceived plan.

I urge you to support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

There are real and serious questions about this process. For this to be truly transparent, HCD leadership must appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance. It would be very helpful to explain other options that were considered and why they were rejected so citizens can better understand the proposed "strategy."

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions. Visit the exhibit at the Museum of San Francisco before you go down in history as making the same devastating mistake.

Sincerely,
KC Degnan
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: ckar101@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kim Russo
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Saturday, November 15, 2025 8:26:08 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Kim Russo
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: connie.rubiano@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Constance Rubiano
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 7:18:28 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I have lived in SF for 47 years. Please amend this proposal to include affordable housing for people who are not in the 1%.

We do need MORE HOUSING IN SF. BUT for whom? This upzoning SHOULD NOT INCLUDE DEMOLISHING EXISTING HOUSING, ESPECIALLY THAT WHICH IS NOW RENT-CONTROLLED.

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Sincerely,
Constance Rubiano
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: norkydeg@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Norman Degelman
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 4:49:04 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): The private sector will not solve the housing problem. They are more concerned with making a profit. They are not concerned with providing affordable housing for people.

Sincerely,
Norman Degelman
San Francisco, CA 94117

From: kathygee606@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kathleen Gee
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Sunday, November 16, 2025 9:46:42 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments: I was born and have lived in San Francisco for over 70 years, the majority in the Richmond district. I understand the desire for growth. The current proposal greatly increases height limits on every other block in the Richmond - Supposedly where the muni lines are. However, the 31 Balboa was eliminated for several years and the 2 Clement still has not returned. Will all bus lines be guaranteed ?
We do not need to give carte blanc to luxury developers, to build mostly tiny studios & one br apts while building heights that greatly impact the sunshine/light and create wind tunnels in the neighborhood. We should ensure our wondrous and unique vistas and neighborhoods. We should not be eliminating parking requirements to simply create more units for the developers. Elderly and citizens with disabilities need to be able to drive and park. Three blocks to a muni stop is too much of a barrier for many to maintain their independence for shopping and other ADL.
Any legislation needs to ensure that San Francisco retains its personality and is actually livable and not just a labyrinth of tiny overcrowded rabbit hutches

Sincerely,
Kathleen Gee
San Francisco, CA 94118

From: epaulshi@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Yang Deng
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Sunday, November 16, 2025 9:08:50 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to you in support of the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

I demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Sincerely,
Yang Deng
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: leishi92@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lei Shi
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Sunday, November 16, 2025 9:07:48 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

I demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Sincerely,
Lei Shi
San Francisco, CA 94116

From:	Cici Lee
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	Sauter, Danny (BOS); SauterStaff; commission.secretary@sfgov.org
Subject:	Heigh Limit
Date:	Sunday, November 16, 2025 8:26:21 PM

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

Dear City Leaders;

Please retain the 40 foot height limit on our little streets. Raising the limit will turn our little alley into a dark and slot canyons that not one wants to live in.

Thanks,
Cici Lee
1332 Pacific Ave, San Francisco, CA 94109

From: Cici Lee
To: commission.secretary@sfgov.org; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS)
Subject: height Limit
Date: Sunday, November 16, 2025 8:17:40 PM

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

Dear City Leaders;

Please retain the 40 foot height limit on our little streets. Raising the limit will turn our little alley into a dark and slot canyons that not one wants to live in.

Thanks,
Cici Lee
1332 Pacific Ave, San Francisco, CA 94109

From:	Kathy Howard
To:	ChanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); MahmoodStaff; MandelmanStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); SherrilStaff@sfgov.org; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Lurie, Daniel (MYR)
Cc:	Mcgarry, Sean (CPC); Campbell, Amy (CPC); Imperial, Theresa (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Braun, Derek (CPC); So, Lydia (CPC); Williams, Gilbert A (CPC); Ionin, Jonas (CPC)
Subject:	BOS LUTC Family Zoning Plan items - Nov. 17, 2025
Date:	Sunday, November 16, 2025 7:11:06 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

The entire City voted on District 4's Great Highway, but once again **District 4**, through no fault of our own, **has NO voice in the upzoning legislation**. This is despite the fact that the upzoning legislation could result in bulldozing our entire neighborhood.

This is **upzoning without representation.** You should postpone this vote until the mayor acts on appointing a replacement. *We are tired of being ignored*.

I urge you to form a Committee of the Whole, including our new Supervisor, to allow all of the Supervisors to hear public testimony and fully deliberate the upzoning proposal. Our new Supervisor should also first spend time in our neighborhood, learning what our residents want to have happen to their home. Whether or not this person is a rubber-stamp for the zoning plan and ignores residents' concerns will determine their ability to be elected in June.

I also ask that the City seek an extension from the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) to allow adequate time for proper environmental review, public engagement, and a full evaluation of the proposed amendments' impacts on existing neighborhoods and housing capacity calculations. Transparency and thorough review should take precedence over arbitrary timelines.

HCD leadership should be required to attend BOS LUTC hearings, Committee of the Whole, and the full Board meeting. Their participation is critical so that ***all 11*** Supervisors and the public can receive direct, transparent answers on how housing capacity is being calculated, how compliance with state mandates is determined, and how proposed amendments will affect San Francisco's standing with the State.

As to the legislation, many changes must be made:

- **Eliminate in-lieu fees**. In-lieu fees delay affordable housing and create exclusive enclaves of luxury housing.

- **Dedicate all suitable public land – excluding parks and public open space - to 100%**

affordable housing.

- **Preserve the Coastal Zone as it is today.**
- **Prohibit upzoning in the Tsunami Zone.** It is reckless to increase building heights or density in areas at high risk of tsunami inundation.
- **Repair and reactivate the local tsunami warning system**.
- **Protect historic and culturally significant buildings, districts and open space.** All **Category A and A-eligible historic buildings, districts, and open space** should be exempted from upzoning. District 4's mid-century homes and civic buildings reflect our community's unique cultural heritage and deserve preservation.
- **Prevent height increases near parks and schools.** Casting shadows on open spaces and classrooms undermines the very "well-resourced" character of our district that the City claims to value.
- **Install the emergency firefighting system before more density is built, or a major quake and the ocean winds could result in an unstoppable fire that will run from west to east over all of San Francisco.**

Thank you for your consideration of these points.

Sincerely,

Katherine Howard

Outer Sunset

District 4

From:	Rick Bond
To:	Sauter, Danny (BOS); SauterStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); commission.secretary@sfgov.org
Subject:	No slot canyons!
Date:	Sunday, November 16, 2025 7:05:56 PM

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

City leaders,

Please retain the 40 foot height limit on our little streets. Raising the limit will turn them into dark, forbidding slot canyons.

Thanks,
Rick Bond
21 Russell St, San Francisco, CA 94109

From: desireemiles@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Desiree Maggiora Miles
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Sunday, November 16, 2025 5:31:26 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):
To Mayor Lurie & Honorable SF Officials,
I take great pride in being a second generation San Franciscan, my parents being first born children of wonderful Italian Immigrants, our grandparents. On my son's paternal side, he is a Fifth Generation San Franciscan, also taking great pride in the fact that his great-grandfather and great uncles, The Miles Brothers , were well-known local photographers in San Francisco at the time of the Great Earthquake of 1906 and took humbling photos of our beloved City in ruins during the days following that historic event. The Miles Brothers sadly lost their studios as a result of the devastating quake but their photos of City Hall after the quake and Market Street a day before are indelible in archives of San Francisco history! I very much appreciate your kind review of my comments and background. The rich history that our families share and the amazing bond that we have with San Francisco is immeasurable. I urgently implore you, Mayor Lurie , and SF Supervisors ,Officials and Planners to RETHINK the plan for up zoning our great City neighborhoods. I vehemently reject the current planning proposals. They will decimate our neighborhood businesses, drive up affordability and not mitigate the issues that they claim to address. The flavor of our neighborhoods will be lost , as well as practical issues like parking spaces - destructive ideas like meters in residential neighborhoods - would wreak havoc on current residents as well as potential, future residents have already been proposed . Our beloved SF is a unique landscape and thus requires careful attention to details of locations, views, services needed to accommodate additional numbers of residents and many other factors that would impact affordability for anyone attempting to enter the rental or home ownership market in our varied neighborhoods. PLEASE fight back against Senator Scott Wiener's dictatorship of required housing in the State of CA and TAMP DOWN these unreasonable mandates to make our City more affordable to live in for some more residents and NOT UNAFFORDABLE FOR MANY!!!!! We have limited space which will impact affordability so a reasonable compromise will help additional residents-although mot many more- to be able to have an OPPORTUNITY to live in our amazing neighborhoods and thrive. Thank you again for your kind and prompts attention to this matter

Sincerely,
Desiree Maggiora Miles

San Francisco, CA 94123

From: PhilD01210@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Phil Dillard
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Sunday, November 16, 2025 4:56:07 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:
Monday's pending Planning Commission hearing on District 3 is, frankly, an abomination of process and a serious failure of representation. I say that as a proud American, a Navy veteran, a capitalist and entrepreneur, and a 17 year San Francisco resident who has lived more than 10 of those years on Green Street in North Beach.
I have already attended multiple hearings on this upzoning and related changes. At the last one, this item was pushed so far back on the agenda that, like many working residents, I had to leave for client meetings before public comment was called. The people who can stay all day tend to be retirees, union contingents, and insiders. Working age residents who are building businesses, paying high rents or mortgages, and raising families are effectively excluded.
And even when we do speak, it does not feel like public comment is taken seriously. Residents from across the neighborhood spoke clearly and in good faith. Commissioners and staff listened, then went right back to minutiae and a predetermined agenda. That is not genuine engagement. It is a box checked.
I am very active in my community. I attend Telegraph Hill Dwellers, Russian Hill and North Beach neighbors meetings. I volunteer with North Beach Citizens and talk with residents, seniors, families, workers and small business owners every week. I walk this city day and night and there is nothing like North Beach anywhere else in San Francisco.
Almost no one I know of working age is aware of the true scope of BOS File 250682 and the related upzoning proposals. When they do learn what is being proposed, they are unanimously opposed. They do not want the elimination of the North Beach Special Use District. They do not want larger commercial footprints that invite chains. They do not want the erosion of conditional use review that silences neighbors. They do not want priority processing that strips away notice and hearings.
They definitely do not want more speculative high rise development that produces empty "safe deposit boxes in the sky" for absentee investors. I live across from one of those towers. It is mostly dark. It does nothing for our housing crisis and nothing for our community.
I have seen this pattern before. I watched it in Chicago and Philadelphia. We have all heard the stories of Seattle and Vancouver, where once distinctive neighborhoods were hollowed out by high rise luxury development, chain retail, and absentee ownership. Within a decade, the culture and small business ecosystem that drew people there in the first place was pushed out.
North Beach is the opposite of that. It is one of the few truly thriving, mixed use, mixed income, small business driven neighborhoods left in this city. People come from all over San Francisco and all over the world to experience something authentic here. The legislation in BOS 250682 and the Upzoning Plan attack the very tools that protected this place for decades.
There is a deep hypocrisy in preaching local democracy, community voice, and equity while pushing top down state and mayoral mandates on the most densely populated district in the city, over the clear objections of the people who actually live and work here. North Beach is already dense. District 3 is already dense. We have existing underused

buildings and existing permits that could be activated without destroying the fabric of the neighborhood.
We are not anti housing. We are not anti development. We are against bad planning and lazy, one size fits all policy th

Sincerely,
Phil Dillard
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: Bridget Dyer
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Sunday, November 16, 2025 4:36:35 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge your support of the combined amendments of Supervisors Connie Chan and Chyanne Chen to Mayor Lurie's Upzoning Plan, specifically:

Don't Demolish Tenant Homes – Over 45,000 renters are at increased risk of displacement as a result of the Plan's increased incentives to demolish tenant-occupied flats in North Beach, Upper Chinatown, Noe Valley, Buena Vista, the Castro, the Sunset, the Marina and the Richmond. SF Planning confirmed in its original plan analysis that we did not need to redevelop rent-controlled homes to meet our unit count goal. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's common-sense amendment to remove all residential flats from the local plan, knowing we don't need to displace hard-working San Franciscans to build the housing we need.

Protect the Public Waterfront – San Francisco once led the nation with thoughtful and sustainable planning that kept our public coast and bay waterfronts safe from overdevelopment. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's proposed amendment to remove the coastal and waterfront parcels that would be exposed to Trumpian privatization and luxury development. We are not Mar-a-Lago!

Build Real Family-Sized Housing – The mayor's Plan currently has no mandatory unit requirements, but rather offers 2-bedroom units as an "option" for developers. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's proposed amendment to the new density decontrol provisions the mayor put into the plan this year, which incentivize more $4000/month "microunits" – instead of the 2- and 3-bedroom homes families need.

Comply With Housing Element, Preserve PEGs – The unanimously adopted Housing Element was clear: Priority Equity Geographies have already born the brunt of development displacement, and yet the mayor included PEG neighborhoods into his new map. This is not what the Board adopted and approved, with support from community. I support Supervisor Chyanne Chen's proposed amendment to protect the PEGs as previously adopted.

Preserve Our Cultural & Historic Assets – We can build the housing we need without destroying San Francisco's cultural and historic assets. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's amendment to protect historic resources in this plan.

Build the Affordable Housing We Need – The mayor has proposed selling off 27+ public sites, which are critical to the construction of the 46,000 units of affordable housing SF is required to build by 2031. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's proposal to create an Affordable Housing Special Use District to maximize our public land for affordable housing.

While we did not elect the anonymous Sacramento bureaucrats at the HCD, we elected you all to be legislators and policy-makers who will advocate for us to the State and do what's best for SF. The mayor claims our hands are tied and we have to let HCD write our laws or we will lose "local control" – if you have to run your emails by HCD officials for approval, it would appear we already have.

Politicians were given a clear mandate from voters this past Election Day – we will support you, when you stand up for us. Don't be the Democrats that bungle another opportunity to fight for real affordable housing for us all – please show some political willpower, moral courage and leadership. Don't let your legacy be making San Francisco a city only for millionaires.

Sincerely,
Bridget Dyer
Hans Hony
Renters

Bridget Dyer
bridgetdyer@gmail.com
14 Prospect Ave,
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Dean Brown
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Sunday, November 16, 2025 12:25:24 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

I live on Carl street and my wife and I often walk down Irving street and there's just tons of 1 story buildings where we could have 3 stories of housing on top and a commercial floor on the bottom. I have kids and grandkids and want them to have a chance to live here. One bedroom apartments rent for more than $2,000 per month and we need all types of housing.

This housing problem did not happen overnight and it won't be solve quickly. However, the Family Zoning Plan is an important step in the right direction and should be approved.

I support Supervisor Melgar's small-business fund, and Supervisors Sherrill and Sauter's amendment to encourage larger family units (2-3 bedrooms). These strengthen the plan without risking state compliance, and the Mayor has signaled support.
And I oppose Proposals to exclude nearly all residential sites from rezoning or impose restrictions that would undercut housing capacity and jeopardize our state approval.

We need to get moving on this housing issue and I am tired of how long it takes to get things done in San Francisco. Please pass this plan so we can move on to building more housing.

Thanks,

Dean

Dean Brown
mondean@gmail.com
458 Carl street
SAN FRANCISCO , California 94117

From: Simone Alberti
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Sunday, November 16, 2025 9:56:56 AM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Simone Alberti
simo.alb88@gmail.com
131 Noe St.
San Francisco, California 94114

From: kumasong@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Karen Kirschling
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Saturday, November 15, 2025 8:04:06 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Karen Kirschling

From: dolbay@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Liam Hennessy
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Saturday, November 15, 2025 6:29:07 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Liam Hennessy
San Francisco, CA 94133

From:	lgpetty
To:	MelgarStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff
Cc:	Carroll, John (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; mahmoudstaff@sfgov.org; Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject:	All Tenant Protection Ordinance Amendments Require Due Deliberation
Date:	Saturday, November 15, 2025 5:33:17 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I write in support of Supervisor Cheyanne Chen's Tenant Protection Ordinance and to urge you not to "disappear" all the other amendments to it that have been proposed by Supervisors Chan and Chen.

In our democracy (yes we still have one) every serious proposal deserves serious consideration in a fair hearing and open decision process.

The public are entitled to know about all of the TPO amendment proposals -- in clear words, and in full. They are entitled to time and opportunity to examine them freely. People are entitled to express their opinions on them -- softly in writing; loudly in public. And, not least of all, the public are entitled to know the position of each of their representatives on each of the proposals.

Or has San Francisco fallen into an elitist shadow world where electeds get to ignore proposed legislation that might help the people, and hide the proposals so deeply that the people are forever denied them?

San Francisco government must not operate in secret.

Would any Supervisor take away the People's basic rights? For what reason? For "efficiency"? For political advantage? For monetary gain? For misguided fear of higher government reprisal? Or just because some can't stand the "noise" in a noisy, messy democracy?

I'll be delighted if you prove San Francisco is indeed still a democracy by giving all the Chan and Chen TPO amendments a full airing.

Lorraine Petty

-For Affordable Housing.
-Against Demolition of Sound Residential Housing.
-D2/5 Voter.

From: nora.chin@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Nora Chin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Saturday, November 15, 2025 4:29:50 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Nora Chin
San Francisco, CA 94118

From: brideynewman@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Bridget Newman
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Saturday, November 15, 2025 3:25:38 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am a District 1 resident; my family has lived in the Richmond District for 45 years. I support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers. I ask that you do the same. Beyond the fact that we lack fire-fighting infrastructure from 12th Avenue to the sea in the Richmond and 19th Avenue to the sea in the Sunset, building towers on sand is sheer folly.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

Ted Egan, San Francisco's Chief Economist, pointed out in his recent report that a high growth scenario under the Upzoning Plan that would include eliminating over 6,000 current rent-controlled housing units and demolishing the sites of hundreds of small businesses would decrease rent on the average apartment by $125/month. However, he also states that "Annual business disruption and relocation costs range from $16 to $28 million, in today's dollars." Density does not equal affordability.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Bridget Newman
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: Xoe Watchman
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Saturday, November 15, 2025 2:20:50 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge your support of the combined amendments of Supervisors Connie Chan and Chyanne Chen to Mayor Lurie's Upzoning Plan, specifically:

Don't Demolish Tenant Homes – Over 45,000 renters are at increased risk of displacement as a result of the Plan's increased incentives to demolish tenant-occupied flats in North Beach, Upper Chinatown, Noe Valley, Buena Vista, the Castro, the Sunset, the Marina and the Richmond. SF Planning confirmed in its original plan analysis that we did not need to redevelop rent-controlled homes to meet our unit count goal. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's common-sense amendment to remove all residential flats from the local plan, knowing we don't need to displace hard-working San Franciscans to build the housing we need.

Protect the Public Waterfront – San Francisco once led the nation with thoughtful and sustainable planning that kept our public coast and bay waterfronts safe from overdevelopment. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's proposed amendment to remove the coastal and waterfront parcels that would be exposed to Trumpian privatization and luxury development. We are not Mar-a-Lago!

Build Real Family-Sized Housing – The mayor's Plan currently has no mandatory unit requirements, but rather offers 2-bedroom units as an "option" for developers. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's proposed amendment to the new density decontrol provisions the mayor put into the plan this year, which incentivize more $4000/month "microunits" – instead of the 2- and 3-bedroom homes families need.

Comply With Housing Element, Preserve PEGs – The unanimously adopted Housing Element was clear: Priority Equity Geographies have already born the brunt of development displacement, and yet the mayor included PEG neighborhoods into his new map. This is not what the Board adopted and approved, with support from community. I support Supervisor Chyanne Chen's proposed amendment to protect the PEGs as previously adopted.

Preserve Our Cultural & Historic Assets – We can build the housing we need without destroying San Francisco's cultural and historic assets. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's amendment to protect historic resources in this plan.

Build the Affordable Housing We Need – The mayor has proposed selling off 27+ public sites, which are critical to the construction of the 46,000 units of affordable housing SF is required to build by 2031. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's proposal to create an Affordable Housing Special Use District to maximize our public land for affordable housing.

While we did not elect the anonymous Sacramento bureaucrats at the HCD, we elected you all to be legislators and policy-makers who will advocate for us to the State and do what's best for SF. The mayor claims our hands are tied and we have to let HCD write our laws or we will lose "local control" – if you have to run your emails by HCD officials for approval, it would appear we already have.

Politicians were given a clear mandate from voters this past Election Day – we will support you, when you stand up for us. Don't be the Democrats that bungle another opportunity to fight for real affordable housing for us all – please show some political willpower, moral courage and leadership. Don't let your legacy be making San Francisco a city only for millionaires.

Sincerely,

Xoe Watchman
xoewatchman@gmail.com
2008 BALBOA ST
San Francisco, California 94121

From: Andrew Nelson
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Saturday, November 15, 2025 2:10:12 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge your support of the combined amendments of Supervisors Connie Chan and Chyanne Chen to Mayor Lurie's Upzoning Plan, specifically:

Don't Demolish Tenant Homes – Over 45,000 renters are at increased risk of displacement as a result of the Plan's increased incentives to demolish tenant-occupied flats in North Beach, Upper Chinatown, Noe Valley, Buena Vista, the Castro, the Sunset, the Marina and the Richmond. SF Planning confirmed in its original plan analysis that we did not need to redevelop rent-controlled homes to meet our unit count goal. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's common-sense amendment to remove all residential flats from the local plan, knowing we don't need to displace hard-working San Franciscans to build the housing we need.

Protect the Public Waterfront – San Francisco once led the nation with thoughtful and sustainable planning that kept our public coast and bay waterfronts safe from overdevelopment. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's proposed amendment to remove the coastal and waterfront parcels that would be exposed to Trumpian privatization and luxury development. We are not Mar-a-Lago!

Build Real Family-Sized Housing – The mayor's Plan currently has no mandatory unit requirements, but rather offers 2-bedroom units as an "option" for developers. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's proposed amendment to the new density decontrol provisions the mayor put into the plan this year, which incentivize more $4000/month "microunits" – instead of the 2- and 3-bedroom homes families need.

Comply With Housing Element, Preserve PEGs – The unanimously adopted Housing Element was clear: Priority Equity Geographies have already born the brunt of development displacement, and yet the mayor included PEG neighborhoods into his new map. This is not what the Board adopted and approved, with support from community. I support Supervisor Chyanne Chen's proposed amendment to protect the PEGs as previously adopted.

Preserve Our Cultural & Historic Assets – We can build the housing we need without destroying San Francisco's cultural and historic assets. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's amendment to protect historic resources in this plan.

Build the Affordable Housing We Need – The mayor has proposed selling off 27+ public sites, which are critical to the construction of the 46,000 units of affordable housing SF is required to build by 2031. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's proposal to create an Affordable Housing Special Use District to maximize our public land for affordable housing.

While we did not elect the anonymous Sacramento bureaucrats at the HCD, we elected you all to be legislators and policy-makers who will advocate for us to the State and do what's best for SF. The mayor claims our hands are tied and we have to let HCD write our laws or we will lose "local control" – if you have to run your emails by HCD officials for approval, it would appear we already have.

Politicians were given a clear mandate from voters this past Election Day – we will support you, when you stand up for us. Don't be the Democrats that bungle another opportunity to fight for real affordable housing for us all – please show some political willpower, moral courage and leadership. Don't let your legacy be making San Francisco a city only for millionaires.

On a personal note, as residents of North Beach for almost two decades and recent small business owners in the neighborhood, the lack of protections for rent controlled units and small businesses in the mayor's big beautiful family zoning plan keeps my wife and I awake at night. As poets in one of the most important neighborhoods for art and poetry in the world, we will not accept any vision of our neighborhood that prioritizes the financial gain of a few real estate developers over the centuries of culture created by the artists & poets who have made our neighborhood so desirable to developers in the first place.

Sincerely,

Andrew Paul Nelson & Caitlyn Sky Wild
Owner/operators of Golden Sardine
362 Columbus Ave.

Andrew Nelson
afishwithfrogseyes@gmail.com
362 Columbus Ave
San Francisco, California 94133

From: joanneshanahan135@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of joanne shanahan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Saturday, November 15, 2025 1:38:54 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a 4th generation San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and will permanently change the whole feel out our neighborhoods. The one thing k I e always loved about SF is all the totally different neighborhoods we have. You can choose single family houses or downtown vibes.

We ask on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent.

I realize the need for more housing but is building high rises in neighborhoods where there isnt any the right thing to do? I think a scaled back version would better suit the city I live.
Thank you.

Sincerely,
joanne shanahan
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: Madhuri Mudaliar
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Saturday, November 15, 2025 1:18:14 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge your support of the combined amendments of Supervisors Connie Chan and Chyanne Chen to Mayor Lurie's Upzoning Plan, specifically:

Don't Demolish Tenant Homes – Over 45,000 renters are at increased risk of displacement as a result of the Plan's increased incentives to demolish tenant-occupied flats in North Beach, Upper Chinatown, Noe Valley, Buena Vista, the Castro, the Sunset, the Marina and the Richmond. SF Planning confirmed in its original plan analysis that we did not need to redevelop rent-controlled homes to meet our unit count goal. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's common-sense amendment to remove all residential flats from the local plan, knowing we don't need to displace hard-working San Franciscans to build the housing we need.

Protect the Public Waterfront – San Francisco once led the nation with thoughtful and sustainable planning that kept our public coast and bay waterfronts safe from overdevelopment. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's proposed amendment to remove the coastal and waterfront parcels that would be exposed to Trumpian privatization and luxury development. We are not Mar-a-Lago!

Build Real Family-Sized Housing – The mayor's Plan currently has no mandatory unit requirements, but rather offers 2-bedroom units as an "option" for developers. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's proposed amendment to the new density decontrol provisions the mayor put into the plan this year, which incentivize more $4000/month "microunits" – instead of the 2- and 3-bedroom homes families need.

Comply With Housing Element, Preserve PEGs – The unanimously adopted Housing Element was clear: Priority Equity Geographies have already born the brunt of development displacement, and yet the mayor included PEG neighborhoods into his new map. This is not what the Board adopted and approved, with support from community. I support Supervisor Chyanne Chen's proposed amendment to protect the PEGs as previously adopted.

Preserve Our Cultural & Historic Assets – We can build the housing we need without destroying San Francisco's cultural and historic assets. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's amendment to protect historic resources in this plan.

Build the Affordable Housing We Need – The mayor has proposed selling off 27+ public sites, which are critical to the construction of the 46,000 units of affordable housing SF is required to build by 2031. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's proposal to create an Affordable Housing Special Use District to maximize our public land for affordable housing.

While we did not elect the anonymous Sacramento bureaucrats at the HCD, we elected you all to be legislators and policy-makers who will advocate for us to the State and do what's best for SF. The mayor claims our hands are tied and we have to let HCD write our laws or we will lose "local control" – if you have to run your emails by HCD officials for approval, it would appear we already have.

Politicians were given a clear mandate from voters this past Election Day – we will support you, when you stand up for us. Don't be the Democrats that bungle another opportunity to fight for real affordable housing for us all – please show some political willpower, moral courage and leadership. Don't let your legacy be making San Francisco a city only for millionaires.

Sincerely,

Madhuri Mudaliar
mmmudaliar1998@gmail.com
2951 Bush Street
San Francisco , California 94115

From:	Sultan Mirza
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please Retain the 40 Foot Height Limit on our ALLEYS - Russian Hill
Date:	Saturday, November 15, 2025 11:34:48 AM

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

Good morning,

Please Retain the 40 Foot Height Limit on our ALLEYS in historic Russian Hill.

If you allow Six Stories, then Prohibit On Street Parking for new Alley construction.

Thank you,

Sultan Mirza
1218 Green St, San Francisco, CA 94109

From: Ciara Keegan
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Saturday, November 15, 2025 10:32:11 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge your support of the combined amendments of Supervisors Connie Chan and Chyanne Chen to Mayor Lurie's Upzoning Plan, specifically:

Don't Demolish Tenant Homes – Over 45,000 renters are at increased risk of displacement as a result of the Plan's increased incentives to demolish tenant-occupied flats in North Beach, Upper Chinatown, Noe Valley, Buena Vista, the Castro, the Sunset, the Marina and the Richmond. SF Planning confirmed in its original plan analysis that we did not need to redevelop rent-controlled homes to meet our unit count goal. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's common-sense amendment to remove all residential flats from the local plan, knowing we don't need to displace hard-working San Franciscans to build the housing we need.

Protect the Public Waterfront – San Francisco once led the nation with thoughtful and sustainable planning that kept our public coast and bay waterfronts safe from overdevelopment. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's proposed amendment to remove the coastal and waterfront parcels that would be exposed to Trumpian privatization and luxury development. We are not Mar-a-Lago!

Build Real Family-Sized Housing – The mayor's Plan currently has no mandatory unit requirements, but rather offers 2-bedroom units as an "option" for developers. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's proposed amendment to the new density decontrol provisions the mayor put into the plan this year, which incentivize more $4000/month "microunits" – instead of the 2- and 3-bedroom homes families need.

Comply With Housing Element, Preserve PEGs – The unanimously adopted Housing Element was clear: Priority Equity Geographies have already born the brunt of development displacement, and yet the mayor included PEG neighborhoods into his new map. This is not what the Board adopted and approved, with support from community. I support Supervisor Chyanne Chen's proposed amendment to protect the PEGs as previously adopted.

Preserve Our Cultural & Historic Assets – We can build the housing we need without destroying San Francisco's cultural and historic assets. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's amendment to protect historic resources in this plan.

Build the Affordable Housing We Need – The mayor has proposed selling off 27+ public sites, which are critical to the construction of the 46,000 units of affordable housing SF is required to build by 2031. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's proposal to create an Affordable Housing Special Use District to maximize our public land for affordable housing.

While we did not elect the anonymous Sacramento bureaucrats at the HCD, we elected you all to be legislators and policy-makers who will advocate for us to the State and do what's best for SF. The mayor claims our hands are tied and we have to let HCD write our laws or we will lose "local control" – if you have to run your emails by HCD officials for approval, it would appear we already have.

Politicians were given a clear mandate from voters this past Election Day – we will support you, when you stand up for us. Don't be the Democrats that bungle another opportunity to fight for real affordable housing for us all – please show some political willpower, moral courage and leadership. Don't let your legacy be making San Francisco a city only for millionaires.

Sincerely,

Ciara Keegan
ciaraksf@gmail.com
4225 23rd Street
San Francisco, California 94114

From:	terrencemchugh@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Terry McHugh
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 11:30:58 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments: With all the building that has already been approved and in the system, why are we in such a hurry to completely change Dist 4 and parts of Dist 7. People out here paid and are paying to be similar to what it is now. No one wants towers (remember The Pink Palace and Geneva Towers), views blocked, shadows in backyards and all new buildings with no parking.

Sincerely,
Terry McHugh
San Francisco, CA 94116

From:	bettymillermd@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Betty miller Kolotkin
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 11:28:41 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Betty miller Kolotkin

From:	frankblanket@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Derrick Scocchera
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 11:25:22 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

No one who lives in this city wants to spend the next decade or more living in a construction zone with constant noise, pollution, and disruption. All to benefit a few already obscenely wealthy developers, who have proven time and again that they have no interest in affordable housing or the history of this great city. As a 33 year resident of San Francisco, I feel that San Franciscans deserve transparent and accountable planning.

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

Sincerely,
Derrick Scocchera
San Francisco, CA 94133

From:	nayrbgo@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Bryan Sanders
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 11:23:05 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Sincerely,
Bryan Sanders

From: natashjadewolf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Natashja Dewolfe
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 11:21:59 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Natashja Dewolfe
San Francisco, CA 94122

From:	DMacDonald@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Donald MacDonald
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 11:20:43 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:
I live in Pacific Heights and am very concerned about the current blanket approach to upzoning across the city. Specifically the provisions in the current plan to make every corner buildable to 65 feet. I foresee this provision having severely negative, unintended speculative consequences that not only destroy neighborhood character but also adjacent property values. This provision is going to upset everyone!! Another provision which will precipitate highly negative, unintended speculative consequences is increasing the buildable height to 65 feet for the Marina Safeway lot. The Marina Safeway is the only major grocery store with parking for the neighborhood. If this store were to close for redevelopment due to the increased allowable buildable height, the neighborhood would suffer a major amenity loss for which the neighborhood would bear a high, long-term cost and loss of value. Thank you for your consideration of these points of major concern.

Sincerely,
Donald MacDonald
San Francisco, CA 94123

From:	kathygee606@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kathleen Gee
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 11:18:05 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:
Please let the unlicensed understand where and why each supervisor stands on this critical issue

Sincerely,
Kathleen Gee
San Francisco, CA 94118

From:	sflronline@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Herbert F Mintz II
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 11:17:07 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly. This is not right!

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands. Don't let those critical amendments die in committee!

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance. Don't let the HCD hide in the shadows!

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

I have spoken before this BOS committee about the fact that the City's Emergency Firefighting Water System infrastructure does not extend much into its western and southern neighborhoods. That is definitely a public safety issue that needs to be addressed. I still think this issue deserves a hearing before the full BOS.

However, right now give the Chan and Chen amendments the public debate they deserve!

Sincerely,
Herbert F Mintz II
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: llakkis@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lisa Lakkis
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 11:10:45 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:
Blanket up-zoning has never been shown to be an effective means to solve housing shortages. San Francisco is a very beautiful, special city that should be protected and our supervisors and city officials should be fighting to protect it, not signing legislation to destroy it. 14 story buildings have no place being built on streets like Jackson, Broadway, and Pacific. My husband and I have recently relocated from Pittsburgh, PA and are living in a 7 story building on Jackson between Franklin and Gough. A 14 story building would be completely out of place in this neighborhood and would increase traffic, which is already too much and too fast in our residential neighborhood. There are no guarantees in your plan that would even require developers to build so-called "family housing" Random upzoning in inappropriate areas will not help. And to call this a transit corridor is ridiculous. It takes my husband 40 minutes to get to the Caltrain from here every morning. Anyone who thinks we should have 14 story buildings in our neighborhood or that is a transit corridor is not familiar enough with this neighborhood to make these momentous descisions.

Sincerely,
Lisa Lakkis
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: cyssf2003@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Christina Shih
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 11:09:40 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

My addition to this email: I was active in the Engardio recall because his actions severely damaged the quality of life for the western side of SF by the closure of the Great Highway and his obvious allegiance to the anti-car activitists/tech money instead of his constituents. The so called Family Zoning plan is anything BUT a "family" plan with the upzoning that allows the demolition of single family homes, rent controlled units, and small business units. The amendments to limit the PERMANENT potential damage upzoning the "Family" zoning will allow must be included and even more amendments to protect historic buildings, green spaces, views.

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Christina Shih
San Francisco, CA 94121

From:	katmacdphoto@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kathryn MacDonald
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 11:08:40 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Kathryn MacDonald
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: sbackman@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Susan Backman
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 11:08:35 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Susan Backman
San Francisco, CA 94118

From: bilgepump100@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Robert Hall
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 11:06:39 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Robert Hall
San Francisco, CA 94117

From: breall@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sophie Breall
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 11:04:59 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

I'm a long time home owner in Balboa Terrace. While I appreciate the need for more housing, I want height limitations and input into design. Don't make this into Richmond Specials that are hideous and falling apart.

Sincerely,
Sophie Breall
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: susanmackowski@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Susan Mackowski
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 11:04:41 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Susan Mackowski
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: inor@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of R. Zierikzee
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 11:00:49 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Please don't block the amendments. This is a public issue. We want and need HCD to attend these upzoning meetings. Many seniors like myself are struggling just to survive in our current housing. If we were to lose it to upzoning we would become homeless and die. Please have mercy. Thank you.

Sincerely,
R. Zierikzee
San Francisco, CA 94118

From:	aebrooke98@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Audrey Brooke
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 10:59:36 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

I am a lifelong resident of san francisco and I hold dear the communities in our city. I do not want to see the zoning laws changed in the city as it will obviously result in demolishing of buildings, displacing residents and business and raising housing prices. Please consider these common sense amendments to protect the city we love.

Sincerely,
Audrey Brooke
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: uluusurf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of BRETT GOBAR
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 10:59:26 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
BRETT GOBAR
Encinitas, CA 92024

From: noguera@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Hatun Noguera
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 10:44:26 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Hatun Noguera
San Francisco, CA 94127

From:	larry@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Larry Habegger
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 10:40:28 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I cannot make it to the hearing today, but I strongly support the amendments put forward by these two supervisors. Please add them to the resolution to create a more fair housing plan.

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Larry Habegger
San Francisco, CA 94133

From:	acxavier@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Alice Xavier
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 10:40:04 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Sincerely,
Alice Xavier
San Francisco, CA 94122

From:	antenored@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Dennis antenore
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 10:39:26 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Dennis antenore
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: tesw@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Tes Welborn
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 10:36:44 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

I have heard for years that HCD/ABAG/etc. require San Francisco approve some 80,000 new housing units. Yet the state refuses to fund this mandate. And San Francisco has had a declining population for years. So, where is the pressure coming from?? I suspect the real estate industry. San Francisco's Planning Committee should hold a public meeting with HCD to explain their demands and who benefits.

Certainly the small businesses do not - and they are the job creators in San Francisco, not big corporations.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

I have heard for years that HCD/ABAG/etc. require San Francisco approve some 80,000 new housing units. Yet the state refuses to fund this mandate. And San Francisco has had a declining population for years. So, where is the pressure coming from?? I suspect the real estate industry. San Francisco's Planning Committee should hold a public meeting with HCD to explain their demands.

Sincerely,
Tes Welborn
San Francisco, CA 94117

From: evajfortune@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Janice Altobelli
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 10:34:10 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:
Housing that is affordable, below market rate is what is needed,not housing for the rich . We need to maintain residential & commercial property which is already housing & serving the San Francisco residents that currently live & work here. The people of San Francisco absolutely need to have a voice in this what appears to be a land grab which will forever change the city we care for. This has been my neighborhood for over 30 years. Housing & improving the City is wonderful but the ideas that we've been able to see & perhaps will not continue to see seem hasty & Ill conceived. Go back to the drawing board , listen & implement the amendments Supervisor Chan & Chen have proposed & keep meetings with HCD Public . Common sense & careful planning is what we need . This is a city for people if all economic levels, don't shut out the average folks . We live in a city that celebrates diversity, let's maintain that in housing & businesses.. San Francisco is not a playground for the rich.Its for all of us.

Sincerely,
Janice Altobelli
San Francisco, CA 94121

From:	georgesery@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of George Sery
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 10:33:53 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
George Sery

From:	rogerh104@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Roger Hansen
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 10:33:22 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Roger Hansen
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: molliespack@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Leslie Wong
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 10:31:36 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am a born and raised San Franciscan, living in District 1 for 60 years. I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): our city is unique and the current upzonIng plan paved a way to destroying the history, charm and character of our smaller neighborhoods. There are other ways to provide more affordable housing; this will not provide for such. It may increase inventory of new, shiny residences that are not affordable to the working class, eliminate mom and pop businesses, eliminate affordable rentals, and destroy the community and character of our beloved city.

Sincerely,
Leslie Wong
San Francisco, CA 94121

From:	Judi Gorski
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff
Cc:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); Lurie, Daniel (MYR)
Subject:	Land Use and Transportation Meeting, 11/17/25, 1:30 pm - Take No Action on Upzoning Until D4 Has Representation
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 10:30:48 AM

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

To: myrna.melgar@sfgov.org
Chenstaff@sfgov.org
Mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org
John.Carroll@sfgov.org

Cc: Board of Supervisors
daniel.lurie@sfgov.org

From: Judi Gorski, D4 Resident
judigorski@gmail.com

Date: November 17, 2025

Re: Land Use and Transportation Meeting, 11/17/25, 1:30 pm - Take No Action on Upzoning Until D4 Has Representation

Dear Supervisors Melgar, Chen and Mandelman:

This is a request that you please postpone discussing and amending the Family Housing Plan and reschedule it to after the Mayor has appointed a Supervisor for District 4 and after District 4 constituents have had time to meet with their new Supervisor. District 4 wants to be a part of discussions concerning the Housing Plan and suggest amendments to it, but we do not have a representative to speak for us in City Hall yet. Please seriously consider postponing this to a later date. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Judi Gorski
District 4 Resident

From: victoria.giampaoli@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Victoria Giampaoli
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 10:27:18 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Please stop this upzoning it's a horrible idea and ruins the charm of this city. Do not go over 3- 4 stories—- we don't want this place to look like NY. There are tons of vacant buildings and many other areas of the city that this would not affect. Thank for your time.

Sincerely,
Victoria Giampaoli
San Francisco, CA 94123

From:	merlegoldstone2@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Merle Goldstone
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 10:26:36 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Merle Goldstone
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: nhf009@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Nancy Fee
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 10:24:31 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning. Let's protect and preserve what we all love about San Francisco and work together openly and with common sense to meet our actual and projected needs for affordable housing,

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Nancy Fee

From: scarampi@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sebastiano Scarampi
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 10:23:45 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Sebastiano Scarampi
San Francisco, CA 94115

From: scarampi@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sebastiano Scarampi
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 10:23:30 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Sebastiano Scarampi
San Francisco, CA 94115

From: dmscott01@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Diana Scott
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 10:23:13 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress. STOP DESTROYING OUR NEIGHBORHOOD! There are already sufficient units in the pipeline to satisfy state requirements, it's been shown - so move what's been approved, don't destroy and displace to satisfy greed.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Diana Scott
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: gb_andrews@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Gandhia Andrews
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 10:22:22 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountability.

Sup. Melgar, do not block these amendments, please. This is the moment for you to prove you are as you declare, for the middle class and small businesses. Do not give in to the greed of developers and realtors.

Sincerely,
Gandhia Andrews
San Francisco, CA 94132

From:	margaret@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Margaret Bradley-Foley
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 10:21:39 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Margaret Bradley-Foley
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: janrobbins7@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jan Robbins
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 10:21:28 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Jan Robbins

From:	erikafrick111@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Erika Frick
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 10:21:23 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a Nob Hill resident of over 25 years, I am extremely concerned about supervisors going along with upzoning that ruins the beauty of our City, creates condos very few people will ever be able to afford, and ignores common sense approaches like converting vacant office spaces. As well, all rent controlled housing should be preserved.

We’re hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won’t invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Erika Frick
San Francisco, CA 94108

From:	janrobbins7@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jan Robbins
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 10:20:49 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Jan Robbins

From: diana.giampaoli@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of diana giampaoli
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 10:20:43 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS please take into consideration all the empty buildings that could be retrofitted for housing. If you need to build only 4 stories. We are not NY. Quit making these developers your friends richer. This won't house the homeless or low income.

Sincerely,
diana giampaoli
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: acxavier@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Alice Xavier
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 10:20:38 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Dear Mayor Lurie,

As a San Franciscan in D7, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Your upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement !

Sincerely,
Alice Xavier
San Francisco, CA 94122

From:	erin.dress@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Erin Dress
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 10:20:34 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won’t invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Please bring greater transparency to this process so people know what is happening with these changes.

Sincerely,
Erin Dress
San Francisco, CA 94121

From:	koelsch1886@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Leslie Koelsch
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 10:19:29 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Leslie Koelsch

From:	bette_stockton@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Bette Stockton
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 10:19:24 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

My husband and I have been residents of North Beach since 1970 and homeowners on Chestnut St. since 1991. These drastic changes to our neighborhood and other areas of San Francisco will not accomplish the most pressing needs - affordable housing and protection for long term residents under rent control. We are not against building but what is proposed so far is not in the City's best interests. We need accountable planning that is transparent.

Sincerely,
Bette Stockton
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: dmscott01@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Diana Scott
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 10:18:21 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments: The West Side has become a political target for political ambitions - and blocking sensible amendments further insults West Side residents (who have recalled one supervisor for disregarding their input). It's time for the BOS and Supervisor Melgar to respect those residents, and stop caving to wealthy corporate interests, aided by those seeking higher political office.

Sincerely,
Diana Scott
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: mkjanis@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of janis kaempfe
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 10:17:39 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a tenant in District 3 - North Beach I am appalled at this threat to myself and other tenants for continuing to live our apartments. This leaves tenants no recourse to remain in their rent controlled apartments, pushes to demolish buildings and replace them with buildings that only upper income residents can afford and the destruction of small businesses that are the life of our community. This is a move to force middle and lower income residents out of San Francisco!

You must vote against amendments that won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
janis kaempfe
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: hedarobi5@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of David Davies
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 10:17:29 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress

Thank you for hearing me. Thank you for your work. Please fight for low-income people. Please retain the diversity of San Francisco and keep the integrity of our neighborhoods.

Sincerely,
David Davies
San Francisco, CA 94116

From:	cdamkroger@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Courtney Damkroger
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 10:17:29 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning. Support a democratic process!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Courtney Damkroger
San Francisco, CA 94109

From:	randymazzei@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Randall Mazzei
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 10:16:58 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Randall Mazzei
San Francisco, CA 94116

From:	jennkroot@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jennifer Kroot
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 10:16:34 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:
PLEASE DON'T DEMOLISH SF, PRETENDING THAT IT WILL HELP ANYONE BUT DEVELOPERS AND POLITICIANS BACKED BY THEM.
I'm so angry about the power of the developers and real estate interests backing neo lib politicians and creating the mythology that building taller and denser will help unhoused folks and working class people. I know that you are aware that there are over 10k empty units right now and that Airbnb has taken thousands of units as well as the fact that there are tons of empty buildings throughout downtown that could be turned into housing.
Without the Chan/Chen amendments, your plan will displace more low income people. You are only helping developers and people who have the money to get 2nd homes (many of these new units end up being investment property and second homes and so many of them remain empty!!!!!). I'm sure you know this already.
I have a lot more that I'd like to say, but I doubt that you've even read what I've written here.
By the way, I'm a bay area native.

Sincerely,
Jennifer Kroot
San Francisco, CA 94117

From:	liberthson@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Dan Liberthson
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 10:16:23 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Apparently, Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

It is important that the Land Use Committee advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

It is vitally important for the livability of our city that tenants and sound structures be protected. SF should be SF, not Manhattan, which it could become in part if the State's housing mandates are allowed to go forward without reasonable assessment and restraints. San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Sincerely,
Dan Liberthson
San Francisco, CA 94127

From:	hedarobi5@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of David Davies
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 10:15:22 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

If my choice is between the State of California taking over our planning, the builder's remedy, and the Lurie plan, I'll take choose the State.

The Lurie plan might be called the Blackstone Plan as initially it just sets up speculators buy now and get richer when new zoning makes properties more valuable.

Sincerely,
David Davies
San Francisco, CA 94116

From:	marymmoc@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mary OConnell
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 10:15:22 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Mary OConnell
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: leejohnj.lee@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Lee
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 10:13:30 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
John Lee
San Francisco, CA 94127

From:	leejohnj.lee@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Lee
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 10:12:30 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
John Lee
San Francisco, CA 94127

From:	films@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Judy Irving
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 9:55:31 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I can't attend in person because I work. PLEASE advance the proposed Chan and Chen amendments to the full Board. The public needs to see where every Supervisor stands.

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block these amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly. HCD leadership needs to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning. You might think you're doing the right thing by refusing to listen to your constituents, but don't be surprised if lawsuits challenge your decisions.

Sincerely,
Judy Irving
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: EmanuelaEstera@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Emanuela Neagu
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 9:50:01 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Emanuela Neagu
San Francisco, CA 94133

From:	EmanuelaEstera@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Emanuela Neagu
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 9:49:06 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Emanuela Neagu
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: erinaulairedonnelly@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Erin Donnelly
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 9:23:32 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments: City planning's stated intention and goal to protect rent controlled housing needs to be backed up with legislation.
Pass laws that protect all renters in our homes.
Renters are the majority in SF and we will vote only for those who support our rights.
Legislate protections for our vibrant small businesses and our precious coastline.
Support and protect your citizens and our beautiful city and coast from being sold off to the highest bidder and demolished.

Sincerely,
Erin Donnelly
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: marilee@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Marilee Gaffney
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 9:05:33 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Sincerely,
Marilee Gaffney
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: pmulholl@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Patrice Mulholland
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 8:54:33 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families who work in the city but cannot live here due to the high rents. Some of these workers make $70-75 annually. The city does not need more luxury apartments.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Let's keep San Francisco affordable and beautiful.

Sincerely,
Patrice Mulholland
San Francisco, CA 94133

From:	tia.lombardi@gmail.com
To:	Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS)
Cc:	Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject:	San Francisco Heritage Letter of Support
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 11:46:54 AM
Attachments:	SFHeritage-SUPPORT-Chan-Amendments.pdf

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

Dear Supervisors Melgar, Chen, Mahmood, and Chan:

Please accept San Francisco's letter of support for Supervisor Chan's proposed amendments to the Family Zoning Plan.

Thank you!

Tia Lombardi
San Francisco Heritage, Board Member

Sent from my iPhone

SF HERITAGE
www.sfheritage.org
2007 FRANKLIN STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94109
415 441 3000

November 12, 2025

Chair Myrna Melgar, Supervisors Chyanne Chen and Bilal Mahmood
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Land Use and Transportation Committee
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

RE: SUPPORT FOR SUPERVISOR CHAN'S AMENDMENTS
November 17, 2025 - Land Use and Transportation Committee Agenda "Family Zoning Plan"

Dear Chair Melgar and Supervisors Chen and Mahmood:

On behalf of our citywide constituency, San Francisco Heritage submits our strong support for Supervisor Chan's proposed amendments, consistent with the adopted Housing Element, for the treatment of historic resources in the Family Zoning Plan as set forth File No. 251073 as follows:

> On Page 12, Lines 13-24; and Page 30, Lines 17-25: "or substantially alter a historic resource that is: designated as a landmark or listed as a contributor to or located within a historic district under Article 10; listed as a Significant or Contributory Building under Article 11; listed in the California Register of Historical Resources or the National Register of Historic Places; identified in an adopted survey or historic context statement as potentially eligible for individual listing in the California Register of Historical Resources or the National Register of Historic Places; or, located within an historic district that is listed in, or identified in an adopted survey or historic context statement as potentially eligible for listing in, the California Register of Historical Resources or the National Register of Historic Places;

The current Family Zoning Plan includes significantly greater impacts to designated and potentially eligible historic and cultural resources than anticipated by the 2022 Housing Element and the certified Environmental Impact Report (EIR). Absent Supervisor Chan's proposed amendments, we believe that a Supplemental Environmental Impact Report ("SEIR"), rather than the Addendum, is warranted to analyze the Family Zoning Plan's impacts to San Francisco's historic and cultural resources.

We have appreciated the attention given by and our conversations with Mayor Lurie and President Mandelman on how we can address protections for historic resources in the Family Zoning Plan. Supervisor Chan's proposal conforms with standard historic preservation practices, and we believe offers the best path forward to ensure San Francisco's special places are preserved in our changing and growing city.

Sincerely,



Woody LaBounty
President & CEO
wlabounty@sfheritage.org

From:	Judi Gorski
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff
Cc:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); Lurie, Daniel (MYR)
Subject:	Land Use and Transportation Meeting, 11/17/25, 1:30 pm - Take No Action on Upzoning Until D4 Has Representation
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 10:30:58 AM

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

To: myrna.melgar@sfgov.org
Chenstaff@sfgov.org
Mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org
John.Carroll@sfgov.org

Cc: Board of Supervisors
daniel.lurie@sfgov.org

From: Judi Gorski, D4 Resident
judigorski@gmail.com

Date: November 17, 2025

Re: Land Use and Transportation Meeting, 11/17/25, 1:30 pm - Take No Action on Upzoning Until D4 Has Representation

Dear Supervisors Melgar, Chen and Mandelman:

This is a request that you please postpone discussing and amending the Family Housing Plan and reschedule it to after the Mayor has appointed a Supervisor for District 4 and after District 4 constituents have had time to meet with their new Supervisor. District 4 wants to be a part of discussions concerning the Housing Plan and suggest amendments to it, but we do not have a representative to speak for us in City Hall yet. Please seriously consider postponing this to a later date. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Judi Gorski
District 4 Resident

From: Sam Woodworth
To: Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject: One Last Chance to Stop the Destruction of San Francisco
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 10:27:25 AM

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

Supervisors,

Today is your chance to stop the destruction of San Francisco and avoid a legacy of infamy and ignominy that will endure for many decades to come. Over and over you've heard overwhelmingly from residents and business associations that neither the people of San Francisco nor the millions of tourists who undergird the city's economy are interested in walls of monolithic condo towers obliterating treasured public vistas, blocking out the sun, generating wind tunnels, displacing tenants and small businesses, and irreparably destroying the unique and world-class beauty of San Francisco -- all so that luxury developers and wealthy landowners can line their pockets.

The developer lobby wants you to believe that upzoning will promote affordability, but that argument has been thoroughly debunked, including by the Federal Reserve Bank-SF. https://www.frbsf.org/research-and-insights/publications/working-papers/2025/03/supply-constraints-do-not-explain-house-price-and-quantity-growth-across-u-s-cities/. Even the city's *own analysis* shows that this argument is a steaming pile of manure. https://newspack-missionlocal.s3.amazonaws.com/mission/wp-content/uploads/2025/10/250700_economic_impact_final.pdf

Will you stand with the people of San Francisco, or with developers, speculators, and the future buyers of luxury condos? Find the backbone to say "no" to this generationally short-sighted and catastrophic mistake. You are not powerless. The current plan drastically over-zones relative to State mandates and fails to count huge recent increases in zoned capacity. The City is not required to capitulate and should take the State to court if necessary.

At a bare minimum, support the Chan and Chen amendments, and require HCD to be present as you debate whether to drive a stake through the heart of San Francisco.

Thank you,
Sam Woodworth
Homeowner, Russian Hill

From: George Wooding
To: Carroll, John (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); George Wooding
Subject: 250966, 250700, 250701 written testimony for November 17, 2025 Land Use and Transportation
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 8:51:15 AM

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

Hi John, Please consider this my written testimony. I hope that all is well with you. Please consider me a disabled person and place me in front of the line

November 16, 2025

Dear Land Use and Transportation committee members.
Melgar, Chen and Mahmood,

Supervisor Connie Chan's amendments are vital for the mayor's family plan to succeed.

Vote No on the Mayor's failed Family Housing plan.

What happened to the "affordable housing" mandates? They have disappeared.

Here is what the Planning Department's new report, "Rezoning Capacity Calculations," doesn't say: under San Francisco's state-approved Housing Element, **57% of those new homes—more than 20,000 units—must be affordable** to low- and very-low-income households. That's not a suggestion; it's part of the state mandate.

The Family Zoning Plan has no funding strategy, no framework for public land, and no realistic plan to produce those affordable homes. It risks satisfying Sacramento's procedural checklist while abandoning the substance of the law: to build housing for the people who need it most. The city is relying completely on developers, grants, GOBs and subsidized funding from the MOHCD.

WHY WASN'T SAN FRANCISCO' CHIEF ECONOMIST CONSULTED ON AFFORDABLE HOUSING?

The balance between supply and demand

San Francisco Politicians and planners don't understand economics. They believe that if they build more units, the price of housing will decrease. This is not true in San Francisco due to market conditions.

Building more houses may not lower prices if there is a simultaneous increase in demand, or if sellers are unwilling to sell for less, a phenomenon known as "
downside stickiness". Other factors like high mortgage rates, rising construction costs, and localized market dynamics can also offset the downward pressure on prices that new supply would typically create.

In a basic economic model, increased supply would lead to lower prices if demand remains constant. However, a parallel increase in demand can keep prices stable or even cause them to rise, despite the new houses.

Rising demand: Population growth, wage increases, favorable

demographic trends, or an influx of institutional investors can drive up demand, absorbing new inventory as it enters the market.

Pent-up demand: In areas that have historically restricted development, a sudden increase in construction can be absorbed by years of pent-up demand, causing prices to plateau rather than fall.

The main cause of higher house prices in SF is the cost of land. Buildable Land is becoming so scarce that only Subsidized affordable housing will be built. The cost of affordable housing will continue to rise

Substitutions and proposed amendments On September 30, a new version of number 250700 was substituted by Mayor Lurie, which made relatively minor zoning changes on a number of parcels. The report analysis reflects those changes

On October 21, supervisor Melgar proposed an amendment that would prohibit the use of the local program on any parcel containing more than two existing housing units which would involve the demolition of a unit subject to rent control

Also, on October 21, supervisor Sauter introduced an amendment that creates incentives for developers to replace lost commercial space As the language of these two amendments were made public last week this report does not attempt to model there economic impact.

-developers are not building due to high land costs and the scarcity of buildable land, high interest rates and high construction costs

-There are almost no grants. Despite best efforts, The Mayors Office Of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD) is currently underfunded and has little ability to subsidize low-income housing in San Francisco.

The dearth of affordable housing was predictable.

-The CPC is currently not trying to attain more housing funding:

Affordable Housing General Obligation Bond (Prop A):
Approval: On March 5, 2024, San Francisco voters approved Proposition A, a $300 million bond to finance the construction, acquisition, and rehabilitation of affordable housing. The funding is on its first tranche--$147.2M

2019 Affordable Housing GOB ($600 million). Approximately $175.9 million remains outstanding, with a final issuance under consideration for late 2025. $55M is being held for the Mercy Housing build beside Laguna Honda Hospital for a senior center.

Voter approval is required: Parcel taxes are special taxes that require voter approval to be enacted. They are not tied to the value of your property.

Mayor Lurie and the MTC are also working on a Parcel tax that will generate $85M - $250M annually for eleven to 14 years. The parcel tax will be almost exclusively on property owners with little passthrough to renters, 2/3rds of SF residents are renters. This parcel tax needs a (50% + 1) citizens vote to pass on November, 2026. This tax is certain to pass.

AMENDMENT LANGUAGE

-Furthering demolition controls to protect tenants. Absolutely. Please don't forget to protect the landlords.

-Implementing Nexus studies and impact fees to ensure adequate infrastructure investment, especially given the fact the city is facing existing funding challenges to build out the emergency water firefighting system for well -resourced neighborhoods, a deficit in public transit, an increased risk of tenant and small business displacement;

The West side EWSS project is already corrupted. The City no

longer wants to build Kaboda piping for high water pressure. Cisterns allow 100 to 250 psi. Kaboda piping remains constant at 300 psi.The fire department is now building large cisterns filled with water and they are also purchasing pump trucks that will connect to other pump tracks. This will allow the fire department to purchase more fire trucks. The cisterns will be attached to the pump trucks which have a limited range. The Kubota piping would have been a much better delivery system but the fire department wanted the trucks. The West side of San Francisco is more in danger of burning than ever before.

The requested reports would be a great idea

-The Mayor's Family Plan does not require developers to build or fix infrastructure. The City will bear the full cost of repairs. This is wrong. The developer should bare the costs of their own project.

-Placing a shot clock to require developers to build within 30 months to boost housing production in the near future to meet the state mandated timeline of 2031; The Planning Department already has 70,000 stored at planning

Factors that influence review time

- **Project complexity:** The scope and size of a project are major factors in the review timeline. Simple projects may be approved more quickly "over the counter," while complex projects may involve multiple reviews and public hearings.
- **Other reviewing agencies:** Building permits must be reviewed by multiple city departments for safety and code compliance. A permit can be sent back to Planning for another review if changes are made to the plans.
- **Permit type:** The type of permit being applied for, such as a building permit, coastal zone permit, or variance, all have

different review processes and timeframes.

- **Application completeness:** Incomplete applications can significantly delay the review process. An application can go through multiple rounds of resubmissions before being accepted for review

LIMITING FORM BASED DENSITY:

Density decontrol is central to the Mayors' family zoning plan. This is the worst type of density planning. A developer can now add as many residential units as they want too. An eight story building can Have thirty units or only one unit. Density decontrol was added to the Mayor's family zoning plan so that San Francisco would have more units then SB 79. This will be uncontrolled density. The city will not stop this program as San Francisco planning is desperate not to be controlled by the state of California

"Density decontrol" was a core component of the initial "**Family "Zoning Plan** legislation introduced by Mayor Daniel Lurie at the Board of Supervisors on **June 24, 2025**.
The concept of density decontrol, which removes unit limits while maintaining existing height and form restrictions, was part of the plan from its formal introduction as legislation, and was also included in earlier draft proposals developed by the Planning Department under former Mayor London Breed. The legislation is currently under consideration by the Board of Supervisors.

"Form-based density" is not an inherently negative planning concept; rather, **specific implementations of form-based codes (FBCs) may face criticisms related to how density is managed, or some residents may object to the very idea of increased density** which FBCs often facilitate.
Common criticisms or perceived negative aspects related to form-based

codes and density include:

- **Community Opposition to Increased Density:** A primary objection from some local residents is that FBCs "promote density and population increases to the detriment of locals" or conflict with an existing "small-town feel". The perception of form-based codes mandating high density can lead to community pushback during the adoption process.
- **Potential for Gentrification:** By creating highly desirable, walkable communities, FBCs can inadvertently result in new developments that sell or rent at a premium, potentially pricing out lower-income residents if affordable housing provisions are not included in the code.
- **Complexity and Administration Challenges:** Form-based codes can be more complex to write and administer than conventional Euclidean zoning, requiring specialized training for planners and staff to interpret design standards objectively. This complexity can lead to confusion, increased review times, or a greater need for variances if the code is not carefully written.
- **"Locking in" Undesirable Existing Forms:** If a form-based code is based strictly on the current urban fabric of an area, it might inadvertently "lock in" low-density, car-dependent patterns, making it harder to densify those areas later if needed to address housing shortages or promote sustainability.
- **Ignoring Market Realities:** Critics sometimes argue that FBCs are overly prescriptive or ignore market demands, although proponents argue that market studies are often a key component of a well-crafted FBC. In some cases, a local market may not be able to support the specific mixed-use or retail components called for in the code.
- **Loss of Perceived "Local Control":** FBCs often streamline the approval process by making projects that meet the code "by-right" (administrative review without public hearings), which some residents or community groups may see as a reduction in public

participation and control over individual projects

There should be an amendment for form based density, but San Francisco well never pass this amendment.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,

George Wooding

415 695-1393

From:	D M LaPointe
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS)
Cc:	Wtpcc Delegates; Wtpcc Officers; Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Segal, Ned (MYR); Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC); Tanner, Rachael (CPC); Farrah, Michael (BOS)
Subject:	Family Zoning - continue item
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 8:33:06 AM
Attachments:	11-17 LU Hearing - WTPCC.docx

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

Please find attached a letter of concern from WTPCC on the Family Zoning Plan.

--
Denise M. LaPointe
President
WTPCC

West of Twin Peaks Central Council
A Resource for Neighborhood Organizations West of Twin Peaks in San Francisco since 1936

WTPCC

PO Box 27112
San Francisco, CA 94127
http://www.westoftwinpeaks.org/

November 17, 2025

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Land Use and Transportation Committee
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Chair Melgar and Members of the Land Use and Transportation Committee:

The West of Twin Peaks Central Council represents some of San Francisco's most longstanding and community-driven neighborhoods - places shaped over generations by residents who invested time, resources, and civic energy into making them safe, livable, and environmentally functioning. These neighborhoods work because they reflect thoughtful neighborhood stewardship, stable planning patterns, and infrastructure-supported growth.

The proposed Family Zoning Plan disregards that history. It subjects these neighborhoods to an extreme, ideology-driven experiment that ignores infrastructure limits, discards long-established planning principles, and threatens to permanently destabilize the Westside - all without delivering real affordability or meeting any demonstrated planning need.

At the same time, District 4 - ground zero for many of these proposed changes - currently lacks stable representation. Advancing a sweeping rezoning that disproportionately targets District 4 without its elected voice at the table is not only unjust; it violates the basic expectations of fairness and transparency that residents deserve from their government.

WTPCC has been firm and consistent: density decontrol does not belong in San Francisco's interior neighborhoods. It is unnecessary, it is harmful, and it is being directed intentionally at stable homeowner areas precisely because they have been successful.

SB 79 already imposes the largest mandatory rezoning the Westside has ever faced. This new state law forces dramatic, by-right density increases along major corridor - including Ocean Avenue, West Portal Avenue, and Sloat Boulevard - regardless of local concerns, transit capacity, or neighborhood conditions. These state mandates alone will accelerate teardown pressure, intensify construction, strain emergency response and school capacity, and overwhelm transit and utility systems that are already stretched thin.

The severity of SB 79 is not theoretical. Its impacts are imminent and unavoidable.

Recent representations from City Hall suggesting that the Family Zoning Plan is "better than SB 79," or that it must be passed for San Francisco to be exempt from SB 79's requirements, are simply not accurate. The exemption window created by SB 79 is temporary and expires in 2032 regardless of whether the Family Zoning Plan passes. In other words, the City will not avoid SB 79 by adopting an aggressive, citywide rezoning - state law

will still apply. What the Family Zoning Plan does is impose an additional, discretionary upzoning *on top of* SB 79, not in place of it.

Given the scale of these mandatory state changes, the City's choice to add an additional, discretionary layer of density decontrol in stable residential neighborhoods that SB 79 *does not* touch is unreasonable and heavy-handed. No planning rationale - not housing production, not compliance, not affordability - justifies piling a second wave of deregulation on top of a state mandate that is already transformative.

This is not responsible planning. It is punitive policymaking directed at long-established homeowner neighborhoods for ideological reasons, not practical ones.

Additional density decontrol would:

- Invite speculative teardowns and irreversible conversions
- Displace long-time families and erode community stability
- Reduce predictability for homeowners and property owners
- Undermine a century of intentional neighborhood planning
- Deliver no meaningful affordability or equity outcomes

Protecting historic resources and the architectural fabric of the Westside is essential to maintaining San Francisco's identity and livability. WTPCC neighborhoods include coherent planning patterns and intact early- and mid-century homes that embody the architectural fabric of the western neighborhoods. The Family Zoning Plan provides no meaningful safeguards against the permanent loss of these irreplaceable assets.

Infrastructure realities cannot be dismissed. The Westside already faces:

- Overloaded and unreliable transit
- Congested streets and inadequate traffic management
- Aging water and sewer systems never designed for unlimited growth
- Emergency response stretched thin across large geographic areas
- Schools operating at or beyond capacity

To assume that infrastructure will "catch up later" is not planning - it is negligence. Growth must follow infrastructure, not race ahead of it.

The City must also demand transparency from HCD. Conflicting and inflated capacity assumptions cannot be used to justify unnecessary upzoning. The City should:

- Seek an extension from HCD
- Require all compliance guidance to be made public
- Ensure the City is not pressured into upzoning beyond what state law actually requires

San Franciscans deserve honest planning - not shifting numbers used to justify a predetermined outcome.

For generations, WTPCC neighborhoods have served as anchors for San Francisco's middle-class and homeowner stability. They are not barriers to progress. They are the communities that make San Francisco livable, attractive, and sustainable.

We urge the Committee to take corrective action:

- Remove density decontrol from the Family Zoning Plan
- Restore meaningful protections for historic and architectural resources
- Address infrastructure deficits *before* approving any significant rezoning
- Seek an HCD extension and demand transparent guidance
- Guarantee full District 4 representation before advancing any westside upzoning

San Francisco can meet its housing goals without sacrificing the livability, architectural fabric, and stability of the West of Twin Peaks neighborhoods. We ask you to protect these neighborhoods and the families-homeowners and tenants alike-who have sustained them for generations.

Sincerely,
Denise LaPointe
President, West of Twin Peaks Central Council

Cc: Mayor Daniel Lurie

Supervisor Rafael Mandelman and Board of Supervisors

Ned Segal, Chief of Housing and Economic Development, City and County of San Francisco

Sarah Dennis Phillips, Planning Director

WTPCC Delegates

From:	Nick Ferris
To:	Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS)
Cc:	Chan, Connie (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Re: Support for Chan and Chen Amendments to the Family Zoning Plan Land Use and Transportation Committee Agenda Items 4-7, November 17, 2025
Date:	Monday, November 17, 2025 8:24:16 AM
Attachments:	THD LUC Upzoning Plan 11.17.25.pdf

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

My apologies. I am adding correct email for President Mandelman.

Nick Ferris
President, Telegraph Hill Dwellers

On Mon, Nov 17, 2025 at 8:15 AM Nick Ferris <nicholashferris@gmail.com> wrote:

> Dear President Mandelman, Chair Melgar, and Members of the Land Use and Transportation Committee,
>
> The Telegraph Hill Dwellers (THD) continues to oppose the proposed Family Zoning Plan ("Upzoning Plan"), but we implore you to adopt the amendments offered by Supervisors Chan and Chen that will help to prevent the displacement of tenants and small businesses and provide a plan for development of the 100% affordable housing we so desperately need. We also continue to urge the Committee and Board of Supervisors to reverse the inclusion of Telegraph Hill, North Beach, and the Northern Waterfront in the Upzoning Plan, which was not contemplated in the 2022 Housing Element or Mayor Breed's zoning proposal.
>
> **President Mandelman, we urge you to please schedule a "Committee of the Whole" to consider all of the proposed amendments.** We are concerned that the Land Use and Transportation Committee may consider tabling and killing the Chan and Chen amendments in committee. We hope not. But, if so, you will have abdicated your responsibility to the democratic process. The full Board of Supervisors deserves a chance to consider these amendments. And, the public deserves to know where each supervisor stands.
>
> In any event, a vote to approve the Upzoning Plan is premature until you have full analysis and clarity on the implications of SB 79 for the Upzoning Plan, not just the 5-page fact-sheet summary prepared by the Planning Department.
>
> If you move forward with this Upzoning Plan, please adopt the following amendments:
>
> 1. **Approve Supervisors Chan's and Chen's Proposed Amendments:**
> - **Exclude all historic resources,** including local historic districts and those eligible for the California and National Registers, from the Upzoning Plan (Chan File No. 251073).
> - **Exclude All Existing Residential Units, including all rent-controlled units** from the Upzoning Plan (Chan File No. 251073).
> - **Remove the Planning Equity Geography Special Use District** ("PEG SUD") from the Upzoning Plan (Chen File No. 251071).
> - **Remove the Coastal Zone** from the Upzoning Plan (Chan File No. 251071).

- **Remove Form-Based Density in the Base Zoning in All Districts** (Chan File No. 251073).
- **Adopt a Progress Requirement** for obtaining a building permit within a time certain of project approval – "Use it or Lose It" (Chan File No. 251073)
- **Require Inclusionary Affordable Housing Within 1⁄2 Mile** of the development (Chan File No. 251073).

2. Amend Supervisor Melgar's Legislation to Remove All Rent-Controlled Housing
We appreciate Supervisor Melgar's amendment removing rent-controlled housing with three or more units but urge her to expand this amendment to exclude **all** rent-controlled housing with two or more units, not just three or more.

3. Approve Supervisor Chan's Legacy Business Controls
THD joins with Small Business Forward to support Supervisor Chan's legislation to extend the requirement for a Conditional Use Authorization for sites where a Legacy Business has been displaced. In absence of having any other tools available or financial resources to support the successful relocation of a Legacy Business within the community, the Conditional Use is an imperfect but necessary mechanism to discourage displacement of Legacy Businesses in the first place. That is why Small Business Forward supports the extension of the CU legislation until other more effective protection measures are in place, such as commercial rent control, the right of return, and adequate relocation assistance.

4. Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District and Funding Strategy.
We join with REP-SF and the Council of Community Housing Organizations (CCHO) to demand that the SFMTA-SUD be revised to provide that these publicly owned parcels be developed for 100% affordable and social housing. Under San Francisco's state-approved Housing Element, as mandated by the state, 57% of the 36,200 new housing units proposed to be developed under the Upzoning Plan—more than 20,000 units—must be affordable to low- and very-low-income households. Yet the Upzoning Plan has no funding strategy or realistic plan to produce those affordable homes. It risks satisfying Sacramento's procedural checklist while abandoning the substance of the law: to build housing for the people who need it most.

5. Remove North Beach, Telegraph Hill, and the Northern Waterfront from the Upzoning Plan.
THD continues to strongly oppose the late inclusion in the Upzoning Plan of major portions of Telegraph Hill, North Beach, and the Northern Waterfront, areas that were not included in the 2022 Adopted Housing Element ("2022 Housing Element") or considered in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR). These areas represent one of the densest neighborhoods in San Francisco, with roughly 82% of our residents currently living in existing pre-1979 multi-family, rent-controlled buildings housing our City's workforce and seniors, including a large immigrant Asian population. Based on the City's profiles of neighborhoods in San Francisco, there are **37,156** people per square mile in North Beach as compared to **17,325** people per square mile in San Francisco. The Planning Department's own data shows that rent-controlled buildings in District 3 (built before 1979 with 2+ units, excluding condos) represent approximately 32,340 individual units, 13,983 of which are located in the current version of the Upzoning Plan. **In other words, tenants occupying 13,983 units will be subject to potential eviction and displacement.**

And, although the 2022 Housing Element and EIR assumed that the Northeast Planning

District would provide net new housing units of only *800 units* by 2050, the Upzoning Plan suddenly increased that figure to *5,900 units*, a stunning *650% increase*. This is a far greater percentage increase than any other area in the City. The height and density increases represented by this increase will significantly impact existing tenants, small businesses, historic resources, parks and open spaces, and the diverse culture of District 3.

* * * * * * * *

In conclusion, THD believes that the Upzoning Plan, as proposed, threatens tenants and small businesses, pits neighborhoods against each other, and disregards decades of community-based policymaking that has built San Francisco into a resilient, vibrant city through a network of strong neighborhoods.

The proposed amendments from Supervisors Chan and Chen address these concerns by focusing on protecting tenants and rent-controlled housing citywide, supporting small businesses, and prioritizing the development of affordable housing. We urge this Committee to move these critical elements forward.

Sincerely,
Nick Ferris, President

November 16, 2025
Via Email

President Rafael Mandelman and
Members of the Land Use and Transportation Committee
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Rafael Mandelman – *Rafael.Mandleman@sfgov.org*
Myrna Melgar, Chair - *Myrna.Melgar@sfgov.org*
Chyanne Chen, Vice-Chair - *Chyanne.Chen@sfgov.org*
Bilal Mahmood, Member - *Bilal.Mahmood@sfgov.org*

RE: Support for Chan and Chen Amendments to the Family Zoning Plan
Land Use and Transportation Committee Agenda Items 4-7, November 17, 2025

Dear President Mandelman, Chair Melgar, and Members of the Land Use and Transportation Committee,

The Telegraph Hill Dwellers (THD) continues to oppose the proposed Family Zoning Plan ("Upzoning Plan"), but we implore you to adopt the amendments offered by Supervisors Chan and Chen that will help to prevent the displacement of tenants and small businesses and provide a plan for development of the 100% affordable housing we so desperately need. We also continue to urge the Committee and Board of Supervisors to reverse the inclusion of Telegraph Hill, North Beach, and the Northern Waterfront in the Upzoning Plan, which was not contemplated in the 2022 Housing Element or Mayor Breed's zoning proposal.

President Mandelman, we urge you to please schedule a "Committee of the Whole" to consider all of the proposed amendments. We are concerned that the Land Use and Transportation Committee may consider tabling and killing the Chan and Chen amendments in committee. We hope not. But, if so, you will have abdicated your responsibility to the democratic process. The full Board of Supervisors deserves a chance to consider these amendments. And, the public deserves to know where each supervisor stands.

In any event, a vote to approve the Upzoning Plan is premature until you have full analysis and clarity on the implications of SB 79 for the Upzoning Plan, not just the 5-page fact-sheet summary prepared by the Planning Department.

If you move forward with this Upzoning Plan, please adopt the following amendments:

1. **Approve Supervisors Chan's and Chen's Proposed Amendments:**

    - **Exclude all historic resources**, including local historic districts and those eligible for the California and National Registers, from the Upzoning Plan (Chan File No. 251073).

    - **Exclude All Existing Residential Units, including all rent-controlled units** from the Upzoning Plan (Chan File No. 251073).

- **Remove the Planning Equity Geography Special Use District** ("PEG SUD") from the Upzoning Plan (Chen File No. 251071).
- **Remove the Coastal Zone** from the Upzoning Plan (Chan File No. 251071).
- **Remove Form-Based Density in the Base Zoning in All Districts** (Chan File No. 251073).
- **Adopt a Progress Requirement** for obtaining a building permit within a time certain of project approval – "*Use it or Lose It*" (Chan File No. 251073)
- **Require Inclusionary Affordable Housing Within ½ Mile** of the development (Chan File No. 251073).

2. **Amend Supervisor Melgar's Legislation to Remove All Rent-Controlled Housing**

We appreciate Supervisor Melgar's amendment removing rent-controlled housing with three or more units but urge her to expand this amendment to exclude ***all*** rent-controlled housing with two or more units, not just three or more.

3. **Approve Supervisor Chan's Legacy Business Controls**

THD joins with Small Business Forward to support Supervisor Chan's legislation to extend the requirement for a Conditional Use Authorization for sites where a Legacy Business has been displaced. In absence of having any other tools available or financial resources to support the successful relocation of a Legacy Business within the community, the Conditional Use is an imperfect but necessary mechanism to discourage displacement of Legacy Businesses in the first place. That is why Small Business Forward supports the extension of the CU legislation until other more effective protection measures are in place, such as commercial rent control, the right of return, and adequate relocation assistance.

4. **Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District and Funding Strategy.**

We join with REP-SF and the Council of Community Housing Organizations (CCHO) to demand that the SFMTA-SUD be revised to provide that these publicly owned parcels be developed for 100% affordable and social housing. Under San Francisco's state-approved Housing Element, as mandated by the state, 57% of the 36,200 new housing units proposed to be developed under the Upzoning Plan—more than 20,000 units—must be affordable to low- and very-low-income households. Yet the Upzoning Plan has no funding strategy or realistic plan to produce those affordable homes. It risks satisfying Sacramento's procedural checklist while abandoning the substance of the law: to build housing for the people who need it most.

5. **Remove North Beach, Telegraph Hill, and the Northern Waterfront from the Upzoning Plan.**

THD continues to strongly oppose the late inclusion in the Upzoning Plan of major portions of Telegraph Hill, North Beach, and the Northern Waterfront, areas that were not included in the 2022 Adopted Housing Element ("2022 Housing Element") or considered in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR). These areas represent one of the densest neighborhoods in San Francisco, with roughly 82% of our residents currently living in existing pre-1979 multi-family, rent-controlled buildings housing our City's workforce and seniors, including a large immigrant Asian population. Based on the City's profiles of neighborhoods in San Francisco, there are **37,156** people per square mile in North Beach as compared to **17,325** people per square mile in San Francisco.[1] The Planning Department's own data shows that rent-controlled buildings in District 3 (built before 1979 with 2+ units, excluding condos) represent approximately 32,340 individual units, 13,983 of which are located in the current version of the Upzoning Plan. **In other words, tenants occupying 13,983 units will be subject to potential eviction and displacement.**

And, although the 2022 Housing Element and EIR assumed that the Northeast Planning District would provide net new housing units of only *800 units* by 2050, the Upzoning Plan suddenly increased that figure to *5,900 units*, a stunning *650% increase*. This is a far greater percentage increase than any other area in the City. The height and density increases represented by this increase will significantly impact existing tenants, small businesses, historic resources, parks and open spaces, and the diverse culture of District 3.

* * * * * * * *

In conclusion, THD believes that the Upzoning Plan, as proposed, threatens tenants and small businesses, pits neighborhoods against each other, and disregards decades of community-based policymaking that has built San Francisco into a resilient, vibrant city through a network of strong neighborhoods.

The proposed amendments from Supervisors Chan and Chen address these concerns by focusing on protecting tenants and rent-controlled housing citywide, supporting small businesses, and prioritizing the development of affordable housing. We urge this Committee to move these critical elements forward.

Sincerely,

Nick Ferris, President

ccs: Supervisor Connie Chan – *connie.chan@sfgov.org*
Clerk John Carroll - *John.Carroll@sfgov.org*
Members, San Francisco Board of Supervisors - *Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org*

[1] https://www.city-data.com/neighborhood/North-Beach-San-Francisco-CA.html

From:	lgpetty
To:	MelgarStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff
Cc:	Carroll, John (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; mahmoudstaff@sfgov.org; Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject:	All Tenant Protection Ordinance Amendments Require Due Deliberation
Date:	Saturday, November 15, 2025 5:33:13 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I write in support of Supervisor Cheyanne Chen's Tenant Protection Ordinance and to urge you not to "disappear" all the other amendments to it that have been proposed by Supervisors Chan and Chen.

In our democracy (yes we still have one) every serious proposal deserves serious consideration in a fair hearing and open decision process.

The public are entitled to know about all of the TPO amendment proposals -- in clear words, and in full. They are entitled to time and opportunity to examine them freely. People are entitled to express their opinions on them -- softly in writing; loudly in public. And, not least of all, the public are entitled to know the position of each of their representatives on each of the proposals.

Or has San Francisco fallen into an elitist shadow world where electeds get to ignore proposed legislation that might help the people, and hide the proposals so deeply that the people are forever denied them?

San Francisco government must not operate in secret.

Would any Supervisor take away the People's basic rights? For what reason? For "efficiency"? For political advantage? For monetary gain? For misguided fear of higher government reprisal? Or just because some can't stand the "noise" in a noisy, messy democracy?

I'll be delighted if you prove San Francisco is indeed still a democracy by giving all the Chan and Chen TPO amendments a full airing.

Lorraine Petty

-For Affordable Housing.
-Against Demolition of Sound Residential Housing.
-D2/5 Voter.

From:	Sharon Ng
To:	Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS)
Cc:	Carroll, John (BOS); Rosa Chen
Subject:	Re: Family Zoning Plan (Board File #250966, 250700, 251071, 250701, 251073)
Date:	Friday, November 14, 2025 1:54:45 PM
Attachments:	CCDC Land Use & Transportation Committee FZP Letter 11.17.2025.pdf

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

(Including the attachment here)

Sharon Ng
Community Planner | Planning and Policy Team
Pronouns: *she/her/hers*
Chinatown Community Development Center
615 Grant Avenue | San Francisco, CA | 94108

From: Sharon Ng
Sent: Friday, November 14, 2025 1:51 PM
To: Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; bilal.mahmood@sfgov.org <bilal.mahmood@sfgov.org>; chyanne.chen@sfgov.org <chyanne.chen@sfgov.org>
Cc: john.carroll@sfgov.org <john.carroll@sfgov.org>; Rosa Chen <rosa.chen@chinatowncdc.org>
Subject: Family Zoning Plan (Board File #250966, 250700, 251071, 250701, 251073)

Dear Supervisors and Clerk Carroll,

Please see CCDC's letter attached on the Family Zoning Plan scheduled for the November 17th Land Use and Transportation hearing, and please let us know if you have any questions or comments.

Thank you!
Sharon

Sharon Ng
Community Planner | Planning and Policy Team
Pronouns: *she/her/hers*
Chinatown Community Development Center
615 Grant Avenue | San Francisco, CA | 94108

Chinatown Community Development Center
華協中心
615 Grant Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94108
TEL 415.984.1450
FAX 415.362.7992
TTY 415.984.9910
www.chinatowncdc.org

November 14, 2025

San Francisco Planning Commission
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Re: Family Zoning Plan (Board File #250966, 250700, 251071, 250701, 251073)

Dear Supervisors,

Chinatown Community Development Center (CCDC) writes to express our concerns with the Family Zoning Plan. While we recognize the need for more housing, this plan as written does not center the needs of the city's working class and low-income residents.

We support the amendments for:

- Prohibiting the demolition of rent-controlled housing in the local program
- Removing form-based density in the base zoning
- Removing all Priority Equity Geographies from the rezoning

Through years of tenant counseling and community organizing, we've seen how sweeping zoning changes—without adequate tenant protections or affordable housing strategies—lead to demolitions, evictions, and displacement. This plan risks fueling speculation by giving developers new incentives to rebuild properties for profit through greater height and density, encouraging the removal of long-term renters—often low-income seniors and families—without providing full tenant protections.

Mrs. Lee's story is a notorious case that comes to mind. In 2013, CCDC supported Mr. and Mrs. Lee and their adult daughter with a disability when they were evicted from their home of over 30 years, where the developer planned to convert all rental units into high-end TICs. In the 10 years following the eviction, the family could not get into affordable housing. This particular case highlights the consequences of when displacement is coupled with the insufficient number of affordable units accessible to extremely low-income families.

In a city with an ever-increasing cost of living, rent controlled housing is one of the few avenues in which long-term residents can afford to continue living in the city. We recognize Supervisor Melgar's amendment exempting properties with 3+ units from use of the HC-SF program, as a step in the right direction, but hundreds of tenants in 2-unit properties remain at risk. While we appreciate the work that Supervisors Melgar and Chen have done to advance protections through the Tenant Protections and Demolitions Ordinance, loopholes such as Ellis Act evictions and the continued inclusion of 2-unit rent-controlled buildings in the upzoning plan leave many tenants vulnerable and unprotected. We ask

that all existing rent-controlled housing be exempt from the HC-SF program. This does not bar property owners from using programs like SDB and therefore should not be considered a constraint on development.

We also ask that form-based density is removed from the base zoning because when it is coupled with the HC-SF program or SDB, the potential for large profits may increase the risk of speculation.

The two aforementioned points are especially important in the context of the PEGs "comprised of areas or neighborhoods with a higher density of vulnerable populations," and where there has been a history of displacement. These areas typically have a high percentage of renters, many of which live in rent-controlled housing. Section 249.97 of the San Francisco Planning Code states "the City needs to expand permanently affordable housing investment" in these areas. This plan does not have a tangible affordable housing plan but rather functions merely as a market-rate housing initiative.

Relying on market-driven development and a 15% inclusionary requirement—most of which serve households between 55% and 200% of AMI—does not constitute an affordable housing strategy. The City's RHNA goals include the production of approximately 46,000 low- and moderate-income units. As it stands, there is no substantial plan to meet that goal. Units that are not deed-restricted affordable will ultimately be unaffordable to the lowest income folks. So, we ask that the PEGs be removed from the plan, per Supervisor Chen's amendment, and that the Board create true affordable housing solutions in the PEGs, and citywide.

We want to be explicit that we are not against building more housing, but the housing we build should be affordable to the communities we serve, existing community members and small businesses should have the right to remain in their neighborhoods, and units should suit the needs of everyday families.

Sincerely,

Rosa Chen

Director of Programs – Planning & Policy

From:	SON-SF SaveOurNeighborhoodsSF
To:	Lurie, Daniel (MYR)
Cc:	Zou, Han (MYR); Board of Supervisors (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; FielderStaff; MahmoodStaff; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); SherrillStaff; Melgar, Myrna (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); So, Lydia (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Braun, Derek (CPC); Campbell, Amy (CPC); Imperial, Theresa (CPC); Mcgarry, Sean (CPC); Williams, Gilbert A (CPC); Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject:	INTERIM D4 SUPERVISOR
Date:	Friday, November 14, 2025 1:48:37 PM

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

Dear Mayor Lurie,

SON-SF ~ Save Our Neighborhoods SF were very disappointed in the most recent appointment of Isabella "Beya" Alcaraz especially in-light of all the negative issues surrounding her business & personal life. *But, we are pleased that she resigned at your request!*

However, this once again leaves District 4 with NO representation that the community had any input on.

We would like to recommend that a Town Hall be held ASAP & all constituents should be invited to discuss this matter & make comment on.

Furthermore, in regards to the vote on **November 17th** at the Land use & Transportation Committee Hearing, we feel that as once more D4 has no representation to submit constituents suggested Amendments regarding the Family Zoning Plan. We feel it's necessary & appropriate to postpone this hearing & others until we have an Interim D4 Supervisor to voice our needs & concerns.

Sincerely,
Renee Lazear & Shawna McGrew
Co-Founders
SON-SF ~ Save Our Neighborhoods SF
sonsf.org

From: Holden Weisman
To: MelgarStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff
Cc: Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject: Habitat for Humanity Greater San Francisco Letter of Support for the Family Zoning Plan
Date: Friday, November 14, 2025 1:07:34 PM
Attachments: Outlook-fthsxqxz2.png
Habitat GSF Letter of Support for FZP 11142025.pdf

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

Members of the Land Use and Transportation Committee,

Please accept the attached letter of support from Habitat for Humanity Greater San Francisco relating to the Family Zoning Plan - Items 4 through 7 on the November 17, 2025 meeting agenda of the Land Use and Transportation Committee. If you have any questions or would like to follow up, please do not hesitate to contact me directly.

Thank you,
Holden Weisman

Holden Weisman | Director of Policy and Advocacy
He / Him / His
Habitat for Humanity Greater San Francisco
300 Montgomery Street, Suite 450, San Francisco, CA 94104
(415) 907-4435
• https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___www.habitatgsf.org___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzpiZGU4ZmMyM2M1NDY5NzljYWYxZGEyZDA2OWJiMTY0ZTo3OmFkZjU6MDQ2ZDk2YmE3NWNiNjM2YzJmM2FkODJmMzBjZmYwN2MxYzFjMTFmYTQzNzk0M2Q5MmNhYWU5NWFlZWY5OTI5NTp0OlQ6Tg
• @Habitatgsf

We build and sustain affordable homeownership opportunities for families in San Francisco, San Mateo, and Marin counties.

Book time to meet with me

Habitat for Humanity®
Greater San Francisco

November 14, 2025

Supervisor Myrna Melgar
Chair, Land Use and Transportation Committee
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Chair Melgar,

On behalf of Habitat for Humanity Greater San Francisco (Habitat GSF), I would like to once again share our support for the Family Zoning Plan, including recent amendments. We believe the Family Zoning Plan will set San Francisco on a realistic path toward addressing the city's housing needs and will allow Habitat GSF to more effectively produce homes that fulfill these needs. We encourage you to vote to recommend the necessary legislation as amended to the full Board of Supervisors for consideration.

Habitat GSF builds homes and sustains affordable homeownership opportunities for families across San Francisco. However, our ability to continue to produce the kinds of 100% permanently affordable multiunit homes for ownership is increasingly limited to relatively few neighborhoods that meet our zoning needs. We also face the challenge all affordable homebuilders must grapple with – scarce availability of affordable land. Without such properties we will be further constrained from producing homes that would allow our homeowners to plant generational roots in well-resourced and transit-rich neighborhoods.

The Family Zoning Plan will open many more doors for Habitat GSF homeowners by dramatically increasing the number of zoned areas that would better meet our financial needs to produce more permanently affordable homeownership opportunities in every district. Further, the inclusion of Supervisor Chen's amendment to grant qualified nonprofits the first right of refusal for sales of property within the SFMTA SUD is invaluable and critical to making the kinds of developments we produce significantly more feasible.

It is for these reasons and for our strong conviction that homeownership is transformative for families' health, education, and building of generational wealth, that we ask that you recommend the Family Zoning Plan as amended to the full Board of Supervisors.

If you have any questions or would like to follow up on these comments, please reach out to me directly at hweisman@habitatgsf.org. Thank you on behalf of Habitat for Humanity Greater San Francisco and our future San Franciscan homeowners.

Sincerely,

Holden Weisman
Director of Policy Advocacy
Habitat for Humanity Greater San Francisco
hweisman@habitatgsf.org

Cc: Supervisor Chyanne Chen

Supervisor Bilal Mahmood

John Carroll, Clerk

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	BOS-Operations; Carroll, John (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS); Calvillo, Angela (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Entezari, Mehran (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS)
Subject:	13 Letters Regarding File Nos. 250700, 250701, 250966, 251071, 251072, and 251073
Date:	Thursday, November 13, 2025 12:18:51 PM
Attachments:	13 Letters Regarding Zoning.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached 13 letters regarding File Nos.:

250700: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan
250701: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan
250966: General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan
251071: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan
251072: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan
251073: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan

Regards,

John Bullock
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-5184
BOS@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

Disclosures: *Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: Maren Vanderkolk
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 3:30:49 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Maren Vanderkolk
mvanderkolk10@gmail.com
2250 Bay St
San Francisco, California 94123

From: Kayla Cranshaw-Craig
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 3:41:40 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Kayla Cranshaw-Craig
kacranshawcraig@gmail.com
1242 34th Ave
San Francisco, California 94122

From: danfoldes@gmail.com
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 9:37:46 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Dan

danfoldes@gmail.com
1430 Cole St Apt 2
San Francisco, California 94117

From: Monica Moore
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Wednesday, November 5, 2025 4:45:03 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

As a concerned constituent, I do not agree that the Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need. This is the antithesis of serving the San Franciscan public.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units.

I am requesting that you vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.

I am requesting that you require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Please truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses. Developers must be required to provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.

Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in our Mayor's Plan.

Given climate change, it is essential that the public access to our waterfront and environment be protected, especially for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.

Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Monica Moore

Monica Moore
monica1973moore@icloud.com
23 Mirabel Ave, # B
San Francisco , California 94110

From: Margo Aparicio
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Thursday, November 6, 2025 10:40:25 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!
As a below median income renter, I can only say this proposal to displace people in rent

controlled properties is an invitation to force tax paying tenants and families to leave San Francisco. Affordability is far more important an issue over high rent towers that like our own downtown will be riddled with empty apartments most people can't afford. Times are tough, so rather than increase homelessness with Mayor Lurie's proposal, please look alternatives.
Has demolishing empty or near empty downtown office high rises buildings for high rise apartments even been considered? I'm not talking office building conversion, but instead NEW housing! You won't be displacing rent controlled units, the skyline won't change drastically, and more housing will be available without additional use of land space.
Sincerely,
Margo Aparicio

Margo Aparicio
margo21st@gmail.com
228 Duncan Street #202
San Francisco, California 94131

From: jonieisen@sbcglobal.net
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, November 11, 2025 11:00:55 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

jonieisen@sbcglobal.net
592 Pennsylvania Avenue
San Francisco, California 94107

From: Michael Taylor
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, November 11, 2025 11:45:39 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Michael Taylor
Nob Hill
San Francisco, CA

Michael Taylor
PHATMICHAELT@GMAIL.COM
1201 California St
San Francisco, California 94109

From: maxbmargolis@gmail.com
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, November 11, 2025 11:56:37 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Max Margolis

maxbmargolis@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94122

From: Tom Zimberoff
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, November 11, 2025 1:14:06 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Tom Zimberoff
tom@zimberoff.com
1364 45th Avenue
San Francisco, California 94122

From: Michael Nguyen
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, November 11, 2025 2:39:46 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Michael Nguyen
mike14780@gmail.com
785 Burnett Ave , #8
San Francisco, California 94131

From: LissaIvy Tiegel
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Wednesday, November 12, 2025 1:08:27 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

LissaIvy Tiegel
tinydiagram@gmaiL.com
201 Roanoke Street, 1a
San Francisco, California 94131

From: Jonathan Hsieh
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Wednesday, November 12, 2025 10:36:29 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Jonathan Hsieh
jzhsieh@gmail.com
1688 PINE ST, UNIT W404
San Francisco, California 94109

From: Cody Vaughn
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 1:00:24 AM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Cody Vaughn
vaughnburger01@gmail.com
1451 Guerrero St, Apt. 3
San Francisco, California 94110-4360

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	BOS-Operations; Carroll, John (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS); Calvillo, Angela (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Entezari, Mehran (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS)
Subject:	20 Letters Regarding File Nos. 250700, 250701, 250966, 251071, 251072, and 251073
Date:	Wednesday, November 12, 2025 3:23:01 PM
Attachments:	20 Letters Regarding Zoning.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached 29 letters regarding File Nos.:

250700: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan
250701: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan
250966: General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan
251071: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan
251072: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan
251073: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan

Regards,

John Bullock
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-5184
BOS@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

Disclosures: *Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: Matthew Castillon
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Sunday, November 9, 2025 2:56:49 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Matthew Castillon
mcastillon10@gmail.com
550 Battery St
San Francisco, California 94111

From:	Eric Brooks
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff
Subject:	Public Comment: Nov 3 Amendments Not Enough! Replace Mayor"s Disastrous Zoning Plan With Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701
Date:	Monday, November 10, 2025 8:53:45 PM

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

Hi again Supervisors,

The amendments that were added on November 3rd to Mayor Lurie's so called 'housing plan' are not remotely enough!

The City Economist's report shows clearly that Lurie's plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing.

We still have 2 months to replace the Mayor's plan with one that will work. Here's a real strategy to solve the City's affordable housing crisis.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units. Together these are more than enough to fulfill state mandates. (Yet instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Lurie's plan moves zoning rules around like deck chairs on the Titanic, does almost nothing to increase affordable housing, and increases the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing over-supply [now at 150%] while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods.)

Now that the City Economist has shown that Lurie's plan won't work, it is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the 'Family Zoning' plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing approved housing permits, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year, in a way that will fully meet state mandates. **And make certain that all affordable housing produced fits the accepted definition of costing only 30% of the income of its residents.**

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put

almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible, instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood, and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

The Mayor's plan would build more excess housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators. **Please REPLACE the text in the Mayor's unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural and community integrity, with text that will truly produce affordable housing and get State bureaucrats off of San Francisco's back.**

Thank you,

Eric Brooks
Our City SF
San Francisco CEQA Defenders
415-756-8844

http://our-city.org

From:	Teresa Palmer
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff
Subject:	Public Comment: Replace Mayor Lurie"s Disastrous Zoning Plan With A Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701
Date:	Tuesday, November 11, 2025 1:00:30 AM

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

Public Comment: Replace Mayor Lurie's Disastrous Zoning Plan With A Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701

Dear Supervisors,

The amendments that were added on November 3rd to Mayor Lurie's so called 'housing plan' are not remotely enough!

The City Economist's report shows clearly that Lurie's plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing.

We still have 2 months to replace the Mayor's plan with one that will work. Here's a real strategy to solve the City's affordable housing crisis.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units. Together these are more than enough to fulfill state mandates. (Yet instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Lurie's plan moves zoning rules around like deck chairs on the Titanic, does almost nothing to increase affordable housing, and increases the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing over-supply [now at 150%] while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods.)

Now that the City Economist has shown that Lurie's plan won't work, it is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the 'Family Zoning' plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing approved housing permits, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year, in a way that will fully meet state mandates. And make certain that all affordable housing produced fits the accepted definition of costing only 30% of the income of its residents.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public

hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible, instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood, and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

The Mayor's plan would build more excess housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators. **Please REPLACE the text in the Mayor's unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural and community integrity, with text that will truly produce affordable housing and get State bureaucrats off of San Francisco's back.**

Thank you,

Teresa Palmer M.D.

1845 Hayes St. San Francisco, California 94117

From:	Kathryn Hyde
To:	Press Office, Mayor (MYR); Severiano.Christian@sen.ca.gov; Raayan.Mohtashemi@sen.ca.gov
Cc:	Carroll, John (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); radhika.gawde@sen.ca.gov
Subject:	housing SF
Date:	Tuesday, November 11, 2025 7:50:24 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

The City Economist's report shows clearly that Lurie's plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing.

- We do not have the infrastructure, police force, roads, parking and water to support this plan.
- Structures should be limited to 5 stories to preserve lighting and wind
- We are only 7 x 7 square miles. SF is not like ares that have space
- Concerns about earthquakes
- There is space to build on vacant lots, Walgreens sites, 7/11 on Clment/9th Ave., etc.
- No buildings close to the shoreline
- We still have 2 months to replace the Mayor's plan with one that will work. Here's a real strategy to solve the City's affordable housing crisis.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units. Together these are more than enough to fulfill state mandates. (Yet instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Lurie's plan moves zoning rules around like deck chairs on the Titanic, does almost nothing to increase affordable housing, and increases the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing over-supply [now at 150%] while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods.)

Now that the City Economist has shown that Lurie's plan won't work, it is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the 'Family Zoning' plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing approved housing permits, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year, in a way that will fully meet state mandates. And make certain that all affordable housing produced fits the accepted definition of costing only 30% of the income of its residents.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible, instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood, and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

The Mayor's plan would build more excess housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators.

Thank you!

Kathryn Hyde
130 Frederick St SF 94117

Kathryn Hyde | 415.359.7971 | IG @reenvisionrepair |
https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___www.reenvisionrepair.com___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzo4NWYyNGNiZmQ1YTZhY2YwMjUwMDE5YzkzZTk4MTRlMjo3OmQ5Nzg6ZjM5MmFmZGJkYTVkZjk5ZTQ0MDA3M2QyNzI3YjAwYjEwNWVjYTc5YWEzYzNiMDVmOTQxYjdlNmM0ODhkYjUzMDp0OlQ6Tg

From: Alan Billingsley
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, November 11, 2025 11:27:13 AM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Alan Billingsley
alanbillingsley215@gmail.com
215 Eureka St
San Francisco , California 94114

From: Anthony Criscione
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Support Family Zoning-San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, November 11, 2025 11:31:50 AM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Anthony Criscione
acriscione1997@gmail.com
145 San Jose Ave
San Francisco , California 94110

From: Phillip Raffle
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, November 11, 2025 11:59:31 AM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Phillip Raffle
phillip.d.raffle@gmail.com
1466 Dolores Street
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Marty Cerles
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, November 11, 2025 12:01:06 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Marty Cerles
martycerles@gmail.com
2940 Turk Blvd
San Francisco, California 94118

From: Julia Diaz
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, November 11, 2025 1:44:32 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Julia Diaz
jmdiaz2016@g.ucla.edu
3841 24th st
San Francisco , California 94114

From: Todor Markov
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, November 11, 2025 2:57:42 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I've called San Francisco home since 2017. I live in Rincon Hill, and I'm writing to voice my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.
I've watched this city change over the past eight years, and one thing has become crystal clear: we need more housing. I've seen friends leave because they couldn't afford to stay. I've watched young families struggle to find space to grow. And I've seen how the lack of housing options makes this city less accessible to the people who make it vibrant and diverse.
That's why I support the Family Zoning Plan. This isn't just policy to me—it's about making sure San Francisco remains a place where everyone can afford to live, not just the wealthy. I want more homes in Rincon Hill and across the city. I want my neighbors to be able to build in-law units for aging parents or backyard cottages for adult children. I want teachers, artists, service workers, and young professionals to have a real shot at living here.
This plan gives families flexibility and expands housing choices in the neighborhoods where people actually want to live—near transit, jobs, and schools. It's a positive step toward a more livable, affordable, and inclusive San Francisco.
I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan. Let's build a city where everyone can belong.
Thank you for listening.
Sincerely,
Todor Markov

Todor Markov
todor.m.markov@gmail.com
301 Main Street #32F
San Francisco, California 94105

From: Justin Truong
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, November 11, 2025 5:21:07 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Justin Truong
justintruong56@gmail.com
33 Junior Terrace
San Francisco, California 94112

From: Patrick Le
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, November 11, 2025 5:39:33 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my very strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more housing, and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

Let's build a San Francisco that will continue to grow and where everyone can belong. It just makes sense to build more housing. More people, more revenue from taxes and local businesses to fund essential services. Why do we want the population to shrink and still have it be so expensive to live here? Please do the right thing.

Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Patrick Le
patrickle1994@gmail.com
511 Eureka St.
San Francisco, California 94114

From: Annette Billingsley
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, November 11, 2025 5:43:55 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Annette Billingsley
ab94115@gmail.com
2821 Pine Street
San Francisco, California 94115

From: Meghan Warner
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, November 11, 2025 6:32:29 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Best,
Meghan Warner, PhD
D4 Resident

Meghan Warner
meghanowarner@gmail.com
2610 47th ave
San Francisco, California 94116

From: Paul Foppe
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, November 11, 2025 7:52:15 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,
As the middle of a sandwich family raising a first grader while taking care of a mother-in-law with alzheimer's dementia, I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan. We need more housing of all types for all income levels for renters and for purchase.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us forward. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Paul Foppe
hugfoppe@gmail.com
2301 Lincoln Way
SAN FRANCISCO, California 94122

From: Alex Wong
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Wednesday, November 12, 2025 12:11:39 AM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

Last Tuesday's elections in NJ, VA and NYC only reinforced an issue that has plagued San Franciscans for decades: the issue of affordability.

When the most expensive expense of any person's paycheck is housing, we have to build much more homes if we have any hope of reining in costs.

The Family Zoning Plan will expand housing choices across the city, especially near transit, jobs, and schools.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Alex Wong
mr.alexander.wong@gmail.com
1539 24th Ave
San Francisco, California 94122

From: Lisa Zahner
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Wednesday, November 12, 2025 9:02:37 AM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Lisa Zahner
lisa@cityrealestatesf.com
348 Scott St
San Francisco, California 94117

From:	Bruce Wolfe N6BMW
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff
Subject:	URGENT! Public Comment: Replace Mayor Lurie"s Disastrous Zoning Plan With A Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701
Date:	Wednesday, November 12, 2025 12:29:06 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

The amendments that were added on November 3rd to Mayor Lurie's so called 'housing plan' are not remotely enough!

The City Economist's report shows clearly that Lurie's plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing.

We still have 2 months to replace the Mayor's plan with one that will work. Here's a real strategy to solve the City's affordable housing crisis.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units. Together these are more than enough to fulfill state mandates. (Yet instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Lurie's plan moves zoning rules around like deck chairs on the Titanic, does almost nothing to increase affordable housing, and increases the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing over-supply [now at 150%] while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods.)

Now that the City Economist has shown that Lurie's plan won't work, it is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the 'Family Zoning' plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing approved housing permits, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year, in a way that will fully meet state mandates. And make certain that all affordable housing produced fits the accepted definition of costing only 30% of the income of its residents.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as

possible, instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood, and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

The Mayor's plan would build more excess housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators. **Please REPLACE the text in the Mayor's unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural and community integrity, with text that will truly produce affordable housing and get State bureaucrats off of San Francisco's back.**

Thank you,

Bruce

94117

From: Maika Pinkston
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Wednesday, November 12, 2025 12:43:06 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Maika Pinkston

Maika Pinkston
maikapinkston@gmail.com
37 Commer CT. #329
San Francisco, California 94124

From: Edward Sullivan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Wednesday, November 12, 2025 2:40:20 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Edward Sullivan
efsullyjr@aol.com
2448 Great Hwy Apt 14
San Francisco, California 94116

From: Bruce Wolfe N6BMW
To: Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff
Subject: URGENT! Public Comment: Replace Mayor Lurie"s Disastrous Zoning Plan With A Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701
Date: Wednesday, November 12, 2025 12:29:03 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

The amendments that were added on November 3rd to Mayor Lurie's so called 'housing plan' are not remotely enough!

The City Economist's report shows clearly that Lurie's plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing.

We still have 2 months to replace the Mayor's plan with one that will work. Here's a real strategy to solve the City's affordable housing crisis.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units. Together these are more than enough to fulfill state mandates. (Yet instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Lurie's plan moves zoning rules around like deck chairs on the Titanic, does almost nothing to increase affordable housing, and increases the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing over-supply [now at 150%] while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods.)

Now that the City Economist has shown that Lurie's plan won't work, it is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the 'Family Zoning' plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing approved housing permits, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year, in a way that will fully meet state mandates. And make certain that all affordable housing produced fits the accepted definition of costing only 30% of the income of its residents.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as

possible, instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood, and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

The Mayor's plan would build more excess housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators. **Please REPLACE the text in the Mayor's unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural and community integrity, with text that will truly produce affordable housing and get State bureaucrats off of San Francisco's back.**

Thank you,

Bruce

94117

From:	Woody LaBounty
To:	Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS)
Cc:	Carroll, John (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); isabella.alcaraz@sfgov.org; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS)
Subject:	Land Use Mtg on 11/17: SF Heritage Supports Supervisor Chan"s Amendments
Date:	Tuesday, November 11, 2025 6:46:24 PM
Attachments:	image001.png SFHeritage-SUPPORT-Chan-Amendments.pdf

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

SUPPORT FOR SUPERVISOR CHAN'S AMENDMENTS
November 17, 2025 - Land Use and Transportation Committee Agenda "Family Zoning Plan"

Dear Chair Melgar and Supervisors Chen and Mahmood:

On behalf of our citywide constituency, San Francisco Heritage submits our strong support for Supervisor Chan's proposed amendments, consistent with the adopted Housing Element, for the treatment of historic resources in the Family Zoning Plan as set forth File No. 251073 as follows:

> On Page 12, Lines 13-24; and Page 30, Lines 17-25: "or substantially alter a historic resource that is: designated as a landmark or listed as a contributor to or located within a historic district under Article 10; listed as a Significant or Contributory Building under Article 11; listed in the California Register of Historical Resources or the National Register of Historic Places; identified in an adopted survey or historic context statement as potentially eligible for individual listing in the California Register of Historical Resources or the National Register of Historic Places; or, located within an historic district that is listed in, or identified in an adopted survey or historic context statement as potentially eligible for listing in, the California Register of Historical Resources or the National Register of Historic Places;

The current Family Zoning Plan includes significantly greater impacts to designated and potentially eligible historic and cultural resources than anticipated by the 2022 Housing Element and the certified Environmental Impact Report (EIR). Absent Supervisor Chan's proposed amendments, we believe that a Supplemental Environmental Impact Report ("SEIR"), rather than the Addendum, is warranted to analyze the Family Zoning Plan's impacts to San Francisco's historic and cultural resources.

We have appreciated the attention given by, and our conversations with, Mayor Lurie and

President Mandelman on how we can address protections for historic resources in the Family Zoning Plan. Supervisor Chan's proposal conforms with standard historic preservation practices, and we believe offers the best path forward to ensure San Francisco's special places are preserved in our changing and growing city.

Sincerely,

Woody LaBounty
President & CEO
wlabounty@sfheritage.org

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

SF HERITAGE
www.sfheritage.org
2007 FRANKLIN STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94109
415 441 3000

November 12, 2025

Chair Myrna Melgar, Supervisors Chyanne Chen and Bilal Mahmood
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Land Use and Transportation Committee
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

RE: SUPPORT FOR SUPERVISOR CHAN'S AMENDMENTS
November 17, 2025 - Land Use and Transportation Committee Agenda "Family Zoning Plan"

Dear Chair Melgar and Supervisors Chen and Mahmood:

On behalf of our citywide constituency, San Francisco Heritage submits our strong support for Supervisor Chan's proposed amendments, consistent with the adopted Housing Element, for the treatment of historic resources in the Family Zoning Plan as set forth File No. 251073 as follows:

> On Page 12, Lines 13-24; and Page 30, Lines 17-25: "or substantially alter a historic resource that is: designated as a landmark or listed as a contributor to or located within a historic district under Article 10; listed as a Significant or Contributory Building under Article 11; listed in the California Register of Historical Resources or the National Register of Historic Places; identified in an adopted survey or historic context statement as potentially eligible for individual listing in the California Register of Historical Resources or the National Register of Historic Places; or, located within an historic district that is listed in, or identified in an adopted survey or historic context statement as potentially eligible for listing in, the California Register of Historical Resources or the National Register of Historic Places;

The current Family Zoning Plan includes significantly greater impacts to designated and potentially eligible historic and cultural resources than anticipated by the 2022 Housing Element and the certified Environmental Impact Report (EIR). Absent Supervisor Chan's proposed amendments, we believe that a Supplemental Environmental Impact Report ("SEIR"), rather than the Addendum, is warranted to analyze the Family Zoning Plan's impacts to San Francisco's historic and cultural resources.

We have appreciated the attention given by and our conversations with Mayor Lurie and President Mandelman on how we can address protections for historic resources in the Family Zoning Plan. Supervisor Chan's proposal conforms with standard historic preservation practices, and we believe offers the best path forward to ensure San Francisco's special places are preserved in our changing and growing city.

Sincerely,



Woody LaBounty
President & CEO
wlabounty@sfheritage.org

From:	Kathryn Hyde
To:	Press Office, Mayor (MYR); Severiano.Christian@sen.ca.gov; Raayan.Mohtashemi@sen.ca.gov
Cc:	Carroll, John (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); radhika.gawde@sen.ca.gov
Subject:	housing SF
Date:	Tuesday, November 11, 2025 7:50:22 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

The City Economist's report shows clearly that Lurie's plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing.

- We do not have the infrastructure, police force, roads, parking and water to support this plan.
- Structures should be limited to 5 stories to preserve lighting and wind
- We are only 7 x 7 square miles. SF is not like ares that have space
- Concerns about earthquakes
- There is space to build on vacant lots, Walgreens sites, 7/11 on Clment/9th Ave., etc.
- No buildings close to the shoreline
- We still have 2 months to replace the Mayor's plan with one that will work. Here's a real strategy to solve the City's affordable housing crisis.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units. Together these are more than enough to fulfill state mandates. (Yet instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Lurie's plan moves zoning rules around like deck chairs on the Titanic, does almost nothing to increase affordable housing, and increases the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing over-supply [now at 150%] while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods.)

Now that the City Economist has shown that Lurie's plan won't work, it is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the 'Family Zoning' plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing approved housing permits, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year, in a way that will fully meet state mandates. And make certain that all affordable housing produced fits the accepted definition of costing only 30% of the income of its residents.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible, instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood, and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

The Mayor's plan would build more excess housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators.

Thank you!

Kathryn Hyde
130 Frederick St SF 94117

Kathryn Hyde | 415.359.7971 | IG @reenvisionrepair |
https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___www.reenvisionrepair.com___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzpmZGY1NDI5NWVjZTU4NmFjODVkZWUyZTc0OTY4OTVkYzo3OjVmMWI6ZjY1NDE2ODMwNDEwNTUzOTZmMWE5NWY5NWZmODc5M2Q5NjNjZDY1MjNlNWFiNTY5NGQ4OWM4Y2EyOGZiZTQ3Mjp0OlQ6Tg

From:	Teresa Palmer
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff
Subject:	Public Comment: Replace Mayor Lurie"s Disastrous Zoning Plan With A Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701
Date:	Tuesday, November 11, 2025 1:00:27 AM

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

Public Comment: Replace Mayor Lurie's Disastrous Zoning Plan With A Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701

Dear Supervisors,

The amendments that were added on November 3rd to Mayor Lurie's so called 'housing plan' are not remotely enough!

The City Economist's report shows clearly that Lurie's plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing.

We still have 2 months to replace the Mayor's plan with one that will work. Here's a real strategy to solve the City's affordable housing crisis.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units. Together these are more than enough to fulfill state mandates. (Yet instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Lurie's plan moves zoning rules around like deck chairs on the Titanic, does almost nothing to increase affordable housing, and increases the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing over-supply [now at 150%] while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods.)

Now that the City Economist has shown that Lurie's plan won't work, it is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the 'Family Zoning' plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing approved housing permits, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year, in a way that will fully meet state mandates. And make certain that all affordable housing produced fits the accepted definition of costing only 30% of the income of its residents.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public

hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible, instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood, and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

The Mayor's plan would build more excess housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators. **Please REPLACE the text in the Mayor's unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural and community integrity, with text that will truly produce affordable housing and get State bureaucrats off of San Francisco's back.**

Thank you,

Teresa Palmer M.D.

1845 Hayes St. San Francisco, California 94117

From:	Eric Brooks
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff
Subject:	Public Comment: Nov 3 Amendments Not Enough! Replace Mayor"s Disastrous Zoning Plan With Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701
Date:	Monday, November 10, 2025 8:53:45 PM

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

Hi again Supervisors,

The amendments that were added on November 3rd to Mayor Lurie's so called 'housing plan' are not remotely enough!

The City Economist's report shows clearly that Lurie's plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing.

We still have 2 months to replace the Mayor's plan with one that will work. Here's a real strategy to solve the City's affordable housing crisis.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units. Together these are more than enough to fulfill state mandates. (Yet instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Lurie's plan moves zoning rules around like deck chairs on the Titanic, does almost nothing to increase affordable housing, and increases the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing over-supply [now at 150%] while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods.)

Now that the City Economist has shown that Lurie's plan won't work, it is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the 'Family Zoning' plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing approved housing permits, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year, in a way that will fully meet state mandates. **And make certain that all affordable housing produced fits the accepted definition of costing only 30% of the income of its residents.**

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put

almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible, instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood, and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

The Mayor's plan would build more excess housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators. **Please REPLACE the text in the Mayor's unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural and community integrity, with text that will truly produce affordable housing and get State bureaucrats off of San Francisco's back.**

Thank you,

Eric Brooks
Our City SF
San Francisco CEQA Defenders
415-756-8844

http://our-city.org

From:	David Romano
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff
Subject:	Public Comment: Please vote no on Mayor Lurie"s Family Zoning Plan and replace It with a Real Affordable Housing Plan
Date:	Saturday, November 1, 2025 4:05:25 PM

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

Dear Supervisors, et al:

The City Economist just released a report showing that Mayor Lurie's 'Family Zoning' plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing.

We still have 3 months to replace the Mayor's plan with one that will work. Here's a real strategy to solve the affordable housing crisis.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units - together more than enough to fulfill state mandates.

Now that the City Economist has shown that Lurie's plan won't work, it is imperative that you stop seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the 'Family Zoning' plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing housing approvals, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year in a way that will fully meet state mandates.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible, instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood, and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

The Mayor's plan would build more excess housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to corporate real estate speculators. Please REPLACE the text in this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural and community integrity, with text that will truly produce affordable housing.

Thank you,

David Romano
San Francsico CA

From:	Elliot Helman
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff
Subject:	Public Comment: VOTE NO On Lurie"s Recipe For Housing Failure & Replace It With A Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701
Date:	Saturday, November 1, 2025 2:48:55 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

The City Economist just released a report showing that Mayor Lurie's 'Family Zoning' plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing.

We still have 3 months to replace the Mayor's plan with one that will work. Here's a real strategy to solve the affordable housing crisis.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units - together more than enough to fulfill state mandates. (Yet instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Lurie's plan simply moves zoning rules around like deck chairs on the Titanic, does almost nothing to increase affordable housing, and increases the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing over-supply [now at 150%] while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods.)

Now that the City Economist has shown that Lurie's plan won't work, it is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the 'Family Zoning' plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing housing approvals, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year in a way that will fully meet state mandates.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible, instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood, and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

The Mayor's plan would build more excess housing for the wealthy, create more

homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators. **Please REPLACE the text in this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural and community integrity, with text that will truly produce affordable housing and get State bureaucrats off of San Francisco's back.**

Thank you,

Elliot Helman
Mission Bay SF 94158

From: David Kaskowitz
To: Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff
Subject: Public Comment: VOTE NO On Lurie"s Recipe For Housing Failure & Replace It With A Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701
Date: Saturday, November 1, 2025 10:10:37 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

It is time to finally adopt a plan that effectively addresses the housing crisis in San Francisco. Mayor Lurie's 'Family Zoning' plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing, as the City Economist recently released report demonstrates.

We still have 3 months to replace the Mayor's plan with one that will work. Here's a real strategy to solve the affordable housing crisis.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units - together more than enough to fulfill state mandates. (Yet instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Lurie's plan simply moves zoning rules around like deck chairs on the Titanic, does almost nothing to increase affordable housing, and increases the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing oversupply [now at 150%] while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods.)

Now that the City Economist has shown that Lurie's plan won't work, it is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the 'Family Zoning' plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing housing approvals, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year in a way that will fully meet state mandates.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible, instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood, and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

The Mayor's plan would build more excess housing for the wealthy, create more

homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators. **Please REPLACE the text in this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural and community integrity, with text that will truly produce affordable housing and get State bureaucrats off of San Francisco's back.**

Thank you,

David Kaskowitz

306 Park St
San Francisco, CA 94110

From: Jeanette Traverso
To: Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject: Fwd: A North Beach Resident"s Perspective on Upzoning
Date: Wednesday, November 5, 2025 5:55:34 PM

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

Hello, John. My apols for the typo in your email address. Pls see below. Many thx! Best, Jeanette

---------- Forwarded message ---------
From: **Jeanette Traverso** <jeanettetraverso@gmail.com>
Date: Wed, Nov 5, 2025 at 5:47 PM
Subject: A North Beach Resident's Perspective on Upzoning
To: <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>, connie.chan@sfgov.org <connie.chan@sfgov.org>, <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>, <stephen.sherrill@sfgov.org>, <danny.sauter@sfgov.org>, <bilal.mahmood@sfgov.org>, matt.dorsey@sfgov.org <matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>, <john.carrroll@sfgov.org>

Hello. My name is Jeanette Traverso. I attended the 11/3/25 Land Use & Transportation Committee hearing for 3.5 hours last Monday, but had to leave before I could give my public comments on upzoning. Please see my perspective below:

My Italian relatives have lived in North Beach for generations. I am one of ten children, & the first & only one of ten to graduate college. I went on to get a law degree from Hastings, now UC Law SF.

Thirty years ago, my husband & I researched neighborhoods throughout San Francisco & chose North Beach for its walkability, identity & waterfront.

We strived to buy a three-unit residential building on Francisco @ Grant, and have lived in one of the units ever since. It's where we raised our two sons.

I have spent decades walking from North Beach to work at a law firm downtown. I still walk through the neighborhood daily & it always gives me a renewed sense of well-being when I walk down Grant & see the water before me.

I recently hosted a sister from the beautiful state of Hawaii, & she was awed by all the charming nooks & crannies of our incredible North Beach neighborhood.

I am in favor of affordable housing, but the proposed upzoning plan is misguided. It will allow speculators to build tall buildings for the rich. It will ruin the beloved character of the neighborhood. It WILL NOT create affordable housing. Hence, there is no good reason to destroy the low-rise, historic architecture of our coveted neighborhood. We all can see that modern high rises on Columbus shadowing the streets, or soulless buildings dwarfing Coit Tower, will be devastating. Likewise, it will be a travesty to allow formula retail to replace our unique cafes, restaurants, clubs & shops.

We have lots of empty commercial buildings throughout the City. We should get creative & convert these underutilized resources to affordable housing.

I am informed that Supervisor Sauter unilaterally put North Beach on the upzoning map, without adequate input from his constituents. This makes me irate.

I urge that the North Beach neighborhood be removed from the upzoning map, so that we can preserve this incredible neighborhood for those of us here today, & for generations to come.

Thank you for your consideration.

Best, Jeanette Traverso

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	BOS-Operations; Carroll, John (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS); Calvillo, Angela (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Entezari, Mehran (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS)
Subject:	29 Letters Regarding File Nos. 250700, 250701, 250966, 251071, 251072, and 251073
Date:	Friday, November 7, 2025 10:38:21 AM
Attachments:	29 Letters Regarding the Family Zoning Plan.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached 29 letters regarding File Nos.:

250700: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan
250701: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan
250966: General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan
251071: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan
251072: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan
251073: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan

Regards,

John Bullock
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-5184
BOS@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

Disclosures: *Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: tvobsf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Anthony Villa
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 3, 2025 1:11:22 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): Don't ruin the neighborhoods by turning them into downtown!

Sincerely,
Anthony Villa
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: eliseravel3@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Elise Ravel
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 3, 2025 1:49:16 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Elise Ravel

From: peterboothlee@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Peter Lee
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 3, 2025 2:53:44 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

No Bulldozers! Historic buildings Must Be Preserved! We will Never build beautiful Victorians again!
And Protect Rent Controlled Buildings! Half of SF Needs These!
As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Peter Lee
San Francisco, CA 94118

From: johnmclemore@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John McLemore
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 3, 2025 2:57:30 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a SF resident, I strongly oppose Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters & small businesses & transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:
- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary Jan 2026 upzoning deadline

Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to SF's land use—going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:
I am outraged at the proposed upzoning all over SF. The proposed height increases have massive ramifications for our City. Our height limits are essential to the character & charm of SF.

I want to specifically address my neighborhood, Aquatic Park/Fisherman's Wharf & how doubling the height limits for those areas to 65+ feet would be devastating to these neighborhoods.

If you love SF at all, you love the iconic hills & priceless beauty of our waterfront rising dramatically from the Bay waters & seemingly all the way to the clouds. Our waterfront is what songs, poems & movies are written about.

From the water, views of those neighborhoods have been photographed a million times over. Every year, hundreds of thousands of tourists marvel at them from cruise ships & Bay cruises & locals from private watercraft. Videos of them compliment nearly every sports broadcast. I am disgusted to think, so many decades ago, views of our majestic hills & alternatively from land our breathtaking SF Bay, were nearly completely obliterated by skyrises, like the horrendous Fontana buildings, nicknamed the "buck teeth" by all locals not selfish or affluent enough to live in them. These types of Miami-style towers were initially planned to encase the entire northern coastline of SF, effectively creating a "wall on the waterfront."

Additionally, I have not heard a single authority figure involved with the disastrous upzoning "plan" address the ramifications of extreme upzoning creating wind tunnels or light shadows, a serious issue in the recent overzealous, overbuilding around NYC's Central Park where it is killing trees, plants, grass & wildlife either from being scorched by refractions or by lack of sunlight. Or that the overdevelopment in NYC has created a massive "land grab" wars over air rights, which allows developers the "right" to build even higher than the original zoning would have allowed & charge renters even higher premiums. Nor have I heard anyone provide any consideration to the FACT that SF exists in a dangerous earthquake zone & how building higher is a VERY risky endeavor on our steep hills. All I've heard from politicians & developers is "build, build, build." There seems to be no care, no consideration, no foresight for ANY long-term consequences. Take HEED & LEARN from the colossal mistakes of other cities, like NYC & Vancouver.

The height limits established in our neighborhoods have made SF arguably one of the most beautiful cities in the world. Please do not let “NOT-MY-MAYOR” Lurie’s SHAMEFUL, LAND-GRAB, DEVELOPER-ENRICHING, SHORT-SIGHTED, UNINFORMED, DISASTOROUS "plan," destroy the very thing that makes SF iconic—its landscapes & views, by obliterating them with obtrusive, obstructive, unnecessary & unjustified skyrises.

Why are we here again?! I have only 1 conclusion—GREED. This is NOT about building more housing, affordable housing or benefitting communities. Its only intention is to make money for those in power & for the people in the pockets of or influencing those in power. Please reconsider your appalling massive height limit increases. SF is NOT FOR SALE!

Sincerely,
John McLemore
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: jillkb@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jill Bittner
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 3, 2025 3:01:27 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a resident, I strongly oppose Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters & small businesses & transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:
- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to SF's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition & luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers & billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning—it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:
I am outraged at the proposed upzoning all over SF. The proposed height increases have massive ramifications for our City. Our height limits are essential to the character & charm of SF.

I want to specifically address my neighborhood, Aquatic Park/Fisherman's Wharf & how doubling the height limits for those areas to 65+ feet would be devastating to these neighborhoods.

If you love SF at all, you love the iconic hills & priceless beauty of our waterfront rising dramatically from the Bay waters & seemingly all the way to the clouds. Our waterfront is what songs, poems & movies are written about.

From the water, views of those neighborhoods have been photographed a million times over. Every year, hundreds of thousands of tourists marvel at them from cruise ships & Bay cruises & locals from private watercraft. Videos of them compliment nearly every sports broadcast. I am disgusted to think, so many decades ago, views of our majestic hills & alternatively from land our breathtaking SF Bay, were nearly completely obliterated by skyrises, like the horrendous Fontana buildings, nicknamed the "buck teeth" by all locals not selfish or affluent enough to live in them. These types of Miami-style towers were initially planned to encase the entire northern coastline of SF, effectively creating a "wall on the waterfront."

Additionally, I have not heard a single authority figure involved with the disastrous upzoning "plan" address the ramifications of extreme upzoning creating wind tunnels or light shadows, a serious issue in the recent overzealous, overbuilding around NYC's Central Park where it is killing trees, plants, grass & wildlife either from being scorched by refractions or by lack of sunlight. Or that the overdevelopment in NYC has created a massive "land grab" wars over air rights, which allows developers the "right" to build even higher than the original zoning would have allowed & charge renters even higher premiums. Nor have I heard anyone provide any consideration to the FACT that SF exists in a dangerous earthquake zone & how building higher is a VERY risky endeavor on our steep hills. All I've heard from politicians & developers is "build, build, build." There seems to be no care, no consideration, no foresight for ANY long-term consequences. Take HEED & LEARN from the colossal mistakes of other cities, like NYC & Vancouver.

The height limits established in our neighborhoods have made SF arguably one of the most beautiful cities in the world. Please do not let “NOT-MY-MAYOR” Lurie’s SHAMEFUL, LAND-GRAB, DEVELOPER-ENRICHING, SHORT-SIGHTED, UNINFORMED, DISASTOROUS "plan," destroy the very thing that makes SF iconic—its landscapes & views, by obliterating them with obtrusive, obstructive, unnecessary & unjustified skyrises.

Why are we here again?! I have only 1 conclusion—GREED. This is NOT about building more housing, affordable housing or benefitting communities. Its only intention is to make money for those in power & for the people in the pockets of or influencing those in power. Please reconsider your appalling massive height limit increases. SF is NOT FOR SALE!

Sincerely,
Jill Bittner
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: jknjl127@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Joe Schmoe
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 3, 2025 3:03:38 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a resident, I strongly oppose Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters & small businesses & transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:
- Drastically scale back Lurie's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to SF's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition & luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers & billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning—it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:
I am outraged at the proposed upzoning all over SF. The proposed height increases have massive ramifications for our City. Our height limits are essential to the character & charm of SF.

I want to specifically address my neighborhood, Aquatic Park/Fisherman's Wharf & how doubling the height limits for those areas to 65+ feet would be devastating to these neighborhoods.

If you love SF at all, you love the iconic hills & priceless beauty of our waterfront rising dramatically from the Bay waters & seemingly all the way to the clouds. Our waterfront is what songs, poems & movies are written about.

From the water, views of those neighborhoods have been photographed a million times over. Every year, hundreds of thousands of tourists marvel at them from cruise ships & Bay cruises & locals from private watercraft. Videos of them compliment nearly every sports broadcast. I am disgusted to think, so many decades ago, views of our majestic hills & alternatively from land our breathtaking SF Bay, were nearly completely obliterated by skyrises, like the horrendous Fontana buildings, nicknamed the "buck teeth" by all locals not selfish or affluent enough to live in them. These types of Miami-style towers were initially planned to encase the entire northern coastline of SF, effectively creating a "wall on the waterfront."

Additionally, I have not heard a single authority figure involved with the disastrous upzoning "plan" address the ramifications of extreme upzoning creating wind tunnels or light shadows, a serious issue in the recent overzealous, overbuilding around NYC's Central Park where it is killing trees, plants, grass & wildlife either from being scorched by refractions or by lack of sunlight. Or that the overdevelopment in NYC has created a massive "land grab" wars over air rights, which allows developers the "right" to build even higher than the original zoning would have allowed & charge renters even higher premiums. Nor have I heard anyone provide any consideration to the FACT that SF exists in a dangerous earthquake zone & how building higher is a VERY risky endeavor on our steep hills. All I've heard from politicians & developers is "build, build, build." There seems to be no care, no consideration, no foresight for ANY long-term consequences. Take HEED & LEARN from the colossal mistakes of other cities, like NYC & Vancouver.

The height limits established in our neighborhoods have made SF arguably one of the most beautiful cities in the world. Please do not let “NOT-MY-MAYOR” Lurie’s SHAMEFUL, LAND-GRAB, DEVELOPER-ENRICHING, SHORT-SIGHTED, UNINFORMED, DISASTOROUS "plan," destroy the very thing that makes SF iconic—its landscapes & views, by obliterating them with obtrusive, obstructive, unnecessary & unjustified skyrises.

Why are we here again?! I have only 1 conclusion—GREED. This is NOT about building more housing, affordable housing or benefitting communities. Its only intention is to make money for those in power & for the people in the pockets of or influencing those in power. Please reconsider your appalling massive height limit increases. SF is NOT FOR SALE!

Sincerely,
Joe Schmoe
93123

From: jnsjl65@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jim Kilton
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 3, 2025 3:06:05 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a resident, I strongly oppose Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters & small businesses & transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:
- Drastically scale back Lurie's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to SF's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition & luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers & billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning—it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:
I am outraged at the proposed upzoning all over SF. The proposed height increases have massive ramifications for our City. Our height limits are essential to the character & charm of SF.

I want to specifically address my neighborhood, Aquatic Park/Fisherman's Wharf & how doubling the height limits for those areas to 65+ feet would be devastating to these neighborhoods.

If you love SF at all, you love the iconic hills & priceless beauty of our waterfront rising dramatically from the Bay waters & seemingly all the way to the clouds. Our waterfront is what songs, poems & movies are written about.

From the water, views of those neighborhoods have been photographed a million times over. Every year, hundreds of thousands of tourists marvel at them from cruise ships & Bay cruises & locals from private watercraft. Videos of them compliment nearly every sports broadcast. I am disgusted to think, so many decades ago, views of our majestic hills & alternatively from land our breathtaking SF Bay, were nearly completely obliterated by skyrises, like the horrendous Fontana buildings, nicknamed the "buck teeth" by all locals not selfish or affluent enough to live in them. These types of Miami-style towers were initially planned to encase the entire northern coastline of SF, effectively creating a "wall on the waterfront."

Additionally, I have not heard a single authority figure involved with the disastrous upzoning "plan" address the ramifications of extreme upzoning creating wind tunnels or light shadows, a serious issue in the recent overzealous, overbuilding around NYC's Central Park where it is killing trees, plants, grass & wildlife either from being scorched by refractions or by lack of sunlight. Or that the overdevelopment in NYC has created a massive "land grab" wars over air rights, which allows developers the "right" to build even higher than the original zoning would have allowed & charge renters even higher premiums. Nor have I heard anyone provide any consideration to the FACT that SF exists in a dangerous earthquake zone & how building higher is a VERY risky endeavor on our steep hills. All I've heard from politicians & developers is "build, build, build." There seems to be no care, no consideration, no foresight for ANY long-term consequences. Take HEED & LEARN from the colossal mistakes of other cities, like NYC & Vancouver.

The height limits established in our neighborhoods have made SF arguably one of the most beautiful cities in the world. Please do not let “NOT-MY-MAYOR” Lurie’s SHAMEFUL, LAND-GRAB, DEVELOPER-ENRICHING, SHORT-SIGHTED, UNINFORMED, DISASTOROUS "plan," destroy the very thing that makes SF iconic—its landscapes & views, by obliterating them with obtrusive, obstructive, unnecessary & unjustified skyrises.

Why are we here again?! I have only 1 conclusion—GREED. This is NOT about building more housing, affordable housing or benefitting communities. Its only intention is to make money for those in power & for the people in the pockets of or influencing those in power. Please reconsider your appalling massive height limit increases. SF is NOT FOR SALE!

Sincerely,
Jim Kilton
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: joeaschmoe@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Joe Schmell
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 3, 2025 3:13:01 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a resident, I strongly oppose Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters & small businesses & transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:
- Drastically scale back Lurie's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to SF's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition & luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers & billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning—it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:
I am outraged at the proposed upzoning all over SF. The proposed height increases have massive ramifications for our City. Our height limits are essential to the character & charm of SF.

I want to specifically address my neighborhood, Aquatic Park/Fisherman's Wharf & how doubling the height limits for those areas to 65+ feet would be devastating to these neighborhoods.

If you love SF at all, you love the iconic hills & priceless beauty of our waterfront rising dramatically from the Bay waters & seemingly all the way to the clouds. Our waterfront is what songs, poems & movies are written about.

From the water, views of those neighborhoods have been photographed a million times over. Every year, hundreds of thousands of tourists marvel at them from cruise ships & Bay cruises & locals from private watercraft. Videos of them compliment nearly every sports broadcast. I am disgusted to think, so many decades ago, views of our majestic hills & alternatively from land our breathtaking SF Bay, were nearly completely obliterated by skyrises, like the horrendous Fontana buildings, nicknamed the "buck teeth" by all locals not selfish or affluent enough to live in them. These types of Miami-style towers were initially planned to encase the entire northern coastline of SF, effectively creating a "wall on the waterfront."

Additionally, I have not heard a single authority figure involved with the disastrous upzoning "plan" address the ramifications of extreme upzoning creating wind tunnels or light shadows, a serious issue in the recent overzealous, overbuilding around NYC's Central Park where it is killing trees, plants, grass & wildlife either from being scorched by refractions or by lack of sunlight. Or that the overdevelopment in NYC has created a massive "land grab" wars over air rights, which allows developers the "right" to build even higher than the original zoning would have allowed & charge renters even higher premiums. Nor have I heard anyone provide any consideration to the FACT that SF exists in a dangerous earthquake zone & how building higher is a VERY risky endeavor on our steep hills. All I've heard from politicians & developers is "build, build, build." There seems to be no care, no consideration, no foresight for ANY long-term consequences. Take HEED & LEARN from the colossal mistakes of other cities, like NYC & Vancouver.

The height limits established in our neighborhoods have made SF arguably one of the most beautiful cities in the world. Please do not let “NOT-MY-MAYOR” Lurie’s SHAMEFUL, LAND-GRAB, DEVELOPER-ENRICHING, SHORT-SIGHTED, UNINFORMED, DISASTOROUS "plan," destroy the very thing that makes SF iconic—its landscapes & views, by obliterating them with obtrusive, obstructive, unnecessary & unjustified skyrises.

Why are we here again?! I have only 1 conclusion—GREED. This is NOT about building more housing, affordable housing or benefitting communities. Its only intention is to make money for those in power & for the people in the pockets of or influencing those in power. Please reconsider your appalling massive height limit increases. SF is NOT FOR SALE!

Sincerely,
Joe Schmell
San Francisco, CA 94109

From:	Lupe Velez
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff
Subject:	Public Comment: VOTE NO On Lurie"s Recipe For Housing Failure & Replace It With A Real Affordable Housing Plan
Date:	Monday, November 3, 2025 3:19:33 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

The City Economist just released a report showing that Mayor Lurie's 'Family Zoning' plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing.

We still have 3 months to replace the Mayor's plan with one that will work. Here's a real strategy to solve the affordable housing crisis.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units - together more than enough to fulfill state mandates. (Yet instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Lurie's plan simply moves zoning rules around like deck chairs on the Titanic, does almost nothing to increase affordable housing, and increases the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing oversupply [now at 150%] while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods.)

Now that the City Economist has shown that Lurie's plan won't work, it is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the 'Family Zoning' plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing housing approvals, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year in a way that will fully meet state mandates.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible, instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood, and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

The Mayor's plan would build more excess housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and

corporate real estate speculators. **Please REPLACE the text in this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural and community integrity, with text that will truly produce affordable housing and get State bureaucrats off of San Francisco's back.**

--

Guadalupe Velez
Communications Director
(She/Her/Hers)
Coalition on Homelessness
280 Turk Street, San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 346-3740 x305

From: kzhuravleva@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Karina Zhuravleva
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 3, 2025 5:56:43 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Karina Zhuravleva
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: Caizhuming888@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Zhu ming Cai
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Tuesday, November 4, 2025 10:07:07 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Zhu ming Cai
San Francisco, CA 94112

From: ms.pedroni@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lilianna Pedroni
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Wednesday, November 5, 2025 8:56:24 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I grew up in North Beach and continue to live here with my family. I'm writing to express concern about proposed changes that could alter the character of this neighborhood. Please preserve North Beach's authentic architecture and avoid turning the waterfront into a wall of tall, generic buildings. The views, historic charm, and human scale are what make this area special—and what draw visitors to it in the first place.

Rather than large-scale redevelopment, what this neighborhood truly needs is improved public transportation access. Enhancing connectivity would benefit both residents and visitors while maintaining the integrity of North Beach's unique identity.

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Lilianna Pedroni
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: carobikam@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Robert Heisler
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Wednesday, November 5, 2025 1:33:36 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress. Democracy in matters such as this no longer exists in San Francisco. Instead we have "citizens united" on full display. If allowed to proceed unhindered, the end result will be a clear definition of SOCIAL CLEANSING.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Robert Heisler
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: margsmay@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Margot May
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Wednesday, November 5, 2025 7:38:40 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Margot May
San Francisco, CA 94108

From: rekathryn@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kathryn Hyde
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, November 6, 2025 7:31:43 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a long time reident of the Richmond and Cole Valley neighborhoods, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

I believe in affordable housing - there are many vacant lots and old buildings were housing could be added (or refurbished) - limit to 5-6 stories to preserve SF.

SF does not have enough police patrol, water, grocery stores in needed areas, parking, and MUNI lines to support 100,000 more residents.

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Kathryn Hyde
San Francisco, CA 94117

From: terridaysf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Terri James-Day
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, November 6, 2025 10:12:54 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Terri James-Day
San Francisco, CA 94112

From:	David Woo
To:	Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS)
Cc:	Raquel Redondiez; Carroll, John (BOS); Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	SOMA Pilipinas Letter RE "Family Zoning Plan"
Date:	Monday, November 3, 2025 12:42:28 PM
Attachments:	SOMA Pilipinas Letter_Family Zoning Plan 11.3.25.pdf

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

President Mandelman and Members of the Board, please see our letter below regarding the "Family Zoning Plan."

November 3, 2025

RE: Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan"

President Mandelman and Members of the Board of Supervisors,

SOMA Pilipinas, the Filipino Cultural Heritage District, is opposed to the proposed upzoning plan. The upzoning plan will lead to the displacement of residents and small businesses, and encourages real estate speculation, harming the South of Market and neighborhoods across the city. The current plan, coupled with numerous cuts to affordable housing and impact fees that have already occurred, highlight how the city's Housing Element and the state co-opt the language of racial and social equity to further deregulation. We are also opposed to the blatant giveaway in Western SOMA of mainly increasing base heights, which will be used with the state density bonus, resulting in basically two upzonings from this plan for SOMA.

We must instead prioritize developing 100% affordable housing, preserving and protecting existing housing, protecting existing residents and small businesses from displacement, and engaging in community based planning. The current upzoning is failing on these fronts. We support the amendments put forward by Supervisor Chan and Supervisor Chen as they constitute a logical baseline of what should be included in such a sweeping upzoning proposal.

The city's Housing Element, mandated by the state, calls for 57% affordable housing to be built. As there is no affordable housing component to this plan, it is clear that it is a market-rate housing plan. The city economist Ted Egan acknowledges that market-rate housing will not get built at the levels "required" by the state, because developers and investors can not get the profit that is desired from these projects, stating the plan will only produce 8,500-14,600 units over the next 20 years. Affordable housing developers, however, are ready and willing to build housing. According to the city's 2024 Housing Inventory Report, affordable housing production accounted for 64% of all new housing production in 2024; as market-rate housing stalled because of lack of return on investment, affordable housing production continued.

If the city and state are really concerned about "building housing," the focus would be on building affordable housing. However, it is clear that the real desire is not simply to "build housing," but instead to provide the best scenario for private developers, investors, and

speculators to make money off of the real estate market in San Francisco.

We must focus on creating 100% affordable housing, protecting our neighborhoods that are composed of residents, small businesses, and neighborhood based organizations, and engaging in community based planning that focuses on the needs of the most vulnerable and marginalized.

Thank you,

David Woo
Community Development and Policy Coordinator
SOMA Pilipinas

--
David Woo
Community Development and Policy Coordinator
SOMA Pilipinas Cultural Heritage District

PILIPINAS

November 3, 2025

RE: Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan"

President Mandelman and Members of the Board of Supervisors,

SOMA Pilipinas, the Filipino Cultural Heritage District, is opposed to the proposed upzoning plan. The upzoning plan will lead to the displacement of residents and small businesses, and encourages real estate speculation, harming the South of Market and neighborhoods across the city. The current plan, coupled with numerous cuts to affordable housing and impact fees that have already occurred, highlight how the city's Housing Element and the state co-opt the language of racial and social equity to further deregulation. We are also opposed to the blatant giveaway in Western SOMA of mainly increasing base heights, which will be used with the state density bonus, resulting in basically two upzonings from this plan for SOMA.

We must instead prioritize developing 100% affordable housing, preserving and protecting existing housing, protecting existing residents and small businesses from displacement, and engaging in community based planning. The current upzoning is failing on these fronts. We support the amendments put forward by Supervisor Chan and Supervisor Chen as they constitute a logical baseline of what should be included in such a sweeping upzoning proposal.

The city's Housing Element, mandated by the state, calls for 57% affordable housing to be built. As there is no affordable housing component to this plan, it is clear that it is a market-rate housing plan. The city economist Ted Egan acknowledges that market-rate housing will not get built at the levels "required" by the state, because developers and investors can not get the profit that is desired from these projects, stating the plan will only produce 8,500-14,600 units over the next 20 years. Affordable housing developers, however, are ready and willing to build housing. According to the city's 2024 Housing Inventory Report, affordable housing production accounted for 64% of all new housing production in 2024; as market-rate housing stalled because of lack of return on investment, affordable housing production continued.

If the city and state are really concerned about "building housing," the focus would be on building affordable housing. However, it is clear that the real desire is not simply to "build housing," but instead to provide the best scenario for private developers, investors, and speculators to make money off of the real estate market in San Francisco.

We must focus on creating 100% affordable housing, protecting our neighborhoods that are composed of residents, small businesses, and neighborhood based organizations, and engaging in community based planning that focuses on the needs of the most vulnerable and marginalized.

Thank you,

David Woo
Community Development and Policy Coordinator
SOMA Pilipinas

From: molinelli@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Amy Molinelli
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Saturday, November 1, 2025 10:09:40 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Dear Mayor Lurie, Supervisor Chan, Planner Chen and other elected officials,

I am a third generation San Franciscan. I live in my grandparents home off of Clement Street. In fact my Italian grandfather washed every window on every storefront on Clement. I chuckle every summer at the tourists eating at our amazing restaurants and coming to walk in Mountain Lake Park and see our neighborhood. I also am amazed at the thriving small businesses, diversity of income and cultures of our neighborhood and multigenerational families who can only afford to live in San Francisco because of THIS neighborhood. I myself, run a small non-profit that serves underserved communities with music, arts and education programming. I work often with districts like SFUSD, Daly City and OUSD.

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors. I am deeply aware of the complex issues but I also have witnessed the history of corruption and developers who promise low-income housing but then somehow it's never enough. Until you can answer why we aren't filling the vacancies in the overflow of luxury housing that already exists in this city and repurposing what we ALREADY have I will not support this demonization of the low and middle class who are trying to survive.

You will demolish what makes San Francisco great and not solve the problems. We read about solutions from the long-term low income housing groups in San Francisco and not from YIMBY which is funneling money from developers and a high powered group of business owners and weaponizing grassroots organizing. This is not the way.

Talk to your small business associations, talk to your communities and please serve the people who live here as well as those who want to live here. Right now it is clear the people who want to make money are being served by using divisive words that tear our communities apart.

I work with teachers, families and the constituents you these developers say they will serve. Families who have working parents, uber drivers, food-service workers, health care workers - with small kids - they need parking and housing and there is housing to be had. Please answer why 15-20 percent of our luxury housing sits empty.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Amy Molinelli
San Francisco, CA 94118

From:	David Kaskowitz
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff
Subject:	Public Comment: VOTE NO On Lurie"s Recipe For Housing Failure & Replace It With A Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701
Date:	Saturday, November 1, 2025 10:10:34 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

It is time to finally adopt a plan that effectively addresses the housing crisis in San Francisco. Mayor Lurie's 'Family Zoning' plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing, as the City Economist recently released report demonstrates.

We still have 3 months to replace the Mayor's plan with one that will work. Here's a real strategy to solve the affordable housing crisis.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units - together more than enough to fulfill state mandates. (Yet instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Lurie's plan simply moves zoning rules around like deck chairs on the Titanic, does almost nothing to increase affordable housing, and increases the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing oversupply [now at 150%] while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods.)

Now that the City Economist has shown that Lurie's plan won't work, it is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the 'Family Zoning' plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing housing approvals, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year in a way that will fully meet state mandates.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible, instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood, and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

The Mayor's plan would build more excess housing for the wealthy, create more

homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators. **Please REPLACE the text in this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural and community integrity, with text that will truly produce affordable housing and get State bureaucrats off of San Francisco's back.**

Thank you,

David Kaskowitz

306 Park St
San Francisco, CA 94110

From: parack@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Patricia Arack
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Saturday, November 1, 2025 6:13:47 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

PARKING ONSITE IS ESSENTIAL!!!!!!
The lack of parking in these new hi rise buildings will have a chilling effect on the purchase or renting of these new units. Those who live in D4 know that a car is a necessity. If there is no parking the units will sit empty, like the eyesore on Sloat and 48th. Muni is inadequate and not safe. Bikes are no good for taking care of school, shopping, medical appointments. It is beyond foolhardy to eliminate on site parking. PEOPLE NEED THEIR CARS OUT HERE AND NEW BUILDINGS NEED PARKING!!!! LISTEN TO D4!!

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Patricia Arack
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: janesmalley1@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jane E Smalley
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Sunday, November 2, 2025 7:10:33 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Jane E Smalley
San Francisco, CA 94118

From: diana.giampaoli@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of diana giampaoli
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 3, 2025 9:37:26 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

HOW COULD YOU ALLOW ONLY 3 STORIES IN THE PRESIDIO AND BUILD OVER 3 STORIES ON LOMBARD. THIS IS INSANE. NOTHING SHOULD BE OVER 4 STORIES ON LOMBARD. PLEASE LISTEN TO US AND NOT THE BUILDERS WHO ARE IN EVERYONES POCKETS. THIS WILL BE HIGH RENTS AND WON'T WORK. WHY DON'T YOU BUILD ON CALIFORNIA STREET THE OLD FIREMANS FUND BUILDING AND CPMC CALIFORNIA CAMPUS. THERE IT WOULD WORK. IT CAN BE LOTS OF HOUSING. BUT MY VIEW IS EVERYONE IS IN EVERYONES POCKETS.....

Sincerely,
diana giampaoli
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: shop@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of beth weissman
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 3, 2025 9:53:44 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
beth weissman
San Francisco, CA 94115

From: jkj2000@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Larry Quantz
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 3, 2025 10:30:53 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors, which, if they don't sell, will become eyesores and attract the Wrong Crowd.

May I ask that you:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Larry Quantz
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: andreacgalvin@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Andrea Galvin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 3, 2025 10:36:51 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am a 35 year resident of San Francisco and am absolutely disgusted that this destructive, ghastly upzoning plan is about to be pushed through with NO real democratic input and based on arbitrary building targets set by an unelected panel of ideologues. If you vote to approve this, as seems to be the foreordained result (as surely as Putin and Maduro, would "win" re-election tomorrow if a vote were held) you will have forfeited every shred of democratic legitimacy you might have left. Mayor Lurie can go down in history as man who destroyed this city of once legendary beauty and charm.

You claim "your hands are tied" by the all mighty Scott Weiner? You can't find the courage push back on a corrupt CA state senator, but yet you proudly "resist" President Trump's offer to deport the illegal Honduran drug dealers who have killed 4,300 San Francisco residents in this decade alone, something most San Francisco's want done? Shame on you. And, do you really think we the citizens are too stupid to see what is going on?

Legitimacy once lost will be difficult to restore.

Mayor Lurie and the Board of Super

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Andrea Galvin
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: mkjanis@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of janis kaempfe
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 3, 2025 10:41:32 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors. So I urge you to:

1. Exclude parcels in the Priority Equity Geographies SUD.

2. Exclude all rent-controlled housing with two or more units, not just 3.

3. Require all publicly owned parcels, like the SFMTA ones, to be 100% affordable housing.

4. Exclude all historic resources from the Upzoning Plan, including local historic districts and those eligible for the California and National Registers.

5. Limit form-based density (density decontrol) and height increases to the Local Plan.

6. Require inclusionary affordable housing to be located on site or nearby within ½ mile of the development.

7. Ted Egan's report from the Controller's office says that housing will unlikely be built no matter what unless rents and sales prices rise. That's just now but well into the future. This plan is one created in quicksand,

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
janis kaempfe
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: pat.huey@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Patricia Huey
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 3, 2025 10:56:51 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

This housing crisis is a myth from greedy real estate developers. We have plenty of housing. The Park Merced apartments have some 3200 apartments available. We have many in-law apartments that no one wants to rent out because small landlords have so few rights. For example, to evict an undesirable tenant, they must pay them $20,000. No small landlord can afford that.

Sincerely,
Patricia Huey
San Francisco, CA 94117

From: cbonavico@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Christopher Bonavico
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, November 3, 2025 11:58:33 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

The proposed new heights along Lombard street are a horrible idea because 1) there is no planning for the additional traffic, 2) no planning for the water issues especially as area sewer pipe is in a terrible state of disrepair so adding new water stress will be a major negative factor, and 3) the plans proposed are for luxury condominiums - they certainly will not helping lower income individuals find housing. This appears to be a monetary windfall to the contractots and developers - and the public officials they donate to. Shame !

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Christopher Bonavico
San Francisco, CA 94123

Request for Notice and Community Feedback on Proposed Upzoning

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2025 NOV 03 PM03:36

Background

The undersigned residents wish to formally express concern regarding the process surrounding the proposed upzoning within the Family Zoning Plan. To date, we have not received reasonable notice regarding this proposal, especially in terms of how it may affect our neighborhood. Furthermore, residents have not been provided with sufficient opportunity to offer meaningful feedback on the proposed changes.

Neighborhood Boundaries

Our neighborhood encompasses the area extending from Van Ness Avenue to Polk/Larkin Streets, spanning from Pacific/Broadway to Greenwich. This includes prominent cross-streets such as Filbert, Union, Bonita, Green, and Vallejo. See MAP, attached

Request for Information

We respectfully request the provision of detailed information addressing the potential impacts of the proposed upzoning, particularly concerning the Van Ness corridor and its immediate surroundings. Comprehensive data and clear communication are essential to enable residents to contribute informed perspectives and feedback before any final decisions are made regarding the Family Zoning Plan.

Name	Address	Phone/email
Diane Joseph	1436 Union St	415-598-9641 djoseph@blackrock.com
Dennis Blum	1438 Union Street	415 577-2438
JOAN ALBERTSON	1438 UNION ST.	415 3070938
MIRIAM KASDAN	1440 Union St	415-350-7591
JOFF NOVICK	1412 Union St.	415 756-5710

Name	Address	Phone/email
Cynthia Chin	1414 Union St	415-832-0450
Janet Song	10 BONITA ST	650-201-8844
CASSANDRA HARVELL	2430 VAN NESS AVE	510 910 1559
Allison Bowden	1770 Pine St	850-443-2084
Ronald Smith	626 POLK ST	415 441 7470
Ruth Waddington	1340 Clay St.	—
Deborah Birnbaum	1950 Clay St. #204	dlbirnbaum@yahoo
Meghan Ministeri	1335 unions st #1	650 787 4841
Lynn Ferrante (Lynn Ferrante)	1335 UNION ST #7	4156011555
Madeline Crowley	2652 Polk #2	415-218-3250
DONNA MARCHESANO	1845 FRANKLIN ST #604	4158790952
Allen Zigman	1440 Union St	4156522217
Reed Connell	1450 Taylor St	510 387 7518
Kristy Eiffert	1455 Union St #12	(661) 703-8672
DAN KUPSCO	1822 POWELL	415.660.6424
Zoe Jacobs	400 Vallejo St. SF CA 94133	(415) 706-6383
Maggie Quinn	733 Chestnut St.	614-949-0732
Ricky Mathew	" "	707-484-6[illegible]
Monica Pelayo	000 Chestnut	650-796-6548
David Rapp-Kirshner	600 Chestnut	315 915 9112
Lisa Rude	2656 Van Ness	415-673-1773
DAVID OH	1440 union St APT 103	213-393-5744
[illegible]	1[illegible] St	415-544-[illegible]
Andrea N. Grant	2560 Polk St #4	917 715 5403

Name	Address	Phone/email
Sebrina Lonergan	2761 Van Ness	8178210957
[illegible]	869 Hyde St #604	watsonamy@mac.com
DAN KUWALSKI	2355 Polk St. #206	516 812-1250
Sara Draper	1660 Sacramento St	
Karan Malhotra	1080 Sutter St. #201	408-599-8040
Jin Rickard	1455 Vallejo St.	kinjojinzen@outlook.com
David Fine	2 539 Polk SF CA	323 [illegible]
Susan Ostermann	2048 Polk St, # 212	(628) 249-5594
[illegible]	1845 Walnut St.	415-216-5449
[illegible]	1590 BROADWAY #226	415-517-2572
Eldera Pedersen	1458 Union St. SF, CA 94109	415-531-4022

Name	Address	Phone/email
Francell K. Haskins	1335 Union St #6	fran.kh@sbcglobal.net
MARIO RMZ	1335 UNION #4	6509066729

Proposed Zoning Map
Local Program Heights
DRAFT September 30, 2025

Board file 250700 v.3
Graphic Source: San Francisco Planning Department



Proposed Local Program Height Limits

- 40' Local Program Height
- 50' Local Program Height
- 65' Local Program Height
- 85' Local Program Height
- 105' Local Program Height
- 120' Local Program Height
- 130' Local Program Height
- 140' Local Program Height
- 160' Local Program Height
- 180' Local Program Height
- 240' Local Program Height
- 250' Local Program Height
- 300' Local Program Height
- 350' Local Program Height
- 450' Local Program Height
- 490' Local Program Height
- 500' Local Program Height
- 650' Local Program Height

- Supervisor District
- Housing Opportunity Areas

NOTES:

In addition to heights shown here, the following lots get a minimum height of 65' through the Local Program: Lots 8,000sf or larger, and Corner lots.

All projects using the Local Program are subject to form-based density (ie density decontrol) regardless of height limit or underlying zoning district.

This map represents heights available to projects that opt into the Local Program. They are generally equivalent to heights projects may receive if using the State Density Bonus or other state bonus program.

0 0.5 Miles

LEARN MORE:
sfgov.org/sfplanning.org/sf-family-zoning-plan

Comments to the Land Use Committee on November 3, 2025
Jessica Vistnes

My name is Jessica Vistnes and I'm from District 2. I am speaking today in strong opposition to the current version of the proposed upzoning plan. I fully support more housing in my neighborhood – I just want it to be thoughtful and in scale.

I am distressed about the increased heights in many parts of District 2, but with only 2 minutes to speak I want to focus on the proposed zoning for 14-story buildings on Lombard Street, starting at Laguna and going east. This change in heights there seems to have only been added in 2025– and my understanding is that it occurred because heights were lowered at the west end of Lombard near the Palace of Fine Arts and as a result heights were simply popped up at the other end to 14 stories to maintain the count – which does not seem like a very thoughtful approach to rezoning Lombard Street.

My understanding from talking with Supervisor Sherrill is that he expects there might be potentially 10 14-story buildings on the three blocks of Lombard from Laguna to Franklin. Many people, even those in favor of the zoning

plan, view the Fontana Towers as eyesores. To me, 14-story towers on Lombard Street, while they are not 18 stories like the Fontana Towers, is just like putting possibly 10 eyesores in an area that would block some of the nicest views in San Francisco so only a privileged few can see them. And people living in the new luxury apartments on floors 7 through 14 of these towers are probably unlikely to be taking the bus on the transit friendly Lombard Street that is the reason for allowing such tall buildings there in the first place.

I live on Vallejo Street and have been paying attention, as I walk around, to the beautiful views at the intersections of Vallejo and Broadway Streets with Laguna, Octavia, Gough, and Franklin streets that would be OBLITERATED with such tall buildings. Apart from residents enjoying views of THE CITY BY THE BAY, there go views for the tourists as they walk around Pacific Heights or drive around in those cute little yellow cars. Lowering heights on three blocks doesn't seem like it would upset the apple cart for this plan with the state and I urge you to consider it.

I am submitting this letter with my public comments because I agree with the proposed revisions

Jessica Vistnes
District 2

COW HOLLOW ASSOCIATION
P.O. BOX 471136 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94147

April 30, 2025

Supervisor Stephen Sherrill
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Proposed Revisions to the Upzoning Map to Reflect District 2's Community Planning, Safety, and Growth Objectives

Dear Supervisor Sherrill,

Thank you for your engagement with our neighborhood as we collectively work toward a vision of housing growth that respects San Francisco's history, diverse communities, scale, and distinctive public spaces.

As SF Planning continues to revise the proposed Upzoning Map, we request a series of specific, actionable changes critical to maintaining the identity, livability, and uniqueness of this part of San Francisco. We look forward to working with you to:

- Maintain Lombard Street as a Scenic Gateway to San Francisco
- Protect Existing Housing and Prioritize Safety
- Safeguard Neighborhood-Serving Retail Corridors
- Remove Density Decontrol Provisions

This part of District 2 features some of San Francisco's most iconic landmarks—from the Bay and the Palace of Fine Arts to the Golden Gate Bridge. As drivers enter the city via the Presidio Parkway, they experience a rare blend of hillside housing and urban density, evoking the charm of Europe's great coastal cities. The combination of natural setting, architectural rhythm, and cultural legacy makes this area both a world-class tourist destination and a cherished residential neighborhood.

For over a century, development west of Van Ness has followed the city's natural topography, integrating the urban grid with the land's slope, sunlight, and airflow. This is no accident—it is the result of organic, community-guided planning. Taller buildings crown the hilltops, gradually stepping down to 40 feet as the land slopes toward the Bay. Where this balance has been ignored, the consequences have been damaging.

As the city updates its zoning map to meet housing goals, it has both the opportunity and the obligation to respect this historic, context-sensitive development pattern. A one-size-fits-all approach invites speculative land grabs, drives up land costs, and risks replacing community-serving homes and businesses with unaffordable, investor-driven development.

Requested Map Changes & Policy Adjustments

1. Maintain Lombard Street as a Scenic Gateway to San Francisco

Lombard Street forms a gateway into San Francisco from the Golden Gate Bridge, framing iconic landmarks like the Palace of Fine Arts. Longstanding planning principles recognize that such landmarks must retain their visual prominence within the surrounding cityscape.

The proposed Upzoning Map undermines those principles by allowing buildings 6 to 8 stories tall—or more—immediately adjacent to or within the vicinity of lower-scale blocks and historic landmarks. These oversized structures, up to 100% larger than their surroundings, would crowd and compete with iconic features like the Palace of Fine Arts—a City Landmark that has long defined San Francisco's northern waterfront. Its visual stature depends on a built environment that respects both scale and setting. A blunt, uniform upzoning to 85 feet disregards topography and erodes the historic character that makes this area both livable and globally recognized.

We recommend a tapered height approach: 40 feet near the Palace, rising gradually to 50 and then 65 feet approaching Van Ness. This reflects the area's historical development pattern and ensures a balanced transition from the waterfront to the city's interior.

Recommended Height Limits:

- Limit building height to 40' on Richardson Avenue and on Lombard Street (starting at the Lombard Gate) to Webster Street
- Allow gradual increases beyond Webster to Van Ness:
    - 50' between Webster and Gough
    - 65' between Gough and Van Ness

This part of San Francisco — including Cow Hollow, the Marina, and Pacific Heights — has been assigned thousands of new units of housing capacity through broad density decontrol and increased height allowances, all contributing to the state's RHNA targets. It is more than our fair share in one of the city's most densely populated neighborhoods. These policies, when done properly, could enable new growth by allowing duplexes, triplexes, and small multi-unit buildings across the neighborhood.

In addition, Lombard is home to many small, independent motels dating back to the era of the Golden Gate Bridge — a rare remnant of San Francisco's history of welcoming visitors within neighborhood settings. Lombard is one of the last Motorways in the country that captures that hope-filled era of travel in mid-century America, rebuilding after World War II. These motels provide reasonably priced rooms and proximity to a major tourist destination, and support for our local businesses. Several of these motels have already been converted to student housing for the Academy of Art University. Losing others will result in losing tourism to our community and neighborhoods.

These recommendations align with the Planning Department's stated goals under the General Plan to preserve neighborhood character, maintain economic diversity, and enhance citywide view corridors.

2. Protect Existing Housing and Prioritize Safety

Lombard Street already has many residents living in rent-controlled apartments. These homes are essential to neighborhood stability and affordability, and support a vibrant mix of retail, services, and housing. Let's ensure long-time tenants in older rent-controlled buildings will not be quietly displaced through buyouts and demolitions.

As the upzoning plans allowed for more residents, we need to ensure the safety of those residents. The Planning Department must consider the serious risk of liquefaction in these areas. Much of the low-lying Marina and Cow Hollow was built on infill and remains vulnerable to seismic activity.

Aside from Lombard being a liquefaction zone, fire response time is a consideration. Cow Hollow boasts a newly rebuilt fire station on Greenwich Street. However, the fire truck ladders at this station can only service buildings as tall as 6-7 stories. If the building heights nearby are raised to 85' or taller, trucks must come from other neighborhoods, increasing the response time and endangering residents and visitors. This public safety issue has not been addressed anywhere in the city where buildings are proposed for drastic height increases.

These issues point to the need for thoughtful major corridor plans along not only Lombard, but Geary, 19th, and Taraval, among others, to ensure that urban planning practices can be implemented with the public input and care that went into the Market-Octavia or Central SOMA Plans of recent years.

3. Safeguard Neighborhood-Serving Retail Corridors

Chestnut, Union, and Fillmore streets are economic and cultural anchors. Their small-scale, sunlit retail corridors support thousands of jobs and contribute significantly to neighborhood livability and a large contingent of the city's 20+ million visitors that further contribute to supporting local employment and small businesses.

Upzoning these corridors would trigger redevelopment that almost always begins with demolition—many of these buildings are historic one-story Art Deco structures that currently house thriving small businesses. These businesses will not survive the transition, and adjacent shops are often dragged down by years of construction-related disruption. Noise, fencing, blocked sidewalks, lost parking, and reduced foot traffic can destabilize entire commercial blocks. The result is not affordable housing—it is the slow erosion of the vitality and street life that make these neighborhoods work.

The Marina Safeway site is another concern. While redevelopment may be considered, its location and current use are vital for residents—especially seniors and families without access to private transportation. A high-rise would be inappropriate and disruptive in this context.

Recommended Height Limits:

- Limit height to 40 feet on:
    - Union Street
    - Chestnut Street
    - Lower Fillmore Street (within the Marina and Cow Hollow)
    - Upper Fillmore Street (from Jackson to Bush)
    - Safeway site (corner of Laguna and Marina Blvd)

4. Remove Density Decontrol Provisions

To promote transparency and encourage meaningful neighborhood engagement, urge SF Planning to update the current interactive Upzoning Map to clearly reflect the two key provisions. Most San Franciscans are unfamiliar with these kinds of online tools and may not realize they need to click the "Info" button in the left-hand legend to uncover the proposed changes.

Currently, if someone clicks on a corner lot within the density decontrol area, the map still shows a proposed height of 40 feet—rather than the actual 65 feet being contemplated. This creates confusion and obscures the true scope of the changes. Failure to make these provisions plainly visible may not meet the standards of procedural transparency or informed public review expected under CEQA and other land use statutes. Complete clarity is essential.

But clarity alone is not enough. These provisions are deeply flawed and should be removed:

Recommended Changes:

- **Remove the provision that allows 65' heights on corners lots.** This will result in taller, randomly-placed towers among otherwise consistent 1-4 story residential blocks — with no relationship to neighborhood form or any broader planning vision.

- **Remove the provision that allows lots 8,000 sq. ft. or greater to automatically rise to 65'.** This provision encourages lot mergers that will invade the unique and vital greenbelts, backyards, and trees that provide vital open space in dense urban living.

Conclusion

We support new housing through thoughtful, context-sensitive growth. Like the city, we believe in expanding housing opportunities through planning that respects topography, preserves neighborhood identity, and safeguards essential services.

This area has already added housing capacity through the 4- and 6-plex legislation led by Supervisor Mandelman and adopted in 2023. We welcome further improvements that recognize Lombard Street's role as a scenic gateway.

But the current map goes too far. It invites speculation, drives up land costs, and encourages the demolition of sound housing—quietly displacing tenants and small businesses in favor of unaffordable luxury towers. These are the very people and places that give our neighborhoods their life and character.

Incorporating the revisions we've outlined will build public trust, reflect sound planning, and reduce the risk of unnecessary conflict or delay.

We urge you to support a smarter, long-term strategy—one that protects what makes San Francisco unique: its layered history, diverse communities, small businesses, and walkable, human-scale neighborhoods that reflect generations of thoughtful planning—while ensuring that truly affordable housing is the outcome, not just the promise, of these efforts.

Sincerely,

Lori Brooke
President, Cow Hollow Association

cc:
CHA Association Board and Membership
Mayor Daniel Lurie
Ned Segal, Chief of Housing and Economic Development
Rich Hillis, Director, Planning Department
Rachael Tanner, Director of Citywide Planning, Planning Department
Joshua Switzky, Deputy Director of Citywide Policy, Planning Department
Lisa Chen, Principal Planner, Planning Department

Bellaire Tower Homeowners' Association

1101 Green St.

San Francisco, CA 94109

Sent via E-Mail

October 31, 2025

San Francisco Mayor's Office
Mayor Daniel Lurie
Ned Segal
Chief Housing and Economic Development

San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Re: Land Use and Transportation Committee
Meeting, November 3rd 1:30 pm
Agenda Item 6, 250966 General Plan Amendments Family Zoning Plan

Dear Mayor Lurie, Chief Segal, and Board of Supervisors:

I write this letter on behalf of Bellaire Towers Homeowners' Association, 64 owners and residents of our 20 story historic high rise at Green and Leavenworth at the top of Russian Hill.

The original Family Zoning Plan heights for the six square blocks: Leavenworth on the east, Larkin to the west, Filbert to the north and Vallejo to the south maintained the current 40 foot height.

Without explanation or comment, in late 2024, the Family Zoning Plan Map increased zoning height in this six square block area from 40 feet to 65 feet.

We respectfully request the original Family Zoning Plan zoning height of 40 feet be reinstated for this six square block area.

Our request is modest and historically correct according to the Family Zoning Plan's own records.

There is substantial Russian Hill community support for retaining this 40 foot limit for this six block area.

On May 6, 2025, (attached)the 600 member Russian Hill Neighbors wrote the San Francisco Planning Department noting the unexpected reversal of the original Family Zoning Plan in the six block area, noting in the penultimate paragraph of their letter:

"Lastly, we were surprised to see that heights were increased from 4 to 6 storys in the approximately 6 blocks centered on Hyde and Union Streets shown in Area A. This appears to be a reversal from the outcome of several discussions we had with Planning on this issue. These blocks are similar in character to the adjacent multi-block areas of Russian Hill immediately to the north and east which remain at 4-5 stories. These are all finely-grained residential areas among the city's densest. As we had mentioned in earlier letters, the availability of "soft" parcels more likely to be candidates for development are extremely limited here, significantly reducing the benefit of any proposed height increases in these blocks. We support density decontrol here, but urge retaining the current 4-story limit in this area."[1]

---

[1] It is expected a representative of the separate and also largely representative Russian Hill Community Association will be present at this meeting in support of the reinstatement of the 40 foot zoning in the six block area.

There are at least three separate and compelling arguments from a land use perspective in retaining the 40 foot height limit in this six block area:

First, this zoning height increase in this six square block area will not lead to affordable housing. To the opposite, it will only lead to gross speculation by developers. Bellaire's representative, Rajan Edwards, so testified at the original SF Planning Commission hearing and the last Land Use and Transportation Committee hearing.

Second, this is an historic district and stable residential neighborhood. Specifically, to the immediate east of Bellaire Tower is the designated historic district, the "Paris Block" legacy residences that survived the 1906 earthquake. Bellaire Tower itself has already obtained an Historic Resource Evaluation and is seeking state and national landmark status with the noted preservation architects Page & Turnbull. Interspersed in the six block square area are other historic or historically evaluated residences. There is significant Russian Hill community support for designating the entire area down to Hyde street with its cable car route an historic district. This entire neighborhood should not be disturbed and irrevocably changed by prospective development.

Third, and finally, increasing the zoning height by 25 feet in this six block area, in all probability, makes no economic sense even to developers. Bellaire has consulted a number of established and knowledgeable developers in San Francisco, who inform us this marginal 25 foot zoning height increase makes no economic sense from a developer's standpoint, given the already high land acquisition cost and the marginal increase in density, making multi-family, as opposed to single family re-development a losing proposition.

I will be personally in attendance at the meeting and would like to testify and answer any questions on this matter.

Respectfully Submitted,

Niels L. Pearson

Niels Pearson

President,

Bellaire Tower Homeowners' Association

Encl.

RUSSIAN HILL
NEIGHBORS

May 6, 2025

Lisa Chen, Principal Planner
San Francisco Planning Department
49 South Van Ness Ave., Suite 1400
San Francisco, CA 94103
lisa.chen@sfgov.org

Subject: **Comments on April 2025 Draft of Proposed Zoning Map**

Dear Lisa:

Building upon our meetings and reviews of last year's drafts of the rezoning, we have reviewed the current iteration of April 2025. While encouraged that the current map reflects a number of our earlier comments, we have remaining concerns over what appear to be several reversals and height increases compared to the February 2024 draft.

We have consistently been supportive of reasonable density and height increases along main commercial and transit corridors, including Van Ness Ave. and Polk St. We are pleased to see that heights along upper- and mid-Polk St. have been limited to 8 stories, as we had recommended, rather than the 14 stories originally proposed that we felt were excessive. However, along Van Ness, heights have grown from 8 to 14 stories at the intersection with Lombard St., and from 25 to 35 stories south of Broadway. We urge a much more gradual transition in these locations. Please see Areas C1 and C2 on the attached map.

Closer to the waterfront, we were gratified to see the blocks along Bay St. reduced from 6 to 4-stories, as we had requested. However, the blocks north of North Point remain at 6-stories which we find problematic as they include Ghirardelli Sq. and are adjacent to Aquatic Park, as shown on Area B in the attachment. We recommend retaining the 4-story limit here.

Lastly, we were surprised to see that heights were increased from 4 to 6 stories in the approximately 6 blocks centered on Hyde and Union Streets shown in Area A. This appears to be a reversal from the outcome of several discussions we had with Planning on this issue. These blocks are similar in character to the adjacent multi-block areas of Russian Hill immediately to the north and east which remain at 4-5 stories. These are all finely-grained residential areas among the city's densest. As we had mentioned in earlier letters, the availability of "soft" parcels more likely to be candidates for development are extremely limited here, significantly reducing the benefit of any proposed height increases in these blocks. We support density decontrol here, but urge retaining the current 4-story limit in this area.

Thank you once again for considering our comments, and please let me know if you have any questions.

Cordially,
Carol Ann Rogers, President
president@rhnsf.org
415-902-3980

Attachments (2)

cc: Rich Hillis, Director rich.hillis@sfgov.org
Commission Affairs commissions.secretary@sfgov.org
Supervisor Danny Sauter sauterstaff@sfgov.org
Supervisor Stephen Sherrill sherrillstaff@sfgov.org

Russian Hill Neighbors ▪ 1819 Polk Street #221 ▪ San Francisco, CA 94109

SAN FRANCISCO
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Historic Resource Evaluation Response

1650 Mission St.
Suite 400
San Francisco,
CA 94103-2479

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

Date	September 28, 2015
Case No.:	**2014-001259ENV**
Project Address:	**60 Russell Street**
Zoning:	RH-2 (Residential House, Two-Family) 40-X Height and Bulk District
Block/Lot:	0123/009
Staff Contact:	Gretchen Hilyard (Preservation Planner) (415) 575-9109 gretchen.hilyard@sfgov.org

PART I: HISTORIC RESOURCE EVALUATION

Buildings and Property Description

The subject property, 60 Russell Street, is located on a rectangular-shaped lot measuring 20 feet by 60 feet on the north side of Russell Street, an alley located between Hyde Street and Eastman Alley in the Russian Hill neighborhood of San Francisco. The property is located within an RH-2 (Residential-House, Two-Family) Zoning District and a 40-X Height and Bulk District.

The subject property is occupied by a one-story over raised basement, single family, wood frame residence constructed in ca. 1906. The residence was originally designed as a flat-front Italianate cottage that was very similar to 64 Russell Street—featuring the same side entry porch, projecting cornice, and façade configuration. Known alterations to the property include: relocation of partition walls, addition of two rooms and three exterior decks, window and door replacement, re-cladding the exterior in wood shingles, and replacement of wall boards and trim (1963); reroofing (1992); and dry rot repair (2006). Other alterations include removal of the period elements of the entry vestibule at an unknown date.

Pre-Existing Historic Rating / Survey

The subject property is considered a "Category B" property (Properties Requiring Further Consultation and Review) for the purposes of the Planning Department's California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review procedures due to its age (constructed in ca. 1906).

On July 8, 2010, the Department issued a Historical Resource Evaluation Response (HRER) for a proposed project at 1945 Hyde Street (Planning Case #2010.0162E), which identified the subject block as part of an eligible historic district. The Historic Resource Evaluation prepared for the project (by Kelley & VerPlanck, dated February 2010) found that Russell Street (from Eastman Alley to Hyde Street) contains "a high concentration of residential buildings constructed in the early years of reconstruction after the 1906 Earthquake and Fire...The buildings within this area are unified historically by theme and form, and therefore could be a potential district."[1] The subject property is located within the boundaries of this identified district. See evaluation section below for further analysis.

---

[1] Kelley & VerPlanck, Historic Resource Evaluation for 1945 Hyde Street, (February 2010).

Neighborhood Context and Description

The subject property is located on a single-block alley on the western side of Russian Hill in San Francisco. The immediate context is characterized by primarily residential land uses with buildings dating from 1906 to the late-1920s. Buildings are generally one to three stories in height and some commercial properties are located along the major streets. The larger neighborhood is generally characterized by its steeply sloping terrain and a wide range of building types and styles dating from 1850-1930, with a scattering of more contemporary buildings throughout. While portions of the Russian Hill neighborhood have been surveyed as potential historic districts (specifically the older buildings at the top of the hill), the immediate blocks surrounding the subject property have not been formally surveyed.

CEQA Historical Resource(s) Evaluation

Step A: Significance

Under CEQA section 21084.1, a property qualifies as a historic resource if it is "listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in, the California Register of Historical Resources." The fact that a resource is not listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in, the California Register of Historical Resources or not included in a local register of historical resources, shall not preclude a lead agency from determining whether the resource may qualify as a historical resource under CEQA.

Individual		Historic District/Context	
Property is individually eligible for inclusion in a California Register under one or more of the following Criteria:		Property is eligible for inclusion in a California Register Historic District/Context under one or more of the following Criteria:	
Criterion 1 - Event:	☐ Yes ☒ No	Criterion 1 - Event:	☒ Yes ☐ No
Criterion 2 - Persons:	☐ Yes ☒ No	Criterion 2 - Persons:	☐ Yes ☒ No
Criterion 3 - Architecture:	☐ Yes ☒ No	Criterion 3 - Architecture:	☒ Yes ☐ No
Criterion 4 - Info. Potential:	☐ Yes ☒ No	Criterion 4 - Info. Potential:	☐ Yes ☒ No
Period of Significance: N/A		Period of Significance: 1906-1911 ☐ Contributor ☒ Non-Contributor	

Based on the information provided in the Historic Resource Evaluation prepared for the subject property by Tim Kelley Consulting (dated June 2014), additional research by staff, and information found in the Planning Department files; staff finds that the subject building is eligible for inclusion on the California Register as a non-contributor to an eligible historic district under California Register Criteria 1 and 3.

Criterion 1: Property is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history, or the cultural heritage of California or the United States.

To be eligible under the event Criterion, the building cannot merely be associated with historic events or trends but must have a specific association to be considered significant.

According to the *Historic Resource Evaluation* prepared by Tim Kelley Consulting, Russian Hill first developed in late-19th century and many of its early residents were prominent members of the Bay Area's artistic, literary, artistic, and intellectual traditions. Early residents of Russian Hill included

Swedenborgian minister Joseph Worcester, architect Willis Polk, writer Gelett Burgess, photographer Dorothea Lane, and painter and poet Maynard Dixon.[2] The Russian Hill neighborhood was severely damaged by the 1906 Earthquake and Fire and all but a few buildings at the summit of the hill were destroyed. After this catastrophic event, residents quickly rebuilt and the subject property was constructed as part of the reconstruction effort that stretched from 1906 to ca. 1915. Many of the reconstruction-era buildings in Russian Hill were built quickly after the event to meet the high need for housing in San Francisco. The subject building did not individually contribute to the pattern of reconstruction of the Russian Hill neighborhood after the 1906 Earthquake and Fire such that it would be individually eligible for listing in the California Register under this criterion. However, the building is part of a collection of buildings that represent this pattern of development and are more appropriately analyzed for eligibility as a historic district (see historic district evaluation below).

Staff finds that 60 Russell Street does not have a specific association with an event such that it would qualify individually under Criterion 1.

Criterion 2: Property is associated with the lives of persons important in our local, regional or national past.
Building permit records indicate that the original owners of 60 Russell Street were Ernest and Marguerite Guinard, who purchased the property in 1906 and sold it in 1911. The early owners and occupants of the subject property and neighboring properties on Russell Street were generally blue-collar workers (carpenters, laborers, etc). Records do not indicate that any of the owners or occupants of the subject property are important to local, regional or national past. Therefore, 60 Russell Street is not eligible under Criterion 2.

Criterion 3: Property embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values.
60 Russell Street is a one-story over raised basement, single family, wood frame residence originally designed as a flat-front Italianate cottage. The building was constructed in ca. 1906, at the beginning of the reconstruction of the Russian Hill neighborhood after the 1906 Earthquake and Fire. The building retains its original form and some architectural features, such as the projecting cornice, but many of the exterior façade materials have been removed or were covered over by wood shingles in 1963.

Based on information outlined in the Historic Resource Evaluation prepared for the project (Tim Kelley Consulting, June 2014), and additional research by staff, the subject property at 60 Russell Street is not individually eligible for inclusion in the California Register under Criterion 3 (Architecture), since the building does not possess high artistic value, nor individually embody distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction.

Criterion 4: Property yields, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.
The subject building is not significant under Criterion 4, since this significance criterion typically applies to rare construction types when involving the built environment. The subject building is not an example of a rare construction type. Evaluation of archeological resources is outside of the scope of this review.

---

[2] Ibid, 5.

Historic District Evaluation

The subject property is part of a single-block alley of small-scale residential properties that are thematically and architecturally associated with the San Francisco's rebuilding after the 1906 Earthquake and Fire. The development of Russell Street followed a city-wide pattern of residential and commercial buildings construction spanning from 1906 to ca. 1915 to provide housing and services to displaced residents after the disaster. Today, Russell Street displays the architectural congruity necessary to qualify for listing under Criterion 1 (Events) representing a significant pattern of development after the 1906 Earthquake and Fire. The block is also eligible for listing under Criterion 3 (Design/Architecture) due to its high concentration of architecturally unified buildings with shared architectural characteristics, form, historic context and period.

Although a survey has not yet been completed, the boundaries of the historic district would include properties on both sides of Russell Street from Eastman Alley to Hyde Street. Based upon the historic context themes associated with the neighborhood, contributing buildings to the potential historic district would include intact multi- and single-family dwellings constructed on Russell Street between 1906 and 1911, the date the last reconstruction-era residence was completed on the street. As a result of this development pattern, there is a considerable degree of visual harmony among the residential properties along Russell Street and the buildings have experienced few exterior alterations. The building styles include Italianate, Classical Revival, Queen Anne, Craftsman, and Edwardian architectural styles. Most buildings still display a high level of historic architectural integrity; while there have been some alterations, the majority of the buildings still possess the basic form and architectural detailing associated with their style from the period of significance. The subject property was constructed during the period of significance, but due to exterior alterations, the building has lost integrity to this period and is considered a non-contributor to the eligible historic district.

***Note: The eligible Russell Street historic district has not been formally surveyed or evaluated. For the purposes of this HRER, the subject property at 60 Russell Street was examined for its possible contribution to the historic district and no other buildings within the district boundary were evaluated in detail.

Step B: Integrity

To be a resource for the purposes of CEQA, a property must not only be shown to be significant under the California Register of Historical Resources criteria, but it also must have integrity. Integrity is defined as "the authenticity of a property's historic identity, evidenced by the survival of physical characteristics that existed during the property's period of significance." Historic integrity enables a property to illustrate significant aspects of its past. All seven qualities do not need to be present as long the overall sense of past time and place is evident.

Location:	☒ Retains	☐ Lacks	**Setting:**	☒ Retains	☐ Lacks
Association:	☒ Retains	☐ Lacks	**Feeling:**	☒ Retains	☐ Lacks
Design:	☐ Retains	☒ Lacks	**Materials:**	☐ Retains	☒ Lacks
Workmanship:	☐ Retains	☒ Lacks			

The street-facing façade of the subject property (60 Russell Street) has undergone many alterations since it was originally constructed in ca. 1906, including replacement of original wood-sash double-hung windows with aluminum sliders, reduction in the size of original window openings, removal of decorative window and door surrounds, modification of the projecting cornice detailing, and covering

the original horizontal wood siding with wood shingles. Although the original building form and scale are evident and some of the original cladding and trim materials may exist underneath the current cladding, in its current state, the building does not retain sufficient integrity to contribute to the eligible historic district.

Step C: Historic District Character Defining Features

For the eligible Russell Street Historic District, the character-defining features would include but are not limited to:

- Location on Russell Street;
- Residential use (single-family or multi-family flats);
- One-to-three story height;
- Wood frame construction;
- Lack of architectural bays (mostly flat facades facing alley with an occasional shallow angled bay);
- Raised basements;
- Horizontal wood cladding;
- Gable or flat roof forms;
- Elevated and recessed entries (some recessed entries feature decorative vestibule panels);
- Wood entry stairs;
- Queen Anne, Craftsman, Classical Revival, Italianate or Edwardian-era architectural detailing;
- Arched Classical Revival style entry surrounds with flanking columns or pilasters;
- Projecting, decorative wood window and door hoods;
- Flat or slightly molded wood board window and door surrounds;
- Wood-sash windows (double-hung and casement), some with multi-lite upper sashes and ogee lugs;
- Paneled and partially glazed wood entry doors;
- Projecting, denticulated cornices with square modillions; and
- Free-standing planter boxes or retaining walls in front setback, or no front setback.

CEQA Historic Resource Determination

☒ Historical Resource Present
- ☐ Individually-eligible Resource
- ☐ Contributor to an eligible Historic District
- ☒ Non-contributor to an eligible Historic District

☐ No Historical Resource Present

PART I: SENIOR PRESERVATION PLANNER REVIEW

Signature: Tina Tam

Tina Tam, *Senior Preservation Planner*

Date: 10-5-2015

cc: Nicholas Foster, Current Planning

GH: G:\Documents\HRER\60 Russell\HRER\60 Russell Street_HRER Part I.doc

IMAGES

Subject property looking northwest.
Image courtesy of Google Maps, 2015.

From:	Lupe Velez
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff
Subject:	Public Comment: VOTE NO On Lurie"s Recipe For Housing Failure & Replace It With A Real Affordable Housing Plan
Date:	Monday, November 3, 2025 3:19:24 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

The City Economist just released a report showing that Mayor Lurie's 'Family Zoning' plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing.

We still have 3 months to replace the Mayor's plan with one that will work. Here's a real strategy to solve the affordable housing crisis.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units - together more than enough to fulfill state mandates. (Yet instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Lurie's plan simply moves zoning rules around like deck chairs on the Titanic, does almost nothing to increase affordable housing, and increases the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing oversupply [now at 150%] while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods.)

Now that the City Economist has shown that Lurie's plan won't work, it is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the 'Family Zoning' plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing housing approvals, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year in a way that will fully meet state mandates.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible, instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood, and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

The Mayor's plan would build more excess housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and

corporate real estate speculators. **Please REPLACE the text in this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural and community integrity, with text that will truly produce affordable housing and get State bureaucrats off of San Francisco's back.**

--

Guadalupe Velez
Communications Director
(She/Her/Hers)
Coalition on Homelessness
280 Turk Street, San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 346-3740 x305

From:	David Woo
To:	Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS)
Cc:	Raquel Redondiez; Carroll, John (BOS); Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	SOMA Pilipinas Letter RE "Family Zoning Plan"
Date:	Monday, November 3, 2025 12:42:26 PM
Attachments:	SOMA Pilipinas Letter_Family Zoning Plan 11.3.25.pdf

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

President Mandelman and Members of the Board, please see our letter below regarding the "Family Zoning Plan."

November 3, 2025

RE: Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan"

President Mandelman and Members of the Board of Supervisors,

SOMA Pilipinas, the Filipino Cultural Heritage District, is opposed to the proposed upzoning plan. The upzoning plan will lead to the displacement of residents and small businesses, and encourages real estate speculation, harming the South of Market and neighborhoods across the city. The current plan, coupled with numerous cuts to affordable housing and impact fees that have already occurred, highlight how the city's Housing Element and the state co-opt the language of racial and social equity to further deregulation. We are also opposed to the blatant giveaway in Western SOMA of mainly increasing base heights, which will be used with the state density bonus, resulting in basically two upzonings from this plan for SOMA.

We must instead prioritize developing 100% affordable housing, preserving and protecting existing housing, protecting existing residents and small businesses from displacement, and engaging in community based planning. The current upzoning is failing on these fronts. We support the amendments put forward by Supervisor Chan and Supervisor Chen as they constitute a logical baseline of what should be included in such a sweeping upzoning proposal.

The city's Housing Element, mandated by the state, calls for 57% affordable housing to be built. As there is no affordable housing component to this plan, it is clear that it is a market-rate housing plan. The city economist Ted Egan acknowledges that market-rate housing will not get built at the levels "required" by the state, because developers and investors can not get the profit that is desired from these projects, stating the plan will only produce 8,500-14,600 units over the next 20 years. Affordable housing developers, however, are ready and willing to build housing. According to the city's 2024 Housing Inventory Report, affordable housing production accounted for 64% of all new housing production in 2024; as market-rate housing stalled because of lack of return on investment, affordable housing production continued.

If the city and state are really concerned about "building housing," the focus would be on building affordable housing. However, it is clear that the real desire is not simply to "build housing," but instead to provide the best scenario for private developers, investors, and

speculators to make money off of the real estate market in San Francisco.

We must focus on creating 100% affordable housing, protecting our neighborhoods that are composed of residents, small businesses, and neighborhood based organizations, and engaging in community based planning that focuses on the needs of the most vulnerable and marginalized.

Thank you,

David Woo
Community Development and Policy Coordinator
SOMA Pilipinas

--
David Woo
Community Development and Policy Coordinator
SOMA Pilipinas Cultural Heritage District

PILIPINAS

November 3, 2025

RE: Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan"

President Mandelman and Members of the Board of Supervisors,

SOMA Pilipinas, the Filipino Cultural Heritage District, is opposed to the proposed upzoning plan. The upzoning plan will lead to the displacement of residents and small businesses, and encourages real estate speculation, harming the South of Market and neighborhoods across the city. The current plan, coupled with numerous cuts to affordable housing and impact fees that have already occurred, highlight how the city's Housing Element and the state co-opt the language of racial and social equity to further deregulation. We are also opposed to the blatant giveaway in Western SOMA of mainly increasing base heights, which will be used with the state density bonus, resulting in basically two upzonings from this plan for SOMA.

We must instead prioritize developing 100% affordable housing, preserving and protecting existing housing, protecting existing residents and small businesses from displacement, and engaging in community based planning. The current upzoning is failing on these fronts. We support the amendments put forward by Supervisor Chan and Supervisor Chen as they constitute a logical baseline of what should be included in such a sweeping upzoning proposal.

The city's Housing Element, mandated by the state, calls for 57% affordable housing to be built. As there is no affordable housing component to this plan, it is clear that it is a market-rate housing plan. The city economist Ted Egan acknowledges that market-rate housing will not get built at the levels "required" by the state, because developers and investors can not get the profit that is desired from these projects, stating the plan will only produce 8,500-14,600 units over the next 20 years. Affordable housing developers, however, are ready and willing to build housing. According to the city's 2024 Housing Inventory Report, affordable housing production accounted for 64% of all new housing production in 2024; as market-rate housing stalled because of lack of return on investment, affordable housing production continued.

If the city and state are really concerned about "building housing," the focus would be on building affordable housing. However, it is clear that the real desire is not simply to "build housing," but instead to provide the best scenario for private developers, investors, and speculators to make money off of the real estate market in San Francisco.

We must focus on creating 100% affordable housing, protecting our neighborhoods that are composed of residents, small businesses, and neighborhood based organizations, and engaging in community based planning that focuses on the needs of the most vulnerable and marginalized.

Thank you,

David Woo
Community Development and Policy Coordinator
SOMA Pilipinas

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Entezari, Mehran (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject:	FW: The FZP - Stop Fighting Each Other Over Capacity. Fight the RHNA"s Illegality Instead. Adopt the Humane, Protective Chan, Chen, and Melgar Amendments
Date:	Monday, November 3, 2025 12:12:18 PM

Dear Supervisors,

Please see below communication regarding File Nos. 250700, 251071; 250701, 251072, 251073; 250966; and 251071.

File No. 250700: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 251071: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 250701: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 251072: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 251073: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 250966: General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 251071: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan

Thank you,

Eileen McHugh
Executive Assistant
Office of the Clerk of the Board
Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689
Phone: (415) 554-7703 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org| www.sfbos.org

From: lgpetty <lgpetty@juno.com>
Sent: Saturday, November 1, 2025 2:03 AM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; BOS-Legislative Aides <bos-legislative_aides@sfgov.org>; Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>
Subject: Re: The FZP - Stop Fighting Each Other Over Capacity. Fight the RHNA's Illegality Instead. Adopt the Humane, Protective Chan, Chen, and Melgar Amendments

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

Dear Land Use Committee Members and all other Supervisors,

I urged in an October 17 email letter that the Board write its own zoning plan to include strong anti-displacement protections for tenants and small businesses, with a prioritized affordable housing funding & site plan.

Thank you, Supervisors Chan, Chen and Melgar, for attempting to inject decency into the FZP.

Thank you Supervisors Chan and Chen for recognizing that the concepts of compliance and capacity can only be met through a clear-eyed lens of San Francisco's actual needs. Not through the distorted view of those who would profit from unlimited removal and replacement of people and their homes with wealthy people and impossibly costly generic "units."

Capacity and compliance are currently based on a numerical fiction... the made-up structure of "State-Mandated RHNA numbers."

We must stop fighting each other in a futile race to rack up housing unit numbers we were never meant to achieve. RHNA's were designed to be impossibly high -- setting up the City to fail -- so that the State would have a rationale to remove all locally-determined regulations via a State-imposed "builders' remedy."

The RHNA's, even if created with good intentions, have been proven irrelevant by Covid impacts, tariff and construction cost inflation, and the loss of an investor-driven economy.

Let's stop chasing this non-existent RHNA capacity holy grail. Let's turn our efforts instead toward establishing the illegality of the RHNA numbers in court.

Let's stop being afraid.

Refine and strengthen tenant and small business protection Amendments for a revised FZP in the meantime. Create a better, uniquely San Francisco zoning plan that provides mostly affordable housing and does it without destroying ourselves and our City.

Thank you for your consideration.

Lorraine Petty

D2/5 senior, renter & voter
Affordable Housing Advocate
Seniors and Tenants Advocate
Member, SFTU & SDA

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations; BOS Legislation, (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject:	37 Letters regarding File Nos. 250700, 251071; 250701, 251072, 251073; 250966; and 251071 as of 11/3/25 12 noon
Date:	Monday, November 3, 2025 12:00:35 PM
Attachments:	37 letters.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached for 37 Letters regarding File Nos. 250700, 251071; 250701, 251072, 251073; 250966; and 251071.

File No. 250700: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 251071: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 250701: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 251072: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 251073: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 250966: General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 251071: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan

Regards,

Richard Lagunte
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Voice (415) 554-5184 | Fax (415) 554-5163
bos@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

Pronouns: he, him, his

Disclosures: *Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written*

or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors' website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.

From: denniseblum@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Dennis Blum
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 30, 2025 1:19:35 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):My home as well as my rental unit on Union Street between Polk and Van Ness will be destroyed and put in nearly constant shadow and darkness by the proposed towering height of the adjacent properties.

Sincerely,
Dennis Blum
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: scoopfoggy@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Shirley Fogarino
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 30, 2025 2:00:12 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Shirley Fogarino
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: sigimcc@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sigrid Bull-McCarthy
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 30, 2025 2:08:23 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Sigrid Bull-McCarthy
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: sigimcc@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sigrid Bull-McCarthy
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 30, 2025 2:08:57 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Sigrid Bull-McCarthy
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: Ravit Shrivastav
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Thursday, October 30, 2025 3:30:11 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Ravit Shrivastav
ravitshrivastav@gmail.com
101 Rivoli Street
San Francisco, California 94117

From: soaring_leap@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lauren Meredith
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 30, 2025 3:50:06 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

If one of these monstrosities goes up next door to us, we'll definitely leave. I won't live in the shadow of a high rise. We honestly bought our home because of all the light and the beauty of looking out at Golden Gate Park. So, our two little gardens and our tree (we call him Barkleaf) will die that will be the end of that. It just won't be the nice quiet neighborhood we planned to live in forever. We're getting ready to retire soon and really hope the city won't force us out to make room for rich folks' condos.

As a resident of the Richmond near Fulton St, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Lauren Meredith
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: Lori Milburn
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Thursday, October 30, 2025 4:36:43 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Lori Milburn

Lori Milburn
lbzmilburn@gmail.com
2395 24th Ave. Apt. 4
San Francisco, California 94116

From: soccercycle1@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mark Keith
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 30, 2025 6:35:17 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Francisco person.,
As long as the affordable housing gets replaced it's ok. There's loads of free space by ccsf.

We call on you to:

- make the upcoming maps apparent and available for public viewing. People need to move in A fare amount of time. Keep doing a good job. Reviving market street will take some work. Don't drive out the poor responsible citizens. All those drugies have been the people that make the art you love so please some compassion. Not everyone has the tech skills to make it in computer software database world. The Loin knows it's time to mix it up and some of those 6 story buildings should have been 10 or higher. Don't forget to tell your mom you love her cuz she's old. Ok have a good day. It takes a lot of work for city that hits harder than its weight class. Keep the focus on the tourism that really separates it from other places, ooh and Sunday brunch.

Sincerely,
Mark Keith
San Francisco, CA 94108

From: yglaros@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of yvonne glaros
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 30, 2025 8:27:50 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
yvonne glaros
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: askalice@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Alice Polesky
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 30, 2025 10:59:15 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Alice Polesky
San Francisco, CA 94107

From: emailamr@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Ann Rubin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 30, 2025 11:36:38 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

We must avoid repeating the past with this new version of Urban Renewal.

Sincerely,
Ann Rubin
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: thealohaangel@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Margo Goldman
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Friday, October 31, 2025 9:07:13 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I have lived in San Francisco for 55 years. I have worked to keep as much as possible the San Francisco charm. It is sad and disturbing that Mayor Lurie's plan has come about. The destruction to neighborhoods, victorians, and other beautiful San Francisco structures are getting torn down to put up which horrible, cooky cutter high-rise buildings....What for....there are many other areas where you could put up housing and create another new area...but why in already beautiful neighborhoods that do not need to be changed or congested.
I voted for you Mayor Lurie..and I am sadden by the turn you are taking...PLEASE STOP THIS CONGESTIVE BUILDING MADDNESS!

Cut back on all this rezoning, take more time to plan this out.
Stop this devastating change to our culturally beautiful San Francisco...
We do not need such a gross amount of Cookie Cutter Luxury Buildings..
Stop ruining our wonderful neighborhoods..

Consider looking at spaces to develop where there is more land and less residential structures
There is all that land by the old shipyards...why not create a new neighborhood there...

Sincerely,
Margo Goldman
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: R. Zierikzee
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 31, 2025 10:42:30 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

R. Zierikzee
inor@earthlink.net
845 Euclid Ave Apt 4
San Francisco, California 94118

From:	Eric Brooks
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff
Subject:	Public Comment: VOTE NO On Lurie"s Recipe For Housing Failure & Replace It With A Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701
Date:	Friday, October 31, 2025 6:18:38 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

The City Economist just released a report showing that Mayor Lurie's 'Family Zoning' plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing.

We still have 3 months to replace the Mayor's plan with one that will work. Here's a real strategy to solve the affordable housing crisis.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units - together more than enough to fulfill state mandates. (Yet instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Lurie's plan simply moves zoning rules around like deck chairs on the Titanic, does almost nothing to increase affordable housing, and increases the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing over-supply [now at 150%] while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods.)

Now that the City Economist has shown that Lurie's plan won't work, it is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the 'Family Zoning' Ordinance and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing housing approvals, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year in a way that will fully meet state mandates.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible, instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood, and diesel construction equipment, releasing major greenhouse gas emissions.

The Mayor's plan would build more excess housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and

corporate real estate speculators. **Please REPLACE the text in this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural, and community integrity, with text that will truly produce affordable housing and get State bureaucrats off of San Francisco's back.**

Thank you,

Eric Brooks, Campaign Coordinator
Our City SF and San Francisco CEQA Defenders
415-756-8844

From: Ann Cabral
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Upcoming "Family Housing Zones" measure proposed by Mayor Lurie
Date: Friday, October 31, 2025 6:34:06 PM

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

I am not likely to be able to attend this coming Monday, 11/ 3/25 Board meeting where it is my understanding there will be discussions about the proposed changes to zoning in our Sunset district, as well as other neighborhood districts. I cannot stand for long periods, or crowded areas.

It is not acceptable for many of us living in single family, or in R2 zones, to have larger unit buildings and increased height permitted, especially when it increases demand on our very aged infrastructure and traffic management cannot be adapted. Many corner lots already have 3 or more stories, or even 4-5 stories on inner Sunset transit lines. A proposal to increase heights even further, demolish our outer neighborhoods to become more commercially profitable is not why we bought here almost 30 years ago. Sunset has become more crowded and traffic noticeably increased just in the past decade, especially with the Great Highway issues now added. The State may be pressuring San Francisco to build, build, build more housing capacity but it cannot be at the expense of destroying our neighborhoods. Keep the housing increases on already major commercial areas where one expects it to be. Don't take away the special uniqueness of the outer districts. There are already efforts to increase housing capacity even with our single family properties where "in law" units can be created more easily. We are not a metropolis like Los Angeles, San Diego, etc, where there was space to expand, and we do not want to become a "Malibu" of the north along the Great Highway.

This type of proposal to increase housing density is just not acceptable.

Regards, Sunset resident & tax payer, Ann Cabral

Sent from my iPad

From:	Francesca Pastine
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff; Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject:	SF Supervisors Support Mayor Lurie"s Affordable Housing and SF Neighborhoods Plan
Date:	Friday, October 31, 2025 7:35:00 PM

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

Hello All,

As you may know, Mayor Lurie's *Family Housing Plan* will go before the Land Use & Transportation Committee this Monday, November 3, sometime after 2 p.m. I fully support this plan. It's time for San Francisco to take real steps toward building enough housing—especially in the low-density neighborhoods on the west side of the city.

While the City Economist, Ted Egan, recently noted that the plan alone will not meet the city's full housing mandates, it represents an essential step toward building the infrastructure we need for future growth.

Let's create a San Francisco where working-class families and future generations can afford to live and thrive.

Best,

Francesca Pastine

1183 Shotwell Street

415 596 5543

--
https://www.francescapastine.com/
www.pastineprojects.com
IN THE MAKE
http://francescapastine.blogspot.com
http://www.innermissionneighborhood.com
www.hillaryronenmission.com

Life is short
Art is long
Opportunity fleeting
Experience treacherous
Judgment difficult

Hippocrates 400 b.c.

From:	Magick Altman
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Family Housing
Date:	Friday, October 31, 2025 8:28:32 PM

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

To whom in may concern, you can usually tell when something is against the people's interest when its called "Family planning". This is a scam to get quick approval of the destruction of our neighborhoods, affordable housing and protections for small businesses. North Beach is fine. LEAVE IT ALONE. There is purpose to the so=called red tape. To make sure the people win and not the developers, who could care less about our neighborhoods.
Stop this illegal and immoral action.
Be Leery of Lurie, Money doesn't talk it Swears.
Yours in Truth,
Magick Altman

From:	Todd
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff
Subject:	Public Comment: VOTE NO On Lurie"s Recipe For Housing Failure & Replace It With A Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701
Date:	Friday, October 31, 2025 8:38:28 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

As a resident of San Francisco (District 2) and a stakeholder, I demand that you adopt a plan that prioritizes **affordable housing**!

The City Economist just released a report showing that Mayor Lurie's 'Family Zoning' plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing.

We still have 3 months to replace the Mayor's plan with one that will work. Here's a real strategy to solve the affordable housing crisis.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units - together more than enough to fulfill state mandates.

Yet instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Lurie's plan simply moves zoning rules around like deck chairs on the Titanic, does almost nothing to increase affordable housing, and increases the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing over-supply [now at 150%] while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods

Now that the City Economist has shown that Lurie's plan won't work, it is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the 'Family Zoning' plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing housing approvals, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year in a way that will fully meet state mandates.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible, instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood, and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

The Mayor's plan would build more excess housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators.

Please REPLACE the text in this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural and community integrity, with text that will truly produce affordable housing and get State bureaucrats off of San Francisco's back.

Thank you,
Todd Snyder
1941 Turk street Apt 4

From:	lgpetty
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides; Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject:	Re: The FZP - Stop Fighting Each Other Over Capacity. Fight the RHNA"s Illegality Instead. Adopt the Humane, Protective Chan, Chen, and Melgar Amendments
Date:	Saturday, November 1, 2025 2:04:08 AM

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

Dear Land Use Committee Members and all other Supervisors,

I urged in an October 17 email letter that the Board write its own zoning plan to include strong anti-displacement protections for tenants and small businesses, with a prioritized affordable housing funding & site plan.

Thank you, Supervisors Chan, Chen and Melgar, for attempting to inject decency into the FZP.

Thank you Supervisors Chan and Chen for recognizing that the concepts of compliance and capacity can only be met through a clear-eyed lens of San Francisco's actual needs. Not through the distorted view of those who would profit from unlimited removal and replacement of people and their homes with wealthy people and impossibly costly generic "units."

Capacity and compliance are currently based on a numerical fiction... the made-up structure of "State-Mandated RHNA numbers."

We must stop fighting each other in a futile race to rack up housing unit numbers we were never meant to achieve. RHNA's were designed to be impossibly high -- setting up the City to fail -- so that the State would have a rationale to remove all locally-determined regulations via a State-imposed "builders' remedy."

The RHNA's, even if created with good intentions, have been proven irrelevant by Covid impacts, tariff and construction cost inflation, and the loss of an investor-driven economy.

Let's stop chasing this non-existent RHNA capacity holy grail. Let's turn our efforts instead toward establishing the illegality of the RHNA numbers in court.

Let's stop being afraid.

Refine and strengthen tenant and small business protection Amendments for a revised FZP in the meantime. Create a better, uniquely San Francisco zoning plan that provides mostly affordable housing and does it without destroying ourselves and our City.

Thank you for your consideration.

Lorraine Petty

D2/5 senior, renter & voter
Affordable Housing Advocate

Seniors and Tenants Advocate
Member, SFTU & SDA

From: Judi Gorski
To: Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chen, Connie (BOS); Wong, Frances (BOS); ChenStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Fariñas, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Busch, Percy (BOS); WaltonStaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Engage, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosales, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Sauer, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Lauer, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Safai, Danny (BOS); SafaiStaff; Andrews, Michelle (BOS); AndrewsStaff
Subject: Public Comment: VOTE NO on Mayor Lurie's Family Housing Plan and Replace it with a Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701 - Land Use and Transportation Meeting, Monday, Nov. 3, 2025, 1:30 pm
Date: Saturday, November 1, 2025 10:01:00 AM

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

To:
John.Carroll@sfgov.org ; board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org ; Myrna.Melgar@sfgov.org ; Jen.Low@sfgov.org ; MelgarStaff@sfgov.org ; connie.chen@sfgov.org ; Frances.Wong@sfgov.org ; ChenStaff@sfgov.org ; rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org ; mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org ; Calvin.Ho@sfgov.org ; Jackie.Fielder@sfgov.org ; Jennifer.Farinas@sfgov.org ; FielderStaff@sfgov.org ; shamann.walton@sfgov.org ; Percy.Burch@sfgov.org ; waltonstaff@sfgov.org ; Chyanne.Chen@sfgov.org ; Jackie.Engage@sfgov.org ; ChenStaff@sfgov.org ; Stephen.Sherrill@sfgov.org ; Lorenzo.Rosales@sfgov.org ; SherrillStaff@sfgov.org ; matt.dorsey@sfgov.org ; Madison.Sauer@sfgov.org ; dorseystaff@sfgov.org ; Bilal.Mahmood@sfgov.org ; Sam.Lauer@sfgov.org ; MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org ; Danny.Safai@sfgov.org ; Michelle.Andrews@sfgov.org ; SafaiStaff@sfgov.org

From:
Judi Gorski, District 4; zip code 94116

Date: November 1, 2025

Subject: Public Comment: VOTE NO on Mayor Lurie's Family Housing Plan and Replace it with a Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701 - Land Use and Transportation Meeting, Monday, Nov. 3, 2025, 1:30 pm

Dear Supervisors,

As a District 4 San Franciscan without representation on the Board of Supervisors, I am writing to ask you to strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's Family Upzoning Plan as it currently exists. As it is now written, the Plan incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

I speak for myself, my family, and many of my neighbors to respectfully ask you to:

- Require adequate infrastructure to be built PRIOR to building any additional housing
- Refuse to allow the use of *geo grouting to harden the earth and sand beneath proposed new housing building sites as it poisons our groundwater (See geo-grouting info at end of this email.)
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

As currently written, this Plan clears the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices and the safety of the very communities they are supposed to represent.

Our far western District 4 does not have existing infrastructure to support these new high-rises, and infrastructure needs to be designed, funded and built first. Circumventing CEQA requirements in a rush to build jeopardizes our safety.

We still have three months to replace the Mayor's Plan with one that will work.

The City Economist recently released a report that shows the Mayor's Plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because **zoning changes do not produce new housing**. Therefore, it is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the Family Zoning Plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing housing approvals, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year in a way that will fully meet state mandates.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units - together more than enough to fulfill state mandates. Instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Lurie's plan just moves the zoning rules around and does little to increase affordable housing. It increases instead the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing over-supply (now at 150%) while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods.

Let us not build more excess housing for the wealthy that will create more homelessness and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to corporate real estate speculators.

Please RELACE the text in this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco homeowners, tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural, and community integrity, with text that will truly produce housing and get State bureaucrats off of San Francisco's back.

Thank you,

Judi Gorski
SF District Resident 47 years , 94116

*CEQA requires that any project involving geo-grouting that requires a discretionary approval by a public agency undergo an environmental review process to identify and mitigate potential environmental impacts.

How geo-grouting can contaminate groundwater:

Toxic additives: Many chemical and cement-based grouts contain additives that can be toxic or carcinogenic and may leach into the surrounding groundwater.

Drilling and installation: The process of drilling holes for grouting can create pathways for surface contaminants to travel directly into aquifers, especially if the boreholes are not sealed properly.

Contaminant pathways: Grouting operations can create or worsen fractures in the ground, creating direct routes for contaminants to flow into groundwater sources.

Chemical reactions: The chemical reactions that occur during the hydration of cement-based grouts can alter the chemistry of the groundwater, potentially increasing dissolved solids and changing its overall characteristics.

Improper disposal: Improper disposal of grout waste can also lead to secondary contamination of soil and water.

From: Patrick Le
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Saturday, November 1, 2025 10:53:51 AM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan. We need to just get this through the Land Use Committee and passed with minimal revisions/amendments as possible. The longer we wait, the longer we are in this affordability crisis that is causing San Francisco to lose thousands of people each year and make it harder for the citizens who live here to survive. Perfection is the enemy of good, and we need to make good progress.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Patrick Le
patrickle1994@gmail.com
511 Eureka St
San Francisco, California 94114

From: Patrick Le
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Saturday, November 1, 2025 10:55:40 AM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan. We just need to stop messing around and get this passed with minimal amendments and revisions as possible. The longer we wait, the more people will leave SF. Perfection is the enemy of good and we just need to build more housing of all different stocks asap.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Patrick Le
patrickhle00@gmail.com
411 Eureka St
San Francisco, California 94114

From: Stephen Gorski
To: Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Shah, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Busch, Percy (BOS); WaltonStaff (BOS); Chen, Chanten (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff
Subject: Public Comment: VOTE NO on Mayor Lurie's Family Housing Plan and Replace it with a Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701 - Land Use and Transportation Meeting, Monday, Nov. 3, 2025, 1:30 pm
Date: Saturday, November 1, 2025 12:52:53 PM

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

To:
john.Carroll@sfgov.org , board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org , Myrna.Melgar@sfgov.org , Jen.Low@sfgov.org , MelgarStaff@sfgov.org , connie.chan@sfgov.org , Frances.Shah@sfgov.org , ChanStaff@sfgov.org , rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org , mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org , Calvin.Ho@sfgov.org , jackie.Fielder@sfgov.org , jennifer.ferrigno@sfgov.org , fielderstaff@sfgov.org , shamann.walton@sfgov.org , Percy.Busch@sfgov.org , waltonstaff@sfgov.org , Chanten.Chen@sfgov.org , jackie.fraser@sfgov.org , ChenStaff@sfgov.org , Stephen.Sherrill@sfgov.org , ionatan.Rosas@sfgov.org , SherrillStaff@sfgov.org , matt.dorsey@sfgov.org , Madison.Tam@sfgov.org , dorseystaff@sfgov.org , bilal.Mahmood@sfgov.org , ahsa.safai@sfgov.org , MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org , Danny.Sauter@sfgov.org , Michelle.Andrews@sfgov.org , SauterStaff@sfgov.org

From:
Stephen J. Gorski, District 4, zip code 94116

Date: November 1, 2025

Subject: Public Comment: VOTE NO on Mayor Lurie's Family Housing Plan and Replace it with a Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701 - Land Use and Transportation Meeting, Monday, Nov. 3, 2025, 1:30 pm

Dear Supervisors,

As a District 4 San Franciscan without representation on the Board of Supervisors, I am writing to ask you to strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's Family Upzoning Plan as it currently exists. As it is now written, the Plan incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

I speak for myself, my family, and many of my neighbors to respectfully ask you to:

- Require adequate infrastructure to be built PRIOR to building any additional housing
- Refuse to allow the use of *geo grouting to harden the earth and sand beneath proposed new housing building sites as it poisons our groundwater(See geo-grouting info at end of this email.)
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

As currently written, this Plan clears the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices and the safety of the very communities they are supposed to represent.

Our far western District 4 does not have existing infrastructure to support these new high-rises, and infrastructure needs to be designed, funded and built first. Circumventing CEQA requirements in a rush to build jeopardizes our safety.

We still have three months to replace the Mayor's Plan with one that will work.
The City Economist recently released a report that shows the Mayor's Plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because **zoning changes do not produce new housing**. Therefore, it is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the Family Zoning Plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing housing approvals, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year in a way that will fully meet state mandates.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units - together more than enough to fulfill state mandates. Instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Lurie's plan just moves the zoning rules around and does little to increase affordable housing. It increases instead the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing over-supply (now at 150%) while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods.

Let us not build more excess housing for the wealthy that will create more homelessness and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to corporate real estate speculators.

Please RELACE the text in this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco homeowners, tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural, and community integrity, with text that will truly produce housing and get State bureaucrats off of San Francisco's back.

Thank you,

Stephen J. Gorski, Esq.
SF District Resident 47 years , 94116

*CEQA requires that any project involving geo-grouting that requires a discretionary approval by a public agency undergo an environmental review process to identify and mitigate potential environmental impacts.

How geo-grouting can contaminate groundwater:

- Toxic additives: Many chemical and cement-based grouts contain additives that can be toxic or carcinogenic and may leach into the surrounding groundwater.
- Drilling and installation: The process of drilling holes for grouting can create pathways for surface contaminants to travel directly into aquifers, especially if the boreholes are not sealed properly.
- Contaminant pathways: Grouting operations can create or worsen fractures in the ground, creating direct routes for contaminants to flow into groundwater sources.
- Chemical reactions: The chemical reactions that occur during the hydration of cement-based grouts can alter the chemistry of the groundwater, potentially increasing dissolved solids and changing its overall characteristics.
- Improper disposal: Improper disposal of grout waste can also lead to secondary contamination of soil and water.

Sent from my iPad

From:	Stardust Doherty
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff; Stardust
Subject:	Public Comment: VOTE NO On Lurie"s Recipe For Housing Failure & Replace It With A Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701
Date:	Saturday, November 1, 2025 1:42:02 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

The City Economist just released a report showing that Mayor Lurie's 'Family Zoning' plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing.

We still have 3 months to replace the Mayor's plan with one that will work. Here's a real strategy to solve the affordable housing crisis.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units - together more than enough to fulfill state mandates. (Yet instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Lurie's plan simply moves zoning rules around like deck chairs on the Titanic, does almost nothing to increase affordable housing, and increases the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing over-supply [now at 150%] while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods.)

Now that the City Economist has shown that Lurie's plan won't work, it is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the 'Family Zoning' plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing housing approvals, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year in a way that will fully meet state mandates.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible, instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood, and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

The Mayor's plan would build more excess housing for the wealthy, create more

homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators. **Please REPLACE the text in this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural and community integrity, with text that will truly produce affordable housing and get State bureaucrats off of San Francisco's back.**

Thank you,

Stardust Doherty
SF 94110

From:	Elliot Helman
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff
Subject:	Public Comment: VOTE NO On Lurie"s Recipe For Housing Failure & Replace It With A Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701
Date:	Saturday, November 1, 2025 2:48:56 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

The City Economist just released a report showing that Mayor Lurie's 'Family Zoning' plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing.

We still have 3 months to replace the Mayor's plan with one that will work. Here's a real strategy to solve the affordable housing crisis.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units - together more than enough to fulfill state mandates. (Yet instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Lurie's plan simply moves zoning rules around like deck chairs on the Titanic, does almost nothing to increase affordable housing, and increases the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing over-supply [now at 150%] while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods.)

Now that the City Economist has shown that Lurie's plan won't work, it is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the 'Family Zoning' plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing housing approvals, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year in a way that will fully meet state mandates.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible, instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood, and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

The Mayor's plan would build more excess housing for the wealthy, create more

homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators. **Please REPLACE the text in this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural and community integrity, with text that will truly produce affordable housing and get State bureaucrats off of San Francisco's back.**

Thank you,

Elliot Helman
Mission Bay SF 94158

From:	David Romano
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff
Subject:	Public Comment: Please vote no on Mayor Lurie"s Family Zoning Plan and replace It with a Real Affordable Housing Plan
Date:	Saturday, November 1, 2025 4:05:29 PM

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

Dear Supervisors, et al:

The City Economist just released a report showing that Mayor Lurie's 'Family Zoning' plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing.

We still have 3 months to replace the Mayor's plan with one that will work. Here's a real strategy to solve the affordable housing crisis.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units - together more than enough to fulfill state mandates.

Now that the City Economist has shown that Lurie's plan won't work, it is imperative that you stop seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the 'Family Zoning' plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing housing approvals, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year in a way that will fully meet state mandates.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible, instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood, and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

The Mayor's plan would build more excess housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to corporate real estate speculators. Please REPLACE the text in this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural and community integrity, with text that will truly produce affordable housing.

Thank you,

David Romano
San Francsico CA

From:	Dave Rhody
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff
Subject:	Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701
Date:	Sunday, November 2, 2025 1:20:00 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

The City Economist just released a report showing that Mayor Lurie's 'Family Zoning' plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing.

We still have 3 months to replace the Mayor's plan with one that will work. Here's a real strategy to solve the affordable housing crisis:

- San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units - together more than enough to fulfill state mandates.

- Instead of Lurie's plan which simply moves zoning rules around like deck chairs on the Titanic, we need to focus on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so.

You need to stop negotiating mere amendments to the 'Family Zoning' plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing housing approvals, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year in a way that will fully meet state mandates.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible, instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood, and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

The Mayor's plan would build more excess housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators. Please replace the text in this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural and community integrity, with text that will truly produce affordable housing and get State bureaucrats off of San Francisco's back.

- Thank you,
Dave Rhody

SF Policy Co-Chair
Climate Reality Project

From:	Carolyn Kenady
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff
Cc:	<board@doloresheights.org>
Subject:	Oppose Mayor"s Upzoning Plan - File #250701
Date:	Sunday, November 2, 2025 4:05:57 PM

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

To the members of the Board of Supervisors -

I am Carolyn Kenady, chair of the Dolores Heights Improvement Club (DHIC) in District 8. We oppose this Upzoning Plan and urge you to amend it to address the issues below.

DHIC opposes this strategy to upzone hundreds of thousands of SF properties because it's:

- Overkill: To meet its housing mandate, San Francisco only needs to approve 36,200 additional projects by 2032. Blanket upzoning allows demolition of existing housing - which is our most affordable housing

- Doesn't produce enough affordable units: 80% of the projects needed to reach this 36K goal must be affordable housing. The affordable requirements and subsidies provided by the proposed program won't produce the required 29k affordable units.

- Not increase market production or reduce housing costs: Per SF Planning's own feasibility study, only slightly improved economic assumptions, will developers undertake market-rate multi-unit projects (1-2 BR, avg $4600 monthly.) The City Economist's impact analysis shows very little impact on rents or prices for housing. (see pages 34 - 63 of SF Planning memo to SF Planning Commissioners, dated June 26, 2025 and the City Economist's Report, page 21, October 2025)

- Displacing tenant and small businesses: in my neighborhood shopping districts - Church & 24th Streets and the Castro NCDs are proposed for 65 foot heights. Most renters and small local businesses displaced by new construction won't be able to afford the new rents. Our small local businesses that attract shoppers and tourists to our neighborhoods will be driven out.

This plan caters to developers. It does not align with our City's housing needs: keeping existing housing – our most affordable resource, preserving the historic and cultural

resources enjoyed by visitors and residents alike, and being more strategic about where to add height vs. blanket zoning large areas of our City. Please revise this plan to protect our key resources, add sufficient affordability, and use height strategically. Thank you.

Carolyn

Carolyn Kenady
carolynkenady@gmail.com
408-218-3115
http://www.linkedin.com/in/ckenady

From:	Nick Ferris
To:	Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS)
Cc:	Chan, Connie (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	COMMENTS ON PROPOSED FAMILY ZONING PLAN Amendments in File Nos. 251071, 251072, and 251073
Date:	Monday, November 3, 2025 7:22:43 AM
Attachments:	THD Land Use Transportation Upzoning Plan 11.3.pdf

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

Dear Chair Melgar and Members of the Committee,

Telegraph Hill Dwellers (THD) continues to oppose the Mayor's proposed Family Zoning Plan ("Upzoning Plan"). As set forth below, we urge the Committee and Board of Supervisors to reverse the last-minute inclusion of Telegraph Hill, North Beach, and the Northern Waterfront in the Upzoning Plan. Further, we implore you to amend the Upzoning Plan to prevent the displacement of tenants and small businesses, and to provide for a real plan for development of the affordable housing we so desperately need by approving amendments related legisnation offered by Supervisors Chan and Chen.

1. Remove North Beach, Telegraph Hill, and the Northern Waterfront from the Upzoning Plan.

THD continues to strongly oppose the late inclusion in the Upzoning Plan of major portions of Telegraph Hill, North Beach, and the Northern Waterfront, areas that were not included in the 2022 Adopted Housing Element ("2022 Housing Element") nor considered in the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR). These areas were not considered for inclusion in the Housing Element because they are one of the densest neighborhoods in San Francisco, with roughly 82% of our residents currently living in existing pre-1979 multi-family, rent-controlled buildings housing our City's workforce and seniors, including a large immigrant Asian population. Based on the City's profiles of neighborhoods in San Francisco, there are 37,156 people per square mile in North Beach as compared to 17,325 people per square mile in San Francisco. The Planning Department's own data shows that rent-controlled buildings in District 3 (built before 1979 with 2+ units, excluding condos) represent approximately 32,340 individual units, 13,983 of which are located in the current version of the Upzoning Plan. In other words, the tenants occupying 13,983 units will be subject to potential eviction and displacement.

And, although the Housing Element and FEIR assumed that the Northeast Planning District would provide net new housing units of only 800 units by 2050, the Upzoning Plan suddenly increased that figure to 5,900 units, a stunning 650% increase. The height and density increases represented by this increase will significantly impact existing tenants, small businesses, historic resources, parks and open spaces, and the diverse culture of District 3.

2. Support for Supervisors Chan's and Chen's Proposed Amendments:

Although we continue to oppose the Upzoning Plan, we appreciate Supervisor Chan and Chen's leadership in introducing critical amendments to strengthen tenant protections, prioritize affordable housing, support small businesses, and create real family-sized housing.

We urge this Committee to move these amendments forward, including those that follow:

(a) Exclude all historic resources, including local historic districts and those eligible for the California and National Registers. from the Upzoning Plan (File No. 251073).

(b) Exclude from the Upzoning Plan all development that would demolish, remove, or convert to another use any existing dwelling unit(s) or residential flat, including rent-controlled units.

(c) Remove areas within the Planning Equity Geography Special Use District ("PEG SUD") from the Upzoning Plan consistent with the 2022 Housing Element (File No. 251071)

(d) Remove areas in the Coastal Zone from the Upzoning Plan (File No. 251071)

(e) Adopt a Progress Requirement or "shot clock" for obtaining a building permit within a time certain of project approval (File No. 251073)

(f) Require inclusionary housing to be located nearby within ½ mile of the development (File No. 251073).

(g) Eliminate form-based density from Neighborhood Commercial Districts and ROTCs because we want family housing not dorm rooms (File No. 251073).

3. THD Urges Supervisor Melgar to Protect All Rent-Controlled Housing

We appreciate Supervisor Melgar's amendment removing rent controlled housing with three or more units but urge her to expand this amendment to exclude all rent-controlled housing with two or more units, not just three or more.

4. Support for Supervisor Chan's Legacy Business Controls

THD joins with Small Business Forward to support Supervisor Chan's legislation to extend the requirement for a Conditional Use Authorization for sites where a Legacy Business has been displaced. In absence of having any other tools available or financial resources to support the successful relocation of a Legacy Business within the community, the Conditional Use is an imperfect but necessary mechanism to discourage displacement of Legacy Businesses in the first place. That is why Small Business Forward supports that the extension of the CU legislation until other more effective protection measures are in place, such as commercial rent control, the right of return, and adequate relocation assistance.

5. Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District and Funding Strategy.

We join with REP-SF and the Council of Community Housing Organizations to demand that the SFMTA-SUD be revised to provide that these publicly owned parcels be developed for 100% affordable and social housing. Under San Francisco's state-approved Housing Element, as mandated by the state, 57% of the 36,200 new housing units proposed to be developed under the Upzoning Plan—more than 20,000 units—must be affordable to low- and very-low-income households. Yet the Upzoning Plan has no funding strategy or realistic plan to produce those affordable homes. It risks satisfying Sacramento's procedural checklist while abandoning the substance of the law: to build housing for the people who need it most.

* * * * * * * *

In conclusion, THD believes that the Upzoning Plan, as proposed, threatens tenants and small businesses, pits neighborhoods against each other, and disregards decades of community-based policymaking that has built San Francisco into a resilient, vibrant city through a network of strong neighborhoods.

The proposed amendments from Supervisors Chan and Chen address these concerns by focusing on protecting tenants and rent-controlled housing citywide, supporting small businesses, and prioritizing the development of affordable housing. We urge this Committee to move these critical elements forward.

Finally, we urge this Committee to recommend that Telegraph Hill, North Beach, and the Northern Waterfront be removed from the Upzoning Plan consistent with the 2022 Housing Element adopted by the Board of Supervisors and approved by HCD.

Sincerely,
Nick Ferris, *President*
Telegraph Hill Dwellers

November 3, 2025
Via Email

Myrna Melgar, Chair - *Myrna.Melgar@sfgov.org*

Chyanne Chen, Vice-Chair - *Chyanne.Chen@sfgov.org*

Bilal Mahmood, Member - *Bilal.Mahmood@sfgov.org*
Land Use and Transportation Committee
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

RE: COMMENTS ON PROPOSED FAMILY ZONING PLAN
Amendments in File Nos. 251071, 251072, and 251073

Dear Chair Melgar and Members of the Committee,

Telegraph Hill Dwellers (THD) continues to oppose the Mayor's proposed Family Zoning Plan ("Upzoning Plan"). As set forth below, we urge the Committee and Board of Supervisors to reverse the last-minute inclusion of Telegraph Hill, North Beach, and the Northern Waterfront in the Upzoning Plan. Further, we implore you to amend the Upzoning Plan to prevent the displacement of tenants and small businesses, and to provide for a real plan for development of the affordable housing we so desperately need by approving amendments related legisnation offered by Supervisors Chan and Chen.

1. **Remove North Beach, Telegraph Hill, and the Northern Waterfront from the Upzoning Plan.**

THD continues to strongly oppose the late inclusion in the Upzoning Plan of major portions of Telegraph Hill, North Beach, and the Northern Waterfront, areas that were not included in the 2022 Adopted Housing Element ("2022 Housing Element") nor considered in the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR). These areas were not considered for inclusion in the Housing Element because they are one of the densest neighborhoods in San Francisco, with roughly 82% of our residents currently living in existing pre-1979 multi-family, rent-controlled buildings housing our City's workforce and seniors, including a large immigrant Asian population. Based on the City's profiles of neighborhoods in San Francisco, there are **37,156** people per square mile in North Beach as compared to **17,325** people per square mile in San Francisco.[1] The Planning Department's own data shows that rent-controlled buildings in District 3 (built before 1979 with 2+ units, excluding condos) represent approximately 32,340 individual units, 13,983 of which are located in the current version of the Upzoning Plan. **In other words, the tenants occupying 13,983 units will be subject to potential eviction and displacement.**

[1] https://www.city-data.com/neighborhood/North-Beach-San-Francisco-CA.html

And, although the Housing Element and FEIR assumed that the Northeast Planning District would provide net new housing units of only *800 units* by 2050, the Upzoning Plan suddenly increased that figure to *5,900 units*, a stunning *650% increase*. The height and density increases represented by this increase will significantly impact existing tenants, small businesses, historic resources, parks and open spaces, and the diverse culture of District 3.

2. **Support for Supervisors Chan's and Chen's Proposed Amendments:**

Although we continue to oppose the Upzoning Plan, we appreciate Supervisor Chan and Chen's leadership in introducing critical amendments to strengthen tenant protections, prioritize affordable housing, support small businesses, and create real family-sized housing. We urge this Committee to move these amendments forward, including those that follow:

(a) Exclude all historic resources, including local historic districts and those eligible for the California and National Registers. from the Upzoning Plan (File No. 251073).

(b) Exclude from the Upzoning Plan all development that would demolish, remove, or convert to another use any existing dwelling unit(s) or residential flat, including rent-controlled units.

(c) Remove areas within the Planning Equity Geography Special Use District ("PEG SUD") from the Upzoning Plan consistent with the 2022 Housing Element (File No. 251071)

(d) Remove areas in the Coastal Zone from the Upzoning Plan (File No. 251071)

(e) Adopt a Progress Requirement or "shot clock" for obtaining a building permit within a time certain of project approval (File No. 251073)

(f) Require inclusionary housing to be located nearby within ½ mile of the development (File No. 251073).

(g) Eliminate form-based density from Neighborhood Commercial Districts and ROTCs because we want family housing not dorm rooms (File No. 251073).

3. **THD Urges Supervisor Melgar to Protect All Rent-Controlled Housing**

We appreciate Supervisor Melgar's amendment removing rent controlled housing with three or more units but urge her to expand this amendment to exclude ***all*** rent-controlled housing with two or more units, not just three or more.

4. **Support for Supervisor Chan's Legacy Business Controls**

THD joins with Small Business Forward to support Supervisor Chan's legislation to extend the requirement for a Conditional Use Authorization for sites where a Legacy Business has been displaced. In absence of having any other tools available or financial resources to support the successful relocation of a Legacy Business within the community, the Conditional Use is an imperfect but necessary mechanism to discourage displacement of Legacy Businesses in the first place. That is why Small Business Forward supports that the extension of the CU legislation until other more effective protection measures are in place, such as commercial rent control, the right of return, and adequate relocation assistance.

5. **Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District and Funding Strategy.**

We join with REP-SF and the Council of Community Housing Organizations to demand that the SFMTA-SUD be revised to provide that these publicly owned parcels be developed for 100% affordable and social housing. Under San Francisco's state-approved Housing Element, as mandated by the state, 57% of the 36,200 new housing units proposed to be developed under the Upzoning Plan—more than 20,000 units—must be affordable to low- and very-low-income households. Yet the Upzoning Plan has no funding strategy or realistic plan to produce those affordable homes. It risks satisfying Sacramento's procedural checklist while abandoning the substance of the law: to build housing for the people who need it most.

* * * * * * * *

In conclusion, THD believes that the Upzoning Plan, as proposed, threatens tenants and small businesses, pits neighborhoods against each other, and disregards decades of community-based policymaking that has built San Francisco into a resilient, vibrant city through a network of strong neighborhoods.

The proposed amendments from Supervisors Chan and Chen address these concerns by focusing on protecting tenants and rent-controlled housing citywide, supporting small businesses, and prioritizing the development of affordable housing. We urge this Committee to move these critical elements forward.

Finally, we urge this Committee to recommend that Telegraph Hill, North Beach, and the Northern Waterfront be removed from the Upzoning Plan consistent with the 2022 Housing Element adopted by the Board of Supervisors and approved by HCD.

Sincerely,

Nick Ferris, President

ccs: Supervisor Connie Chan – *connie.chan@sfgov.org*
Clerk John Carroll - *John.Carroll@sfgov.org*
Members, San Francisco Board of Supervisors - *Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org*

From:	aeboken
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject:	Strongly OPPOSING Land Use and Transportation Committee Meeting November 3, 2025 Agenda Item #6 [General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan] File #250966
Date:	Monday, November 3, 2025 8:13:34 AM

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

TO: Land Use and Transportation Committee members and full Board of Supervisors

FR: Eileen Boken, President
Sunset-Parkside Education and Action Committee (SPEAK)

RE: Land Use and Transportation Committee Meeting November 3, 2025 Agenda Item #6
[General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan] File #250966

Position: Strongly OPPOSING

To the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors, we didn't elect you to play the part of victims.

You tell us to swallow the poison pill and support the upzoning because the only other option is for the State and Builders Remedy to take over our planning process.

Are you unwilling to sue the State or fight back if the State attempts a hostile takeover of our planning process?

If you were willing to call out the proposed hostile takeover by the National Guard, then this should also be on the table.

Don't say you're going to come back next year and review the current proposed upzoning with the possibility of down zoning.

SB330 (Skinner) (2019) expressly prohibits down zoning.

And finally, the Planning Department has acknowledged that the upzoning maps don't include Special Use Districts (SUD).

In District 4, the SUD is defined in BOS File #230808.

It allows the upzoning of corner lots as well as the lot merger of up to three lots on either side of that corner lot.

An example would be the Gus's Market project at 3701 Noriega.

This is the poster child for gentrification in District 4.

The apartments are all market rate.

The amenities include an onsite fitness center and rooftop lounge.

There is onsite parking for the market but not for the apartments.

The Gus's market is high end.

The massive four story building towers over other structures.

It has no step down to transition to lower heights buildings surrounding it.

###

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

From: aeboken
To: BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Strongly OPPOSING Land Use and Transportation Committee Meeting November 3, 2025 Agenda Item #7 [Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan] File #250700
Date: Monday, November 3, 2025 8:17:50 AM

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

TO: Land Use and Transportation Committee members and full Board of Supervisors members

FR: Eileen Boken, President
Sunset-Parkside Education and Action Committee (SPEAK)

RE: Land Use and Transportation Committee Meeting November 3, 2025 Agenda Item #7 [Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan] File #250700

Position: Strongly OPPOSING

The Planning Department has stated that it has learned from the mistakes it made in the past in redevelopment.

For the proposed upzoning on the Westside, in general, and the Coastal Zone, in particular, the past mistakes of redevelopment seem to be playing out once again.

The Lurie plan focuses upzoning heavily on the Westside including the Coastal Zone.

In two meetings on the Westside, the Mayor has stated that the current amendments should be approved to meet the HCD deadline and can be revisited next year.

The Planning Department staff at one Westside meeting even went so far as to state that down zoning next year would be possible.

This contradicts SB330 (Skinner) (2019) which expressly prohibits down zoning.

The Family Zoning Plan even contradicts itself with family zoning which are larger units and density decontrol which are smaller units.

In proposed ordinance 250700, the following text is potentially problematic:

- Page 7 lines 14 - 22 regarding Local Coastal Program (LCP) rezoning height and bulk to R-4 and RTO-C.

- Page 11 lines 7 - 17 LCP Height Maps HT01 - HT13.

- Page 13 lines 11 - 16. Housing Choice SF (HC-SF)

- Page 15 lines 5 - 7 HC-SF

- Page 17 lines 20 - 22 HC-SF

- Page 20 lines 1 - 4 LCP Zoning Use District Map ZN13 & Height and Bulk District Map HT13.

- Page 21 lines 4 - 5 "All properties in the Coastal Zone are in the new Height and Bulk District R-4".

Are these amendments designed to change Ocean Beach into Miami Beach?

###

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

From:	aeboken
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject:	Strongly OPPOSING Land Use and Transportation Committee Meeting November 3, 2025 Agenda Item #9 [Planning, Business and Tax Regulations - Family Zoning Plan] File #250701
Date:	Monday, November 3, 2025 8:22:25 AM

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

TO: Land Use and Transportation Committee members and full Board of Supervisors

FR: Eileen Boken, President
Sunset-Parkside Education and Action Committee (SPEAK)

RE: Land Use and Transportation Committee Meeting November 3, 2025 Agenda Item #9 [Planning, Business and Tax Regulations - Family Zoning Plan] File #250701

Position: Strongly OPPOSING

SB828 (Wiener) (session 2017 - 2018) has caused the current housing numbers required by the State to more than double for San Francisco.

The Embarcadero Institute analysis states that the housing numbers required by the State (Regional Housing Needs Allocation aka RHNA) for all municipalities skyrocketed in part because of requirements in SB828 (Wiener).

SB828 (Wiener) added in new overcrowding and cost burdening numbers even though these numbers were already in the Department of Finance numbers which the DofF provides to the Department of Housing and Community Development for RHNA.

This results in double counting.

SB828 (Wiener) also used an incorrect vacancy rate as it failed to differentiate between vacancy rates for rental and homeowner housing units.

It uses only the higher rate for rentals when calculating vacancy rates for both rental and homeowner housing unit.

This also results in overcounting.

Even though Scott Wiener is aware of these issues with SB828, he hasn't introduced any "clean-up" bills.

The State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) allocated 441,000 housing units for the current RHNA cycle #6 to the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG).

ABAG could have appealed this number to HCD as being too high but chose not to.

ABAG created a methodology to allocate RHNA numbers to the different Bay Area municipalities.

ABAG allocated 82,000 units to San Francisco.

San Francisco could have appealed this number to ABAG as being too high but chose not to.

San Francisco has about 10% of the Bay Area's population but was allocated about 18% of the region's RHNA housing units.

This alone should have been justification for the City to appeal to ABAG.

Since San Francisco is a charter city, why isn't the City suing the state?

Other municipalities in SoCal have successfully sued the State over SB9 (Atkins) (session 2021-2022).

###

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

From:	aeboken
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject:	Strongly OPPOSING Land Use and Transportation Committee Meeting November 3, 2025 Agenda Item #11 [Local Coastal Program - Family Zoning Plan] File #250985
Date:	Monday, November 3, 2025 8:27:44 AM

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

TO: Land Use and Transportation Committee members and full Board of Supervisors

FR: Eileen Boken, President
Sunset-Parkside Education and Action Committee (SPEAK)

RE: Land Use and Transportation Committee Meeting November 3, 2025 Agenda Item #11
[Local Coastal Program - Family Zoning Plan] File #250985

Position: Strongly OPPOSING

The City could place itself in legal jeopardy by transmitting the proposed Local Coastal Program amendments to the Coastal Commission.

The citation of the California Public Resources Code is incorrect notably California Public Resources Code 30604 (g).

San Francisco has no authority to amend the California Public Resources Code through what appears to be an intentionally incorrect citation.

By default, the California Public Resources Code issue makes the proposed Local Coastal Program amendments inconsistent with the Coastal Act.

The Planning Department hasn't had staff knowledgeable in the Coastal Act since 2018.

Therefore, the revisions to the City's Local Coastal Program have been questionable.

The Planning Commission, Board of Supervisors and Board of Appeals also lack expertise in the Coastal Act.

As currently drafted, the proposed Local Coastal Program amendments are inconsistent with the General Plan and its 8 priority policies.

All of these issues would result in the Local Coastal Program being bastardized as well as changing Ocean Beach into Miami Beach.

###

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

From:	aeboken
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject:	Strongly OPPOSING Land Use and Transportation Committee Meeting November 3, 2025 Agenda Item #11 [Local Coastal Program - Family Zoning Plan] File #250985
Date:	Monday, November 3, 2025 8:27:44 AM

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

TO: Land Use and Transportation Committee members and full Board of Supervisors

FR: Eileen Boken, President
Sunset-Parkside Education and Action Committee (SPEAK)

RE: Land Use and Transportation Committee Meeting November 3, 2025 Agenda Item #11
[Local Coastal Program - Family Zoning Plan] File #250985

Position: Strongly OPPOSING

The City could place itself in legal jeopardy by transmitting the proposed Local Coastal Program amendments to the Coastal Commission.

The citation of the California Public Resources Code is incorrect notably California Public Resources Code 30604 (g).

San Francisco has no authority to amend the California Public Resources Code through what appears to be an intentionally incorrect citation.

By default, the California Public Resources Code issue makes the proposed Local Coastal Program amendments inconsistent with the Coastal Act.

The Planning Department hasn't had staff knowledgeable in the Coastal Act since 2018.

Therefore, the revisions to the City's Local Coastal Program have been questionable.

The Planning Commission, Board of Supervisors and Board of Appeals also lack expertise in the Coastal Act.

As currently drafted, the proposed Local Coastal Program amendments are inconsistent with the General Plan and its 8 priority policies.

All of these issues would result in the Local Coastal Program being bastardized as well as changing Ocean Beach into Miami Beach.

###

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

From:	Erica Zweig
To:	Connie Chan; ChanStaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Lurie, Daniel (MYR)
Cc:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject:	11/3 D4ward Position "Family" Housing plan
Date:	Monday, November 3, 2025 10:24:30 AM
Attachments:	D4ward letter on upzoning.pdf

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

Sent from AT&T Yahoo Mail on Android

D4ward is a grassroots network of Sunset District neighbors working to keep our community a place where regular people can afford to live, thrive, and have a real say in what happens here. We support affordable housing, stand up to big-money influence in San Francisco politics, protect workers, defend our coastline, and fight for community needs over corporate interests.

We are deeply concerned that, due to the delay in appointing a new District 4 Supervisor, our district is now being upzoned **without representation** on the current Board of Supervisors. Proceeding with this legislation under these circumstances amounts to **government without representation**. The Board should **postpone all hearings and votes on District 4 zoning changes until a new Supervisor is seated.**

D4ward's Key Positions and Priorities

In general, D4ward supports the **amendments proposed by Supervisors Connie Chan and Chyanne Chen** at the first Land Use and Transportation Committee hearing on the Mayor's upzoning plan. We urge the Board to incorporate these changes to protect affordability, safety, and neighborhood integrity.

Our specific priorities are:

1. Accelerate downtown office-to-housing conversions.
Before targeting stable, working-class neighborhoods like ours for massive rezoning, the City must aggressively pursue the conversion of empty downtown office buildings into housing.

2. Protect small businesses and tenants in District 4.
Under the Mayor's plan, our unique small businesses would become targets for demolition along all commercial corridors. We strongly support the **Race and Equity in All Planning Coalition (REP-SF)** and Supervisor Chan's **Tenant Protection Ordinance** to safeguard both tenants and neighborhood-serving businesses.

3. Eliminate in-lieu fees.
Developers must not be allowed to "fee out" of affordable housing requirements. In-lieu fees only produce delayed, off-site projects and create enclaves of market-rate luxury housing.

4. Dedicate all suitable public land for 100% affordable housing.
All appropriate public land—excluding parks and open space—should be reserved for **100% affordable housing** serving a full range of incomes, from middle-income working families to deeply affordable and supportive housing.

5. Preserve the Coastal Zone.
No land should be removed from the existing Coastal Zone boundaries. Coastal protections are essential for public safety, environmental resilience, and equity.

6. Prohibit upzoning in the Tsunami Zone.
It is reckless to increase building heights or density in areas at high risk of tsunami inundation. The City must also repair and reactivate the local tsunami warning system.

7. Ensure fire safety before allowing large-scale development.
No significant new upzoning should take effect until a secure **emergency firefighting water system** is installed in the Sunset and Parkside Districts, which are already vulnerable to wildfire and earthquake-related fires.

8. Protect historic and culturally significant buildings.
All **Category A and A-eligible historic buildings and districts** should be exempted from upzoning. District 4's mid-century homes and civic buildings reflect our community's unique cultural heritage and deserve preservation.

9. Prevent excessive height near parks and schools.
Properties bordering the southern edges of our parks and schools should not be upzoned for additional height. Casting shadows on open spaces and classrooms undermines the very "well-resourced" character the City claims to value.

Erica Zweig
Corresponding Secretary

From:	James Lloyd
To:	Chen, Lisa (CPC); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Supervisors; ChanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); MahmoodStaff; MandelmanStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Cc:	Carroll, John (BOS); Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC); Cityattorney
Subject:	Re: public comment re items 6-11 for today"s Land Use Committee meeting
Date:	Monday, November 3, 2025 11:40:14 AM
Attachments:	San Francisco - Housing Choice SF Letter - BoS Land Use Committee 2025.11.03.pdf

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

Please disregard the previous message.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

The California Housing Defense Fund submits the attached public comment for today's Land Use and Transportation Committee meeting regarding the Family Zoning plan, agendized as items 6 through 11.

Sincerely,

James M. Lloyd
Director of Planning and Investigations
California Housing Defense Fund
james@calhdf.org
CalHDF is grant & donation funded
Donate today - https://calhdf.org/donate/

On Mon, Nov 3, 2025 at 11:35 AM James Lloyd <james@calhdf.org> wrote:

> Dear San Francisco City Council,
>
> The California Housing Defense Fund submits the attached public comment for today's City Council Land Use and Transportation Committee meeting regarding the Family Zoning plan, agendized as items 6 through 11.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> James M. Lloyd
> Director of Planning and Investigations
> California Housing Defense Fund
> james@calhdf.org
> CalHDF is grant & donation funded
> Donate today - https://calhdf.org/donate/

Nov 3, 2025

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
49 South Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94103

Re: Housing Element Implementation

By email: Lisa.chen@sfgov.org, Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org, bos@sfgov.org, bos-supervisors@sfgov.org, ChanStaff@sfgov.org, ChenStaff@sfgov.org, DorseyStaff@sfgov.org, Jackie.Fielder@sfgov.org, MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org, MandelmanStaff@sfgov.org, MelgarStaff@sfgov.org, SauterStaff@sfgov.org, SherrillStaff@sfgov.org, Shamann.Walton@sfgov.org

Cc: john.carroll@sfgov.org; sarah.dennis-phillips@sfgov.org; cityattorney@sfcityatty.org

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

The California Housing Defense Fund ("CalHDF") writes in advance of the Land Use and Transportation Committee meeting scheduled for November 3, 2025 at 1:30pm. CalHDF writes to warn the Committee, as well as the larger Board, that certain elements of the proposed Housing Choice-San Francisco ("HCSF") plan – which is, in turn, part of the overall Family Zoning Plan – violate state law. The HCSF program, in its current form, would explicitly forbid the application of state housing laws and/or require housing project applicants to waive protections they and their projects are entitled to under state law. The City, however, lacks authority to enact a program with these restrictions.

If the City does not obey the law, CalHDF will challenge the City in court. Such a lawsuit would expose the City to penalties for failure to comply with housing element law. The City would also be ordered to grant development applicants access to *both* the HCSF program *and* state laws, including the Statewide Density Bonus Law (the "SDBL"). CalHDF urges the City to avoid such needless litigation and instead comply with the law in the first instance. The City should drop the HCSF program's effort to carve itself out of the SDBL and other state laws.

//

State Law Limits Certain Aspects of the Proposed Housing Choice–San Francisco Bonus Program

The proposed HCSF bonus program provides additional residential zoning capacity for projects that meet certain criteria. Overall, this is good. However, one of the HCSF eligibility criteria poses a problem: the requirement, found in section 206.10(b)(5), that an HCSF project "not receive any density or development bonuses or relief from applicable Planning Code standards in any other State or local law or program." This requirement is unenforceable to the extent it pertains to state law, and, should it be enacted, developers will have the option to ignore it.

This is for four reasons. First, the City "cannot choose to forgo application of land use policies imposed by the Legislature." (*Ailanto Properties, Inc. v. City of Half Moon Bay* (2006) 142 Cal.App.4th 572, 595.) Second, just as the City cannot waive state law's application, project applicants cannot waive protections to which they are entitled under state law, since those protections are designed to serve the public interest. (See Civ. Code, § 3513 ["a law established for a public reason cannot be contravened by a private agreement"].) Third, the SDBL includes explicit rules for local density bonus programs: such programs must build on, rather than supplant, the SDBL. Finally, even if the first three points are ignored, the SDBL allows project applicants to waive the HCSF eligibility requirement forbidding the use of state bonuses. (Gov. Code, § 65915, subd. (e).) Legal interpretations from the California Department of Housing and Community Development ("HCD"), the state agency charged with interpreting and enforcing state housing law, support these conclusions.

Background

State law contains many provisions that grant rights and protections to proposed housing developments and applications for proposed housing developments. These include AB 2011, codified at Government Code section 65912.100 et seq., the SDBL, codified at Government Code section 65915 et seq., SB 35, codified at Government Code section 65913.4, and more besides. These laws accomplish a variety of pro-housing policies by, among other things, allowing proposed housing developments that meet certain criteria (such as the inclusion of affordable units) to reduce or avoid local zoning and other land use restrictions. In some cases, whether a project is eligible for state law protections and the extent to which it may reduce or avoid local rules depends on the generosity of the local zoning code. For example, the SDBL calculates density bonuses using a "base density," defined as "the greatest number of units allowed under the zoning ordinance, specific plan, or land use element of the general plan." (Gov. Code, § 65915, subd. (o)(6).)

The proposed HCSF program expands the San Francisco zoning code's accommodation for denser housing in much of the City. The aforementioned state laws then further expand the allowed range of housing projects, providing for even greater density and even more

forgiving standards for projects. But there is a catch: the HCSF program attempts to forestall these state laws, in section 206.10(b)(5). If not for proposed section 206.10(b)(5), housing project applicants would be able to propose projects under the HCSF rules and avail themselves of the full range of state law protections. Thus, the critical question is: does proposed section 206.10(b)(5) have any legal effect? As explained below, the answer is no. Developers may use both the HCSF rules and any state law bonuses or protections that apply.

The City Cannot Forgo the Application of State Law

State law preempts local law. (Cal. Const., art. XI, § 7.) This is a foundational constitutional principle, and it is no less true in the land use context than anywhere else. As a corollary to this principle, local governments "cannot choose to forgo application of land use policies imposed by the Legislature." (*Ailanto Properties*, *supra*, 142 Cal.App.4th at 595.) Proposed section 206.10(b)(5), however, attempts to do exactly that: it states, in effect, that state land use laws do not apply to projects proceeding under the HCSF program. The City is careful to word the section to dance around the point, perhaps in recognition of the legal consequences, but the section's intended purpose is unmistakably to "forgo application of land use policies imposed by the Legislature," as caselaw and the California constitution forbid. (*Ibid.*)

As explained above, numerous state laws – particularly the SDBL – grant certain housing projects legal protections. None of these state laws allows local governments to circumvent or opt out of these rules. The attempt to do so, in section 206.10(b)(5) of the proposed HCSF program, does not pass legal muster, and project applicants will be entitled to ignore it.

Project Applicants Cannot Waive State Law Protections to Which They Are Entitled

Just as the City cannot waive the application state land use and housing laws, neither can developers. "[A] law established for a public reason cannot be contravened by a private agreement." (Civ. Code, § 3513.) In other words, if a law is designed to accomplish a public benefit (possibly in addition to private benefits), the law's provisions cannot be waived. (See, e.g., *County of Riverside v. Superior Court* (2000) 86 Cal.App.4th 211, 220 [holding employment protections for public safety officers, although they benefitted individual officers, also served a broader public purpose and could not be waived].) The legislature has made clear that pro-housing laws serve the broader public interest.[1] (See, e.g., Gov. Code, §§ 65915, subd. (u); 65913.4, subd. (u); 65582.1; Stats. 2024, ch. 294, § 1; Stats. 2023, ch. 783, § 1.) The legislative history for these laws, moreover, confirms they are intended to serve the public by

[1] On one occasion, California courts found that a law establishing time limits for housing permit application processing primarily benefitted project applicants and not the general public, and hence project applicants could waive them. (*Bickel v. City of Piedmont* (1997) 16 Cal.4th 1040, 1049-1052.) The legislature immediately rebuked the Courts and overturned the *Bickel* holding through legislation. (See *Riverwatch v. County of San Diego* (1999) 76 Cal.App.4th 1428, 1439.)

expanding the supply of housing and affordable housing. (See *Doskocz v. ALS Lien Services* (2024) 102 Cal.App.5th 107, 115-116 [legislative history is relevant in deciding whether law serves a public purpose and hence cannot be waived].) Hence, project applicants have no authority to disclaim the application of these laws, as the City's proposed HCSF program would have them do.

Two additional reasons prevent project applicants from waiving their right to pursue state law protections.

First, as with all legal waivers, such a waiver must be voluntary. (*Harvey v. County of Kern* (1930) 107 Cal.App. 590, 597.) As currently framed, the HCSF program does not ask project applicants to voluntarily waive their state law rights. It instead makes waiver *mandatory* for any project applicant. No waiver can occur through such an ultimatum; to the extent that the issue is unclear, moreover, the ambiguity resolves against the existence of a waiver. (See *Perini v. Perini* (1964), 225 Cal.App.2d 399.)

Second, waiver requires "an abandonment of a right that could be enforced or a privilege that could be exercised." (*Estate of Goyette* (1971) 14 Cal.App.3d 224, 232 [internal citations omitted].) Thus, for an applicant to be able to waive the application of state law to an HCSF project, it must be the case that the applicant could, absent the waiver, enforce the application of the relevant state law. And it must be the case, from there, that the applicant could choose *not* to waive their rights and instead apply state law protections and bonuses to their project. In this way, the City faces a catch-22, and however it resolves the dilemma, developers will be able to use both the HCSF program and state law.

<u>The State Density Bonus Law Creates Narrow Guidelines for Local Bonus Programs, Which the HCSF Program Does Not Obey</u>

The SDBL does allow local governments to implement local bonus programs. It includes strict rules for such programs, however, which the proposed HCSF program does not meet. Local bonus programs must add to, rather than supplant, the SDBL. Government Code section 65915, subdivision (n), states: "nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit a city, county, or city and county from granting a density bonus *greater than* what is described in this section for a development that meets the requirements of this section" (emphasis added). By negative implication, local governments are forbidden from offering density bonuses that do not incorporate, at minimum, the bonuses allowed by the SDBL. Local bonus programs must add to the SDBL; they cannot displace it in favor of an entirely separate density bonus scheme. As described above, moreover, preemption principles prevent local governments from evading the SDBL, and this language in the SDBL confirms that outcome.

The SDBL includes stronger language too. Government Code section 65917 states:

> In enacting this chapter it is the intent of the Legislature that the density bonus or other incentives offered by the city, county, or city and county pursuant to this chapter shall contribute significantly to the economic feasibility of lower income housing in proposed housing developments. **In the absence of an agreement by a developer in accordance with Section 65915, a locality shall not offer a density bonus or any other incentive that would undermine the intent of this chapter.**

(Emphasis added.) In other words, if San Francisco wishes to offer a density bonus to developers, it must first allow them any protections they are entitled to under the SDBL. Only then can it offer a local bonus program. The law establishes a clear baseline: project applicants may avail themselves of any bonuses and benefits they are entitled to under the SDBL, and further local bonuses and benefits must come on top of the SDBL.

These rules are especially important in San Francisco. HCD has found that the SDBL is "critical" for developers navigating San Francisco's complex zoning rules and extensive procedural hurdles. (See "Examining Local Law, Policy, and Planning Practice on Development in San Francisco Using CALES," O'Neill et al., pp. 38-39 (available here).) In some cases, HCD has issued Notices of Violation to San Francisco for impeding housing development by refusing to grant bonuses, incentives, and waivers allowed by the SDBL. (See, e.g., California Department of Housing and Community Development, Letter to Kate Conner, December 29, 2022 (available here).) These HCD findings and Notices of Violation confirm the SDBL's importance in producing housing in San Francisco.

The proposed HCSF program, by attempting to displace the SDBL entirely, violates the SDBL's explicit rules for local bonus program. This violation carries particular significance for San Francisco, where project applicants often rely on the SDBL to navigate a complex zoning code and approval process. If San Francisco wishes to implement a local bonus program, it must stack that program on top of the SDBL. It cannot offer an "alternative" bonus program, such as the proposed HCSF program, that attempts to remove SDBL eligibility for projects that are eligible for SDBL protections.

In closing this section, CalHDF notes that HCD has weighed in on the question of whether local governments may enact zoning bonus programs that serve as alternatives to state law. In a letter to Menlo Park (available here), the Department wrote: "[T]he City's Affordable Housing Overlay states that the overlay will be an alternative to state density bonus law. **This is in conflict with state law and must be revised."** (Emphasis added.)[2] HCD's view warrants substantial deference as the interpretation of a "technical, obscure, [or] complex" statutory

[2] Separately, as explained later in this letter, HCD's Site Inventory Guidebook (available here) analyzes whether zoning overlays or other local zoning programs established by a city's housing element may supplant or displace the SDBL and firmly establishes that they cannot. (See pages 14-15 of the guidebook.) This analysis is more relevant to the question of how the HCSF program will affect the City's compliance with the Housing Element Law, but this analysis also underscores the specific point that the City may not wriggle out of state law.

scheme by the agency charged with enforcing it. (See *Boling v. Public Employment Relations Bd.* (2018) 5 Cal.5th 898, 911 [citing *Yamaha Corp. of America v. State Bd. of Equalization* (1998) 19 Cal.4th 1, 12]; *Hoffmaster v. City of San Diego* (1997) 55 Cal.App.4th 1098, 1113, fn. 13 ["We substantially rely on the Department of Housing and Community Development's interpretation [...] regarding compliance with the housing element law"].)

Even if the City Can Prohibit the Application of State Law, the Density Bonus Law Gives Project Applicants the Legal Right to Circumvent the City's Prohibition

Even if the above legal rules do not neutralize the City's attempt to avoid state law, any project eligible for the SDBL will be able to defeat the application of proposed section 206.10(b)(5). The SDBL states: "In no case may a city, county, or city and county apply any development standard that will have the effect of physically precluding the construction of a development meeting the criteria of subdivision (b) at the densities or with the concessions or incentives permitted by this section." (Gov. Code, § 65915, subd. (e)(1).) If a proposed project complies with the HCSF except for section 206.10(b)(5) – because it seeks benefits under the SDBL or another state law – and the application of section 206.10(b)(5) would physically preclude the project by eliminating its eligibility for the HCSF, then the City cannot apply that section to the project. To the extent the City doubts or intends to contest this, CalHDF reminds the City that the SDBL, by its terms, "shall be interpreted liberally in favor of producing the maximum number of total housing units." (*Id.* at subd. (r).) Flouting the law on this point also carries severe penalties, including mandatory payment of attorney's fees to a project applicant who challenges the City in court. (*Id.* at subd. (e)(1).)

The HCSF Program Violates the Housing Element Law

Furthermore, the HCSF violates the Housing Element Law (Gov. Code, § 65580 et seq.). Rezoning programs enacted pursuant to a housing element, such as the proposed Family Zoning Plan and its component HCSF program, may not exempt themselves from state law's application, as HCD has explained in its Site Inventory Guidebook (available here – see pages 14-15). Pursuing the HCSF program as it is currently designed would violate this rule and risk the City's housing element compliance. This would expose it to a range of penalties, including the "builder's remedy."

The City Should Take Care to Comply with New Caselaw Concerning Housing Element Rezonings

Lastly, the City should take care to ensure that the rezoning complies with housing element law requiring minimum residential density on low-income sites. The newly published Court of Appeal decision *New Commune DTLA LLC v. City of Redondo Beach* (Oct. 10, 2025, No. B336042) ___ Cal.App.5th ___ makes clear that in order to comply with minimum density requirements, local zoning must require that all new development include a minimum

density of residential use. Zoning "overlays" that allow for 100% non-residential development on a site fail to comply with housing element law. The proposed zoning includes many low-income sites that are given additional residential density on top of base commercial zoning. In order to comply with housing element law, the City should make clear that all new development of these sites must include the minimum density of residential use, and that 100% commercial development is prohibited.

As you are well aware, California remains in the throes of a statewide crisis-level housing shortage. New multifamily housing in San Francisco a public benefit: it will help satisfy demand for housing near jobs and transit, thereby reducing displacement pressure; and it will also cut down on transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions by providing housing in a major metro area, as opposed to farther-flung regions in the state (and out of state). CalHDF therefore urges the City to follow through on the commitments in its housing element, as the law requires, and obey state law in drafting and enforcing its land use regulations.

CalHDF is a 501(c)(3) non-profit corporation whose mission includes advocating for increased access to housing for Californians at all income levels, including low-income households. You may learn more about CalHDF at www.calhdf.org.

Sincerely,

Dylan Casey
CalHDF Executive Director



James M. Lloyd
CalHDF Director of Planning and Investigations

Nov 3, 2025

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
49 South Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94103

Re: Housing Element Implementation

By email: Lisa.chen@sfgov.org, Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org, bos@sfgov.org, bos-supervisors@sfgov.org, ChanStaff@sfgov.org, ChenStaff@sfgov.org, DorseyStaff@sfgov.org, Jackie.Fielder@sfgov.org, MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org, MandelmanStaff@sfgov.org, MelgarStaff@sfgov.org, SauterStaff@sfgov.org, SherrillStaff@sfgov.org, Shamann.Walton@sfgov.org

Cc: john.carroll@sfgov.org; sarah.dennis-phillips@sfgov.org; cityattorney@sfcityatty.org

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

The California Housing Defense Fund ("CalHDF") writes in advance of the Land Use and Transportation Committee meeting scheduled for November 3, 2025 at 1:30pm. CalHDF writes to warn the Committee, as well as the larger Board, that certain elements of the proposed Housing Choice-San Francisco ("HCSF") plan – which is, in turn, part of the overall Family Zoning Plan – violate state law. The HCSF program, in its current form, would explicitly forbid the application of state housing laws and/or require housing project applicants to waive protections they and their projects are entitled to under state law. The City, however, lacks authority to enact a program with these restrictions.

If the City does not obey the law, CalHDF will challenge the City in court. Such a lawsuit would expose the City to penalties for failure to comply with housing element law. The City would also be ordered to grant development applicants access to *both* the HCSF program *and* state laws, including the Statewide Density Bonus Law (the "SDBL"). CalHDF urges the City to avoid such needless litigation and instead comply with the law in the first instance. The City should drop the HCSF program's effort to carve itself out of the SDBL and other state laws.

//

State Law Limits Certain Aspects of the Proposed Housing Choice–San Francisco Bonus Program

The proposed HCSF bonus program provides additional residential zoning capacity for projects that meet certain criteria. Overall, this is good. However, one of the HCSF eligibility criteria poses a problem: the requirement, found in section 206.10(b)(5), that an HCSF project "not receive any density or development bonuses or relief from applicable Planning Code standards in any other State or local law or program." This requirement is unenforceable to the extent it pertains to state law, and, should it be enacted, developers will have the option to ignore it.

This is for four reasons. First, the City "cannot choose to forgo application of land use policies imposed by the Legislature." (*Ailanto Properties, Inc. v. City of Half Moon Bay* (2006) 142 Cal.App.4th 572, 595.) Second, just as the City cannot waive state law's application, project applicants cannot waive protections to which they are entitled under state law, since those protections are designed to serve the public interest. (See Civ. Code, § 3513 ["a law established for a public reason cannot be contravened by a private agreement"].) Third, the SDBL includes explicit rules for local density bonus programs: such programs must build on, rather than supplant, the SDBL. Finally, even if the first three points are ignored, the SDBL allows project applicants to waive the HCSF eligibility requirement forbidding the use of state bonuses. (Gov. Code, § 65915, subd. (e).) Legal interpretations from the California Department of Housing and Community Development ("HCD"), the state agency charged with interpreting and enforcing state housing law, support these conclusions.

Background

State law contains many provisions that grant rights and protections to proposed housing developments and applications for proposed housing developments. These include AB 2011, codified at Government Code section 65912.100 et seq., the SDBL, codified at Government Code section 65915 et seq., SB 35, codified at Government Code section 65913.4, and more besides. These laws accomplish a variety of pro-housing policies by, among other things, allowing proposed housing developments that meet certain criteria (such as the inclusion of affordable units) to reduce or avoid local zoning and other land use restrictions. In some cases, whether a project is eligible for state law protections and the extent to which it may reduce or avoid local rules depends on the generosity of the local zoning code. For example, the SDBL calculates density bonuses using a "base density," defined as "the greatest number of units allowed under the zoning ordinance, specific plan, or land use element of the general plan." (Gov. Code, § 65915, subd. (o)(6).)

The proposed HCSF program expands the San Francisco zoning code's accommodation for denser housing in much of the City. The aforementioned state laws then further expand the allowed range of housing projects, providing for even greater density and even more

forgiving standards for projects. But there is a catch: the HCSF program attempts to forestall these state laws, in section 206.10(b)(5). If not for proposed section 206.10(b)(5), housing project applicants would be able to propose projects under the HCSF rules and avail themselves of the full range of state law protections. Thus, the critical question is: does proposed section 206.10(b)(5) have any legal effect? As explained below, the answer is no. Developers may use both the HCSF rules and any state law bonuses or protections that apply.

The City Cannot Forgo the Application of State Law

State law preempts local law. (Cal. Const., art. XI, § 7.) This is a foundational constitutional principle, and it is no less true in the land use context than anywhere else. As a corollary to this principle, local governments "cannot choose to forgo application of land use policies imposed by the Legislature." (*Ailanto Properties*, *supra*, 142 Cal.App.4th at 595.) Proposed section 206.10(b)(5), however, attempts to do exactly that: it states, in effect, that state land use laws do not apply to projects proceeding under the HCSF program. The City is careful to word the section to dance around the point, perhaps in recognition of the legal consequences, but the section's intended purpose is unmistakably to "forgo application of land use policies imposed by the Legislature," as caselaw and the California constitution forbid. (*Ibid.*)

As explained above, numerous state laws – particularly the SDBL – grant certain housing projects legal protections. None of these state laws allows local governments to circumvent or opt out of these rules. The attempt to do so, in section 206.10(b)(5) of the proposed HCSF program, does not pass legal muster, and project applicants will be entitled to ignore it.

Project Applicants Cannot Waive State Law Protections to Which They Are Entitled

Just as the City cannot waive the application state land use and housing laws, neither can developers. "[A] law established for a public reason cannot be contravened by a private agreement." (Civ. Code, § 3513.) In other words, if a law is designed to accomplish a public benefit (possibly in addition to private benefits), the law's provisions cannot be waived. (See, e.g., *County of Riverside v. Superior Court* (2000) 86 Cal.App.4th 211, 220 [holding employment protections for public safety officers, although they benefitted individual officers, also served a broader public purpose and could not be waived].) The legislature has made clear that pro-housing laws serve the broader public interest.[1] (See, e.g., Gov. Code, §§ 65915, subd. (u); 65913.4, subd. (u); 65582.1; Stats. 2024, ch. 294, § 1; Stats. 2023, ch. 783, § 1.) The legislative history for these laws, moreover, confirms they are intended to serve the public by

[1] On one occasion, California courts found that a law establishing time limits for housing permit application processing primarily benefitted project applicants and not the general public, and hence project applicants could waive them. (*Bickel v. City of Piedmont* (1997) 16 Cal.4th 1040, 1049-1052.) The legislature immediately rebuked the Courts and overturned the *Bickel* holding through legislation. (See *Riverwatch v. County of San Diego* (1999) 76 Cal.App.4th 1428, 1439.)

expanding the supply of housing and affordable housing. (See *Doskocz v. ALS Lien Services* (2024) 102 Cal.App.5th 107, 115-116 [legislative history is relevant in deciding whether law serves a public purpose and hence cannot be waived].) Hence, project applicants have no authority to disclaim the application of these laws, as the City's proposed HCSF program would have them do.

Two additional reasons prevent project applicants from waiving their right to pursue state law protections.

First, as with all legal waivers, such a waiver must be voluntary. (*Harvey v. County of Kern* (1930) 107 Cal.App. 590, 597.) As currently framed, the HCSF program does not ask project applicants to voluntarily waive their state law rights. It instead makes waiver *mandatory* for any project applicant. No waiver can occur through such an ultimatum; to the extent that the issue is unclear, moreover, the ambiguity resolves against the existence of a waiver. (See *Perini v. Perini* (1964), 225 Cal.App.2d 399.)

Second, waiver requires "an abandonment of a right that could be enforced or a privilege that could be exercised." (*Estate of Goyette* (1971) 14 Cal.App.3d 224, 232 [internal citations omitted].) Thus, for an applicant to be able to waive the application of state law to an HCSF project, it must be the case that the applicant could, absent the waiver, enforce the application of the relevant state law. And it must be the case, from there, that the applicant could choose *not* to waive their rights and instead apply state law protections and bonuses to their project. In this way, the City faces a catch-22, and however it resolves the dilemma, developers will be able to use both the HCSF program and state law.

<u>The State Density Bonus Law Creates Narrow Guidelines for Local Bonus Programs, Which the HCSF Program Does Not Obey</u>

The SDBL does allow local governments to implement local bonus programs. It includes strict rules for such programs, however, which the proposed HCSF program does not meet. Local bonus programs must add to, rather than supplant, the SDBL. Government Code section 65915, subdivision (n), states: "nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit a city, county, or city and county from granting a density bonus *greater than* what is described in this section for a development that meets the requirements of this section" (emphasis added). By negative implication, local governments are forbidden from offering density bonuses that do not incorporate, at minimum, the bonuses allowed by the SDBL. Local bonus programs must add to the SDBL; they cannot displace it in favor of an entirely separate density bonus scheme. As described above, moreover, preemption principles prevent local governments from evading the SDBL, and this language in the SDBL confirms that outcome.

The SDBL includes stronger language too. Government Code section 65917 states:

> In enacting this chapter it is the intent of the Legislature that the density bonus or other incentives offered by the city, county, or city and county pursuant to this chapter shall contribute significantly to the economic feasibility of lower income housing in proposed housing developments. **In the absence of an agreement by a developer in accordance with Section 65915, a locality shall not offer a density bonus or any other incentive that would undermine the intent of this chapter.**

(Emphasis added.) In other words, if San Francisco wishes to offer a density bonus to developers, it must first allow them any protections they are entitled to under the SDBL. Only then can it offer a local bonus program. The law establishes a clear baseline: project applicants may avail themselves of any bonuses and benefits they are entitled to under the SDBL, and further local bonuses and benefits must come on top of the SDBL.

These rules are especially important in San Francisco. HCD has found that the SDBL is "critical" for developers navigating San Francisco's complex zoning rules and extensive procedural hurdles. (See "Examining Local Law, Policy, and Planning Practice on Development in San Francisco Using CALES," O'Neill et al., pp. 38-39 (available here).) In some cases, HCD has issued Notices of Violation to San Francisco for impeding housing development by refusing to grant bonuses, incentives, and waivers allowed by the SDBL. (See, e.g., California Department of Housing and Community Development, Letter to Kate Conner, December 29, 2022 (available here).) These HCD findings and Notices of Violation confirm the SDBL's importance in producing housing in San Francisco.

The proposed HCSF program, by attempting to displace the SDBL entirely, violates the SDBL's explicit rules for local bonus program. This violation carries particular significance for San Francisco, where project applicants often rely on the SDBL to navigate a complex zoning code and approval process. If San Francisco wishes to implement a local bonus program, it must stack that program on top of the SDBL. It cannot offer an "alternative" bonus program, such as the proposed HCSF program, that attempts to remove SDBL eligibility for projects that are eligible for SDBL protections.

In closing this section, CalHDF notes that HCD has weighed in on the question of whether local governments may enact zoning bonus programs that serve as alternatives to state law. In a letter to Menlo Park (available here), the Department wrote: "[T]he City's Affordable Housing Overlay states that the overlay will be an alternative to state density bonus law. **This is in conflict with state law and must be revised."** (Emphasis added.)[2] HCD's view warrants substantial deference as the interpretation of a "technical, obscure, [or] complex" statutory

[2] Separately, as explained later in this letter, HCD's Site Inventory Guidebook (available here) analyzes whether zoning overlays or other local zoning programs established by a city's housing element may supplant or displace the SDBL and firmly establishes that they cannot. (See pages 14-15 of the guidebook.) This analysis is more relevant to the question of how the HCSF program will affect the City's compliance with the Housing Element Law, but this analysis also underscores the specific point that the City may not wriggle out of state law.

scheme by the agency charged with enforcing it. (See *Boling v. Public Employment Relations Bd.* (2018) 5 Cal.5th 898, 911 [citing *Yamaha Corp. of America v. State Bd. of Equalization* (1998) 19 Cal.4th 1, 12]; *Hoffmaster v. City of San Diego* (1997) 55 Cal.App.4th 1098, 1113, fn. 13 ["We substantially rely on the Department of Housing and Community Development's interpretation [...] regarding compliance with the housing element law"].)

Even if the City Can Prohibit the Application of State Law, the Density Bonus Law Gives Project Applicants the Legal Right to Circumvent the City's Prohibition

Even if the above legal rules do not neutralize the City's attempt to avoid state law, any project eligible for the SDBL will be able to defeat the application of proposed section 206.10(b)(5). The SDBL states: "In no case may a city, county, or city and county apply any development standard that will have the effect of physically precluding the construction of a development meeting the criteria of subdivision (b) at the densities or with the concessions or incentives permitted by this section." (Gov. Code, § 65915, subd. (e)(1).) If a proposed project complies with the HCSF except for section 206.10(b)(5) – because it seeks benefits under the SDBL or another state law – and the application of section 206.10(b)(5) would physically preclude the project by eliminating its eligibility for the HCSF, then the City cannot apply that section to the project. To the extent the City doubts or intends to contest this, CalHDF reminds the City that the SDBL, by its terms, "shall be interpreted liberally in favor of producing the maximum number of total housing units." (*Id.* at subd. (r).) Flouting the law on this point also carries severe penalties, including mandatory payment of attorney's fees to a project applicant who challenges the City in court. (*Id.* at subd. (e)(1).)

The HCSF Program Violates the Housing Element Law

Furthermore, the HCSF violates the Housing Element Law (Gov. Code, § 65580 et seq.). Rezoning programs enacted pursuant to a housing element, such as the proposed Family Zoning Plan and its component HCSF program, may not exempt themselves from state law's application, as HCD has explained in its Site Inventory Guidebook (available here – see pages 14-15). Pursuing the HCSF program as it is currently designed would violate this rule and risk the City's housing element compliance. This would expose it to a range of penalties, including the "builder's remedy."

The City Should Take Care to Comply with New Caselaw Concerning Housing Element Rezonings

Lastly, the City should take care to ensure that the rezoning complies with housing element law requiring minimum residential density on low-income sites. The newly published Court of Appeal decision *New Commune DTLA LLC v. City of Redondo Beach* (Oct. 10, 2025, No. B336042) ___ Cal.App.5th ___ makes clear that in order to comply with minimum density requirements, local zoning must require that all new development include a minimum

density of residential use. Zoning "overlays" that allow for 100% non-residential development on a site fail to comply with housing element law. The proposed zoning includes many low-income sites that are given additional residential density on top of base commercial zoning. In order to comply with housing element law, the City should make clear that all new development of these sites must include the minimum density of residential use, and that 100% commercial development is prohibited.

As you are well aware, California remains in the throes of a statewide crisis-level housing shortage. New multifamily housing in San Francisco a public benefit: it will help satisfy demand for housing near jobs and transit, thereby reducing displacement pressure; and it will also cut down on transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions by providing housing in a major metro area, as opposed to farther-flung regions in the state (and out of state). CalHDF therefore urges the City to follow through on the commitments in its housing element, as the law requires, and obey state law in drafting and enforcing its land use regulations.

CalHDF is a 501(c)(3) non-profit corporation whose mission includes advocating for increased access to housing for Californians at all income levels, including low-income households. You may learn more about CalHDF at www.calhdf.org.

Sincerely,

Dylan Casey
CalHDF Executive Director



James M. Lloyd
CalHDF Director of Planning and Investigations

From:	James Lloyd
To:	Chen, Lisa (CPC); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Supervisors; ChanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); MahmoodStaff; MandelmanStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Cc:	Carroll, John (BOS); Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC); Cityattorney
Subject:	Re: public comment re items 6-11 for today"s Land Use Committee meeting
Date:	Monday, November 3, 2025 11:40:15 AM
Attachments:	San Francisco - Housing Choice SF Letter - BoS Land Use Committee 2025.11.03.pdf

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

Please disregard the previous message.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

The California Housing Defense Fund submits the attached public comment for today's Land Use and Transportation Committee meeting regarding the Family Zoning plan, agendized as items 6 through 11.

Sincerely,

James M. Lloyd
Director of Planning and Investigations
California Housing Defense Fund
james@calhdf.org
CalHDF is grant & donation funded
Donate today - https://calhdf.org/donate/

On Mon, Nov 3, 2025 at 11:35 AM James Lloyd <james@calhdf.org> wrote:

> Dear San Francisco City Council,
>
> The California Housing Defense Fund submits the attached public comment for today's City Council Land Use and Transportation Committee meeting regarding the Family Zoning plan, agendized as items 6 through 11.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> James M. Lloyd
> Director of Planning and Investigations
> California Housing Defense Fund
> james@calhdf.org
> CalHDF is grant & donation funded
> Donate today - https://calhdf.org/donate/

From: Robyn Tucker
To: MelgarStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; ChenStaff
Cc: Carroll, John (BOS); SauterStaff; kcourtney@xdm.com
Subject: Agenda Item 6, 250966 General Plan Amendments Family Zoning Plan
Date: Monday, November 3, 2025 11:59:18 AM

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

Sent via Email

November 2, 2025

From: The Pacific Avenue Neighborhood Association (PANA)

To: SF Board of Supervisors Land Use and Transportation Committee

I am writing on behalf of the Pacific Avenue Neighborhood Association and our 300+ supporters to request preservation of our 40 feet height limits and 45% rear yard setbacks for the Pacific Avenue Neighborhood Commercial District.

Pacific Avenue History
From 2004 through 2009, PANA leadership worked shoulder to shoulder with a designated member from the San Francisco Planning Department to plan and design our neighborhood to better serve our community then and in the future. The result of our collaboration was legislation establishing the Pacific Avenue Neighborhood Commercial District. The legislation's key elements set building heights at 40 feet, rear yard setbacks at 45% for specific lots to encourage contiguous green open space, and businesses that would best serve and protect our neighborhood.

In addition, in legislation notesthat taller buildings should be at located at corners to minimize impact on the entire surrounding residential blocks and under no circumstance should taller buildings be located mid block. Hence, the design would be one of staggered height, moving east to west.

Decades ago, Pacific Avenue was expected to develop into a Commercial thoroughfare. This never happened. In fact, historically, most of the commercial activity consisted of sweat shops and garages that are no longer present, except some small business garages continue to flourish. Parking has always been at an has always been at a premium as Pacific Ave narrows from east to West with the most narrow portion between Leavenworth and Polk Street.

Family Zoning Plan
The original Family Zoning Plan heights for 12 square blocks that make up the Pacific Avenue NCD, which include from the North and South - Broadway to Jackson Streets and from East and West - Taylor to Polk Street maintained the current 40 foot height. It is unclear whether the rear yard setbacks have been modified or eliminated. We asked that they remain to allow for maximum light and air.

Respectfully, the Pacific Avenue neighborhood Association asks that the Family Zoning Plan be modified to respect our current height limits in an eight block rectangle between Leavenworth and Polk Street along Pacific Avenue and between Broadway and Jackson Street and on our alley's adjacent to and within our Pacific Avenue community.

With many thanks for your consideration,

Robyn Tucker
Chair
Pacific Avenue Neighborhood Association
(PANA)
7 McCormick Street (7 ft wide alley)
San Francisco, CA 94109
415-609-5607

From:	Paul Wermer
To:	Melgar, Myrna (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Chen, Chyanne (BOS); ChenStaff; Carroll, John (BOS)
Cc:	SherrillStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS)
Subject:	File No. 250701 Family Zoning Plan - Ammendment needed to avoid gaming the system
Date:	Monday, November 3, 2025 11:59:07 AM

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

Dear Land Use and Transportation Committee:

At the last hearing, I spoke to a very specific problem: The upzoning bonuses under Sec 206.10, Housing Choice -San Francisco Program do not require any inclusionary or mixed income housing to serve the needs of San Franciscans. The concern has not been addressed.

The State programs all require significant affordability contributions to qualify. Apparently San Francisco does not, and based on Planning's Residential Nexus studies, the existing language may exacerbate the housing affordability problem we face.

Unfortunately, Sec 206.10 only requires that at least one unit be added, and the project must comprise at least 2 units, excluding ADUs, to qualify for the Local Program Bonus. No inclusionary requirements apply unless at least 10 units are built.

This creates a perverse incentive - especially in desirable areas, where views or amenities are attractive to the wealthier segment of San Francisco, small projects can qualify for the Local Program Bonus. This creates the opportunity for projects of between 2 and 9 units, each up to 4000 sq ft in size, catering to the very wealthy. There are hundreds of attractive sites - with views of the Bay, the ocean, Golden Gate Park, one lot adjacent to the Presidio. In aggregate there are potentially hundreds if not thousands of luxury apartments with desirable views. Furthermore, for RTO-C areas, commercial spaces are allowed - offering additional rentable space where perhaps the view is not so good.

at a minimum, the legislation should require Inclusionary contributions from ALL market rate projects qualifying for the Local Program.

Sincerely,

Paul Wermer

--
Paul Wermer
2309 California St
San Francisco,CA 94115

From:	James Lloyd
To:	Chen, Lisa (CPC); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Supervisors; ChanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); MahmoodStaff; MandelmanStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Cc:	Carroll, John (BOS); Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC); Cityattorney
Subject:	Re: public comment re items 6-11 for today"s Land Use Committee meeting
Date:	Monday, November 3, 2025 11:40:13 AM
Attachments:	San Francisco - Housing Choice SF Letter - BoS Land Use Committee 2025.11.03.pdf

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

Please disregard the previous message.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

The California Housing Defense Fund submits the attached public comment for today's Land Use and Transportation Committee meeting regarding the Family Zoning plan, agendized as items 6 through 11.

Sincerely,

James M. Lloyd
Director of Planning and Investigations
California Housing Defense Fund
james@calhdf.org
CalHDF is grant & donation funded
Donate today - https://calhdf.org/donate/

On Mon, Nov 3, 2025 at 11:35 AM James Lloyd <james@calhdf.org> wrote:

> Dear San Francisco City Council,
>
> The California Housing Defense Fund submits the attached public comment for today's City Council Land Use and Transportation Committee meeting regarding the Family Zoning plan, agendized as items 6 through 11.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> James M. Lloyd
> Director of Planning and Investigations
> California Housing Defense Fund
> james@calhdf.org
> CalHDF is grant & donation funded
> Donate today - https://calhdf.org/donate/

Nov 3, 2025

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
49 South Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94103

Re: Housing Element Implementation

By email: Lisa.chen@sfgov.org, Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org, bos@sfgov.org, bos-supervisors@sfgov.org, ChanStaff@sfgov.org, ChenStaff@sfgov.org, DorseyStaff@sfgov.org, Jackie.Fielder@sfgov.org, MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org, MandelmanStaff@sfgov.org, MelgarStaff@sfgov.org, SauterStaff@sfgov.org, SherrillStaff@sfgov.org, Shamann.Walton@sfgov.org

Cc: john.carroll@sfgov.org; sarah.dennis-phillips@sfgov.org; cityattorney@sfcityatty.org

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

The California Housing Defense Fund ("CalHDF") writes in advance of the Land Use and Transportation Committee meeting scheduled for November 3, 2025 at 1:30pm. CalHDF writes to warn the Committee, as well as the larger Board, that certain elements of the proposed Housing Choice-San Francisco ("HCSF") plan – which is, in turn, part of the overall Family Zoning Plan – violate state law. The HCSF program, in its current form, would explicitly forbid the application of state housing laws and/or require housing project applicants to waive protections they and their projects are entitled to under state law. The City, however, lacks authority to enact a program with these restrictions.

If the City does not obey the law, CalHDF will challenge the City in court. Such a lawsuit would expose the City to penalties for failure to comply with housing element law. The City would also be ordered to grant development applicants access to *both* the HCSF program *and* state laws, including the Statewide Density Bonus Law (the "SDBL"). CalHDF urges the City to avoid such needless litigation and instead comply with the law in the first instance. The City should drop the HCSF program's effort to carve itself out of the SDBL and other state laws.

//

State Law Limits Certain Aspects of the Proposed Housing Choice–San Francisco Bonus Program

The proposed HCSF bonus program provides additional residential zoning capacity for projects that meet certain criteria. Overall, this is good. However, one of the HCSF eligibility criteria poses a problem: the requirement, found in section 206.10(b)(5), that an HCSF project "not receive any density or development bonuses or relief from applicable Planning Code standards in any other State or local law or program." This requirement is unenforceable to the extent it pertains to state law, and, should it be enacted, developers will have the option to ignore it.

This is for four reasons. First, the City "cannot choose to forgo application of land use policies imposed by the Legislature." (*Ailanto Properties, Inc. v. City of Half Moon Bay* (2006) 142 Cal.App.4th 572, 595.) Second, just as the City cannot waive state law's application, project applicants cannot waive protections to which they are entitled under state law, since those protections are designed to serve the public interest. (See Civ. Code, § 3513 ["a law established for a public reason cannot be contravened by a private agreement"].) Third, the SDBL includes explicit rules for local density bonus programs: such programs must build on, rather than supplant, the SDBL. Finally, even if the first three points are ignored, the SDBL allows project applicants to waive the HCSF eligibility requirement forbidding the use of state bonuses. (Gov. Code, § 65915, subd. (e).) Legal interpretations from the California Department of Housing and Community Development ("HCD"), the state agency charged with interpreting and enforcing state housing law, support these conclusions.

Background

State law contains many provisions that grant rights and protections to proposed housing developments and applications for proposed housing developments. These include AB 2011, codified at Government Code section 65912.100 et seq., the SDBL, codified at Government Code section 65915 et seq., SB 35, codified at Government Code section 65913.4, and more besides. These laws accomplish a variety of pro-housing policies by, among other things, allowing proposed housing developments that meet certain criteria (such as the inclusion of affordable units) to reduce or avoid local zoning and other land use restrictions. In some cases, whether a project is eligible for state law protections and the extent to which it may reduce or avoid local rules depends on the generosity of the local zoning code. For example, the SDBL calculates density bonuses using a "base density," defined as "the greatest number of units allowed under the zoning ordinance, specific plan, or land use element of the general plan." (Gov. Code, § 65915, subd. (o)(6).)

The proposed HCSF program expands the San Francisco zoning code's accommodation for denser housing in much of the City. The aforementioned state laws then further expand the allowed range of housing projects, providing for even greater density and even more

forgiving standards for projects. But there is a catch: the HCSF program attempts to forestall these state laws, in section 206.10(b)(5). If not for proposed section 206.10(b)(5), housing project applicants would be able to propose projects under the HCSF rules and avail themselves of the full range of state law protections. Thus, the critical question is: does proposed section 206.10(b)(5) have any legal effect? As explained below, the answer is no. Developers may use both the HCSF rules and any state law bonuses or protections that apply.

The City Cannot Forgo the Application of State Law

State law preempts local law. (Cal. Const., art. XI, § 7.) This is a foundational constitutional principle, and it is no less true in the land use context than anywhere else. As a corollary to this principle, local governments "cannot choose to forgo application of land use policies imposed by the Legislature." (*Ailanto Properties*, *supra*, 142 Cal.App.4th at 595.) Proposed section 206.10(b)(5), however, attempts to do exactly that: it states, in effect, that state land use laws do not apply to projects proceeding under the HCSF program. The City is careful to word the section to dance around the point, perhaps in recognition of the legal consequences, but the section's intended purpose is unmistakably to "forgo application of land use policies imposed by the Legislature," as caselaw and the California constitution forbid. (*Ibid.*)

As explained above, numerous state laws – particularly the SDBL – grant certain housing projects legal protections. None of these state laws allows local governments to circumvent or opt out of these rules. The attempt to do so, in section 206.10(b)(5) of the proposed HCSF program, does not pass legal muster, and project applicants will be entitled to ignore it.

Project Applicants Cannot Waive State Law Protections to Which They Are Entitled

Just as the City cannot waive the application state land use and housing laws, neither can developers. "[A] law established for a public reason cannot be contravened by a private agreement." (Civ. Code, § 3513.) In other words, if a law is designed to accomplish a public benefit (possibly in addition to private benefits), the law's provisions cannot be waived. (See, e.g., *County of Riverside v. Superior Court* (2000) 86 Cal.App.4th 211, 220 [holding employment protections for public safety officers, although they benefitted individual officers, also served a broader public purpose and could not be waived].) The legislature has made clear that pro-housing laws serve the broader public interest.[1] (See, e.g., Gov. Code, §§ 65915, subd. (u); 65913.4, subd. (u); 65582.1; Stats. 2024, ch. 294, § 1; Stats. 2023, ch. 783, § 1.) The legislative history for these laws, moreover, confirms they are intended to serve the public by

[1] On one occasion, California courts found that a law establishing time limits for housing permit application processing primarily benefitted project applicants and not the general public, and hence project applicants could waive them. (*Bickel v. City of Piedmont* (1997) 16 Cal.4th 1040, 1049-1052.) The legislature immediately rebuked the Courts and overturned the *Bickel* holding through legislation. (See *Riverwatch v. County of San Diego* (1999) 76 Cal.App.4th 1428, 1439.)

expanding the supply of housing and affordable housing. (See *Doskocz v. ALS Lien Services* (2024) 102 Cal.App.5th 107, 115-116 [legislative history is relevant in deciding whether law serves a public purpose and hence cannot be waived].) Hence, project applicants have no authority to disclaim the application of these laws, as the City's proposed HCSF program would have them do.

Two additional reasons prevent project applicants from waiving their right to pursue state law protections.

First, as with all legal waivers, such a waiver must be voluntary. (*Harvey v. County of Kern* (1930) 107 Cal.App. 590, 597.) As currently framed, the HCSF program does not ask project applicants to voluntarily waive their state law rights. It instead makes waiver *mandatory* for any project applicant. No waiver can occur through such an ultimatum; to the extent that the issue is unclear, moreover, the ambiguity resolves against the existence of a waiver. (See *Perini v. Perini* (1964), 225 Cal.App.2d 399.)

Second, waiver requires "an abandonment of a right that could be enforced or a privilege that could be exercised." (*Estate of Goyette* (1971) 14 Cal.App.3d 224, 232 [internal citations omitted].) Thus, for an applicant to be able to waive the application of state law to an HCSF project, it must be the case that the applicant could, absent the waiver, enforce the application of the relevant state law. And it must be the case, from there, that the applicant could choose *not* to waive their rights and instead apply state law protections and bonuses to their project. In this way, the City faces a catch-22, and however it resolves the dilemma, developers will be able to use both the HCSF program and state law.

<u>The State Density Bonus Law Creates Narrow Guidelines for Local Bonus Programs, Which the HCSF Program Does Not Obey</u>

The SDBL does allow local governments to implement local bonus programs. It includes strict rules for such programs, however, which the proposed HCSF program does not meet. Local bonus programs must add to, rather than supplant, the SDBL. Government Code section 65915, subdivision (n), states: "nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit a city, county, or city and county from granting a density bonus *greater than* what is described in this section for a development that meets the requirements of this section" (emphasis added). By negative implication, local governments are forbidden from offering density bonuses that do not incorporate, at minimum, the bonuses allowed by the SDBL. Local bonus programs must add to the SDBL; they cannot displace it in favor of an entirely separate density bonus scheme. As described above, moreover, preemption principles prevent local governments from evading the SDBL, and this language in the SDBL confirms that outcome.

The SDBL includes stronger language too. Government Code section 65917 states:

> In enacting this chapter it is the intent of the Legislature that the density bonus or other incentives offered by the city, county, or city and county pursuant to this chapter shall contribute significantly to the economic feasibility of lower income housing in proposed housing developments. **In the absence of an agreement by a developer in accordance with Section 65915, a locality shall not offer a density bonus or any other incentive that would undermine the intent of this chapter.**

(Emphasis added.) In other words, if San Francisco wishes to offer a density bonus to developers, it must first allow them any protections they are entitled to under the SDBL. Only then can it offer a local bonus program. The law establishes a clear baseline: project applicants may avail themselves of any bonuses and benefits they are entitled to under the SDBL, and further local bonuses and benefits must come on top of the SDBL.

These rules are especially important in San Francisco. HCD has found that the SDBL is "critical" for developers navigating San Francisco's complex zoning rules and extensive procedural hurdles. (See "Examining Local Law, Policy, and Planning Practice on Development in San Francisco Using CALES," O'Neill et al., pp. 38-39 (available here).) In some cases, HCD has issued Notices of Violation to San Francisco for impeding housing development by refusing to grant bonuses, incentives, and waivers allowed by the SDBL. (See, e.g., California Department of Housing and Community Development, Letter to Kate Conner, December 29, 2022 (available here).) These HCD findings and Notices of Violation confirm the SDBL's importance in producing housing in San Francisco.

The proposed HCSF program, by attempting to displace the SDBL entirely, violates the SDBL's explicit rules for local bonus program. This violation carries particular significance for San Francisco, where project applicants often rely on the SDBL to navigate a complex zoning code and approval process. If San Francisco wishes to implement a local bonus program, it must stack that program on top of the SDBL. It cannot offer an "alternative" bonus program, such as the proposed HCSF program, that attempts to remove SDBL eligibility for projects that are eligible for SDBL protections.

In closing this section, CalHDF notes that HCD has weighed in on the question of whether local governments may enact zoning bonus programs that serve as alternatives to state law. In a letter to Menlo Park (available here), the Department wrote: "[T]he City's Affordable Housing Overlay states that the overlay will be an alternative to state density bonus law. **This is in conflict with state law and must be revised."** (Emphasis added.)[2] HCD's view warrants substantial deference as the interpretation of a "technical, obscure, [or] complex" statutory

[2] Separately, as explained later in this letter, HCD's Site Inventory Guidebook (available here) analyzes whether zoning overlays or other local zoning programs established by a city's housing element may supplant or displace the SDBL and firmly establishes that they cannot. (See pages 14-15 of the guidebook.) This analysis is more relevant to the question of how the HCSF program will affect the City's compliance with the Housing Element Law, but this analysis also underscores the specific point that the City may not wriggle out of state law.

scheme by the agency charged with enforcing it. (See *Boling v. Public Employment Relations Bd.* (2018) 5 Cal.5th 898, 911 [citing *Yamaha Corp. of America v. State Bd. of Equalization* (1998) 19 Cal.4th 1, 12]; *Hoffmaster v. City of San Diego* (1997) 55 Cal.App.4th 1098, 1113, fn. 13 ["We substantially rely on the Department of Housing and Community Development's interpretation [...] regarding compliance with the housing element law"].)

Even if the City Can Prohibit the Application of State Law, the Density Bonus Law Gives Project Applicants the Legal Right to Circumvent the City's Prohibition

Even if the above legal rules do not neutralize the City's attempt to avoid state law, any project eligible for the SDBL will be able to defeat the application of proposed section 206.10(b)(5). The SDBL states: "In no case may a city, county, or city and county apply any development standard that will have the effect of physically precluding the construction of a development meeting the criteria of subdivision (b) at the densities or with the concessions or incentives permitted by this section." (Gov. Code, § 65915, subd. (e)(1).) If a proposed project complies with the HCSF except for section 206.10(b)(5) – because it seeks benefits under the SDBL or another state law – and the application of section 206.10(b)(5) would physically preclude the project by eliminating its eligibility for the HCSF, then the City cannot apply that section to the project. To the extent the City doubts or intends to contest this, CalHDF reminds the City that the SDBL, by its terms, "shall be interpreted liberally in favor of producing the maximum number of total housing units." (*Id.* at subd. (r).) Flouting the law on this point also carries severe penalties, including mandatory payment of attorney's fees to a project applicant who challenges the City in court. (*Id.* at subd. (e)(1).)

The HCSF Program Violates the Housing Element Law

Furthermore, the HCSF violates the Housing Element Law (Gov. Code, § 65580 et seq.). Rezoning programs enacted pursuant to a housing element, such as the proposed Family Zoning Plan and its component HCSF program, may not exempt themselves from state law's application, as HCD has explained in its Site Inventory Guidebook (available here – see pages 14-15). Pursuing the HCSF program as it is currently designed would violate this rule and risk the City's housing element compliance. This would expose it to a range of penalties, including the "builder's remedy."

The City Should Take Care to Comply with New Caselaw Concerning Housing Element Rezonings

Lastly, the City should take care to ensure that the rezoning complies with housing element law requiring minimum residential density on low-income sites. The newly published Court of Appeal decision *New Commune DTLA LLC v. City of Redondo Beach* (Oct. 10, 2025, No. B336042) ___ Cal.App.5th ___ makes clear that in order to comply with minimum density requirements, local zoning must require that all new development include a minimum

density of residential use. Zoning "overlays" that allow for 100% non-residential development on a site fail to comply with housing element law. The proposed zoning includes many low-income sites that are given additional residential density on top of base commercial zoning. In order to comply with housing element law, the City should make clear that all new development of these sites must include the minimum density of residential use, and that 100% commercial development is prohibited.

As you are well aware, California remains in the throes of a statewide crisis-level housing shortage. New multifamily housing in San Francisco a public benefit: it will help satisfy demand for housing near jobs and transit, thereby reducing displacement pressure; and it will also cut down on transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions by providing housing in a major metro area, as opposed to farther-flung regions in the state (and out of state). CalHDF therefore urges the City to follow through on the commitments in its housing element, as the law requires, and obey state law in drafting and enforcing its land use regulations.

CalHDF is a 501(c)(3) non-profit corporation whose mission includes advocating for increased access to housing for Californians at all income levels, including low-income households. You may learn more about CalHDF at www.calhdf.org.

Sincerely,

Dylan Casey
CalHDF Executive Director



James M. Lloyd
CalHDF Director of Planning and Investigations

From:	Erica Zweig
To:	Connie Chan; ChanStaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Lurie, Daniel (MYR)
Cc:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject:	11/3 D4ward Position "Family" Housing plan
Date:	Monday, November 3, 2025 10:24:34 AM
Attachments:	D4ward letter on upzoning.pdf

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

Sent from AT&T Yahoo Mail on Android

D4ward is a grassroots network of Sunset District neighbors working to keep our community a place where regular people can afford to live, thrive, and have a real say in what happens here. We support affordable housing, stand up to big-money influence in San Francisco politics, protect workers, defend our coastline, and fight for community needs over corporate interests.

We are deeply concerned that, due to the delay in appointing a new District 4 Supervisor, our district is now being upzoned **without representation** on the current Board of Supervisors. Proceeding with this legislation under these circumstances amounts to **government without representation**. The Board should **postpone all hearings and votes on District 4 zoning changes until a new Supervisor is seated.**

D4ward's Key Positions and Priorities

In general, D4ward supports the **amendments proposed by Supervisors Connie Chan and Chyanne Chen** at the first Land Use and Transportation Committee hearing on the Mayor's upzoning plan. We urge the Board to incorporate these changes to protect affordability, safety, and neighborhood integrity.

Our specific priorities are:

1. Accelerate downtown office-to-housing conversions.
Before targeting stable, working-class neighborhoods like ours for massive rezoning, the City must aggressively pursue the conversion of empty downtown office buildings into housing.

2. Protect small businesses and tenants in District 4.
Under the Mayor's plan, our unique small businesses would become targets for demolition along all commercial corridors. We strongly support the **Race and Equity in All Planning Coalition (REP-SF)** and Supervisor Chan's **Tenant Protection Ordinance** to safeguard both tenants and neighborhood-serving businesses.

3. Eliminate in-lieu fees.
Developers must not be allowed to "fee out" of affordable housing requirements. In-lieu fees only produce delayed, off-site projects and create enclaves of market-rate luxury housing.

4. Dedicate all suitable public land for 100% affordable housing.
All appropriate public land—excluding parks and open space—should be reserved for **100% affordable housing** serving a full range of incomes, from middle-income working families to deeply affordable and supportive housing.

5. Preserve the Coastal Zone.
No land should be removed from the existing Coastal Zone boundaries. Coastal protections are essential for public safety, environmental resilience, and equity.

6. Prohibit upzoning in the Tsunami Zone.
It is reckless to increase building heights or density in areas at high risk of tsunami inundation. The City must also repair and reactivate the local tsunami warning system.

7. Ensure fire safety before allowing large-scale development.
No significant new upzoning should take effect until a secure **emergency firefighting water system** is installed in the Sunset and Parkside Districts, which are already vulnerable to wildfire and earthquake-related fires.

8. Protect historic and culturally significant buildings.
All **Category A and A-eligible historic buildings and districts** should be exempted from upzoning. District 4's mid-century homes and civic buildings reflect our community's unique cultural heritage and deserve preservation.

9. Prevent excessive height near parks and schools.
Properties bordering the southern edges of our parks and schools should not be upzoned for additional height. Casting shadows on open spaces and classrooms undermines the very "well-resourced" character the City claims to value.

Erica Zweig
Corresponding Secretary

From: L.D. Kirshenbaum
To: Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject: Please, Land Use Committee: Listen to Us!
Date: Monday, November 3, 2025 10:06:32 AM

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

Hello to all members of the Land Use Committee:

I am devastated by the trend in ignoring facts and stonewalling constituents.

We need affordability, and this ill-defined plan will only make housing problems worse.

I won't be attending today to say this in person; last time seemed like a disrespectful charade.

Sincerely,

– Daniela Kirshenbaum

From: Judy Irving
To: Melgar, Myrna (BOS); ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff
Cc: Carroll, John (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS)
Subject: Re: Upzoning and demolitions, etc.
Date: Monday, November 3, 2025 9:51:18 AM

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

I cannot attend today, but please address the point I made about demolition in my prior email (copied below). How do you rationalize the candy-coating this issue has received?

History will judge your acquiescence to state laws that will, if implemented, will destroy the fabric, culture, and livability of San Francisco.

> On Oct 19, 2025, at 6:00 PM, Judy Irving <films@pelicanmedia.org> wrote:
>
> One of the rationalizations I've heard over and over at meetings concerning the proposed upzoning is that
>
> "Since there have been very few demolitions in the past few years, there are bound to be few in the future."
>
> But in this case history will not repeat itself, because local zoning controls and other restrictions that have kept demolitions in check will be thrown out the window. De-regulation will *incentivize* demolitions because land values will rise so precipitously:
>
> "Buy that building! Tear it down! Build a highrise! Make a ton of money!" From a developer standpoint, it's irresistible.
>
> Don't be taken in by assurances that existing housing for middle-income San Francisco residents will be immune from developer greed.
>
> This is not a "family" plan — it's actually a "wealthy singles" plan, since 75% of new units will be studios and one-bedrooms. How can anyone believe that building highrise condos for well-off tech workers will somehow benefit families?
>
> You can turn this around by refusing to accept the YIMBY lobbyists' rhetoric. You can be proud of the fact that you stood up for small businesses, working-class tenants, and historic buildings by insisting on adaptive re-use of existing structures and 100% affordable development. The proposed amendments to this plan don't do nearly enough. Don't look back a few years from now and say to yourself, "I helped ruin a world-class city."
>
> Thank you.

From: Robyn Tucker
To: MelgarStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; ChanStaff (BOS)
Cc: Carroll, John (BOS); SauterStaff; kcourtney@xdm.com
Subject: Agenda Item 6, 250966 General Plan Amendments Family Zoning Plan
Date: Monday, November 3, 2025 9:45:23 AM

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

Sent via Email

November 2, 2025

From: The Pacific Avenue Neighborhood Association (PANA)

To: SF Board of Supervisors Land Use and Transportation Committee

I am writing on behalf of the Pacific Avenue Neighborhood Association and our 300+ supporters to request preservation of our 40 feet height limits and 45% rear yard setbacks for the Pacific Avenue Neighborhood Commercial District.

Pacific Avenue History
From 2004 through 2009, PANA leadership worked shoulder to shoulder with a designated member from the San Francisco Planning Department to plan and design our neighborhood to better serve our community then and in the future. The result of our collaboration was legislation establishing the Pacific Avenue Neighborhood Commercial District. The legislation's key elements set building heights at 40 feet, rear yard setbacks at 45% for specific lots to encourage contiguous green open space, and businesses that would best serve and protect our neighborhood.

In addition, in legislation notesthat taller buildings should be at located at corners to minimize impact on the entire surrounding residential blocks and under no circumstance should taller buildings be located mid block. Hence, the design would be one of staggered height, moving east to west.

Decades ago, Pacific Avenue was expected to develop into a Commercial thoroughfare. This never happened. In fact, historically, most of the commercial activity consisted of sweat shops and garages that are no longer present, except some small business garages continue to flourish. Parking has always been at an has always been at a premium as Pacific Ave narrows from east to West with the most narrow portion between Leavenworth and Polk Street.

Family Zoning Plan

The original Family Zoning Plan heights for 12 square blocks that make up the Pacific Avenue NCD, which include from the North and South - Broadway to Jackson Streets and from East and West - Taylor to Polk Street maintained the current 40 foot height. It is unclear whether the rear yard setbacks have been modified or eliminated. We asked that they remain to allow for maximum light and air.

Respectfully, the Pacific Avenue neighborhood Association asks that the Family Zoning Plan be modified to respect our current height limits in an eight block rectangle between Leavenworth and Polk Street along Pacific Avenue and between Broadway and Jackson Street and on our alley's adjacent to and within our Pacific Avenue community.

With many thanks for your consideration,

Robyn Tucker
Chair
Pacific Avenue Neighborhood Association
(PANA)
7 McCormick Street (7 ft wide alley)
San Francisco, CA 94109
415-609-5607

From: Nick Ferris
To: Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS)
Cc: Chan, Connie (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: COMMENTS ON PROPOSED FAMILY ZONING PLAN Amendments in File Nos. 251071, 251072, and 251073
Date: Monday, November 3, 2025 7:22:47 AM
Attachments: THD Land Use Transportation Upzoning Plan 11.3.pdf

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

Dear Chair Melgar and Members of the Committee,

Telegraph Hill Dwellers (THD) continues to oppose the Mayor's proposed Family Zoning Plan ("Upzoning Plan"). As set forth below, we urge the Committee and Board of Supervisors to reverse the last-minute inclusion of Telegraph Hill, North Beach, and the Northern Waterfront in the Upzoning Plan. Further, we implore you to amend the Upzoning Plan to prevent the displacement of tenants and small businesses, and to provide for a real plan for development of the affordable housing we so desperately need by approving amendments related legisnation offered by Supervisors Chan and Chen.

1. Remove North Beach, Telegraph Hill, and the Northern Waterfront from the Upzoning Plan.

THD continues to strongly oppose the late inclusion in the Upzoning Plan of major portions of Telegraph Hill, North Beach, and the Northern Waterfront, areas that were not included in the 2022 Adopted Housing Element ("2022 Housing Element") nor considered in the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR). These areas were not considered for inclusion in the Housing Element because they are one of the densest neighborhoods in San Francisco, with roughly 82% of our residents currently living in existing pre-1979 multi-family, rent-controlled buildings housing our City's workforce and seniors, including a large immigrant Asian population. Based on the City's profiles of neighborhoods in San Francisco, there are 37,156 people per square mile in North Beach as compared to 17,325 people per square mile in San Francisco. The Planning Department's own data shows that rent-controlled buildings in District 3 (built before 1979 with 2+ units, excluding condos) represent approximately 32,340 individual units, 13,983 of which are located in the current version of the Upzoning Plan. In other words, the tenants occupying 13,983 units will be subject to potential eviction and displacement.

And, although the Housing Element and FEIR assumed that the Northeast Planning District would provide net new housing units of only 800 units by 2050, the Upzoning Plan suddenly increased that figure to 5,900 units, a stunning 650% increase. The height and density increases represented by this increase will significantly impact existing tenants, small businesses, historic resources, parks and open spaces, and the diverse culture of District 3.

2. Support for Supervisors Chan's and Chen's Proposed Amendments:

Although we continue to oppose the Upzoning Plan, we appreciate Supervisor Chan and Chen's leadership in introducing critical amendments to strengthen tenant protections, prioritize affordable housing, support small businesses, and create real family-sized housing.

We urge this Committee to move these amendments forward, including those that follow:

(a) Exclude all historic resources, including local historic districts and those eligible for the California and National Registers. from the Upzoning Plan (File No. 251073).

(b) Exclude from the Upzoning Plan all development that would demolish, remove, or convert to another use any existing dwelling unit(s) or residential flat, including rent-controlled units.

(c) Remove areas within the Planning Equity Geography Special Use District ("PEG SUD") from the Upzoning Plan consistent with the 2022 Housing Element (File No. 251071)

(d) Remove areas in the Coastal Zone from the Upzoning Plan (File No. 251071)

(e) Adopt a Progress Requirement or "shot clock" for obtaining a building permit within a time certain of project approval (File No. 251073)

(f) Require inclusionary housing to be located nearby within ½ mile of the development (File No. 251073).

(g) Eliminate form-based density from Neighborhood Commercial Districts and ROTCs because we want family housing not dorm rooms (File No. 251073).

3. THD Urges Supervisor Melgar to Protect All Rent-Controlled Housing

We appreciate Supervisor Melgar's amendment removing rent controlled housing with three or more units but urge her to expand this amendment to exclude all rent-controlled housing with two or more units, not just three or more.

4. Support for Supervisor Chan's Legacy Business Controls

THD joins with Small Business Forward to support Supervisor Chan's legislation to extend the requirement for a Conditional Use Authorization for sites where a Legacy Business has been displaced. In absence of having any other tools available or financial resources to support the successful relocation of a Legacy Business within the community, the Conditional Use is an imperfect but necessary mechanism to discourage displacement of Legacy Businesses in the first place. That is why Small Business Forward supports that the extension of the CU legislation until other more effective protection measures are in place, such as commercial rent control, the right of return, and adequate relocation assistance.

5. Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District and Funding Strategy.

We join with REP-SF and the Council of Community Housing Organizations to demand that the SFMTA-SUD be revised to provide that these publicly owned parcels be developed for 100% affordable and social housing. Under San Francisco's state-approved Housing Element, as mandated by the state, 57% of the 36,200 new housing units proposed to be developed under the Upzoning Plan—more than 20,000 units—must be affordable to low- and very-low-income households. Yet the Upzoning Plan has no funding strategy or realistic plan to produce those affordable homes. It risks satisfying Sacramento's procedural checklist while abandoning the substance of the law: to build housing for the people who need it most.

* * * * * * * *

In conclusion, THD believes that the Upzoning Plan, as proposed, threatens tenants and small businesses, pits neighborhoods against each other, and disregards decades of community-based policymaking that has built San Francisco into a resilient, vibrant city through a network of strong neighborhoods.

The proposed amendments from Supervisors Chan and Chen address these concerns by focusing on protecting tenants and rent-controlled housing citywide, supporting small businesses, and prioritizing the development of affordable housing. We urge this Committee to move these critical elements forward.

Finally, we urge this Committee to recommend that Telegraph Hill, North Beach, and the Northern Waterfront be removed from the Upzoning Plan consistent with the 2022 Housing Element adopted by the Board of Supervisors and approved by HCD.

Sincerely,
Nick Ferris, *President*
Telegraph Hill Dwellers

November 3, 2025
Via Email

Myrna Melgar, Chair - *Myrna.Melgar@sfgov.org*

Chyanne Chen, Vice-Chair - *Chyanne.Chen@sfgov.org*

Bilal Mahmood, Member - *Bilal.Mahmood@sfgov.org*
Land Use and Transportation Committee
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

RE: COMMENTS ON PROPOSED FAMILY ZONING PLAN
Amendments in File Nos. 251071, 251072, and 251073

Dear Chair Melgar and Members of the Committee,

Telegraph Hill Dwellers (THD) continues to oppose the Mayor's proposed Family Zoning Plan ("Upzoning Plan"). As set forth below, we urge the Committee and Board of Supervisors to reverse the last-minute inclusion of Telegraph Hill, North Beach, and the Northern Waterfront in the Upzoning Plan. Further, we implore you to amend the Upzoning Plan to prevent the displacement of tenants and small businesses, and to provide for a real plan for development of the affordable housing we so desperately need by approving amendments related legisnation offered by Supervisors Chan and Chen.

1. **Remove North Beach, Telegraph Hill, and the Northern Waterfront from the Upzoning Plan.**

THD continues to strongly oppose the late inclusion in the Upzoning Plan of major portions of Telegraph Hill, North Beach, and the Northern Waterfront, areas that were not included in the 2022 Adopted Housing Element ("2022 Housing Element") nor considered in the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR). These areas were not considered for inclusion in the Housing Element because they are one of the densest neighborhoods in San Francisco, with roughly 82% of our residents currently living in existing pre-1979 multi-family, rent-controlled buildings housing our City's workforce and seniors, including a large immigrant Asian population. Based on the City's profiles of neighborhoods in San Francisco, there are **37,156** people per square mile in North Beach as compared to **17,325** people per square mile in San Francisco.[1] The Planning Department's own data shows that rent-controlled buildings in District 3 (built before 1979 with 2+ units, excluding condos) represent approximately 32,340 individual units, 13,983 of which are located in the current version of the Upzoning Plan. **In other words, the tenants occupying 13,983 units will be subject to potential eviction and displacement.**

[1] https://www.city-data.com/neighborhood/North-Beach-San-Francisco-CA.html

And, although the Housing Element and FEIR assumed that the Northeast Planning District would provide net new housing units of only *800 units* by 2050, the Upzoning Plan suddenly increased that figure to *5,900 units*, a stunning *650% increase*. The height and density increases represented by this increase will significantly impact existing tenants, small businesses, historic resources, parks and open spaces, and the diverse culture of District 3.

2. **Support for Supervisors Chan's and Chen's Proposed Amendments:**

Although we continue to oppose the Upzoning Plan, we appreciate Supervisor Chan and Chen's leadership in introducing critical amendments to strengthen tenant protections, prioritize affordable housing, support small businesses, and create real family-sized housing. We urge this Committee to move these amendments forward, including those that follow:

(a) Exclude all historic resources, including local historic districts and those eligible for the California and National Registers. from the Upzoning Plan (File No. 251073).

(b) Exclude from the Upzoning Plan all development that would demolish, remove, or convert to another use any existing dwelling unit(s) or residential flat, including rent-controlled units.

(c) Remove areas within the Planning Equity Geography Special Use District ("PEG SUD") from the Upzoning Plan consistent with the 2022 Housing Element (File No. 251071)

(d) Remove areas in the Coastal Zone from the Upzoning Plan (File No. 251071)

(e) Adopt a Progress Requirement or "shot clock" for obtaining a building permit within a time certain of project approval (File No. 251073)

(f) Require inclusionary housing to be located nearby within ½ mile of the development (File No. 251073).

(g) Eliminate form-based density from Neighborhood Commercial Districts and ROTCs because we want family housing not dorm rooms (File No. 251073).

3. **THD Urges Supervisor Melgar to Protect All Rent-Controlled Housing**

We appreciate Supervisor Melgar's amendment removing rent controlled housing with three or more units but urge her to expand this amendment to exclude ***all*** rent-controlled housing with two or more units, not just three or more.

4. **Support for Supervisor Chan's Legacy Business Controls**

THD joins with Small Business Forward to support Supervisor Chan's legislation to extend the requirement for a Conditional Use Authorization for sites where a Legacy Business has been displaced. In absence of having any other tools available or financial resources to support the successful relocation of a Legacy Business within the community, the Conditional Use is an imperfect but necessary mechanism to discourage displacement of Legacy Businesses in the first place. That is why Small Business Forward supports that the extension of the CU legislation until other more effective protection measures are in place, such as commercial rent control, the right of return, and adequate relocation assistance.

5. **Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District and Funding Strategy.**

We join with REP-SF and the Council of Community Housing Organizations to demand that the SFMTA-SUD be revised to provide that these publicly owned parcels be developed for 100% affordable and social housing. Under San Francisco's state-approved Housing Element, as mandated by the state, 57% of the 36,200 new housing units proposed to be developed under the Upzoning Plan—more than 20,000 units—must be affordable to low- and very-low-income households. Yet the Upzoning Plan has no funding strategy or realistic plan to produce those affordable homes. It risks satisfying Sacramento's procedural checklist while abandoning the substance of the law: to build housing for the people who need it most.

* * * * * * * *

In conclusion, THD believes that the Upzoning Plan, as proposed, threatens tenants and small businesses, pits neighborhoods against each other, and disregards decades of community-based policymaking that has built San Francisco into a resilient, vibrant city through a network of strong neighborhoods.

The proposed amendments from Supervisors Chan and Chen address these concerns by focusing on protecting tenants and rent-controlled housing citywide, supporting small businesses, and prioritizing the development of affordable housing. We urge this Committee to move these critical elements forward.

Finally, we urge this Committee to recommend that Telegraph Hill, North Beach, and the Northern Waterfront be removed from the Upzoning Plan consistent with the 2022 Housing Element adopted by the Board of Supervisors and approved by HCD.

Sincerely,

Nick Ferris, President

ccs: Supervisor Connie Chan – *connie.chan@sfgov.org*
Clerk John Carroll - *John.Carroll@sfgov.org*
Members, San Francisco Board of Supervisors - *Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org*

From:	Jean Barish
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; ChenStaff
Cc:	Lurie, Daniel (MYR); ChanStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; WaltonStaff (BOS)
Subject:	LUTC Meeting - Nov. 3, 2025 - Agenda Items 6 - 11
Date:	Monday, November 3, 2025 4:07:31 AM
Attachments:	LUTC Letter 25_11_03.docx

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

Dear LUTC Committee Members:

Attached above and pasted below is a letter regarding Agenda Items 6 - 11 on the Monday November 3, 2025 Land Use and Transportation Committee meeting.

JEAN B BARISH
711 27th Avenue San Francisco, CA 94121
jeanbbarish@hotmail.com

November 3, 2025

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Land Use and Transportation Committee
City Hall 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Re: November 3, 2025 LUTC Meeting – Agenda Items 6 - 11

Dear Committee Members;

I am the President of Planning Association for the Richmond (sfpar.org) and the Vice-President of SaveMUNI (savemuni.org), two organizations that are very concerned about the impacts of Mayor Lurie's Family Zoning Plan. I am writing on my own behalf urging you not to pass this plan as currently written.

Below are just a few of the many reasons why you should not approve this plan as currently written.

- The State's RHNA Numbers are Flawed and the Amount of New Housing Mandated by the State is Overstated
- The Plan Does Not Meet the City's Need for Affordable Housing
- The Plan Will Destroy Many Small Businesses
- Density Decontrol Throughout the Residential Neighborhoods Must be Eliminated from the Plan
- Upzoning will Significantly Impact the Quality of Life and the Environment in the Richmond and Many Other Neighborhoods
- There are No Provisions in the Plan for Adding Vital Infrastructure
- The Plan Changes the Coastal Zone and Will Irreparably Damage our Priceless Coastal Environment
- There are Alternatives to Extensive Upzoning

This plan has no substantial affordable housing mandates, and will destroy neighborhoods to enable more gentrifying luxury housing. This will further increase skyrocketing rents, evictions and homelessness. There is a gentrification crisis that is destroying San Francisco, and this plan will simply advance that plan while destroying so much that is precious in San Francisco.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units - together more than enough to fulfill state mandates. Yet instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Mayor Lurie's plan simply rearranges zoning rules, which does almost nothing to increase affordable housing, and increases the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing over-supply while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods.

Further, a serious problem with this plan is that it removes necessary hard-won Coastal protections that are very important to the safety and wellbeing of many San Franciscans, especially those of us living on the west side of the City. Any changes to the existing Coastal zone regulations should be entirely removed from this plan.

Additionally, the City Economist just released a report showing that Mayor Lurie's Family Zoning plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing. Now that the City Economist has shown that Mayor Lurie's plan won't work you must replace his plan with one that will actually work. San Francisco needs a plan that would identify how to manage existing housing approvals, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing; protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review; and produce as much housing as possible out of existing vacancies and empty office space.

Supervisors Chan and Chen have proposed amendments that reduce the harm caused by this plan. While these amendments do not solve the fundamental flaws in this plan, they are a step in the right direction and should be considered.

And we mustn't lose sight of the fact that one of the attractions of San Francisco is its magnificent beauty and spectacular views. Recently, for example, an ad from SF Travel aired on the television broadcast of Game 7 of the World Series. (https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9jlZggQV1Fg___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzpkNzFiZDJjMjZjNTY2MmU4Y2E1ZjNhZTdjZTdlNzU1ZDo3OmQ5Yjl6NDBiNjk5OGQyNmQyODE2ZDc4YjU0NzYzNjM5YjFlZDQ5YzdmOTUxOTIzOTc2YjA0Mjg0OTU4ODM5N2NkMWMzYTp0OkY6Tg) This ad should remind you of how uniquely situated and built San Francisco is. Please do not desecrate our City with an upzoning plan that will turn San Francisco into a concrete, dehumanized megalopolis.

In closing, I urge you to delete and replace the current Family Zoning Plan with one that will actually solve our housing shortage, comply with the State's mandate, satisfy the needs and demands of countless San Franciscans and preserve and protect the splendor of Baghdad by the Bay.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Jean B Barish

cc: Mayor Daniel Lurie, Supervisors C. Chan, S. Sherrill, D. Sauter, M. Dorsey, R. Mandelman, J. Fielder, S. Walton

JEAN B BARISH
711 27th Avenue San Francisco, CA 94121
jeanbbarish@hotmail.com

November 3, 2025

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Land Use and Transportation Committee
City Hall 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Re: November 3, 2025 LUTC Meeting – Agenda Items 6 - 11

Dear Committee Members;

I am the President of Planning Association for the Richmond (sfpar.org) and the Vice-President of SaveMUNI (savemuni.org), two organizations that are very concerned about the impacts of Mayor Lurie's Family Zoning Plan. I am writing on my own behalf urging you not to pass this plan as currently written.

Below are just a few of the many reasons why you should not approve this plan as currently written.

- The State's RHNA Numbers are Flawed and the Amount of New Housing Mandated by the State is Overstated
- The Plan Does Not Meet the City's Need for Affordable Housing
- The Plan Will Destroy Many Small Businesses
- Density Decontrol Throughout the Residential Neighborhoods Must be Eliminated from the Plan
- Upzoning will Significantly Impact the Quality of Life and the Environment in the Richmond and Many Other Neighborhoods
- There are No Provisions in the Plan for Adding Vital Infrastructure
- The Plan Changes the Coastal Zone and Will Irreparably Damage our Priceless Coastal Environment
- There are Alternatives to Extensive Upzoning

This plan has no substantial affordable housing mandates, and will destroy neighborhoods to enable more gentrifying luxury housing. This will further increase skyrocketing rents, evictions and homelessness. There is a gentrification crisis that is destroying San Francisco, and this plan will simply advance that plan while destroying so much that is precious in San Francisco.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units - together more than enough to fulfill state mandates. Yet instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Mayor Lurie's plan simply rearranges zoning rules, which does almost nothing to increase affordable housing, and increases the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing over-supply while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods.

Further, a serious problem with this plan is that it removes necessary hard-won Coastal protections that are very important to the safety and wellbeing of many San Franciscans, especially those of us living on the west side of the City. Any changes to the existing Coastal zone regulations should be entirely removed from this plan.

Additionally, the City Economist just released a report showing that Mayor Lurie's Family Zoning plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing. Now that the City Economist has shown that Mayor Lurie's plan won't work you must replace his plan with one that will actually work. San Francisco needs a plan that would identify how to manage existing housing approvals, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing; protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review; and produce as much housing as possible out of existing vacancies and empty office space.

Supervisors Chan and Chen have proposed amendments that reduce the harm caused by this plan. While these amendments do not solve the fundamental flaws in this plan, they are a step in the right direction and should be considered.

And we mustn't lose sight of the fact that one of the attractions of San Francisco is its magnificent beauty and spectacular views. Recently, for example, an ad from SF Travel aired on the television broadcast of Game 7 of the World Series. (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9jIZggOV1Fg) This ad should remind you of how uniquely situated and built San Francisco is. Please do not desecrate our City with an upzoning plan that will turn San Francisco into a concrete, dehumanized megalopolis.

In closing, I urge you to delete and replace the current Family Zoning Plan with one that will actually solve our housing shortage, comply with the State's mandate, satisfy the needs and demands of countless San Franciscans and preserve and protect the splendor of Baghdad by the Bay.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Jean B Barish

cc: Mayor Daniel Lurie, Supervisors C. Chan, S. Sherrill, D. Sauter, M. Dorsey, R. Mandelman, J. Fielder, S. Walton

From:	Carroll, John (BOS)
To:	"George Wooding"; Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Sciammas, Charlie (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Cooper, Raynell (BOS)
Subject:	RE: 250966, 250700, 250701 written testimony for November 3, 2025 Land Use and Transportation Committee
Date:	Monday, November 3, 2025 10:28:00 AM
Attachments:	chan amendments.docx image001.png

Thank you for your comment letter.

I am forwarding your comments to the members of the Land Use and Transportation committee, and I will include your comments in the files for these ordinance matters.

I invite you to review the entire matter on our Legislative Research Center by following the links below:

- Board of Supervisors File No. 250966

  Board of Supervisors File No. 250700

- Board of Supervisors File No. 251071

  Board of Supervisors File No. 250701

- Board of Supervisors File No. 251072

- Board of Supervisors File No. 251073

John Carroll
Assistant Clerk
Board of Supervisors
San Francisco City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415)554-4445

Click here to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The Legislative Research Center provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation and archived matters since August 1998.

Disclosures: *Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other*

public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.

From: George Wooding <gswooding@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 2, 2025 11:28 PM
To: Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>; George Wooding <gswooding@gmail.com>
Subject: 250966, 250700, 250701 written testimony for November 3, 2025 Land Use and Transportation Committee

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

Hi John,

Please consider me a person with special needs. I am requesting early speaking for speaker comments.

My written comments are attached for your review

Land Use and Transportation committee members. Melgar

November 2, 2025

Supervisor Connie Chans amendments are vital for the mayor's family plan to succeed.

What happened to the "affordable housing" mandates? They have disappeared.

Here is what the Planning Department's new report, "Rezoning Capacity Calculations," doesn't say: under San Francisco's state-approved Housing Element, **57% of those new homes—more than 20,000 units—must be affordable** to low- and very-low-income households. That's not a suggestion; it's part of the state mandate.

The Family Zoning Plan has no funding strategy, no framework for public land, and no realistic plan to produce those affordable homes. It risks satisfying Sacramento's procedural checklist while abandoning the substance of the law: to build housing for the people who need it most. The city is relying completely on developers, grants, GOBs and subsidized funding from the MOHCD.

-developers are not building due to high land costs and the scarcity of buildable land, high interest rates and high construction costs

-There are almost no grants. Despite best efforts, The Mayors Office Of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD) is currently underfunded and has little ability to subsidize low-income housing in San Francisco.

-The CPC is currently not trying to attain more housing funding: **Affordable Housing General Obligation Bond (Prop A)**: **Approval:** On March 5, 2024, San Francisco voters approved Proposition A, a $300 million bond to finance the construction, acquisition, and rehabilitation of affordable housing. The funding is on its first tranche--$147.2M

2019 Affordable Housing GOB ($600 million). Approximately $175.9 million remains outstanding, with a final issuance under consideration for late 2025. $55M is being held for the Mercy Housing build beside Laguna Honda Hospital for a senior center.

The balance between supply and demand

San Francisco Politicians and planners don't understand economics. They believe that if they build more units, the price of housing will decrease. This is not true in San Francisco due to market conditions.

Building more houses may not lower prices if there is a simultaneous increase in demand, or if sellers are unwilling to sell for less, a phenomenon known as " downside stickiness". Other factors like high mortgage rates, rising construction costs, and localized market dynamics can also offset the downward pressure on prices that new supply would typically create.

In a basic economic model, increased supply would lead to lower prices if demand remains constant. However, a parallel increase in demand can keep prices stable or even cause them to rise, despite the new houses.

Rising demand: Population growth, wage increases, favorable demographic trends, or an influx of institutional investors can drive up demand, absorbing new inventory as it enters the market.

Pent-up demand: In areas that have historically restricted development, a sudden increase in construction can be absorbed by years of pent-up demand, causing prices to plateau rather than fall.

The main cause of higher house prices in SF is the cost of land. Buildable Land is becoming so scarce that only Subsidized affordable housing will be built. The cost of affordable housing will continue to rise

Substitutions and proposed amendments On September 30, a new version of number 250700 was substituted by Mayor Lurie, which made relatively minor zoning changes on a number of parcels. The report analysis reflects those changes

On October 21, supervisor Melgar proposed an amendment that would prohibit the use of the local program on any parcel containing more than two existing housing units which would involve the demolition of a unit subject to rent control

Also, on October 21, supervisor Sauter introduced an amendment that creates incentives for developers to replace lost commercial space As the language of these two amendments was made public last week this report does not attempt to model there economic impact.

AMENDMENT LANGUAGE

-Furthering demolition controls to protect tenants. Absolutely. Please don't forget to protect the landlords.

-Implementing Nexus studies and impact fees to ensure adequate infrastructure investment, especially given the fact the city is facing existing funding challenges to build out the emergency water firefighting system for well -resourced neighborhoods, a deficit in public transit, an increased risk of tenant and small business displacement;

The West side EWSS project is already corrupted. The City no longer wants to build Kaboda piping for high water pressure. The fire department is now building large cisterns filled with water and they are also purchasing pump trucks that will connect to other pump tracks. This will allow the fire department to purchase more fire trucks. The cisterns will be attached to the pump trucks which have a limited range. The Kubota piping would have been a much better delivery system but the fire department wanted the trucks. The West side of San Francisco is more in danger of burning than ever before.

The requested reports would be a great idea

-The Mayor's Family Plan does not require developers to build or fix infrastructure. The City will bear the full cost of repairs. This is wrong. The developer should bare the costs of their own project.

-Placing a shot clock to require developers to build within 30 months to boost housing production in the near future to meet the state mandated timeline of 2031; The Planning Department already has 70,000 stored at planning

Factors that influence review time

- **Project complexity:** The scope and size of a project are major factors in the review timeline. Simple projects may be approved more quickly "over the counter," while complex projects may involve multiple reviews and public hearings.

- **Other reviewing agencies:** Building permits must be reviewed by multiple city departments for safety and code compliance. A permit can be sent back to Planning for another review if changes are made to the plans.

- **Permit type:** The type of permit being applied for, such as a building permit, coastal zone permit, or variance, all have different review processes and timeframes.
- **Application completeness:** Incomplete applications can significantly delay the review process. An application can go through multiple rounds of resubmissions before being accepted for review

LIMITING FORM BASED DENSITY:

Density decontrol is central to the Mayors' family zoning plan. This is the worst type of density planning. A developer can now add as many residential units as they want too. An eight story building can Have thirty units or only one unit. Density decontrol was added to the Mayor's family zoning plan so that San Francisco would have more units then SB 79. This will be uncontrolled density. The city will not stop this program as San Francisco planning is desperate not to be controlled by the state of California

"

Density decontrol" was a core component of the initial **Family Zoning Plan** legislation introduced by Mayor Daniel Lurie at the Board of Supervisors on **June 24, 2025**.
The concept of density decontrol, which removes unit limits while maintaining existing height and form restrictions, was part of the plan from its formal introduction as legislation, and was also included in earlier draft proposals developed by the Planning Department under former Mayor London Breed. The legislation is currently under consideration by the Board of Supervisors.

"

Form-based density" is not an inherently negative planning concept; rather, **specific implementations of form-based codes (FBCs) may face criticisms related to how density is managed, or some residents may object to the very idea of increased density** which FBCs often facilitate.
Common criticisms or perceived negative aspects related to form-based codes and density include:

- **Community Opposition to Increased Density:** A primary objection from some local residents is that FBCs "promote density and population increases to the detriment of locals" or conflict with an existing "small-town feel". The perception of form-based codes mandating high density can lead to community pushback during the adoption process.

- **Potential for Gentrification:** By creating highly desirable, walkable communities, FBCs can inadvertently result in new developments that sell or rent at a premium, potentially pricing out lower-income residents if affordable housing provisions are not included in the code.

- **Complexity and Administration Challenges:** Form-based codes can be more complex to write and administer than conventional Euclidean zoning, requiring specialized training for planners and staff to interpret design standards objectively. This complexity can lead to confusion, increased review times, or a greater need for variances if the code is not carefully written.

- **"Locking in" Undesirable Existing Forms:** If a form-based code is based strictly on the current urban fabric of an area, it might inadvertently "lock in" low-density, car-dependent patterns, making it harder to densify those areas later if needed to address housing shortages or promote sustainability.

- **Ignoring Market Realities:** Critics sometimes argue that FBCs are overly prescriptive or ignore market demands, although proponents argue that market studies are often a key component of a well-crafted FBC. In some cases, a local market may not be able to support the specific mixed-use or retail components called for in the code.

- **Loss of Perceived "Local Control":** FBCs often streamline the approval process by making projects that meet the code "by-right" (administrative review without public hearings), which some residents or community groups may see as a reduction in public participation and control over individual projects

There should be an amendment for form based density, but San Francisco well never pass this amendment.

Thank you for your consideration.

Best Regards,

George Wooding

415 695-1393

From: T Flandrich
To: Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS)
Cc: Carroll, John (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); ChenStaff; MelgarStaff (BOS)
Subject: FAMILY ZONING PLAN AMENDMENTS: SUPPORT CHAN, CHEN AMENDMENTS
Date: Sunday, November 2, 2025 11:49:20 AM

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

1 November 2025
Dear Chair Melgar, Supervisors Chen & Mahmood,
I am writing to ask you to support the amendments made by Supervisor Chan. Most importantly, the amendment which will preserve ALL rent-controlled housing thereby continuing to have real affordable housing choices for tenants today & in the future.

While I appreciate Supervisor Melgar's attempt to carve out some rent-controlled buildings, that amendment unfortunately does not go far enough.

I also ask you to support Supervisor Chen's amendments, especially as they address affordability, to serve our needs, our goal of creating, building 100% affordable housing. Public land must be used for public good.

In 2023, our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. Protecting tenants, our existing homes and using all available public land to build 100% affordable housing, must be our achievement.

Thank you for your consideration.
Theresa Flandrich
North Beach Tenants Committee

From:	Dave Rhody
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff
Subject:	Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701
Date:	Sunday, November 2, 2025 1:20:00 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

The City Economist just released a report showing that Mayor Lurie's 'Family Zoning' plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing.

We still have 3 months to replace the Mayor's plan with one that will work. Here's a real strategy to solve the affordable housing crisis:

- San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units - together more than enough to fulfill state mandates.

- Instead of Lurie's plan which simply moves zoning rules around like deck chairs on the Titanic, we need to focus on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so.

You need to stop negotiating mere amendments to the 'Family Zoning' plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing housing approvals, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year in a way that will fully meet state mandates.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible, instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood, and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

The Mayor's plan would build more excess housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators. Please replace the text in this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural and community integrity, with text that will truly produce affordable housing and get State bureaucrats off of San Francisco's back.

- Thank you,
Dave Rhody

SF Policy Co-Chair
Climate Reality Project

From:	Carolyn Kenady
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff
Cc:	<board@doloresheights.org>
Subject:	Oppose Mayor"s Upzoning Plan - File #250701
Date:	Sunday, November 2, 2025 4:05:58 PM

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

To the members of the Board of Supervisors -

I am Carolyn Kenady, chair of the Dolores Heights Improvement Club (DHIC) in District 8. We oppose this Upzoning Plan and urge you to amend it to address the issues below.

DHIC opposes this strategy to upzone hundreds of thousands of SF properties because it's:

- Overkill: To meet its housing mandate, San Francisco only needs to approve 36,200 additional projects by 2032. Blanket upzoning allows demolition of existing housing - which is our most affordable housing

- Doesn't produce enough affordable units: 80% of the projects needed to reach this 36K goal must be affordable housing. The affordable requirements and subsidies provided by the proposed program won't produce the required 29k affordable units.

- Not increase market production or reduce housing costs: Per SF Planning's own feasibility study, only slightly improved economic assumptions, will developers undertake market-rate multi-unit projects (1-2 BR, avg $4600 monthly.) The City Economist's impact analysis shows very little impact on rents or prices for housing. (see pages 34 - 63 of SF Planning memo to SF Planning Commissioners, dated June 26, 2025 and the City Economist's Report, page 21, October 2025)

- Displacing tenant and small businesses: in my neighborhood shopping districts - Church & 24th Streets and the Castro NCDs are proposed for 65 foot heights. Most renters and small local businesses displaced by new construction won't be able to afford the new rents. Our small local businesses that attract shoppers and tourists to our neighborhoods will be driven out.

This plan caters to developers. It does not align with our City's housing needs: keeping existing housing – our most affordable resource, preserving the historic and cultural

resources enjoyed by visitors and residents alike, and being more strategic about where to add height vs. blanket zoning large areas of our City. Please revise this plan to protect our key resources, add sufficient affordability, and use height strategically. Thank you.

Carolyn

Carolyn Kenady
carolynkenady@gmail.com
408-218-3115
http://www.linkedin.com/in/ckenady

From:	Stardust Doherty
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff; Stardust
Subject:	Public Comment: VOTE NO On Lurie"s Recipe For Housing Failure & Replace It With A Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701
Date:	Saturday, November 1, 2025 1:42:02 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

The City Economist just released a report showing that Mayor Lurie's 'Family Zoning' plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing.

We still have 3 months to replace the Mayor's plan with one that will work. Here's a real strategy to solve the affordable housing crisis.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units - together more than enough to fulfill state mandates. (Yet instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Lurie's plan simply moves zoning rules around like deck chairs on the Titanic, does almost nothing to increase affordable housing, and increases the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing over-supply [now at 150%] while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods.)

Now that the City Economist has shown that Lurie's plan won't work, it is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the 'Family Zoning' plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing housing approvals, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year in a way that will fully meet state mandates.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible, instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood, and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

The Mayor's plan would build more excess housing for the wealthy, create more

homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators. **Please REPLACE the text in this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural and community integrity, with text that will truly produce affordable housing and get State bureaucrats off of San Francisco's back.**

Thank you,

Stardust Doherty
SF 94110

From: Stephen Gorski
To: Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Walsh, Frances (BOS); ChenStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); WaltonStaff (BOS); Chen, Chanson (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorraine (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Lee, Mandelman (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Walkswood, Ahsha (BOS); Lopez, Gracelyn (BOS); WalkswoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); SauterStaff
Subject: Public Comment: VOTE NO on Mayor Lurie's Family Housing Plan and Replace it with a Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701 - Land Use and Transportation Meeting, Monday, Nov. 3, 2025, 1:30 pm
Date: Saturday, November 1, 2025 12:52:46 PM

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

To:
John.Carroll@sfgov.org , board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org , Myrna.Melgar@sfgov.org , Jen.Low@sfgov.org , MelgarStaff@sfgov.org , connie.chan@sfgov.org , Frances.Walsh@sfgov.org , ChenStaff@sfgov.org , rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org , mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org , Calvin.Ho@sfgov.org , jackie.fielder@sfgov.org , jennifer.ferrigno@sfgov.org , fielderstaff@sfgov.org , shamann.walton@sfgov.org , Percy.Burch@sfgov.org , waltonstaff@sfgov.org , "Jeanne Chen@sfgov.org , jackie.prager@sfgov.org , ChenStaff@sfgov.org , Stephen.Sherrill@sfgov.org , lorraine.Rosas@sfgov.org , SherrillStaff@sfgov.org , matt.dorsey@sfgov.org , Madison.Lee@sfgov.org , dorseystaff@sfgov.org , Ahsha.Walkswood@sfgov.org , gracelyn.lopez@sfgov.org , MalkswoodStaff@sfgov.org , Danny.Sauter@sfgov.org , Michelle.Andrews@sfgov.org , SauterStaff@sfgov.org

From:
Stephen J. Gorski, District 4, zip code 94116

Date: November 1, 2025

Subject: Public Comment: VOTE NO on Mayor Lurie's Family Housing Plan and Replace it with a Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701 - Land Use and Transportation Meeting, Monday, Nov. 3, 2025, 1:30 pm

Dear Supervisors,

As a District 4 San Franciscan without representation on the Board of Supervisors, I am writing to ask you to strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's Family Upzoning Plan as it currently exists. As it is now written, the Plan incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

I speak for myself, my family, and many of my neighbors to respectfully ask you to:

- Require adequate infrastructure to be built PRIOR to building any additional housing
- Refuse to allow the use of *geo grouting to harden the earth and sand beneath proposed new housing building sites as it poisons our groundwater(See geo-grouting info at end of this email.)
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

As currently written, this Plan clears the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices and the safety of the very communities they are supposed to represent.

Our far western District 4 does not have existing infrastructure to support these new high-rises, and infrastructure needs to be designed, funded and built first. Circumventing CEQA requirements in a rush to build jeopardizes our safety.

We still have three months to replace the Mayor's Plan with one that will work.
The City Economist recently released a report that shows the Mayor's Plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because **zoning changes do not produce new housing**. Therefore, it is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the Family Zoning Plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing housing approvals, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year in a way that will fully meet state mandates.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units - together more than enough to fulfill state mandates. Instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Lurie's plan just moves the zoning rules around and does little to increase affordable housing. It increases instead the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing over-supply (now at 150%) while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods.

Let us not build more excess housing for the wealthy that will create more homelessness and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to corporate real estate speculators.

Please RELACE the text in this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco homeowners, tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural, and community integrity, with text that will truly produce housing and get State bureaucrats off of San Francisco's back.

Thank you,

Stephen J. Gorski, Esq.
SF District Resident 47 years , 94116

*CEQA requires that any project involving geo-grouting that requires a discretionary approval by a public agency undergo an environmental review process to identify and mitigate potential environmental impacts.

How geo-grouting can contaminate groundwater:

- Toxic additives: Many chemical and cement-based grouts contain additives that can be toxic or carcinogenic and may leach into the surrounding groundwater.
- Drilling and installation: The process of drilling holes for grouting can create pathways for surface contaminants to travel directly into aquifers, especially if the boreholes are not sealed properly.
- Contaminant pathways: Grouting operations can create or worsen fractures in the ground, creating direct routes for contaminants to flow into groundwater sources.
- Chemical reactions: The chemical reactions that occur during the hydration of cement-based grouts can alter the chemistry of the groundwater, potentially increasing dissolved solids and changing its overall characteristics.
- Improper disposal: Improper disposal of grout waste can also lead to secondary contamination of soil and water.

Sent from my iPad

From: Judi Gorski
To: Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chen, Connie (BOS); Wong, Frances (BOS); ChenStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Fariñas, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Busch, Percy (BOS); WaltonStaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Engage, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosales, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Sauer, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Lauer, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Safai, Danny (BOS); SafaiStaff; Andrews, Michelle (BOS); AndrewsStaff
Subject: Public Comment: VOTE NO on Mayor Lurie's Family Housing Plan and Replace it with a Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701 - Land Use and Transportation Meeting, Monday, Nov. 3, 2025, 1:30 pm
Date: Saturday, November 1, 2025 10:01:00 AM

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

To:
John.Carroll@sfgov.org ; board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org ; Myrna.Melgar@sfgov.org ; Jen.Low@sfgov.org ; MelgarStaff@sfgov.org ; connie.chen@sfgov.org ; Frances.Wong@sfgov.org ; ChenStaff@sfgov.org ; rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org ; mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org ; Calvin.Ho@sfgov.org ; Jackie.Fielder@sfgov.org ; Jennifer.Farinas@sfgov.org ; FielderStaff@sfgov.org ; shamann.walton@sfgov.org ; Percy.Burch@sfgov.org ; waltonstaff@sfgov.org ; Chyanne.Chen@sfgov.org ; Jackie.Engage@sfgov.org ; ChenStaff@sfgov.org ; Stephen.Sherrill@sfgov.org ; Lorenzo.Rosales@sfgov.org ; SherrillStaff@sfgov.org ; matt.dorsey@sfgov.org ; Madison.Sauer@sfgov.org ; dorseystaff@sfgov.org ; Bilal.Mahmood@sfgov.org ; Sam.Lauer@sfgov.org ; MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org ; Danny.Safai@sfgov.org ; Michelle.Andrews@sfgov.org ; SafaiStaff@sfgov.org

From:
Judi Gorski, District 4; zip code 94116

Date: November 1, 2025

Subject: Public Comment: VOTE NO on Mayor Lurie's Family Housing Plan and Replace it with a Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701 - Land Use and Transportation Meeting, Monday, Nov. 3, 2025, 1:30 pm

Dear Supervisors,

As a District 4 San Franciscan without representation on the Board of Supervisors, I am writing to ask you to strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's Family Upzoning Plan as it currently exists. As it is now written, the Plan incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

I speak for myself, my family, and many of my neighbors to respectfully ask you to:

- Require adequate infrastructure to be built PRIOR to building any additional housing
- Refuse to allow the use of *geo grouting to harden the earth and sand beneath proposed new housing building sites as it poisons our groundwater (See geo-grouting info at end of this email.)
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

As currently written, this Plan clears the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices and the safety of the very communities they are supposed to represent.

Our far western District 4 does not have existing infrastructure to support these new high-rises, and infrastructure needs to be designed, funded and built first. Circumventing CEQA requirements in a rush to build jeopardizes our safety.

We still have three months to replace the Mayor's Plan with one that will work.

The City Economist recently released a report that shows the Mayor's Plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because **zoning changes do not produce new housing**. Therefore, it is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the Family Zoning Plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing housing approvals, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year in a way that will fully meet state mandates.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units - together more than enough to fulfill state mandates. Instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Lurie's plan just moves the zoning rules around and does little to increase affordable housing. It increases instead the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing over-supply (now at 150%) while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods.

Let us not build more excess housing for the wealthy that will create more homelessness and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to corporate real estate speculators.

Please RELACE the text in this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco homeowners, tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural, and community integrity, with text that will truly produce housing and get State bureaucrats off of San Francisco's back.

Thank you,

Judi Gorski
SF District Resident 47 years , 94116

*CEQA requires that any project involving geo-grouting that requires a discretionary approval by a public agency undergo an environmental review process to identify and mitigate potential environmental impacts.

How geo-grouting can contaminate groundwater:

Toxic additives: Many chemical and cement-based grouts contain additives that can be toxic or carcinogenic and may leach into the surrounding groundwater.

Drilling and installation: The process of drilling holes for grouting can create pathways for surface contaminants to travel directly into aquifers, especially if the boreholes are not sealed properly.

Contaminant pathways: Grouting operations can create or worsen fractures in the ground, creating direct routes for contaminants to flow into groundwater sources.

Chemical reactions: The chemical reactions that occur during the hydration of cement-based grouts can alter the chemistry of the groundwater, potentially increasing dissolved solids and changing its overall characteristics.

Improper disposal: Improper disposal of grout waste can also lead to secondary contamination of soil and water.

From:	lgpetty
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides; Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject:	Re: The FZP - Stop Fighting Each Other Over Capacity. Fight the RHNA"s Illegality Instead. Adopt the Humane, Protective Chan, Chen, and Melgar Amendments
Date:	Saturday, November 1, 2025 2:04:07 AM

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

Dear Land Use Committee Members and all other Supervisors,

I urged in an October 17 email letter that the Board write its own zoning plan to include strong anti-displacement protections for tenants and small businesses, with a prioritized affordable housing funding & site plan.

Thank you, Supervisors Chan, Chen and Melgar, for attempting to inject decency into the FZP.

Thank you Supervisors Chan and Chen for recognizing that the concepts of compliance and capacity can only be met through a clear-eyed lens of San Francisco's actual needs. Not through the distorted view of those who would profit from unlimited removal and replacement of people and their homes with wealthy people and impossibly costly generic "units."

Capacity and compliance are currently based on a numerical fiction... the made-up structure of "State-Mandated RHNA numbers."

We must stop fighting each other in a futile race to rack up housing unit numbers we were never meant to achieve. RHNA's were designed to be impossibly high -- setting up the City to fail -- so that the State would have a rationale to remove all locally-determined regulations via a State-imposed "builders' remedy."

The RHNA's, even if created with good intentions, have been proven irrelevant by Covid impacts, tariff and construction cost inflation, and the loss of an investor-driven economy.

Let's stop chasing this non-existent RHNA capacity holy grail. Let's turn our efforts instead toward establishing the illegality of the RHNA numbers in court.

Let's stop being afraid.

Refine and strengthen tenant and small business protection Amendments for a revised FZP in the meantime. Create a better, uniquely San Francisco zoning plan that provides mostly affordable housing and does it without destroying ourselves and our City.

Thank you for your consideration.

Lorraine Petty

D2/5 senior, renter & voter
Affordable Housing Advocate

Seniors and Tenants Advocate
Member, SFTU & SDA

From:	Magick Altman
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Family Housing
Date:	Friday, October 31, 2025 8:28:24 PM

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

To whom in may concern, you can usually tell when something is against the people's interest when its called "Family planning". This is a scam to get quick approval of the destruction of our neighborhoods, affordable housing and protections for small businesses. North Beach is fine. LEAVE IT ALONE. There is purpose to the so=called red tape. To make sure the people win and not the developers, who could care less about our neighborhoods.
Stop this illegal and immoral action.
Be Leery of Lurie, Money doesn't talk it Swears.
Yours in Truth,
Magick Altman

From:	Francesca Pastine
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff; Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject:	SF Supervisors Support Mayor Lurie"s Affordable Housing and SF Neighborhoods Plan
Date:	Friday, October 31, 2025 7:35:08 PM

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

Hello All,

As you may know, Mayor Lurie's *Family Housing Plan* will go before the Land Use & Transportation Committee this Monday, November 3, sometime after 2 p.m. I fully support this plan. It's time for San Francisco to take real steps toward building enough housing—especially in the low-density neighborhoods on the west side of the city.

While the City Economist, Ted Egan, recently noted that the plan alone will not meet the city's full housing mandates, it represents an essential step toward building the infrastructure we need for future growth.

Let's create a San Francisco where working-class families and future generations can afford to live and thrive.

Best,

Francesca Pastine

1183 Shotwell Street

415 596 5543

--
https://www.francescapastine.com/
www.pastineprojects.com
IN THE MAKE
http://francescapastine.blogspot.com
http://www.innermissionneighborhood.com
www.hillaryronenmission.com

Life is short
Art is long
Opportunity fleeting
Experience treacherous
Judgment difficult

Hippocrates 400 b.c.

From:	Eric Brooks
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff
Subject:	Public Comment: VOTE NO On Lurie"s Recipe For Housing Failure & Replace It With A Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701
Date:	Friday, October 31, 2025 6:18:38 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

The City Economist just released a report showing that Mayor Lurie's 'Family Zoning' plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing.

We still have 3 months to replace the Mayor's plan with one that will work. Here's a real strategy to solve the affordable housing crisis.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units - together more than enough to fulfill state mandates. (Yet instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Lurie's plan simply moves zoning rules around like deck chairs on the Titanic, does almost nothing to increase affordable housing, and increases the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing over-supply [now at 150%] while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods.)

Now that the City Economist has shown that Lurie's plan won't work, it is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the 'Family Zoning' Ordinance and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing housing approvals, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year in a way that will fully meet state mandates.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible, instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood, and diesel construction equipment, releasing major greenhouse gas emissions.

The Mayor's plan would build more excess housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and

corporate real estate speculators. **Please REPLACE the text in this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural, and community integrity, with text that will truly produce affordable housing and get State bureaucrats off of San Francisco's back.**

Thank you,

Eric Brooks, Campaign Coordinator
Our City SF and San Francisco CEQA Defenders
415-756-8844

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations; BOS Legislation, (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject:	74 Letters regarding File Nos. 250700, 251071; 250701, 251072, 251073; 250966; and 251071
Date:	Thursday, October 30, 2025 3:00:33 PM
Attachments:	74 Letters regarding Zoning.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached for 74 Letters regarding File Nos. 250700, 251071; 250701, 251072, 251073; 250966; and 251071.

File No. 250700: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 251071: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 250701: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 251072: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 251073: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 250966: General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 251071: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan

Sincerely,

Joe Adkins
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From:	Nick Eckenwiler
To:	Tanner, Rachael (CPC); Chen, Lisa (CPC); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Supervisors; Bonde, Aly (MYR); Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC)
Cc:	McDougall, Paul@HCD; gustavo.velasquez@hcd.ca.gov; Megan.Kirkeby@hcd.ca.gov; Coy, Melinda@HCD; shannan.west@hcd.ca.gov; Zisser, David@HCD; Lisa.Frank@hcd.ca.gov; Fidel.Herrera@hcd.ca.gov; alex.fisch@doj.ca.gov; Matthew.Struhar@doj.ca.gov; David Pai
Subject:	CalHDF Letter Regarding San Francisco's Housing Element Implementation
Date:	Wednesday, October 29, 2025 4:21:46 PM
Attachments:	San Francisco - Housing Element Rezoning Letter - 2025.10.29 (Report Attached).pdf

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

Good afternoon,

Please see attached for a letter from the California Housing Defense Fund regarding San Francisco's proposed Family Zoning Plan and the City's obligations under the Housing Element Law.

Sincerely,

--

Nicholas Eckenwiler
Staff Attorney

Oct 29, 2025

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
49 South Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94103

Re: San Francisco's Housing Element Implementation

By email: rachael.tanner@sfgov.org, Lisa.chen@sfgov.org, Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org, bos@sfgov.org, bos-supervisors@sfgov.org, aly.bonde@sfgov.org, sarah.dennis-phillips@sfgov.org

Cc: Paul.McDougall@hcd.ca.gov, gustavo.velasquez@hcd.ca.gov, Megan.Kirkeby@hcd.ca.gov, Melinda.Coy@hcd.ca.gov, shannan.west@hcd.ca.gov, David.Zisser@hcd.ca.gov, Lisa.Frank@hcd.ca.gov, Fidel.Herrera@hcd.ca.gov, alex.fisch@doj.ca.gov, Matthew.Struhar@doj.ca.gov, David.Pai@doj.ca.gov

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

The California Housing Defense Fund ("CalHDF") submits this letter to outline the City of San Francisco's legal obligations surrounding its efforts to implement its housing element. Specifically, CalHDF writes to remind the City:

1. The City must rezone as promised in its housing element – it must upzone enough to produce (not merely attain capacity for) 36,282 units based on an analytical model that assesses the probability of development for rezoned parcels under current economic conditions.
2. The City's housing element and the housing element law oblige it to reduce constraints on housing production and refrain from adding new constraints, especially in the City's efforts to satisfy its other housing element obligations.

If the City does not obey the law on these points, CalHDF stands ready to challenge the City's intransigence in court. Such a lawsuit would expose the City to penalties, including the payment of CalHDF's attorney's fees. CalHDF urges the City to avoid such needless litigation and instead comply with state law, the contours of which are explained in detail below.

The City's Proposed Rezonings Are Inadequate

The Housing Element Law (Gov. Code, §§ 65580 et seq.) establishes a clear process for the evaluation, planning, and enactment of the City's housing policy. That process has a two-part structure. In the first part, the City must adopt a housing element on a specified timeline and that meets certain requirements. In the second part, the City must implement the programs promised in its housing element. Crucially, the second step relies on the first step: what, precisely, the City must do in the second step has already been established by the housing element. (See Gov. Code, § 65583, subd. (c).) The second step is *not* a freestanding exercise in policymaking or policy analysis. (See *id.*) The policymaking and policy analysis are conducted in the first step, and the Housing Element Law leaves essentially no room to alter the results at the second step.[1]

San Francisco has completed the first step. It adopted a housing element on January 31, 2023, adhering to the substantive and procedural rules in the Housing Element Law. The California Department of Housing and Community Development ("HCD") also certified the City's adopted housing element as legally compliant, pursuant to its statutory authority. (See, e.g., Gov. Code, § 65585.) That housing element made numerous detailed commitments. These commitments include promises to rezone large areas of the City to accommodate housing growth necessary to meet demand and ease upward pressures on housing costs. (See Gov. Code, §§ 65583 [establishing standards for required rezonings]; 65583.1 [same]; 65583.2 [same].) The housing element, moreover, promised not only to rezone, but to engage in detailed analysis that would help shape the rezoning. (See Program 7.1.1 in San Francisco's Housing Element, available here.)

San Francisco is now at the second step of the process: implementing the commitments in its housing element. This includes the aforementioned rezoning and associated policy analyses. The City's proposed rezoning, however, fails to fulfill crucial aspects of housing element commitments – commitments that the City, as explained above, cannot renege on without going through a full amendment process for its housing element.

Program 7.1.1 of the City's housing element commits the City to implementing a rezoning program that "reasonably account[s] for sites' likelihood of development during the planning period using an analytical model." The housing element uses mandatory language, stating that the City "shall" build its rezoning program around such a "probability-of-development" analysis. In sum: the City must rezone to an extent that the expected number of new units that will be built after the rezoning, calculated via a robust probability-of-development analysis, meets the City's projected housing need (i.e. the

[1] If the City wishes to alter the policy analysis or programs promised by its housing element, it has an avenue to do that: it may amend its housing element according to the procedures set forth in Government Code section 65585. But the process remains a two-step process: the City must first amend its housing element, and only then can it proceed to the second step of implementing the promised housing element programs.

Regional Housing Needs Assessment, or "RHNA," allocation, plus a buffer specified in the housing element).

The current rezoning proposal does not do this. The proposal's failure is twofold. First, none of the methods the Planning Department has relied on to assess whether the proposal will satisfy San Francisco's rezoning obligation constitutes a probability-of-development analysis using an analytical model in line with Program 7.1.1 in the housing element. Second, when the City has conducted an analysis that meets the requirements of Program 7.1.1, the analysis shows the current rezoning proposal will not satisfy San Francisco's rezoning obligation.

With respect to the rezoning proposal's first failure: the City proposes three methods to project the number of new units the proposed rezoning can be expected to produce. None of the three methods measures up to the standards in Program 7.1.1.

1. The first method is the "soft sites" method, which is described in appendix B of the City's housing element. This method assumes that a site currently hosting a residential use has a two percent probability of being redeveloped with the rezoning's planned residential capacity and a site currently hosting a non-residential use has a seventy percent probability of redevelopment. Such rigid calculations based on uniform, citywide assumptions about the odds of development on thousands of very different sites are not an "analytical model" and do not "reasonably account for sites' likelihood of development" as required by Program 7.1.1. These assumptions, furthermore, are not reasonable and do not rest on any evidence. They are highly motivated guesswork, and highly motivated guesswork will not cut the mustard.

2. The second method rests on an economic model developed by a consultant. This model does not assess the likelihood of a given site's being developed under the rezoning proposal. Instead, it calculates how many units of housing are "financially feasible" on parcels throughout the City. This is not an "analytical model" that "reasonably account[s] for sites' likelihood of development" as required by Program 7.1.1. As the City well knows, property owners across the City submit permit applications for only a small portion of economically feasible new housing units, and not all of those permit applications ultimately produce actual housing units. The City attempts to address this problem by assuming – similar to the soft sites method – that two percent of sites with economically feasible new housing developments currently occupied by residential uses and thirty-five percent of other sites with economically feasible new housing developments will be developed. This is inadequate for the same reasons the soft sites method is inadequate. Moreover, this method projects only 19,000 new units of housing over the planning period – far below the 36,282 units the City must accommodate.

3. The third method involves looking at "how much of the City's overall zoning capacity has gotten built out over the years." This – again – is not an "analytical model." Nor does it look at the sites slated for rezoning under the current rezoning proposal and assess the likelihood they will produce new housing. This method is further flawed because much of San Francisco's recent increase in zoned capacity, and much of the new housing that has been built, took place on vacant sites, whereas the proposed housing element rezoning covers a broad swath of the City and comprises mostly non-vacant sites. Other problems here include unrealistically low estimates of the City's residential zoning capacity in prior years (thus inflating the share of residential zoned capacity that has been built out) and the inclusion of residential projects built under development agreements, which do not correspond to rezonings, and which were separately counted towards the City's pre-existing residential zoned capacity in the housing element.

With respect to the rezoning proposal's second failure, analytical models that would satisfy Program 7.1.1 in the housing element demonstrate that the proposed rezoning will not produce anywhere close to the required number of new units. San Francisco's City Economist recently released an analysis of the City's proposed rezoning (available at the link and appended to this letter). This analysis relies on the exact approach that San Francisco's Housing Element pledged to use: an analytical model that assesses the probability of development. (Indeed, it is the exact approach HCD suggested the city use.) The results are damning. In the **best case scenario,** San Francisco's City Economist's analytical model found that the rezoning can only be reasonably expected to produce around **14,646 units by 2045**. Less optimistic assumptions produce a forecast of only 8,504 units by 2045. This indicates the rezoning plan falls far short of what is required: being shown by an analytical model to reasonably be expected to produce **36,282 units by 2031**.

These are not minor problems. Program 7.1.1 is central to San Francisco's compliance with the Housing Element Law. The City's housing element meets the requirements of the Housing Element Law *only because* it included Program 7.1.1's commitment to rezone based on a realistic probability-of-development analysis. To be crystal clear: without Program 7.1.1, the housing element does not comply with Government Code section 65583.2, subdivision (g)(2). This is because the housing element relies on non-vacant sites to accommodate more than half of its RHNA allocation at the lower-income level, and thus the Housing Element Law requires its housing element to "demonstrate that the existing use [on each non-vacant site] does not constitute an impediment to additional residential development." (Gov. Code, § 65583.2, subd. (g)(2).) "An existing use shall be presumed to impede additional residential development, absent findings based on substantial evidence that the use is likely to be discontinued." (*Ibid.*) San Francisco's housing element does not demonstrate with substantial evidence that specific existing uses on specific sites intended to accommodate low-income housing will not impede additional residential development. Instead, the housing element commits the City, in Program 7.1.1, to rezoning in a manner that "shall

reasonably account for sites' likelihood of development during the planning period using an analytical model." That commitment is the basis of the City's compliance with Government Code section 65583.2, subdivision (g)(2). Refusing to follow through on that commitment would leave the City without any basis for compliance with the Housing Element Law on this point.[2]

CalHDF urges the City to do as the law requires. The City must adopt a rezoning that an analytical model such as the City Economists' shows can reasonably be expected to produce 36,282 new units under current economic conditions, as required by Program 7.1.1. Alternatively, the City can increase the probability of sites' development (again, according to a realistic analytical model) by adjusting non-zoning policies that constrain housing production: the City could, for example, reduce transfer taxes for residential projects, impact fees for new residential construction, or inclusionary zoning requirements. The City should not – it cannot – rely on flawed and insufficient analyses to justify its planned rezonings. Doing so violates the law.

The City Must Reduce Constraints on Housing Production, Not Add New Ones

The City's planned rezoning, although on net it adds new capacity, includes constraints on housing development that do not exist under current zoning rules. Specifically, the proposal includes minimum office densities, caps on dwelling unit size, new limits on curb cuts, and lower parking maximums. Furthermore, the City's proposed local zoning bonus program, known as the "Housing Choice–San Francisco" ("HCSF") program, imposes new limitations on residential projects' eligibility for protections and benefits under state laws, including the Statewide Density Bonus Law. While some of these constraints may be good policy, they pose a problem for two reasons.

First, the new constraints were not analyzed by the City's housing element. The Housing Element Law requires local governments to analyze governmental constraints on housing production. (Gov. Code, § 65583, subd. (a)(5).) The results of this analysis then inform the policies and programs in the housing element. (See *id.*; *id.* at subd. (c)(3); *Californians for Homeownership, Inc. v. City of Beverly Hills* (2023) Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCP00143, at p. 6, [finding planned rezonings for housing element site inventory must consider constraints identified by the housing element's constraints analysis] [opinion attached to this letter].) Because the new constraints attached to the City's rezoning proposal were not analyzed in the City's housing element, the City cannot rely on the rezoning proposal to produce as many units as it is required to unless the City analyzes the effects of the new constraints and offsets their impact on housing production.

[2] The City could address this issue by producing site-specific evidence that existing uses on non-vacant sites will not impede additional residential development, adding that evidence to a new draft of its housing element, and adopting the amended housing element. But – again – the City would have to do this before rezoning. The process of developing and adopting housing element commitments and then, separately, implementing those commitments remains a two-step process.

Second, the City's housing element explicitly recognizes this and commits the City to refrain from adding new constraints. Program 7.1.1 states: "The rezoning program … shall not add government constraints that reduce project financial feasibility as determined by an analysis prior to the rezoning enactment." Program 8.1.6 states: "[A]ny City-adopted rezoning or development controls shall not impose any new governmental constraints to the development of housing unless those increased constraints are offset by the removal or reduction of other constraints." If San Francisco wishes to establish new governmental constraints to housing production (such as making new developments ineligible for the waivers and protections offered by State Density Bonus Law), it must concurrently reduce other constraints to a degree that maintains the overall viability of new residential construction, "as determined by an analysis prior to the rezoning enactment" that assess projects' "financial feasibility." Pursuing the new constraints without offsetting them by reducing existing constraints, however, would violate the commitments in housing element programs 7.1.1 and 8.1.6 and hence violate the Housing Element Law.

As you are well aware, California remains in the throes of a statewide crisis-level housing shortage. New multifamily housing in San Francisco a public benefit: it will help satisfy demand for housing near jobs and transit, thereby reducing displacement pressure; and it will also cut down on transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions by providing housing in a major metro area, as opposed to farther-flung regions in the state (and out of state). CalHDF therefore urges the City to follow through on the commitments in its housing element, as the law requires, and obey state law in drafting and enforcing its land use regulations.

CalHDF is a 501(c)(3) non-profit corporation whose mission includes advocating for increased access to housing for Californians at all income levels, including low-income households. You may learn more about CalHDF at www.calhdf.org.

Sincerely,

Dylan Casey
CalHDF Executive Director

James M. Lloyd
CalHDF Director of Planning and Investigations

Family Zoning Plan: Economic Impact Report

Office of the Controller
Office of Economic Analysis

Items 250700 & 250701
October 29, 2025

Introduction

- Two proposed ordinances would change zoning controls to permit more housing on a large segment of San Francisco, particularly on the western half of the city. They implement changes to the Housing Element of the City's General Plan, a planning document whose revisions were adopted in 2023.
- The Ordinance in file #250700, the Zoning Map Amendment, would generally raise allowable building heights along commercial corridors and transit lines, to permit mid-rise and some high-rise development.
- The Ordinance in file #250701 implements the Housing Choice-San Francisco program, which offers an alternative to the State Density Bonus program.
- The Office of Economic Analysis (OEA) has prepared this report because the proposed legislation may have a material impact on the city's economy. This report uses a model that estimates potential new development, in order to assess economic impact. That model is not a replacement for the City's estimates of realistic capacity under Government Code § 65583.2.

Zoning Map Amendment: Key Provisions

- The Zoning Map Amendment would make changes to allowable building heights and bulk, and/or zoning districts, in over 92,000 parcels in the city.
- The vast majority are residential parcels, whose allowable heights would either remain at 40 feet, or rise to 50 or 65 feet.
- On these and many other rezoned parcels, the Housing Choice San Francisco program (described on the next page) relaxes existing controls on the number of housing units allowed on a parcel.
- Allowable heights are generally increased to 65 to 85 feet along many commercial corridors, with development along wider streets near transit stations or major lines increased to 85 feet.
- Heights above 140 feet are allowed on certain streets that currently allow high-rise development or have larger parcels, at key intersections, and near certain major transit routes and stations. The map on page 5 provides additional details.

Housing Choice San Francisco – Key Provisions

- The Housing Choice San Francisco program, or “Local Program”, gives developers an alternative to the State Density Bonus.
- Many of the rezoned residential parcels are too small to be eligible for the State Density Bonus, but may achieve greater density through the use of the Local Program.
- Local Program users also gain benefits associated with housing unit mix, methods of complying with inclusionary housing requirements, rear-yard and setback requirements, broad code flexibility, and certain process changes.
- The ordinance has several other provisions, including limiting the maximum size of new residential units, reducing allowable parking, and restricting new curb cuts. These policy changes are not considered in this report.
- Additionally, the proposed ordinance gives displaced businesses the right to relocate anywhere in the city where their activity is permitted by zoning, without a conditional use permit, and waives development impact fees associated with the relocation.

Details of the Rezoning



The map to the left, from the City Planning department, indicates which parcels in the city will be rezoned, and to which heights. It reflects the plan as of July.

Gray parcels will be zoned for low-rise, 40-50 feet housing developments. This includes single-family residential zones, within which greater density will be permitted via the Local Program.

Yellow and orange parcels will be upzoned to mid-rise development of 65-105 feet.

Pink and purple parcels will have height limits ranging from 120-180 feet, and the blue and green parcels will be upzoned for high-rise development, of 240 feet or greater.

The Rezoning and the Regional Housing Needs Assessment

- Each jurisdiction in California is required to have its Housing Element be certified by the State's Housing and Community Development Department.
- Certification involves, among other things, ensuring that the City has the zoning capacity to meet the city's obligations under the State's Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA).
- RHNA is a Statewide planning process, in which future needs are forecasted for metropolitan areas, and then allocated to the individual cities and counties that administer land use planning.
- In San Francisco's case, the RHNA obligation requires the City to have realistic capacity for approximately 82,000 new housing units, at different economic levels, within an 8-year planning period ending in 2031.
- Of this 82,000 unit requirement, the City must create capacity for approximately 36,000 units.

Substitutions and Proposed Amendments

- On September 30, a new version of #250700 was substituted by Mayor Lurie, which made relatively minor zoning changes on a number of parcels. This analysis reflects those changes.
- On October 21, Supervisor Melgar proposed an amendment that would prohibit the use of the Local Program on any parcel containing more then two existing housing units, which would involve the demolition of a unit subject to rent control.
- Also on October 21, Supervisor Sauter introduced an amendment that creates incentives for developers to replace lost commercial space.
- As the language of these two amendments was made public less than one week ago, this report does not attempt to model their economic impact.

Economic Impact Factors

- When the City relaxes zoning controls, by reducing density restrictions or increasing allowable heights, more development projects will become financially feasible, and the supply of housing in the city will rise.
- This increased supply will put downward pressure on housing prices in the city. Cheaper housing benefits city residents who move within the city, and also makes San Francisco more affordable for new arrivals.
- The development of new housing also stimulates investment and employment in construction and related industries.
- The population growth associated with new housing also stimulates the local economy, by expanding the numbers of workers and consumers.
- On the other hand, the limited amount of vacant lots in the city means that new housing generally involves the loss of existing buildings, including both residential and commercial properties. This can impose relocation and other costs on residential and commercial tenants.

Estimating the Likelihood of New Housing Development

- The amount of new housing that the rezoning will produce is an important contributor to its economic impact. To estimate this, OEA refined a statistical model that it has used since 2016 to estimate the impact of policy changes on housing production in the city[1].
- The model was the result of statistical analysis of housing production in San Francisco over the 2004-2024 period. Technical details on the model are provided in the Appendix.
- The first part of the model estimates the likelihood that multifamily housing will be developed on a given parcel, in a given year. The statistical analysis found that a parcel is more likely to develop when:
  - it has smaller existing buildings (or is vacant), and is located closer to downtown.
  - its zoning allows for a greater height, makes it eligible for the State Density Bonus, and does not restrict the number of units that may be constructed.
  - housing prices are relatively high, and construction costs are relatively low, compared to other years.

Estimating the Number of Units Produced

- The second part of the model estimates the number of units that will be produced when a parcel does develop housing. Based on past experience, the statistical analysis found that a parcel developing housing will produce more units when:
  - its land area and allowable maximum height are greater;
  - it is eligible for the State Density Bonus;
  - its zoning does not restrict the number of units that may be built.
- The OEA used the first part of the model to estimate the probability that housing will be built on a parcel over the next twenty years[2]. That probability was multiplied by the estimate of housing units from the second part, to create an expected number of housing units generated for each parcel over twenty years. When this is summed across all parcels, a citywide housing total is generated.
- This method was used to create estimates of housing production under the existing zoning, and the proposed rezoning. The difference is the estimate of housing that could be produced as a result of the proposed zoning changes.

Limitations of the Housing Development Model

- The housing development model can forecast future housing development based on the city's past experience, but important caveats must be made.
- Because of data availability, not every factor that affects housing production could be included. Missing data may include features of the parcel itself, or policies that may have changed over the 2004-24 period, or vary within the aggregated zoning designations used by the model.
- Limited data also prevents the analysis of fine-grained policy changes in the proposed rezoning, such as restrictions on unit size and mix.
- Several new City and State policies that were intended to encourage housing production have been enacted in recent years, such as, for example, the City's 2023 Housing Production Ordinance (0248-23). The model may be unable to properly assess the impact of these policies in the future.
- Despite these limitations, the OEA believes this approach is well-suited to estimating housing production, for the purposes of economic impact reporting.

Future Housing Market Scenarios

- As noted earlier, the amount of housing that will be produced as a result of the rezoning, and its economic impact, will depend on future housing market conditions. This creates an additional level of uncertainty in the forecasts.
- Gauging future market conditions is further complicated by changes in the city's housing market since the COVID-19 pandemic, as described on the next page.
- To understand the scope of what could potentially happen, the OEA created two future scenarios for housing prices and costs in San Francisco.
- In a high-growth scenario, San Francisco's housing prices, relative to the U.S., return to pre-COVID levels by 2030, and grow at the city's pre-COVID rate after that. Construction costs are assumed to grow at the same rate as inflation.
- In a low-growth scenario, San Francisco's post-COVID relative housing prices are assumed to represent a "new normal," and housing prices are assumed to grow only at a national average level over the next twenty years. Construction costs are also assumed to grow at the same rate as inflation.

San Francisco and U.S. Housing Price Trends Since 2000



While San Francisco's housing has always been expensive, during the 2010s, average San Francisco condo prices rose much faster than the rest of the U.S., to as much as 5 times the typical U.S. price.

Since 2020, however, San Francisco condo prices have declined, despite rising inflation and rising U.S. condo prices. Adjusted for inflation, typical San Francisco condo prices in 2025 are 25% lower than they were in 2019.

Among other factors, the increase in remote office work during COVID has reduced the value of a residence near large office employment centers like downtown San Francisco.

Source: Zillow. Data retrieved October 1, 2025.

Housing Price Trends Within the City



Source: Zillow. Data retrieved October 1, 2025.

The reduced value of a downtown location has also shifted multifamily price patterns within the city.

Condos in neighborhoods like Downtown and South of Market have experienced inflation-adjusted price drops of more than 40% since 2016, while the Richmond and Sunset have fallen by far less.

Because most multifamily housing in the city is near downtown, but most of the proposed rezoning is not, the use of a citywide average condo price index is inappropriate. This analysis uses an average price across the 10 Zillow neighborhoods most affected by the zoning, which is somewhat higher than the citywide average.

High and Low Growth Scenario Price Forecasts



Our high-growth scenario assumes that San Francisco's housing prices, relative to the U.S., return to pre-pandemic levels by 2030, and then grow at the city's long-term average rate until 2045. This implies a rapid growth in housing prices over the next five years, of over 10% per year.

In the low-growth scenario, the post-COVID housing market represents a new normal, and San Francisco housing prices are assumed to grow only at the U.S. long-term rate at 1.8% per year, in inflation-adjusted dollars. Under this assumption, San Franciso housing prices would not recover to their pre-COVID peak, in inflation-adjusted dollars, until 2041.

Source: Zillow. 10 Neighborhoods are Buena Vista, Polk Gulch, Inner Sunset, Marina, Mission, North Waterfront, Outer Sunset, Outer Richmond, Inner Richmond, and Western Addition.

Construction Cost Trends and Scenarios



Source: Bureau of Economic Analysis; U.S. Census Bureau, "Quarterly Workforce Indicators

The housing development model uses two measures of construction costs: materials cost and local construction industry wages. They are blended into a single index for modeling purposes. Details are in the Appendix.

The cost of construction materials and local wages have grown faster than overall inflation, particularly in the last few years. In 2024, real construction materials costs were 18% higher, and real local wages were 10% higher, than they were in 2016.

In both the high-growth and low-growth scenarios, the blended index is assumed to grow at 0% (after inflation) over the 2026-2045 period. This reflects an assumption that both labor and material costs inflation will revert to the broader rate of inflation in the long term.

Housing Production Forecasts Under Current Zoning

Planning District	Historic, 2000-24	Low-Growth Scenario Forecast, 2026-45	High-Growth Scenario Forecast, 2026-45
Buena Vista	975	43	90
Central	72	192	390
Downtown	289	112	230
Ingleside	0	58	120
Inner Sunset	123	28	59
Marina	131	126	263
Mission	187	197	406
Northeast	449	136	283
Outer Sunset	15	16	33
Richmond	0	23	47
South Central	0	6	11
Western Addition	997	658	1,265
Total	3,238	1,594	3,199

Generally, the housing development model forecasts that the current zoning will produce fewer units in the next 20 years than the numbers of units that were produced in the last 20 years.

The table to the left only covers the portion of each planning district that is in the proposed rezoning area. In total, under the current zoning, the model forecasts 1,594 or 3,199 units under the low- and high-growth forecasts, respectively, while 3,238 units were built in the same areas over the 2000-2024 period.

On the next two pages, the model's forecasts of the additional housing created by the proposed zoning is discussed.

Source: For historic housing production, San Francisco Planning Department

Forecast Net Effect of the Zoning

- As shown in the table below, under the low-growth and high-growth scenarios described earlier, the rezoning would lead to 8,504 and 14,646 additional housing units, beyond what would be produced under current zoning, over the next 20 years.

Low Growth Scenario	**Units**
20-Year Housing Production, Existing Zoning	1,594
20-Year Housing Production, Proposed Rezoning	10,098
Effect of Proposed Rezoning	8,504

High Growth Scenario	**Units**
20-Year Housing Production, Existing Zoning	3,199
20-Year Housing Production, Proposed Rezoning	17,845
Effect of Proposed Rezoning	14,646

Summary by Current Zoning District

		Low-Growth			High-Growth		
Current Zoning[3]	Number of Parcels	Average Housing Likelihood, Current	Average Housing Likelihood, Proposed	Change in Housing Units	Average Housing Likelihood, Current	Average Housing Likelihood, Proposed	Change in Housing Units
RH1	43,009	0.001%	0.205%	798	0.003%	0.446%	1,731
RH2	26,486	0.002%	0.259%	576	0.005%	0.565%	1,250
RH3_RM1	13,741	0.009%	0.347%	547	0.018%	0.756%	1,186
Office/Commercial	114	0.570%	0.780%	48	1.185%	1.639%	104
Public	239	0.060%	1.450%	3,483	0.122%	2.560%	4,814
Density-Restricted Multifamily	7,079	0.336%	0.490%	3,007	0.674%	1.026%	5,467
Form-Based Multifamily	2,053	0.725%	0.725%	46	1.502%	1.502%	94
Total	92,721			8,504			14,646

The table to the left breaks out the results by current zoning. It illustrates how many rezoned parcels are in the RH-1, RH-2, and RH-3 or RM-1 residential zones, primarily in the western side of the city. These areas will see a substantial increase in the likelihood of developing housing over the next 20 years, but the chances are still small, so those 83,000+ parcels are only forecast to produce about additional 4,200 housing units by 2045, in the high growth scenario.

Fewer Public parcels (generally owned by the City or SFUSD) are larger, and more likely to develop housing through the rezoning, though this depends on the owner's decisions.

Estimating the Loss of Existing Residential Units

- To evaluate the economic impact, OEA calculated the net increase in housing units.
- In the low-growth scenario, 463 more units would be lost under the proposed zoning than under current zoning, over the 20-year forecast period. In the high-growth scenario, 1,031 more housing units would be lost. These losses represent a 6-8% of the housing units gained as a result of the rezoning. Amendments proposed on October 20th may reduce these losses, along with overall housing production.
- The loss of existing housing slightly dampens the housing price reductions associated with the rezoning, and may impose financial harms on existing tenants. City and State law heavily restricts, but does not prohibit, the eviction of tenants for the purpose of demolition, or the demolition of rent-controlled housing. These events have been quite rare in recent decades. If this occurs, tenants are entitled to relocation payments.
- Without any way to meaningfully estimate the number of evictions or demolitions of rent-controlled units, or the financial impact on tenants, this report does not attempt to quantify these potential costs.

Impacts on Housing Prices

- The responsiveness of housing prices to increases in housing supply is a function of price elasticities of supply and demand, which the OEA has estimated in past research[4].
- The elasticities imply that the proposed rezoning would lead to a -2.5% to -4.2% change in housing prices in the city, depending on the scenario. For context, those percentages are also expressed in terms of current housing prices and apartment rents.

	Low Growth Scenario	**High Growth Scenario**
Net Change in Housing Supply (units produced less demolitions)	8,041	13,615
Percentage Change in Housing Supply[5]	2.0%	3.4%
Price Elasticity of Demand	-0.7	-0.7
Price Elasticity of Supply	0.1	0.1
Percent change in housing prices	-2.5%	-4.2%
Corresponding change in condo prices[6]	-$24,500	-$41,600
Corresponding change in annual apartment market rents[7]	-$903	-$1,529

Estimating Relocation and Disruption Costs

- To account for the impact on commercial businesses, OEA estimated potential displacement costs. Details are provided in the Appendix.
- Displaced businesses are estimated to occupy commercial space ranging from approximately 1.5 to 2.6 million square feet, depending on the scenario. This displacement would occur over twenty years, and it is highly likely that the rezoning would lead to an increase in the amount of commercial space in the city.
- Annual business disruption and relocation costs range from $16 to $28 million, in today's dollars.

	Low Growth	High Growth
Loss of occupied commercial space (million sf)	1.5	2.6
Disruption-relocation cost/sf	$190	$190
Annual disruption/relocation cost (2025 $ million)	$16	$28

REMI Economic Impact Simulation

- Based on the economic impact factors described earlier, the OEA used the REMI model to measure the net economic impact of the changes associated with the high and low growth scenarios to the city's economy over the 2026-2045 period:
  - An increase in the city's residential capital stock of $8.0 billion (low growth) to $13.5 billion (high growth) in today's dollars, representing the investment associated with the new units forecast under the two scenarios. These figures are calculated by multiplying the net increase in units by average prices.
  - A reduction in citywide housing prices, reaching 2.5% (low growth) and 4.2% (high growth) by 2045.
  - Annual business disruption and relocation costs for retail businesses of $16 million (low growth) and $28 million (high growth) in today's dollars, until 2045.

Economic Impact Assessment

- In the low-growth scenario, the city's GDP would be $560 million larger, in today's dollars, on average over the 2026-45 period. Total employment in the city would be approximately 3,000 more than under the current zoning, on average over the period.
- In the high-growth scenario, the city's GDP growth would be $940 million larger than under current zoning, in 2025 dollars. Employment would be about 5,000 higher.
- Employment gains are expected in every sector, but would be most heavily concentrated in the construction, health care, real estate, and accommodations and food services sectors.
- Despite the displacement of businesses, retail trade is forecast to grow as a result of the population and economic growth created by the proposed rezoning, adding about 210 jobs in the low-growth scenario and about 350 jobs in the high-growth scenario.
- Like most major policies, the proposed rezoning involves benefits and costs. Our analysis suggests the proposed rezoning's positive impact on the city's economy, from lower housing prices and construction, outweighs the negative impact from displaced businesses, by a factor of approximately 22:1.

Conclusions

- The context for housing development in San Francisco has changed profoundly in the past several years. Since 2019, after adjusting for inflation, condo prices in San Francisco have dropped by 25%, while our blended construction cost index has risen by 8%.
- Given this starting point, an expansive rezoning effort, like the proposed Family Zoning plan, will be challenged to match the 2010s levels of new housing development in the city, even under an optimistic high-growth scenario.
- Nevertheless, under both scenarios considered in this report, the proposed rezoning would lead to a significant increase in the city's housing supply, and have broadly positive effects on housing prices and the city's broader economy. The benefits of new residential investments and lower housing prices are projected to outweigh the costs of business interruption and displacement by a factor of roughly 22:1.
- If market conditions were such that the 36,000 unit target was achieved, as a result of the rezoning, the economic impact on the city would likely be significantly more positive than the estimates in this report.

Footnotes

1. See, for example, Inclusionary Housing Working Group: Preliminary Report September 2016.
2. Three large parcels were excluded from the analysis: Laguna Honda Hospital, and the USF Main and Lone Mountain campuses. While all three parcels receive height increases in the proposed rezoning, their size and unique uses makes them unsuitable for the model. If the model could accurately estimate the amount of housing likely to occur on those parcels, the total housing estimate reported in this report would be larger.
3. These are the aggregate zoning classifications used by the model. See the Appendix for details.
4. See Potential Effects of Limiting Market-Rate Housing in the Mission.
5. Assuming 406,000 housing units in the city.
6. Based on Zillow's 2025 average condo prices for San Francisco.
7. Based on 2025 average apartment asking rents, from ApartmentList.

Appendix

- Housing Development Model
  - Methodology
  - Data sources
  - Model coefficients and performance
  - Scenario Inputs
  - Zoning District Classification
  - Logic of Applying the Model to the Proposed Rezoning
- Estimates of Business Interruption and Relocation Costs

Appendix: Housing Development Model: Methodology

- The housing development model is a two-stage step model. The first stage is a logistic regression, covering every parcel in the city, except those subject to a development agreement, over the 2004-2024 period.
- The dependent variable of the logistic regression is 1 if the parcel produced housing in a given year, and 0 otherwise. Parcels that produce housing in a given year were removed from the dataset for subsequent years. Independent variables, reflecting existing land use, market conditions, and zoning, are listed on the next page.
- The second stage is a regression model including all parcels that produced multifamily housing with more than 10 units, over the 2004-24 period. The dependent variable is the number of units produced on the parcel, and the independent variables are the parcel's "building envelope" (its area multiplied by its allowable height), and two interaction variables: the building envelope times a dummy indicating if the parcel was eligible for the State Density Bonus in that year, and the building envelope times a dummy indicating if the parcel was subject to density-restricted zoning in that year. The intercept of the model was fixed at zero.

Appendix: Housing Development Model: Methodology

- The models' coefficients were used in a forecast that calculated the log-likelihood of development for each rezoned parcel, in each of the forecast years 2026-2045, using the site and zoning information, and the price and cost assumptions for each year (shown on the next page). The log-likelihoods were converted into annual probabilities, from which a 20-year probability of development was calculated.
- The model coefficients were also used to calculate a units estimate; the 20-year probability times the units estimate is the expected number of units produced on that parcel in the 20-year forecast period.
- The forecast model was run for both the current and the proposed zoning. See the section "Logic of Applying the Model to the Proposed Rezoning" for more details.
- Three parcels were excluded from the forecast: Laguna Honda Hospital, the University of San Francisco Main Campus, and the University of San Francisco Lone Mountain Campus. While some housing may be built on those parcels in the forecast period, the model is not well-suited for large parcels with unique uses like these.

Appendix: Housing Development Model: Data Sources

Variable Description	Variable	Data Source
Height limit for site in ft	Height_Ft	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Area for lot in 1000 sq ft	Area_1000	Planning Department, Land Use Database 4/16/25
Extisting building square footage in 1000 sq ft	Bldg_SqFt_1000	Planning Department, Land Use Database 4/16/25
Residential Existing Use using ResUnits (Dummy)	Res_Dummy	Planning Department, Land Use Database 4/16/25
Historic Status for Parcel (Dummy)	Historic	Planning Department, Land Use Database 4/16/25
Real Construction Cost Variable, 2 years prior	Construc_Cost_Real	a 60/40 average of Real Construction Materials PPI and Real San Francisco MSA Construction Wages, 2016=100
10-Neighborhood Housing Price Index (Zillow), Real, 2 years prior	Zillow_Price_Real	SF real condo prices per Zillow, 2016=100
Dummy indicating eligibility for State Density Bonus, 2016 forward	SDB_2016_5Plus	Calculated from Zoning Districts
Zoning dummy: Office/Commercial	zp_OfficeComm	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Zoning dummy: Density Restricted Multifamily, RTO = Form Based	zp_DRMulti_RTO	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Zoning dummy: Form Based Multifamily, RTO = form based	zp_FBDMulti_RTO	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Zoning dummy: Industrial / Production, Distribution & Repair	zp_PDRInd	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Zoning dummy: Public/Open Space	zp_Public	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Zoning dummy: Redevelopment Area	zp_Redev	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Zoning dummy: Residential 2-Family (2 Units per Lot)	zp_RH2	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Zoning = Residential 3-Family or Res Mixed (1/800 sqft)	zp_RH3_RM1	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Planning District dummy variables	DIST_<District Name>	Planning District from Assessor's Secured Roll DB

Appendix: Logistic Regression Coefficients

Variable Description	Variable	Coeff	StdErr	WaldChiSq	Prob>Chi Sq
Intercept	Intercept	(1.6226)	1.2829	1.5998	0.2059
Height limit for site in ft	Height_Ft	0.0017	0.0007	4.9693	0.0258
Area for lot in 1000 sq ft	Area_1000	0.0049	0.0009	30.6563	0.0000
Envelope Area in 1000 sq ft (area/1000*ht/10)	Env_1000_Area_Height	0.0002	0.0001	5.0369	0.0248
Extisting building square footage in 1000 sq ft	Bldg_SqFt_1000	(0.0023)	0.0007	10.7241	0.0011
Residential Existing Use using ResUnits (Dummy)	Res_Dummy	(0.8231)	0.1222	45.3669	0.0000
Historic Status for Parcel (Dummy)	Historic	(1.0378)	0.1271	66.6847	0.0000
Real Construction Cost Variable	Construc_Cost_Real	(0.0992)	0.0129	58.8929	0.0000
SF Housing Price Index (Zillow), Real	Zillow_Price_Real	0.0143	0.0053	7.1326	0.0076
Dummy for State Density Bonus, 5+ Unit Sites, 2016 forward	SDB_2016_5Plus	0.6303	0.1608	15.3724	0.0000
Zoning = Office/Commercial	zp_OfficeComm	4.2634	0.4873	76.5337	0.0000
Zoning = Density Restricted Multifamily, RTO = Form Based	zp_DRMulti_RTO	4.2450	0.4523	88.0989	0.0000
Zoning = Form Based Multifamily, RTO = form based	zp_FBDMulti_RTO	5.0508	0.4640	118.4768	0.0000
Zoning = Industrial / Production, Distribution & Repair	zp_PDRInd	3.4115	0.4790	50.7257	0.0000
Zoning = Public/Open Space	zp_Public	1.2491	0.8385	2.2190	0.1363
Zoning = Redevelopment Area	zp_Redev	4.5361	0.4999	82.3213	0.0000
Zoning = Residential 2-Family (2 Units per Lot)	zp_RH2	0.2674	0.6672	0.1607	0.6885
Zoning = Residential 3-Family or Res Mixed (1/800 sqft)	zp_RH3_RM1	1.3187	0.6064	4.7289	0.0297

Appendix: Logistic Regression Coefficients (Continued)

Variable Description	Variable	Coeff	StdErr	WaldChiSq	Prob>Chi Sq
District = South Bayshore	DIST_SBayshore	(1.4824)	0.3179	21.7380	0.0000
District = Bernal Heights	DIST_BernalHts	(1.7011)	0.6087	7.8100	0.0052
District = South Central	DIST_Scentral	(1.7307)	0.3867	20.0267	0.0000
District = Central	DIST_Central	(1.1523)	0.3353	11.8102	0.0006
District = Buena Vista	DIST_BuenaVista	(2.5369)	1.0188	6.2010	0.0128
District = Northeast	DIST_Northeast	(1.4171)	0.2539	31.1439	0.0000
District = Western Addition	DIST_WestAddition	(0.6831)	0.2362	8.3630	0.0038
District = South of Market	DIST_SOMA	(0.0756)	0.1903	0.1579	0.6911
District = Inner Sunset	DIST_InnerSunset	(1.6187)	0.4882	10.9939	0.0009
District = Richmond	DIST_Richmond	(2.8019)	0.5355	27.3716	0.0000
District = Ingleside	DIST_Ingleside	(1.8670)	0.4925	14.3711	0.0002
District = Outer Sunset	DIST_OuterSunset	(2.6147)	0.6098	18.3867	0.0000
District = Marina	DIST_Marina	(1.2492)	0.3253	14.7457	0.0001
District = Mission	DIST_Mission	(1.0938)	0.2380	21.1176	0.0000

Omitted Variables for Groups of Dummy Variables:

Omitted zoning = RH1

Omitted district = Downtown

Appendix: Units Regression Coefficients

Variable Description	Variable	Coeff	St Error	T-Stat
Simple building envelope (area/1000 * ht/10)	Env_1000_Area_Height	0.4252	0.0159	26.72
State Density Bonus * Simple Bldg Envelope (5+ Unit Sites, 2016 forward)	SDB_2016_5Plus_EnvFull	0.4385	0.0389	11.28
Simple Bldg Envelope only if density-restricted	Zoning_DR_EnvFull	(0.1601)	0.0174	(9.22)

Note: Model removes largest 5% (Positive and Negative) residual outliers

Appendix: Model Performance

Logistic Regression	
Number of Observations	3,369,573
Number with Dependent Variable = 1	422
Pseudo R-Square	0.000611
Max Rescaled R-Square	0.244596

Units Regression	
Number of Observations	383
R-Sq	0.867779
Adj R-Sq	0.866735
Dependent Mean Value	81.87206
Standard Error of Regression	48.40184

Appendix: Zoning Classifications

- The table below shows the correspondence between the City's zoning districts, and the aggregate zoning variables in the model.

Zoning Variable	Zoning Districts
zp_RH1	C-2/RH-1(D); RH-1(D)/C-2; C-M/RH-1; M-1/RH-1; NC-1/RH-1; NC-1/RH-1/RH-2; NC-2/RH-1; NC-2/RH-1(D); NC-3/RH-1; NCD/RH-1; NCD/RH-1(D); NC-S/RH-1; NCT-OCEAN/RH-1(D); NCT/RH-1(D); P/P-W/RH-1; P/RH-1; P/RH-1(D); P/RH-1/RH-1(D); P/RH-1/RH-2; RH-1; RH-1(D); RH-1(D)/NC-2; RH-1(D)/RH-1; RH-2/RH-1; RH-2/RH-1(D); RH-1(D)/RH-2; RH-1(D)/RM-1; RH-1(S); RH-1/C-M; RH-1/M-1; RH-1/NC-1; RH-1/NC-2; RH-1/NC-3; RH-1/NC-S; RH-1/RH-1(D); RH-1/RH-2; RH-1/RH-2/RM-1; RH-1/RM-1; RM-1/RH-1; RH-3/RH-1
zp_RH2	NC-1/RH-1/RH-2; P/RH-1/RH-2; RH-2/RH-1; RH-2/RH-1(D); RH-1(D)/RH-2; RH-1/RH-2; RH-1/RH-2/RM-1; M-1/RH-2/RM-1; MUR/RH-2; NC-1/RH-2; NC-2/RH-2; NC-3/RH-2; NCD/RH-2; NC-S/RH-2; NCT-GLEN PARK/RH-2; NCT-OCEAN/RH-2; NCT/RH-2; P/RH-2; P/RM-1/RH-2; RH-2; RH-2/NC-1; RH-2/NC-2; RH-2/NC-3; RH-2/RH-3; RH-2/RM-1; RM-1/RH-2; RH-2/RM-2; RM-2/RH-2; RH-2/RM-3; RM-3/RH-2; RH-3/RH-2
zp_RH3_RM1	RH-1/RH-2/RM-1; M-1/RH-2/RM-1; P/RM-1/RH-2; RH-2/RH-3; RH-2/RM-1; RM-1/RH-2; RH-3/RH-2; RH-1(D)/RM-1; RH-1/RM-1; RM-1/RH-1; RH-3/RH-1; C-2/RH-3; C-2/RM-1; C-2/RM-1/RM-4; C-M/RM-1; HP-RA/RM-1; M-1/RM-1; M-2/RH-3; NC-1/RM-1; RM-1/NC-1; NC-2/RH-3; NC-2/RM-1; NC-3/RH-3; NC-3/RM-1; NCD/RH-3; NCD/RH-3/UPR MARKET; NCD/RH-3/UPR MARK; NCD/RH-3/VALENCIA; NCD/RM-1; NCD/RM-1/SACRAMENTO; NCD/SACRAMENTO ST; NCD/SACRAMENTO/RM-1; NCD/RM-1/SACRAMEN; NCT-DIVISADERO/RH-3; NCT-DIVISADERO/RM-1; NCT/RH-3; NCT/RM-1; P/PM-R/RM-1; P/RH-3; P/RM-1; PM-MU2/PM-OS/PM-R/RM-1; PM-R/RM-1; RH-3; RH-3/C-2; RH-3/HAYES; RH-3/M-2; RH-3/NC-2; RH-3/RM-1; RM-1/RH-3; RH-3/RM-2; RM-2/RH-3; RH-3/RM-3; RM-3/RH-3; RH-3/RSD; RH-3/VALENCIA; RM-1; RM-1/C-M; RM-1/C-M/M-1; RM-1/NC-3; RM-1/RM-2; RM-1/RM-3; RM-1/RM-4; RM-1/SACRAMENTO
zp_OfficeComm	C-2/RH-3; C-2/RM-1; C-2/RM-1/RM-4; C-M/RM-1; RH-3/C-2; RM-1/C-M; RM-1/C-M/M-1; C-2/RH-1(D); RH-1(D)/C-2; C-M/RH-1; RH-1/C-M; C-2; C-2/M-1; C-2/M-1/P; C-2/P; C-3-G; C-3-G/C-3-R; C-3-G/C-M; C-3-G/RC-4; C-3-O; C-3-O(SD); C-3-O(SD)/P; C-3-O(SD)/TB DTR; C-3-O/C-3-O(SD); C-3-O/C-3-R; C-3-O/C-3-S; C-3-O/C-3-S/P; C-3-O/TB DTR; C-3-R; C-3-S; C-3-S/P; C-M; C-M/M-1; CMUO; CMUO/MUR; CMUO/P; MUO; NCD/C-2; P/C-3-R; RM-3/C-2; RM-4/C-2; WMUO

Appendix: Zoning Classifications (Continued)

Zoning Variable	Zoning Districts
zp_DRMulti_RTO	NC-2/P; NC-3/P/RM-3; NCD/P; NC-S/P; P/NC-S; P/NC-2; P/RC-4; P/RM-2; P/RM-3; C-2/RM-1/RM-4; C-3-G/RC-4; NCD/C-2; RM-3/C-2; RM-4/C-2; NC-1/RM-1; RM-1/NC-1; NC-2/RH-3; NC-2/RM-1; NC-3/RH-3; NC-3/RM-1; NCD/RH-3; NCD/RH-3/UPR MARKET; NCD/RH-3/UPR MARK; NCD/RH-3/VALENCIA; NCD/RM-1; NCD/RM-1/SACRAMENTO; NCD/SACRAMENTO ST; NCD/SACRAMENTO/RM-1; NCD/RM-1/SACRAMEN; RH-3/HAYES; RH-3/NC-2; RH-3/RM-2; RM-2/RH-3; RH-3/RM-3; RM-3/RH-3; RH-3/RSD; RH-3/VALENCIA; RM-1/NC-3; RM-1/RM-2; RM-1/RM-3; RM-1/RM-4; RM-1/SACRAMENTO; NC-1/RH-1/RH-2; NC-1/RH-2; NC-2/RH-2; NC-3/RH-2; NCD/RH-2; NC-S/RH-2; RH-2/NC-1; RH-2/NC-2; RH-2/NC-3; RH-2/RM-2; RM-2/RH-2; RH-2/RM-3; RM-3/RH-2; NC-1/RH-1; NC-2/RH-1; NC-2/RH-1(D); NC-3/RH-1; NCD/RH-1; NCD/RH-1(D); NC-S/RH-1; RH-1(D)/NC-2; RH-1/NC-1; RH-1/NC-2; RH-1/NC-3; RH-1/NC-S; 24TH-MISSION; 24TH STREET- NOE VALL; 24TH-NOE; BROADWAY; BROADWAY NEIGHBORHOOD; C-2/RM-4; CASTRO STREET NEIGHBO; CASTRO; CCB; CRNC; CR-NC; CRNC/CVR; CR-NC/CVR; CRNC/RM-4; CVR; DTR/RC-4; FILLMORE; HAIGHT; HAIGHT STREET NEIGHBO; HAYES; HAIGHT STREET NEIGHBO; INNER CLEMENT; INNER CLEMENT STREET; INNER SUNSET; INNER SUNSET NEIGHBOR; M-1/NC-2; M-1/RM-2; M-1/RSD; NC-1; NC-1/RM-2; NC-1/RM-3; NC-2; NC-2/M-1; NC-2/NC-3; NC-3/NC-2; NC-2/RM-3; NC-2/RM-4; NC-3; NC-3/RC-4; NC-3/RM-3; NC-3/RM-4; NCD; NCD/; NCD/24TH STREET- NOE VALL; NCD/24TH STREET-; NCD/24TH-MISSION; NCD/24TH-NOE; NCD/24TH-NOE-VALLE; NCD/24TH-NOE-VALLEY; NCD/BROADWAY; NCD/BROADWAY NEIG; NCD/BROADWAY NEIGHBORHOOD; NCD/CASTRO; NCD/CASTRO STREET; NCD/CASTRO STREET NEIGHBO; NCD/EXCELSIOR OUTER MISSI; NCD/EXCELSIOR OUT; EXCELSIOR OUTER MISSI; NCD/FILLMORE; NCD/HAIGHT; NCD/HAIGHT STREET; NCD/HAIGHT STREET NEIGHBO; NCD/HAYES; NCD/HAYES NCT; NCD/HAYES NCT/RTO; NCD/INNER CLEMENT; NCD/INNER CLEMENT STREET; NCD/INNER SUNSET; NCD/INNER SUNSET NEIGHBOR; NCD/IRVING STREET NEIGHBO; NCD/IRVING STREET; NCD/IRVING; IRVING STREET NEIGHBO; NCD/JAPANTOWN NEIGHBORHOO; NCD/JAPANTOWN NEI; JAPANTOWN NEIGHBORHOO; NCD/JUDAH STREET NEIGHBOR; NCD/JUDAH; NCD/JUDAH STREET; JUDAH STREET NEIGHBOR; NCD/NC-1; NCD/NC-2; NCD/NC-3; NCD/NCT; NCD/NO BEACH; NCD/NORIEGA STREET NEIGHB; NCD/NORIEGA STREE; NCD/NORIEGA; NCD/NORTH BEACH NEIGHBORH; NCD/NORTH BEACH N; NCD/NORTH BEACH; NCD/NORTHBEACH; NCD/NORTH BEACH/RM-1; NCD/NORTHBEACH/RM-1; NCD/OUTER CLEMENT; NCD/OUTER CLEMENT STREET; NCD/OUTER CLEMENT STREET; NCD/PACIFIC; NCD/PACIFIC AVENU; NCD/PACIFIC/RM-3; NCD/PACIFIC;RM-3; NCD/PACIFIC AVENUE NEIGHB; NCD/POLK; NCD/POLK STREET N; NCD/POLK STREET NEIGHBORH; NCD/POLK/RC-3; NCD/POLK/RC-4; NCD/RC-3; NCD/RESIDENTIAL- HOUSE, O; NCD/RESIDENTIAL-; NCD/RM-2; NCD/RM-3; NCD/RM-3/PACIFIC; NCD/RTO; NCD/SACRAMENTO; NCD/SACRAMENTO STREET NEI; NCD/TARAVAL STREET NEIGHB; NCD/TARAVAL STREE; NCD/TARAVAL; NCD/UNION; NCD/UNION STREET; NCD/UNION STREET NEIGHBOR; NCD/UPPER FILLMORE NEIGHB; NCD/UPPER FILLMOR; NCD/UPPER FILLMORE; NCD/UPPERFILLMORE; NCD/UPPER MARKET STREET N; NCD/UPPER MARKET; NCD/UPR MARKET NC; NCD/UPR MARKET; NCD/UPR MARKET NCT; NCD/UPR MARKET NCT/; NCD/VALENCIA; NCD/WEST PORTAL; NCD/WEST PORTAL A; NCD/WEST PORTAL AVENUE NE; NCD/BAYVIEW; NCD/COLE VALLEY; NCD/CORTLAND AVENUE; NCD/GEARY BOULEVARD; NCD/GEARY BOULEVA; NCD/GEARY BOULEVARD/RH-2; NCD/GEARY BOULEVARD/RM-1; NCD/INNER BALBOA STREET; NCD/INNER BALBOA S; NCD/OUTER BALBOA STREET; NCD/ OUTER BALBOA STREET; NCD/OUTER BALBOA S; NCD/LOWER HAIGHT STREET; NCD/LOWER HAIGHT S; NCD/LOWER HAIGHT STREET/RH-3; NCD/LOWER POLK STREET; NCD/MISSION BERNAL; NCD/INNER TARAVAL STREET; NCD/INNER TARAVAL; NCD/SAN BRUNO AVENUE; NCD/LAKESIDE VILLAGE; NCD/LAKESIDE VILLAG; NC-S; NC-S/PM-R; NC-S/RM-3; NCT-DIVISADERO/RM-3; NCT/RM-3; NCT/RM-4; NO BEACH; OUTER CLEMENT; POLK; RC-3; RC-3/POLK; RC-3/RM-3; RC-4; RC-4/NC-3; RC-4/RH DTR; RC-4/RM-4; RED/SLR; RM-2; RM-2/M-1; RM-2/NC-1; RM-2/NC-2; RM-2/NO BEACH; RM-2/RM-3; RM-2/RM-4; RM-3; RM-3/NC-1; RM-3/NC-2; RM-3/NC-3; RM-3/NC-S; RM-3/RC-3; RM-3/RM-4; RM-4; RM-4/CR-NC; RM-4/NC-2; RM-4/NC-3; RM-4/RC-4; RSD; RSD/SLR; SACRAMENTO; SLR; SSO; UNION; UPR MARKET; VALENCIA; WEST PORTAL

Appendix: Zoning Classifications (Continued)

Zoning Variable	Zoning Districts
zp_Public	C-2/M-1/P; C-2/P; C-3-O(SD)/P; C-3-O/C-3-S/P; C-3-S/P; CMUO/P; P/C-3-R; P/RM-1/RH-2; P/PM-R/RM-1; P/RH-3; P/RM-1; PM-MU2/PM-OS/PM-R/RM-1; P/RH-1/RH-2; P/RH-2; P/P-W/RH-1; P/RH-1; P/RH-1(D); P/RH-1/RH-1(D); Remove; HP-RA/M-1/M-2/P; HP-RA/M-2/P; M-1/M-2/P; M-1/P; M-2/MB-OS; M-2/MB-RA/P; M-2/P; MB-O; MB-O/MB-RA; MB-OS; MB-RA/P; MUG/P; NC-2/P; NC-3/P/RM-3; NCD/P; NC-S/P; NCT/P; NCT-3/P; NCT-3/RTO; P; P/C-3-O(SD); P/M-1; P/M-2; P/MISS BAY S PL; P/MISS BAY S PLN; P/MUR; P/NC-S; P/NC-2; P/PDR-2; P/PM-OS; P/PM-OS/PM-R; P/P-W; P/RC-4; P/RM-2; P/RM-3; P/TB DTR; P/RTO-C; P, RTO-C; PM-CF; PM-CF/PM-OS; PM-CF/PM-OS/PM-R; PM-MU1/PM-OS; PM-MU2/PM-OS/PM-R; PM-OS; PM-OS/PM-R; PM-OS/PM-R/PM-S; PM-OS/PM-S; Public
zp_FBDMulti_RTO	DTR/RC-4; NCD/HAYES NCT; NCD/HAYES NCT/RTO; NCD/NCT; NCD/RTO; NCD/UPR MARKET NCT; NCD/UPR MARKET NCT/; NC-S/PM-R; NCT-DIVISADERO/RM-3; NCT/RM-3; NCT/RM-4; RC-4/RH DTR; RED/SLR; P/PM-R/RM-1; PM-MU2/PM-OS/PM-R/RM-1; MUG/P; NCT/P; NCT-3/P; NCT-3/RTO; P/MUR; P/PM-OS/PM-R; P/TB DTR; P/RTO-C; P, RTO-C; PM-CF/PM-OS/PM-R; PM-MU1/PM-OS; PM-MU2/PM-OS/PM-R; PM-OS/PM-R; PM-OS/PM-R/PM-S; C-3-O(SD)/TB DTR; C-3-O/TB DTR; CMUO/MUR; NCT-DIVISADERO/RH-3; NCT-DIVISADERO/RM-1; NCT/RH-3; NCT/RM-1; PM-R/RM-1; MUR/RH-2; NCT-GLEN PARK/RH-2; NCT-OCEAN/RH-2; NCT/RH-2; NCT-OCEAN/RH-1(D); NCT/RH-1(D); DTR; DTR/M-1; M-1/RH DTR; M-2/MR-MU; M-2/P70-MU; MB-RA/MR-MU; MR-MU; MUG; MUG/RED; MUR; NCT; NCT-DIVISADERO; NCT-FOLSOM; NCT-GLEN PARK; NCT-HAYES; NCT-HAYES/RTO; NCT-HAYES/RTO-1; NCT-MISSION; NCT-UPPER MARKET; NCT-UPPER MARKET;; NCT-UPPER MARKET/RH-2; NCT-UPPER MARKET/RH-3; NCT-OCEAN; NCT-SOMA; NCT/NCT-3; NCT/RCD; NCT/RED-MX; NCT/RTO; NCT/RTO-M; NCT/UMU; NCT-1; NCT-2; NCT-3; NCT-3/NCT-HAYES; RTO-1/NCT-3; RTO/NCT-3; P70-MU; PDR-1-D/UMU; PDR-1-G/UMU; PM-MU1; PM-MU1/PM-R; PM-MU2/PM-R; PM-MU2; PM-R; RCD; RED; RED-MX; RED-MX/WMUG; RH DTR; RH DTR/SB-DTR; RH DTR/TB DTR; RTO; RTO-1; RTO/NCT; RTO-1/RTO-C; RTO-C; RTO-M; SB-DTR; SPD; TB DTR; UMU; WMUG
zp_PDRInd	DTR/M-1; M-1/RH DTR; M-2/MR-MU; M-2/P70-MU; PDR-1-D/UMU; PDR-1-G/UMU; M-1/NC-2; M-1/RM-2; M-1/RSD; NC-2/M-1; RM-2/M-1; C-2/M-1/P; HP-RA/M-1/M-2/P; HP-RA/M-2/P; M-1/M-2/P; M-1/P; M-2/MB-OS; M-2/MB-RA/P; M-2/P; P/M-1; P/M-2; P/PDR-2; C-2/M-1; C-M/M-1; RH-1/RH-2/RM-1; M-1/RH-2/RM-1; M-1/RM-1; M-2/RH-3; RH-3/M-2; M-1/RH-1; RH-1/M-1; HP-RA/M-1; HP-RA/M-2; M-1; M-1/M-1; M-1/M-2; M-1/PDR-1-B; M-1/PDR-2; M-2; M-2 (MB); M-2/MB-RA; M-2/PDR-2; M-2/SLI; MISS BAY S PLN/M-2; MISS BAY S PL; MISS BAY S PLN; MISS BAY S PLN/M-; PDR-1; PDR-1/PDR-2; PDR-1-B; PDR-1-B/PDR-2; PDR-1-D; PDR-1-G; PDR-2; SALI; SLI; SLI/M-2
zp_Redev	HP-RA/M-1/M-2/P; HP-RA/M-2/P; M-2/MB-RA/P; HP-RA/M-1; HP-RA/M-2; M-2/MB-RA; MISS BAY S PLN/M-2; MISS BAY S PL; MISS BAY S PLN; MISS BAY S PLN/M-; MB-RA/MR-MU; MB-O/MB-RA; MB-RA/P; P/MISS BAY S PL; P/MISS BAY S PLN; HP-RA/RM-1; HP-RA; MB-RA; MISS BAY N RED; MISS BAY N RED PLN; MISS BAY N RED PL; MISS BAY S RED; MISS BAY S RED PLN; MISS BAY S RED PL

Appendix: Logic of Applying the Model

- This section of the appendix describes in more detail how the model was used to produce estimates of future housing production.
- For the existing zoning ("baseline"), the application of the model is straightforward. Current zoning was encoded using the zoning classification on the previous page, and current allowable height was used as the height variable in the logistic regression, and to calculate building envelope in the units regression.
- For the proposed rezoning ("policy"), the logic used was as follows: based on the units regression, each 1000 square feet of building envelope results in 0.42 units. The State Density Bonus adds an additional 0.44 units. Parcels that elect to use the Local Program therefore need to accommodate at least 0.44 additional units per 1000 square feet of envelope if developers are to choose this option. For parcels where the Local Program was more desirable, and on parcels that are ineligible for the SDB, because their zoning and size prevents them from building more than 5 units, the Local Program was applied. For all other parcels the SDB was used.

Appendix: Logic of Applying the Model (Continued)

- Probabilities and units for any parcel using the State Density Bonus were calculated by:
  - In the logistic regression, using the first new height in the rezoning table for Height_Ft and in the Env_1000_Area_Height calculation.
  - In the units regression, using the first new height in the rezoning table to calculate Env_1000_Area_Height;
  - Incorporating the SDB_2016_5Plus_EnvFull effect;
  - Incorporating the Zoning_DR_EnvFull if applicable (i.e. the parcel is density-restricted.

Appendix: Logic of Applying the Model (Continued)

- Probabilities and units for any parcel using the Local Program were calculated by:
  - In the logistic regression, setting zp_FBDMulti_RTO = 1, to account for the relaxation of density controls in the Local Program;
  - In the logistic regression, using the second new height in the rezoning table for Height_Ft and in the Env_1000_Area_Height calculation.
  - In the units regression, using the second new height in the rezoning table to calculate Env_1000_Area_Height;
  - In the units regression, removing the SDB_2016_5Plus_EnvFull effect;
  - In the units regression, removing the Zoning_DR_EnvFull effect.

Appendix: Business Disruption / Relocation Costs

- The analysis makes the following assumptions about business disruption and relocation costs:
  - Lost space will be 10% vacant, so 90% of the loss represents the loss of occupied space.
  - Lost business net income (for 6 months of disruption): $5/occupied square foot.
  - Fixed labor costs (for 6 months): $10/occupied square foot.
  - Moving costs and build-out of space at new premises: $175/occupied square foot

Staff Contact

Ted Egan, Ph.D., Chief Economist ted.egan@sfgov.org

From:	Jane Natoli
To:	paul.mcdougall@hcd.ca.gov
Cc:	gustavo.velasquez@hcd.ca.gov; melinda.coy@hcd.ca.gov; Zisser, David@HCD; megan.kirkeby@hcd.ca.gov; shannan.west@hcd.ca.gov; Frank, Lisa@HCD; Herrera, Fidel@HCD; matthew.struhar@doj.ca.gov; david.pai@doj.ca.gov; alex.fisch@doj.ca.gov; Annie Fryman; Tanner, Rachael (CPC); Chen, Lisa (CPC); Sonja Trauss; matt@caforhomes.org; senator.wiener@senate.ca.gov; Severiano.Christian@sen.ca.gov; Mohtashemi, Raayan; David Broockman; Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Supervisors; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Bonde, Aly (MYR); Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC)
Subject:	SF YIMBY"s letter on the City Economist"s report
Date:	Wednesday, October 29, 2025 4:13:34 PM
Attachments:	SF YIMBY FZP Letter October 29 2025.pdf

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

Hello,

We are writing to urgently draw your attention to the just released report from the City Economist that shows San Francisco's rezoning will not meet our state housing requirements. Please see our attached letter, and let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you,

--

Jane Natoli (she/her)
San Francisco Organizing Director
415-335-9950

Check out everything we achieved in 2024!

Paul McDougall, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Mayor Daniel Lurie
San Francisco Board of Supervisors (re: file #250700)
October 29, 2025

We write to urgently draw your attention to **an analysis the City of San Francisco ("SF") released that finds that its own rezoning plan would violate state law.** The Family Zoning Plan ("FZP") is a significant step forward, but the city's analysis found that it will not meet the city's Housing Element's 36,282-unit requirement. **According to the city's own numbers, state law requires the city to conduct additional rezoning beyond the FZP.**

As a reminder, in 2022, the California Department of Housing and Community Development ("HCD") suggested that, instead of a traditional sites inventory, SF instead pledge to assess the capacity of its rezoning using the method from its underutilized sites analysis (a model called BlueSky, which estimates the likelihood of development). Housing Element Program 7.1.1 thus committed that SF's rezoning "shall reasonably account for sites' likelihood of development during the planning period using an analytical model."

SF's August submission to HCD revealed that SF still had not done so (see Appendix). HCD thus instructed SF that "As part of Program 7.1.1 and using analytical models to account for a site's likelihood of development in the planning period, the city should continue to explore additional and multiple methods and make adjustments as appropriate."

Today, SF did so: its City Economist reported that he used an updated version of the BlueSky analytical model—the same method HCD originally suggested SF use—to estimate the number of units the FZP will likely develop. **He reported that, in the best case scenario, the City's analytical model finds that the FZP is only likely to develop 14,646 units by 2045, far less than the 36,282 required by 2031** under 7.1.1. In other words, **using the exact method HCD suggested SF use, the City itself has found that its rezoning plan does not meet Program 7.1.1's requirements, and is around 10 times too small.**

Gov. Code § 65588(e)(4)(C)(iii) states, "If a jurisdiction...fails to complete the required rezoning within the time period required, the jurisdiction's adopted housing element shall be subject to" the housing element decertification process. Thus, **if SF fails to expand its plan, HCD will be legally obliged to begin the decertification process**.

We encourage HCD to offer SF guidance about how to bring its proposed rezoning into compliance, building on HCD's recent guidance to the city to "make adjustments as appropriate" when more analysis was made available. For example, using recent changes in state law (e.g., SB 131, SB 79), additional rezoning or policy changes that supplement the FZP (e.g., reduced fees and exactions) could be passed within months. Given the timeline required for decertification, HCD could reasonably offer SF up to six months before the builders' remedy would apply to fully complete its "required rezoning" through such a supplement.

Confirming that SF must rely on the City Economist's updated BlueSky analytical model to assess the rezoning's capacity, as well as the actions taken to satisfy Program 8.1.5 (the "circuit breaker"), would also be consistent with HCD's recent direction to the city to "us[e] conservative assumptions...that facilitate the highest housing outcomes."

SF's actions risk paving a path for other cities to evade state law. In particular, rather than "demonstrat[ing] that the existing use [on each non-vacant site] does not constitute an impediment to additional residential development" (Gov. Code, § 65583.2(g)), cities will be tempted to follow SF: promise in a Housing Element to provide this evidence later in the form of statistical analysis—but then ignore what this evidence shows when rezoning.

Best regards,

Salim Damerdji

Volunteer Lead, San Francisco YIMBY

Jane Natoli

San Francisco Organizing Director,

YIMBY Action

CC: Gustavo Velasquez, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Megan Kirkeby, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Melinda Coy, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Shannan West, California Department of Housing and Community Development
David Zisser, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Lisa Frank, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Fidel Herrera, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Alex Fisch, California Department of Justice
Matthew Struhar, California Department of Justice
David Pai, California Department of Justice
Annie Fryman, SPUR
Aly Bonde, Office of Mayor Daniel Lurie
Sarah Dennis-Phillips, Rachael Tanner, and Lisa Chen, San Francisco Planning
Sonja Trauss, YIMBY Law
Matt Gelfand, Californians for Homeownership
Senator Scott Wiener

Appendix: Why the Planning Department's methods do not satisfy the Housing Element's requirement to "reasonably account for sites' likelihood of development during the planning period using an analytical model"

The San Francisco Planning Department's August 1 submission to HCD contained three analyses of the capacity provided by its rezoning. None of these analyses satisfy Program 7.1.1's commitment to "reasonably account for sites' likelihood of development during the planning period using an analytical model." The below details why each of the Planning Department's methods do not satisfy this requirement. Indeed, a closer look at the Planning Department's analyses suggests conclusions that are in line with the City Economist's finding that the rezoning is insufficient.

"Soft Sites Method"

Under this method, the vast majority of the rezoning's capacity is from sites without existing residential uses (but that largely have other uses). The Planning Department assumes that 70% of these sites will be developed to their maximum capacity during the planning period. This 70% assumption is not "reasonabl[e]" (and certainly not "conservative" like the city claims):

1. In San Francisco, fewer than 70% of entitled projects are ultimately developed — making it implausible that 70% of all sites without residential use will be developed, even those where no interest has been expressed in development or discontinuing existing uses. As another comparison, the Terner Center found that only 8.6% of LA's very best sites are developed over 5 years (versus SF's 70% assumption across a huge number of sites).
2. These sites largely do have other non-residential uses which make their development especially improbable. For example, the first page of SF's parcel list includes 1201-05 Columbus Avenue, a 3-story Travelodge in Fisherman's Wharf. The city assumes there is a 70% chance that properties like this will be redeveloped during the planning period.
3. The city's related assertion that 2% of sites with existing residential uses will be redeveloped during the planning period is similarly made without evidence.

This approach also allows the city to evade complying with GC 65583.2(g)'s requirement that the city provide substantial evidence that existing uses on "lower income" sites are likely to be discontinued during the planning period. The city has not provided site-specific evidence supporting their assertion that most sites with existing non-residential uses will be developed during the planning period. The lack of site-specific evidence would not be a problem if the city had provided statistical evidence (i.e., had statistically estimated what percent of these sites will have their existing use discontinued during the planning period based on historical data, as action 7.1.1 promises). But the Planning Department simply provides no evidence whatsoever that 70% of sites with existing non-residential uses will be developed, either site-specific or

statistical. This 70% figure is simply fabricated — not from “an analytical model,” and it is not at all “reasonable.”

“Citywide Capacity Method”

This method calculates what share of the city’s remaining zoned capacity was developed annually over the last 18 years (2005-2023). It then assumes the new capacity created by the rezoning will be developed at a similar annual rate.

While reasonable in theory, there are several errors and problems with how the Planning Department is implementing this approach that make it not “reasonabl[e]” in practice:

1. The city has two versions of this approach, each with errors:
    a. The primary version (with “exclusions”) divides citywide development by the amount of capacity on only a subset of parcels. This overstates the rate at which capacity historically translates into development because less capacity is considered despite all development being considered. This is like computing the average grades of all students in a class by adding up all students’ grades but then dividing this total by half the number of students there are in the class.
    b. The city describes another version of the method that measures capacity on all parcels but uses Planning entitlements to measure development; during this period there were 90K entitlements but only 53K building permits. Using entitlements to measure development overstates the historical development rate, as in San Francisco many entitlements are never developed (in part due to constraints the city places on development).
2. The city’s statistic that 53K units were constructed citywide 2005-2023 includes development from development agreements (DAs). By counting historical DA development when computing the rate at which historical zoned capacity is developed, the city therefore assumes that the rezoning will produce new DA development during this planning period. This is unreasonable, as DAs do not result from (re)zoning. Furthermore, the city’s housing element already counted expected development from DAs during the planning period in its claims of existing capacity.
3. Parcels where projects have been proposed but have not received permits are excluded from the city’s calculation of its historical capacity; this leads the city to underestimate how much historical capacity it had, and therefore overstate the development rate of its capacity.
4. The new rezoned capacity is also less developable than the existing remaining capacity. Specifically, according to the city’s Bluesky model (the model it used for its underutilized sites analysis), the new capacity is about 20% less likely to be developed. This is because, for example, rezoned capacity is 3x more likely to be on sites with an existing residential use than existing capacity. It’s therefore not entirely reasonable to assume that the city’s historical rate of development will manifest for the new capacity.

5. The Planning Department is relying on its UrbanSim tool to measure its remaining zoned capacity (313K). But the city's housing element (Sites Inventory Appendix B2 p. 4) gives a much larger number for this (572K), as do our own calculations. Insofar as the city is now understating how much capacity it has, it is therefore overstating the rate at which that capacity has been developed. We have asked for data that would help us understand this discrepancy, but the city has indicated that its UrbanSim tool is unable to provide the underlying data that supports this 313K calculation.

When addressing the first four errors and issues above, and when using the city's housing element's estimate that the city has 572K units of capacity remaining (see point 5), the historical development rate is 0.4% and the adjusted capacity of the rezoning is therefore 10K units.

"Financial Feasibility Method"

The Planning Department has contracted with UrbanSim to estimate whether development will be economically feasible on rezoned parcels. While this analysis is welcome, there are several problems with this approach:

1. Totaling the amount of economically feasible development does not "account for sites' likelihood of development." Historically, only a fraction of economically feasible units are actually developed, and some research practitioners have advised us that there is nearly an order of magnitude difference between the two.
2. The Planning Department's economic assumptions are not "reasonabl[e]": the Department assumes that construction costs, interest rates, and developer return expectations will drop without providing evidence. It also assumes rents will jump. The Department justifies these optimistic assumptions by asserting that it is only responsible for making housing feasible to develop under better economic conditions than are likely during this planning period — but action 7.1.1 commits to providing enough capacity to make 36K units likely developed during this planning period. Furthermore, the city's poor economic environment for development reflects the city's constraints on development that Housing Element Law is supposed to remediate. I.e., the fact that the city so heavily constrains development makes more rezoning (and changes to its other policies) necessary, and cannot be ignored when considering the appropriate scope of actions to accommodate development.
3. The Department's submission describes a flawed approach for using UrbanSim's output to account for the likelihood of development: asserting that 2% of economically feasible projects will occur on sites with existing residential uses and 35% of economically feasible projects will occur on sites with other non-residential uses. These assumptions are not based on any evidence and, for the same reasons we described in the context of the "soft sites" method, are not reasonable.
4. After applying this flawed approach for accounting for the likelihood of development, the Planning Department nevertheless finds that only 19K units will be developed during the planning period. This is short of the 36K required by action 7.1.1. The Planning

Department argues that this is acceptable because the method must only demonstrate sufficient capacity for meeting the city's 16K RHNA shortfall in the Moderate and Above-Moderate income categories. But action 7.1.1 makes no reference to separate by-category targets, it simply states that the rezoning must "accommodate… approximately 36,282 new units." Furthermore, the Department's argument is also belied by the Housing Element Law and the No Net Loss Law, both of which contemplate development of market-rate and mixed-income projects on "lower income" sites (GC 65583.2(c) & (h); GC 65863(c)(2)).

From:	BOS Legislation, (BOS)
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS)
Cc:	BOS Legislation, (BOS)
Subject:	FW: Public Comment – 875 Lombard St (Technical Map Correction, Files 250700 / 250701)
Date:	Monday, October 27, 2025 9:17:48 AM
Attachments:	Exhibit A – 875 Lombard St Height Correction Map.pdf

---

From: Kenneth Kim <ken.ei.kim@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 27, 2025 9:15 AM
To: CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>; BOS Legislation, (BOS) <bos.legislation@sfgov.org>
Cc: Andrews, Michelle (BOS) <michelle.andrews@sfgov.org>; SauterStaff <SauterStaff@sfgov.org>
Subject: Public Comment – 875 Lombard St (Technical Map Correction, Files 250700 / 250701)

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

Dear Commission Secretary and Supervisors,

I support the Expanding Housing Choice / Family Zoning proposal and request a technical map correction for 875 Lombard Street (Block 0073, Lot 017B, APN 0073017B).

My parcel is shown as 40//40-R-4, while the immediately adjacent parcel (APN 0073018) and all parcels directly across Lombard Street are 40//50-R-4, all within RM-1. The attached Exhibit A illustrates a single-parcel discontinuity.

Extending the 40//50-R-4 Local Program Height one parcel west to include 875 Lombard would not change the underlying use (it remains RM-1) but would:

• restore consistent streetwall and block-face form,

• support gentle-density objectives in RM-1 under the Local Program framework, and

• add incremental Housing Element capacity without altering neighborhood character.

Thank you for considering this technical correction for inclusion in the final map clean-ups for Files 250700 / 250701.

Sincerely,

Kenneth Kim

Owner – 875 Lombard Street, San Francisco, CA 94133

917-891-1805 | ken.ei.kim@gmail.com

Attachment: Exhibit A – 875 Lombard St Height Correction Map.pdf


San Francisco Planning
Expanding Housing Choice (Proposed Zoning Map)
Legend
Info
Layers
Imagery
PDF
Help
Legend
Rezoning September 2025 Ordinance (Board File 250700 - v3)
Proposed Local Program Height Limits (September 2025)
40'
50'
65'
85'
105'
120'
130'
140'
160'
180'
240'
250'
300'
350'
875 LOMBARD ST, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNI...
Search result
Proposed Height District (September 2025)
Zoom to
Parcel 0073017B
Block 0073
Lot 017B
Proposed Local Program Height 40//40-R-4
Proposed Base Height 40
Existing Height District 40-X
Supervisor District 3
Existing Zoning District RM-1
Proposed Zoning District No change
All opposite parcels: 40//50-R-4 Local Program Height
0073017B – 40//40-R-4 875 Lombard
0073018 -40//50-R-4 869 Lombard
Columbus Ave
Francisco St
Houston St
Water St
Mason St
Taylor St
Jones St
Jansen St
Greenwich St
Valparaiso St
Filbert St
Scotland St
Via Bufano
Stockton St
DiMaggio Playground
Michelangelo Playground
875 Lombard St (0073017B) – Single-parcel discontinuity in proposed Local Program Height (40//40-R-4 vs. 40//50-R-4 adjacent)
Source: San Francisco Planning Department – Expanding Housing Choice (Proposed Zoning Map, Sept 2025).
Esri Community Maps Contributors, California State Parks, © OpenStreetMap, Microsoft, Esri, TomTom, Garmin, SafeGraph, GeoTechnologies, Inc, METI/NASA, USGS, Bureau of Land Management, EPA, NPS, US Census Bureau, USDA, USFWS
Powered by Esri

From: Tamila Wong
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 8:02:32 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Tamila Wong
tamilawong@yahoo.com
106 Byxbee St
San Francisco , California 94132

From: shelbyville500@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Shelby Campbell
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Saturday, October 25, 2025 1:32:37 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan resident, I oppose parts of Mayor Lurie's plan. Residents deserve the opportunity to have more input in the process.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees. Together, these plans prioritize the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent.

I provided my comments to the Planning Department's proposed upzoning of the Sunset. I was very much in support of the upzoning of transportation corridors that run perpendicular to the ocean, with two exceptions:
1. Consider not upzoning past Sunset Blvd or maybe as far as 44th Avenue on these corridors, to preserve the coastal environment of the outer Sunset.
2. Strongly oppose high rises at the beach. If you grant an exception for the investor on Sloat, you will set a precedent for a row of high rises at the beach, destroying the open space and coastal environment that defines the Outer Sunset.

We hope you will take the neighborhood's comments into consideration in making decisions about our community.

Sincerely,
Shelby Campbell
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: Vivienne Hay
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Saturday, October 25, 2025 12:56:06 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Vivienne Hay
vivienne.l.hay@gmail.com
1495 Golden Gate Avenue, Apt 207
San Francisco, California 94115

From: eugenemccarthy63@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Eugene McCarthy
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Saturday, October 25, 2025 8:44:26 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Eugene McCarthy

From: Sophia Hagy
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 24, 2025 4:32:17 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

To whom it may concern,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more

than ever!

Sincerely,
Sophia Hagy
San Francisco community member and Paraeducator for SFUSD

Sophia Hagy
sophiahagy@gmail.com
1302 York Street
San Francisco, California 94110

From: ROMALYN SCHMALTZ
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 3:05:32 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Romalyn Schmaltz

ROMALYN SCHMALTZ
romalynschmaltz@gmail.com
740 Union St
San Francisco, California 94133-2747

From: Kate Blumberg
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 2:10:33 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan. I live in a rent-controlled apartment in D10. Over the 24 years we have lived here, we have seen the incredible benefits that more housing can bring to support a thriving local business community and a more walkable and vibrant neighborhood. But only do the small business districts sprinkled throughout our neighborhoods need more homes to thrive, the citizens of San Francisco need more homes to provide the flexibility and affordability that can help us stay in this great city even if our circumstances change.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes in every corner of our city — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

I know there are several amendments proposed, some of which make sense and others which would weaken the plan. I especially support providing funds and resources to small businesses to help them weather change and incentives for larger family units to be built. While in theory I like the idea of any incentive to get builders building, I don't think a strict time clock would help in these turbulent times.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Kate Blumberg
kate@acmetron.com
2002 22nd. St
San Francisco, California 94107-3204

From: Ted.Hexter@proton.me
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 2:03:34 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Ted.Hexter@proton.me
1670 Market Street Apt 68
San Francisco, California 94102

From: elizbreilly@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Elizabeth Reilly
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 1:40:40 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Elizabeth Reilly
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: Cheryl Meeker
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 12:58:52 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Do not be manipulated into destroying rent controlled units and small businesses with this zoning change.

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the

private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Cheryl Meeker
cherylmeeker@gmail.com
1296 Haight St Apt 28
San Francisco, California 94117

From: rout.rishav@gmail.com
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 11:19:39 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Rishav Rout

rout.rishav@gmail.com
1075 Valencia St, Apt 1
San Francisco, California 94110

From: sayuri.anya@gmail.com
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 10:00:25 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

sayuri.anya@gmail.com
38 Tacoma St
SAN FRANCISCO, California 94118

From: alvatenebrae@gmail.com
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 9:53:16 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning plan will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis. It will accelerate displacement, enrich developers, and prioritize luxury units over homes for working people. Without significant amendments, this plan will make the housing crisis worse, not better.

There is a way forward that meets State density requirements while protecting renters, preserving small businesses, and delivering truly affordable housing. Any upzoning plan must include these transformative policies. Establish an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to guarantee a minimum of 50% genuinely affordable homes on large opportunity parcels. Protect all 100,000 rent-controlled homes – representing 200,000 people – from this plan. Our elected officials have already prioritized preserving people's homes.

Require more, not fewer, affordable units. Reject any scheme to swap BMR homes for market-rate units. Raise the BMR inclusionary requirement to 20% on-site so that new construction actually benefits working San Franciscans. Build for families. Require 50% of units to be 2-3 bedrooms with communal living spaces. Protect small businesses. Prohibit demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses. Require developers to cover relocation costs starting at $150k and provide turn-key "warm shell" improvements for displaced tenants.

Ensure workers who build our city receive a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements across all projects. Protect public space and our coast. Prevent the privatization or development of protected waterfront land. Go beyond the Mayor's plan. Push a real affordable housing financing strategy. Leverage state and federal support instead of relying on private developers or Downtown donors.

San Francisco's housing crisis is a product of systemic inequality. It is time for bold, people-first policies that confront developers' greed, protect working people, and ensure housing is a right, not a commodity. We need leadership that will fight for the city's residents, not developers' profits.

alvatenebrae@gmail.com
1177 Market St Apt 1432
San Francisco, California 94103

From: slpretti@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sharon Pretti
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 9:12:17 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

I've lived in the Richmond district for over 30 years. These changes would be devasting to renters like me, to seniors, and to families living and working in SF. This proposed plan is NOT a viable way to create affordable housing. It is reckless and harmful and will leave many people without housing. Also, I think it's reprehensible to put small businesses at risk. Neighborhood communities and small businesses are what define SF, NOT luxury high rises designed for the wealthy.

PLEASE work to scale back this very dangerous upzoning plan.

Sincerely,
Sharon Pretti
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: Charlie Musoff
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: All Eyes on the Mayor's RV Ban - No Tows Before Housing!
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 9:11:21 AM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to strongly protest the implementation of Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on oversize vehicle parking. RV residents, advocates, and media are all reporting exactly what we all feared: a rushed, inadequate rollout that clears the way for the Mayor to pursue his true goal of reducing visible poverty no matter the human cost.

Many longtime San Francisco RV residents were not included in the May 31st, 2025 count of vehicles that the City used to create the refuge permit eligibility list. Appeals are cumbersome and require large amounts of documentation and a five-day wait for a response - all done against an only month-long timeline before tows take place. The City has also arbitrarily tightened appeal requirements - going from requiring proof of residence at any time before May 31st, to an arbitrary window between March and May 2025.

Some permits are being issued, but outreach has been utterly inadequate, with RV residents just two blocks away from HOT team events unaware they're occurring. Into these gaps, a patchwork of groups, including RV residents, the Coalition on Homelessness and DSA SF members, are stepping up to try to ensure eligible residents get permits. We can't - and shouldn't - have to do this work against a manufactured deadline of November 1st.

To prevent irreparable harm to our neighbors living in RVs, this is what we're demanding:

1. Provide transparent reporting on the program before tows take place, including permits issued, appeal statistics, number of RV residents who attended outreach events, and number and type of housing offers made to RV residents.
2. Have outreach workers go door to door to issue permits to all RV residents currently on the permit eligibility list. RV residents already on the permit eligibility list should be automatically given permits. Until all permits have been issued, have SFMTA workers validate if an oversize vehicle is permit-eligible using license plate numbers before ticketing / towing.
3. Delay implementation of the November 1st towing deadline. If tows occur, ensure multiple warnings are given before towing vehicles. until permits can be issued.
4. Restore the original time window for appeals eligibility - documents showing an RV resident was present before May 31st, 2025 should be honored by the City. Expand the acceptable documents list to include Additional acceptable documents Acceptable documents must include enrollment at SFUSD or childcare, letters from employers, enrollment in benefits or Coordinated Entry, letters from medical or social service providers that residents you are receiving services in SF, or pictures/videos of vehicle with geolocation and time stamps (e.g. Google Maps streetview).

5. Issue short-term permits for RV residents currently appealing their permit status or with appeal hearings scheduled once the 2-hour parking limit goes into effect.
6. Provide direct, real-time support in troubleshooting appeals (not just a web portal), including establishing a permanent physical location, run by HSH or another department, for RV residents to ask questions.
7. For appeals, SFMTA must also cross reference anyone's ineligibility with already existing parking and tow records. Rather than putting the onus on RV residents to find a ticket record, the SFMTA should provide the record when someone is appealing.
8. Ensure housing offers that are given to permit recipients are provided in writing, and that residents have a transparent, well-documented system for refusing offers that don't work for them without losing their refuge permits.
9. Have family providers do mobile Coordinated Entry registration at city information sessions for RV residents.
10. For residents that accept an offer of temporary shelter, continue to provide a refuge permit or alternative parking for their vehicle until a permanent housing offer is made.

Our City owes RV residents more than a month of chaotic bureaucracy, inaccurate AI, and half-hearted outreach before towing their homes. Thank you for your attention and action.

Sincerely,

Charlie Musoff
charliemusoff@gmail.com
507 Bartlett St
San Francisco, California 94110

From: mary@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of MARY THOMAS
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 8:47:05 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS WE WILL NEVER HAVE ENOUGH AFFORDABLE HOUSING UNLESS YOU RAISE THE FEE DEVELOPERS HAVE TO PAY IF THEY OMIT THE 15% AFFORDABLE HOUSING... THE CURRENT FEES ARE NOT HIGH ENOUGH AND JUST BURRIED IN THE SALE PRICE OF UNITS AND GIVES SAN FRANCISCANS WHO NEEED LOW INCOME HOUSING NO HOPE... JUST MORE RISING COSTS OF HOUSING - DO THE MATH

Sincerely,
MARY THOMAS
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: Olivia Page
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 11:22:31 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Olivia Page

Olivia Page
oliviaindigopage@gmail.com
780 Shotwell St
San Francisco , California 94110

From: jeanettercool@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jeanette Cool
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 10:21:16 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Jeanette Cool
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: Nick DeRenzi
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: All Eyes on the Mayor's RV Ban - No Tows Before Housing!
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 9:33:04 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to strongly protest the implementation of Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on oversize vehicle parking. RV residents, advocates, and media are all reporting exactly what we all feared: a rushed, inadequate rollout that clears the way for the Mayor to pursue his true goal of reducing visible poverty no matter the human cost.

Many longtime San Francisco RV residents were not included in the May 31st, 2025 count of vehicles that the City used to create the refuge permit eligibility list. Appeals are cumbersome and require large amounts of documentation and a five-day wait for a response - all done against an only month-long timeline before tows take place. The City has also arbitrarily tightened appeal requirements - going from requiring proof of residence at any time before May 31st, to an arbitrary window between March and May 2025.

Some permits are being issued, but outreach has been utterly inadequate, with RV residents just two blocks away from HOT team events unaware they're occurring. Into these gaps, a patchwork of groups, including RV residents, the Coalition on Homelessness and DSA SF members, are stepping up to try to ensure eligible residents get permits. We can't - and shouldn't - have to do this work against a manufactured deadline of November 1st.

To prevent irreparable harm to our neighbors living in RVs, this is what we're demanding:

1. Provide transparent reporting on the program before tows take place, including permits issued, appeal statistics, number of RV residents who attended outreach events, and number and type of housing offers made to RV residents.
2. Have outreach workers go door to door to issue permits to all RV residents currently on the permit eligibility list. RV residents already on the permit eligibility list should be automatically given permits. Until all permits have been issued, have SFMTA workers validate if an oversize vehicle is permit-eligible using license plate numbers before ticketing / towing.
3. Delay implementation of the November 1st towing deadline. If tows occur, ensure multiple warnings are given before towing vehicles. until permits can be issued.
4. Restore the original time window for appeals eligibility - documents showing an RV resident was present before May 31st, 2025 should be honored by the City. Expand the acceptable documents list to include Additional acceptable documents Acceptable documents must include enrollment at SFUSD or childcare, letters from employers, enrollment in benefits or Coordinated Entry, letters from medical or social service providers that residents you are receiving services in SF, or pictures/videos of vehicle with geolocation and time stamps (e.g. Google Maps streetview).

5. Issue short-term permits for RV residents currently appealing their permit status or with appeal hearings scheduled once the 2-hour parking limit goes into effect.
6. Provide direct, real-time support in troubleshooting appeals (not just a web portal), including establishing a permanent physical location, run by HSH or another department, for RV residents to ask questions.
7. For appeals, SFMTA must also cross reference anyone's ineligibility with already existing parking and tow records. Rather than putting the onus on RV residents to find a ticket record, the SFMTA should provide the record when someone is appealing.
8. Ensure housing offers that are given to permit recipients are provided in writing, and that residents have a transparent, well-documented system for refusing offers that don't work for them without losing their refuge permits.
9. Have family providers do mobile Coordinated Entry registration at city information sessions for RV residents.
10. For residents that accept an offer of temporary shelter, continue to provide a refuge permit or alternative parking for their vehicle until a permanent housing offer is made.

Our City owes RV residents more than a month of chaotic bureaucracy, inaccurate AI, and half-hearted outreach before towing their homes. Thank you for your attention and action.

Sincerely,

Nick D

Nick DeRenzi
nickderenziphoto@gmail.com
2808 Golden Gate Ave
San Francisco, California 94118

From: Cecily Gardner
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 8:00:28 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Cecily Gardner
gardner.cecily@gmail.com
3627 21st St
San Francisco , California 94114

From: ramon lazo
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 5:41:46 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
R Lazo

ramon lazo
9guj0037j@hotmail.com
193 gladstone drive
san francisco, ca

From: Thomas Plagemann
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 5:31:16 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely, Thomas Plagemann

Thomas Plagemann
thosplag@sbcglobal.net
762 Capp St
San Francisco , California 94110

From: dj@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Diane Josephs
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 4:48:42 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Diane Josephs
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: Julia Diaz
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 3:18:53 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Julia Diaz
jmdiaz2016@g.ucla.edu
3841 24th st
San Francisco , California 94114

From: David Alexander
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 2:33:00 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I am a parent of two SFUSD students. We badly need housing for families on the Westside and beyond. The current housing availability is untenable and needs to change.

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

thank you,

Dave Alexander

David Alexander
alexanderdavid415@gmail.com
2806 Anza St
San Francisco, California 94121

From: msmarlomunoz@yahoo.com
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 2:31:31 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Marlo Dowell

msmarlomunoz@yahoo.com

San Francisco, California 94114

From: nieberding3@gmail.com
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 1:27:35 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

nieberding3@gmail.com
18 10th St Apt 640
San Francisco, California 94103

From: Edward Sullivan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 12:14:23 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Edward Sullivan
efsullyjr@aol.com
2448 Great Hwy Apt 14
San Francisco, California 94116

From: Jim Chappell
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 9:38:29 AM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Jim Chappell
jimchappellsf@gmail.com
708 Guerrero St
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Francesca P
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 8:57:28 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Francesca P
ballets.lank_0z@icloud.com
Po Box 460703
San Francisco, California 94146

From: Ben Wessel
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: I support the family zoning plan
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 8:28:11 AM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Hi Board of Supervisors --

My name is Ben Wessel, I live in the Inner Sunset, and I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan. This year, my wife and I were fortunate enough to move out of our small rent-controlled apartment into a condo on Judah Street, an opportunity that made it easier for us to decide to have a child -- and our daughter Mika was born just two weeks ago! Unfortunately, for many of our friends who we've met in the neighborhood over the last ten years, the cost to move into a bigger place or even buy a place was too high for them to stay in the city. We've lost four different families from our friend crew who have all moved to Oakland to find more affordable places to live or more space. Each of these families told us they would have stayed in SF if they could have found a place like our condo.

I guess I write all this because I just wish San Francisco was a place that my friends could see themselves for years to come, the way that I do. I don't know if this plan will get that done, but it seems better than doing nothing. Let me know if you have better ideas.

Thanks,
Ben

PS: Here's the boilerplate language from the Housing Action Coalition that I think you've probably all read already: "San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future."

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration."

Ben Wessel
benkwessel@gmail.com

937 Judah Street
San Francisco, California 94122

From: Eric Baird
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 8:26:44 AM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Eric Baird
erichansb@gmail.com
141 Scott Street
San Francisco, California 94117

From: Meg Kammerud
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please Support Family Zoning Plan - SF Needs More Homes of All Sorts in Every Neighborhood
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 8:18:18 AM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan. I am a long-time District 8 home owner and support bringing more housing to my neighborhood -- and every neighborhood across our city. We must not let individuals or individual neighborhoods dismantle a plan that will make all of San Francisco better and more livable, somewhere my children may be able to not only grow up but stay.

I support Supervisor Melgar's small-business fund, and Supervisors Sherrill and Sauter's amendment to encourage larger family units (2-3 bedrooms). These strengthen the plan without risking state compliance.

I strongly oppose any proposal to exclude residential sites from rezoning or impose any restrictions that would undercut housing capacity and jeopardize our state housing obligations.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and the original plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Sincerely,
Meg Kammerud
Glen Park

Meg Kammerud
meg.kammerud@gmail.com
810 Congo St
San Francisco, California 94131

From: Ted Neranchi
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 8:01:05 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Ted Neranchi
tneranchi@gmail.com
296 Guttenberg St
San Francisco, California 94112

From: Tim Colen
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 7:18:40 AM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Tim Colen
timcolen@gmail.com
1501 Greenwich St, Unit 502
San Francisco, California 94123

From: Alan Billingsley
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 2:54:35 AM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Alan Billingsley
alanbillingsley215@gmail.com
215 Eureka St
San Francisco , California 94114

From: leobilly69@gmail.com
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 2:07:54 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

William T. Heaton

leobilly69@gmail.com
168 Hyde Street Apt 206
San Francisco, California 94102-3656

From: Megan Bute
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 1:12:22 AM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Megan Bute
wikis-scows.4t@icloud.com
273 29th St
San Francisco, California 94131

From: John Oda
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 12:43:19 AM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

John Oda
jandjoda@aol.com
2000 post
San Francisco, California 94115

From: Jason Fischel
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Redevelopment Plan is too timid
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 12:21:37 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Hello,

The proposed redevelopment plan will not increase housing enough in SF. Look at Austin, we can bring down rents, but we need to greatly decrease the burden of regulations and make SF a city for all.

Cheers,
Jason

Jason Fischel
fischelj@udel.edu
227 Clinton park
San Francisco, ca, California 94103

From: Steven Susaña-Castillo
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 11:29:49 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Although I think the plan doesn't go far enough, I think this gets in the right direction of undoing wrongs. Historically, San Francisco's zoning (and downzoning in the mid 20th century) was used as a tool to keep neighborhoods exclusive and keep out low income folks, immigrants, and/or racial minorities. (Many wealthier neighborhoods like Forest Hill and Pac Heights have used their City Hall connections to keep out minorities like the Japanese in the 40s from their neighborhoods by ensuring that mixed used zoning was banned and that the newly arriving immigrants could not set up their businesses there). Its scars are still evident today.

The Environmental Impact Report and a Chronicle article back in 1978 rightfully pointed out what would happen if we doubled down on restrictive zoning. Both warned that such restrictive zoning would cause San Francisco to become an exclusive playground for the rich, would deny the ability of low income people to live (and stay) here, would skyrocket home prices, and would inevitably lead to a housing shortage. We are now living the consequences.

Personally, we cannot call ourselves a progressive and/or liberal city when we are actively defending keeping intact zoning that is a derived from redlining. When you revisit Chronicle articles, newspaper cartoons, speeches/public comments from past supervisors, etc, you begin to pick up that these zoning rules were initiated from a standpoint of xenophobia and racism. By attempting to undo these policies, we are declaring that we want a San Francisco that is for everyone and that we are not just giving lipservice to these ideals we say we have.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and

collaboration.

Steven Susaña-Castillo
coolsteven2@gmail.com
1075 Valencia St, Apt 4
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Jen Rosas
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 10:36:02 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my very strong support for the Family Zoning Plan. Especially as a resident of the Outter Richmond, we need more density, and more housing options.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Jen Rosas
jenmrosas@yahoo.com
825 La Playa St #228
San Francisco, California 94121

From: Rachel Sheinbein
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 10:09:14 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Rachel

Rachel Sheinbein
rachel.sheinbein@gmail.com
2621 harrison st
San Francisco , California 94110

From: Laurie Dewan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 9:57:53 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan. My grandparents came to San Francisco in the 1930s and raised four children on a working-class income. While I am proud to be raising my children here too, I see so many families who simply can't make it work - and I wonder how long my husband and I can continue to manage the high cost of housing.

To me, the Family Zoning plan means taking this city I love into a bright, diverse future where families and working people can thrive.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Laurie Dewan
laurie.dewan@gmail.com
3362 Sacramento Street
San Francisco, California 94118

From: Lada Shchekleina
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 9:20:30 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Lada Shchekleina
ladannn@gmail.com
555 MISSION ROCK STR, APT # 630
SAN FRANCISCO, California 94158

From: Tyler Pullen
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 9:16:47 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan, preferably without the amendment casually excluding the literal majority of rental buildings (that are rent-controlled) from the plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes, and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love and the work they need.

Part of me wants the state to take over a preempt our land use rules -- which, to be clear, are the very stakes we are playing with -- because of the seeming inability of our local government to competently and earnestly allow enough housing to meet demand. But I'd love to avoid tempting that outcome by enthusiastically supporting the functional upzoning reflected in the original plan (and even more than that, ideally). Market rate housing will not single-handedly solve our affordability crisis, but we have all the evidence in the world that restricting housing of all types only makes the entire situation worse, especially so for the low income households we purport to care so much about.

This barely meets the state-mandated Housing Element goals which represents the bare minimum of meeting our city's long-underserved housing obligations, and amendments like the exclusion of rent-controlled buildings nakedly undermine the spirit of the plan in a way that is performatively progressive but functionally regressive. Our city's low income households (of which I am a part) live daily the consequences of our housing crisis most severely, and plans that continue to resist the improvement and expansion of our housing stock worsen our outcomes in both relative and absolute terms.

I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan without the rent-controlled unit exemption, and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Tyler Pullen

tpullen28@gmail.com
3477 1/2 17th St
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Beth O"Leary
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 9:11:10 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Beth O'Leary
beth@oleary.con
445 Baden St
San Francisco, California 94131

From: Carlos Abela
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan need to be
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 8:34:26 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Do not change zoning in the Sunset District Leave zoning changes up to the people who live in that zone. Some, like the downtown area, would welcome it. Others, like in the Sunset District, do not want it. You can build plenty of housing by converting offices and building high rises where they already exist.
Sincerely,
Carlos Abela

Carlos Abela
abela@mac.com
1266 40th Avenue
San Francisco, California 94122

From: Charissa Schaefer
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 7:53:46 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I know how gentrification starts and this upzoning plan is not in service of the people who live here. Please choose us over the corporations who would like to change the face of these neighborhoods. This city is already hugely expensive to live in. Don't make it worse.

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds,

beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Charissa Schaefer

Charissa Schaefer
cbs.music.news@gmail.com
1420 Turk St, Apt 1101
San Francisco, California 94115

From: Marty Cerles
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 7:41:23 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Marty Cerles
martycerles@gmail.com
2940 Turk Blvd
San Francisco, California 94118

From: George Ference
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 7:32:35 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

George Ference
michael.ference@gmail.com
1386 31st Ave
San Francisco, California 94122

From: David Downs
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 7:28:44 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

D11 voter in support of the Family Zoning Plan.

Build, baby, build.

David Downs
daviddownspresents@pm.me
251 Farallones St.
San Francisco, California 94112

From: Cora M. Shaw
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 7:24:33 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Cora M. Shaw
daft-sniper-0e@icloud.com
451 Guerrero St
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Mark Macy
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 7:24:04 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Amendments I Support:

Supervisor Melgar's small-business fund, and Supervisors Sherrill and Sauter's amendment to encourage larger family units (2-3 bedrooms). These strengthen the plan without risking state compliance, and the Mayor has signaled support.

Amendments I Oppose:

Proposals to exclude nearly all residential sites from rezoning or impose restrictions that would undercut housing capacity and jeopardize our state housing obligations.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Mark Macy
markm@macyarchitecture.com
241 10th Avenue #1
San Francisco, California 94118

From: Elliot Schwartz
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 7:21:36 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Elliot Schwartz
elliot.schwartz@gmail.com
2828 Bryant Street
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Heather Davies
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Real Affordability Housing in D4
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 6:56:05 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Heather Davies

Heather Davies
daviesva@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94116

From: Sharon Bradbury
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 6:32:11 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Sharon Bradbury
sharcrow@yahoo.com
839 Haight St, Apt 8
San Francisco, California 94117

From: Lynetta Oliver
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 1:00:05 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Lynetta Oliver
lynettaoliver@gmail.com
527 Balboa
San Francisco , California 94118

From: lunbeck@sbcglobal.net
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChenStaff
Cc: CPC.SF.Housing.Choice
Subject: Public Comment: Family Zoning Plan -- follow-up to 10/20 meeting of LUT Committee
Date: Thursday, October 30, 2025 12:40:26 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,
Please accept the following comment on the ongoing Family Zoning Plan (upzoning initiative) under consideration:

I live in Lakeside and have lived in San Francisco for over 35 years. I am deeply concerned about the density decontrol provision in the Family Zoning Plan.
Blanket density decontrol will irretrievably devastate West Side neighborhoods.
It's often remarked that SF is a city of neighborhoods. Many are low-density residential. Uncontrolled high-density development permitted virtually anywhere in low-density residential blocks will destroy local neighborhoods by tearing at the hard-won fabric of local community woven over the years.
It appears blanket density decontrol was introduced to reduce the plan's maximum building heights. Proponents disingenuously claim that preserving existing 40' limits on the West Side should allay concerns that neighborhoods will be dramatically transformed. This is misleading. Very few dwellings in the West Side now reach maximum heights, with the vast majority well under 30'. Newly permitted multifamily dwellings will certainly push toward the 40' maximum, towering over the other dwellings in their blocks, permanently destroying such blocks' longstanding character and architectural integrity.
Worse, density decontrol would enshrine – in perpetuity – this devastating threat to neighborhood integrity by allowing such out-of-place development anywhere and at any time. It's a permanent Sword of Damocles threatening virtually every West Side block, with no recourse once this predictable disaster begins to unfold.
Density decontrol will create a crazy quilt of inappropriate, out-of-place new development opportunistically scattered across the entire West Side. No block will be safe from ruination. Even one isolated large new multifamily dwelling will damage the surrounding neighborhood's character. Instead of unnecessarily putting every dwelling on every block in the West Side at risk, dense development should be concentrated in defined zones, as embodied in earlier iterations of upzoning maps.
Further, density decontrol could change every parcel's highest and best use to multifamily development. Single-family homes will turn into de facto teardowns, discouraging maintenance and improvements. This itself is a formula for widespread neighborhood deterioration – even if no new development has occurred in the vicinity.
The Planning Department contends that density decontrol is the only way to achieve State mandates. This claim appears dubious, as earlier versions of the proposed zoning map

achieved State mandates without incorporating blanket density decontrol.
Please remove the pernicious blanket density decontrol provision from the City's upzoning plan.

Thank you for your consideration.
Yours sincerely,
Robert Lunbeck
150 Junipero Serra Boulevard
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: sfdavidbancroft@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of David Bancroft
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 30, 2025 11:53:34 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am a 54 year D2 resident.

Don't Do It!

The Mayor's upzoning plan for Lombard St. will create a canyon entrance to SF, cleave Cow Hollow from the Marina and Chestnut St., and make those neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors. Where's the affordable housing?

No competent city planner would ever choose this as part of a viable solution for SF's housing needs!

Don't Do It.

David Bancroft
San Francisco, CA 94109

Sincerely,
David Bancroft
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: jeannelu@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jeannette Luini
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 30, 2025 11:41:56 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Jeannette Luini
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: georgesery@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of George Sery
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 30, 2025 11:38:18 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
George Sery

From: scarampi@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sebastiano Scarampi
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 30, 2025 11:34:01 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):You will destroy one of the world's most beautiful cities if you allow this zoning to pass. I WILL NEVER VOTE FOR, AND ACTIVELY CAMPAIGN AGAINST, ANY SF ELECTED OFFICIAL WHO SUPPORTS THIS MONSTROSITY. The San Francisco northern waterfront should be a UNESCO World Heritage site instead of a new Miami Beach or Manhattan. It is one of the most beautiful places in the world, thanks to its unique geography and views and the respect with which it has been developed up to now. Its beauty is dependent on the harmony of the city with its surroundings, and the human scale at which it is built. It is fully built up. There is no more room unless you want to destroy a beautiful community that has evolved in harmony with its environment. The neighborhood does not want more development. POLL US IF YOU HAVE ANY DOUBT. Notre Dame in Paris was exactly rebuilt as it was after the fire, because the French knew its importance. Where are the similar leaders here? Who will rebuild San Francisco after the aesthetically clueless, money-grabbing developers who can't tell a properly functioning neighborhood from a hole in ground are done defacing our magnificent neighborhood, a magical place that attracts visitors from all over the world?

Sincerely,
Sebastiano Scarampi
San Francisco, CA 94115

From: jandckehoe@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Christine Kehoe
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 30, 2025 10:17:46 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a lifelong San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

While I know we need housing that working people can afford, this is not the answer. PLEASE OPPOSE THIS!

Sincerely,
Christine Kehoe
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: evajfortune@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jay Altobelli
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 30, 2025 10:04:29 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): Affordable housing is necessary, luxury towers will not provide an answer. This looks hasty & a land grab which irreconcilablely destroy not only the scale of our city but the citizens that live work & have small businesses will be permanently displaced. . San Francisco is not a play ground for the rich , it's a city made up of people from all economic levels, that's what we should value & protect . There's always a way . Let's not hear our elected politicians say our hands are tied & we won't give our citizens a chance to disagree, comment or discuss. Don't shut the people & our city out . Don't turn San Francisco into a billionaire city , for the rich , for corporate businesses. No one wants that .

Sincerely,
Jay Altobelli
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: jayelliott415@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jay Elliott
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 30, 2025 9:27:48 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

WE are the stewards of our beautiful city, not Sacramento. They are the ugly step sister hellbent on ruining Cinderella. San Francisco has made mistakes before (Fillmore), let's not do it again! Many brave San Franciscans have fought against development that would harm, and because of their sacrifices and subsequent wins, we have Mt. Davidson (my neighborhood) as open space and many other treasures (Tea and Cookies ladies saved the Bay when the Sierra Club couldn't be bothered!). We can do better than Sacramento and as a Charter city, we have the right to. Strategic growth is smart, mandates are not!

That';s why, as a native San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors (and haven't we seen how the billionaire class is ruining our country!) while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Jay Elliott
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: vandana1@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Vandana Di Scala
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 30, 2025 9:21:31 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

The building at 2550 Irving is across the street from our apartment. This building is far too big for existing transit services and there is little to no parking. I strongly suggest repurposing existing commercial vacant buildings in/around downtown that are along multiple transit lines into affordable housing vs adding high density housing throughout SF before ensuring adequate transit lines and parking.

Sincerely,
Vandana Di Scala
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: randymazzei@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Randall Mazzei
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 30, 2025 9:11:34 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Randall Mazzei
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: john.nulty@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Nulty
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 30, 2025 8:42:34 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
John Nulty
San Francisco, CA 94142

From: terence.y.chu@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Terence Chu
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 30, 2025 2:07:43 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Terence Chu
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: jg1964chi@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Joan Albertson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 7:50:32 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Joan Albertson
San Francisco, CA 94109

From:	BOS Legislation, (BOS)
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS)
Cc:	BOS Legislation, (BOS)
Subject:	FW: Public Comment – 875 Lombard St (Technical Map Correction, Files 250700 / 250701)
Date:	Monday, October 27, 2025 9:17:48 AM
Attachments:	Exhibit A – 875 Lombard St Height Correction Map.pdf

---

From: Kenneth Kim <ken.ei.kim@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 27, 2025 9:15 AM
To: CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>; BOS Legislation, (BOS) <bos.legislation@sfgov.org>
Cc: Andrews, Michelle (BOS) <michelle.andrews@sfgov.org>; SauterStaff <SauterStaff@sfgov.org>
Subject: Public Comment – 875 Lombard St (Technical Map Correction, Files 250700 / 250701)

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

Dear Commission Secretary and Supervisors,

I support the Expanding Housing Choice / Family Zoning proposal and request a technical map correction for 875 Lombard Street (Block 0073, Lot 017B, APN 0073017B).

My parcel is shown as 40//40-R-4, while the immediately adjacent parcel (APN 0073018) and all parcels directly across Lombard Street are 40//50-R-4, all within RM-1. The attached Exhibit A illustrates a single-parcel discontinuity.

Extending the 40//50-R-4 Local Program Height one parcel west to include 875 Lombard would not change the underlying use (it remains RM-1) but would:

• restore consistent streetwall and block-face form,

• support gentle-density objectives in RM-1 under the Local Program framework, and

• add incremental Housing Element capacity without altering neighborhood character.

Thank you for considering this technical correction for inclusion in the final map clean-ups for Files 250700 / 250701.

Sincerely,

Kenneth Kim

Owner – 875 Lombard Street, San Francisco, CA 94133

917-891-1805 | ken.ei.kim@gmail.com

Attachment: Exhibit A – 875 Lombard St Height Correction Map.pdf


San Francisco Planning
Expanding Housing Choice (Proposed Zoning Map)
Legend
Info
Layers
Imagery
PDF
Help
Legend
Rezoning September 2025 Ordinance (Board File 250700 - v3)
Proposed Local Program Height Limits (September 2025)
40'
50'
65'
85'
105'
120'
130'
140'
160'
180'
240'
250'
300'
350'
875 LOMBARD ST, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNI...
Search result
Proposed Height District (September 2025)
Zoom to
Parcel 0073017B
Block 0073
Lot 017B
Proposed Local Program Height 40//40-R-4
Proposed Base Height 40
Existing Height District 40-X
Supervisor District 3
Existing Zoning District RM-1
Proposed Zoning District No change
All opposite parcels: 40//50-R-4 Local Program Height
0073017B – 40//40-R-4 875 Lombard
0073018 -40//50-R-4 869 Lombard
Columbus Ave
Francisco St
Water St
Mason St
Houston St
Taylor St
Jones St
Jansen St
Greenwich St
Valparaiso St
Filbert St
Scotland St
Via Bufano
Stockton St
DiMaggio Playground
Michelangelo Playground
875 Lombard St (0073017B) – Single-parcel discontinuity in proposed Local Program Height (40//40-R-4 vs. 40//50-R-4 adjacent)
Source: San Francisco Planning Department – Expanding Housing Choice (Proposed Zoning Map, Sept 2025).
Esri Community Maps Contributors, California State Parks, © OpenStreetMap, Microsoft, Esri, TomTom, Garmin, SafeGraph, GeoTechnologies, Inc, METI/NASA, USGS, Bureau of Land Management, EPA, NPS, US Census Bureau, USDA, USFWS
Powered by Esri

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	BOS-Operations; Carroll, John (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS); Calvillo, Angela (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Entezari, Mehran (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS)
Subject:	13 Letters Regarding File Nos. 250700, 250701, 250966, 251071, 251072, and 251073
Date:	Thursday, October 23, 2025 1:09:23 PM
Attachments:	13 Letters Regarding Zoning.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached 13 letters regarding File Nos.:

250700: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan
250701: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan
250966: General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan
251071: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan
251072: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan
251073: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan

Regards,

John Bullock
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-5184
BOS@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

Disclosures: *Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: James Nelson
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Wednesday, October 22, 2025 11:02:33 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
James Nelson

James Nelson
jimmie.nelson@gmail.com
3900 Adeline Street, Unit 309
Emeryville, California 94608

From: Michelle Santos
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Wednesday, October 22, 2025 11:19:14 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Michelle Santos
michelllesantoss@gmail.com
39 Sycamore st
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Anne Eunice
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Wednesday, October 22, 2025 12:05:19 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Anne Eunice
annemarieeunice1968@gmail.com
3850 18th Street Apt 203
SF, California 94114

From: Cassia Brill
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Wednesday, October 22, 2025 1:33:18 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Cassia Brill
cassiagbrill@gmail.com
695 John Muir Dr apt f102
SAN FRANCISCO, California 94132

From: mpegdietz@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Margaret Dietz
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Wednesday, October 22, 2025 2:32:02 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps and just do the minimum to meet the State requirements. Further rezoning can wait while the voters weigh in.
Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

- Exempt all parcels with rent controlled buildings from the Plan.

-Require that any and all development on city-owned land must be 100% affordable for working families.

-Exempt the Coastal land from the Plan.

The Plan destroys the priceless treasure that is San Francisco, and will erase what attracts the world's tourists to this destination. People like it here because of its' human scale and trees. They are not coming to see luxury towers. Do not prioritize the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the citizens.

Sincerely,
Margaret Dietz
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: debra.riat@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of deborah riat
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Wednesday, October 22, 2025 4:27:16 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Your up zoning plan is NOT good for our neighborhood. It is ridiculous for you to propose 6 story buildings next to 1 story single family houses. It is especially bad to go west of 20th avenue on Geary, California, Clement, Fulton with this OVERKILL CRAZY ZONING PLAN designed to pay off developers for your campaign contributions. We all know that you launder these funds into your own personal accounts. Why do you attack us in this way? The housing shortage is diminishing rapidly. AI and robotics are eating jobs and will start to do so more rapidly in the near future. The border is closed to illegal immigration and illegal immigrants are being deported and encouraged to leave of their own volition. YOU ARE BEHIND THE TIMES! I am asking you to come to your senses and STOP making WAR on the people of San Francisco!!! This radical zoning plan is NOT necessary, and it is BAD for our city.

Also, why do you continue to let drug addicts RUIN SAN FRANCISCO? Frequently my friends tell me horror stories about riding MUNI. Yesterday the story was a drug addict was asleep on the bus and his pit bull was running up and down and sitting wherever it wanted. People were terrorized. PEOPLE ARE AFRAID TO RIDE MUNI. All these stabbing murders we have had in past months, where crazed drug addicts kill people for no reason. And this morning a video of a crazy woman stabbing a restaurant owner with a knife from his kitchen. THIS IS INSANITY AND IT IS ALL ON YOU!!!!! Drug addition is not a victimless crime. I live near Sutro Heights park. I have seen over 5 dead bodies pulled out of there in the last few years. This was not happening 10 years ago. Taking drugs is illegal and these people should be arrested and detoxed for their own good and for the good of our community.

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,

deborah riat
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: rosie447@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Rosie Gozali
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Wednesday, October 22, 2025 6:43:43 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Rosie Gozali

From: Nadya Williams
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Wednesday, October 22, 2025 7:03:56 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Nadya Williams
nadyanomad@gmail.com
1436 Grant Ave. # 10
San Francisco , California 94133

From: Sarah Kliban
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Wednesday, October 22, 2025 7:25:33 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

There are many reasons that this plan does not work, which are listed below. But in addition to those ideas, let me present to you that a lot of the cities money comes from tourists who see the city through film and television and print. A lot of us work in the film, business. What this new legislation will do is change the landscape of the city. It will change the views of the city and the presentation of the city. This means that the city that people are coming to visit is not going to be the same, but especially, for my industry, it means that people who like to make films here to show off the views will not be as attracted to bringing their projects here. Especially in district 3, which is the most filmed section of San Francisco in the past several decades.
Additionally, the Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not

side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Sarah Kliban
Casting Director
Fifth generation San Francisco resident

Sarah Kliban
casting27@gmail.com
250 Columbus Avenue
San Francisco, California 94133

From: Madison Wise
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Wednesday, October 22, 2025 9:01:37 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

I want you have a future myself and others in the City of San Francisco. We need more adorable housing not less.

Sincerely,

Madison Wise
Internal Organizer, SEIU-USWW

Madison Wise
unlit_frame3x@icloud.com
930 Sutter Street, Apt. 104
San Francisco, California 94109

From: Afrodisia Cuevas
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Wednesday, October 22, 2025 9:05:14 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.

Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Afrodisia Cuevas

Afrodisia Cuevas
afrodisiacuevas@gmail.com
190 Alhambra St.
San Francisco, California 94123

From:	jim keith
To:	Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tanner, Rachael (CPC); SauterStaff; Mahmood, Bilal (BOS)
Cc:	Conner, Kate (CPC); Cityattorney; BOS Clerks Office (BOS); Mayor, MYR (MYR); Low, Jen (BOS); Farrah, Michael (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; cityattorney.legislative@sfgov.org; SFhousingInfo
Subject:	URGENT! Please Correct Exclusion of Property from Family Zoning Ordinance
Date:	Wednesday, October 22, 2025 9:40:39 PM

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

Dear Mayor Lurie, President Tanner, Supervisor Melgar, Supervisor Mahmood, Supervisor Sauter, Supervisor Dorsey,

My name is James Keith, Managing Member of Midtown Lands LLC. We are the owners of a **3-acre parcel (Block 2724, Lot 004),** also known as **402 Dellbrook Ave**. It has come to my attention that this property was **mistakenly excluded from the parcel list in the proposed Family Zoning Ordinance**. Upon reviewing the legislative parcel number list, I confirmed that our property is not included, which appears to be an error.

This parcel is located well within the boundaries of the proposed Family Zoning Ordinance and represents a prime opportunity to address the city's critical need for additional housing. The exclusion of our property undermines the ordinance's goal of expanding housing opportunities and must be rectified before the next reading of the legislation to ensure the integrity and effectiveness of the rezoning process.

I respectfully request **that all necessary steps** be taken to correct this oversight and include our property, Block 2724, Lot 004 (402 Dellbrook Ave), in the Family Zoning Ordinance. Please confirm receipt of this request and provide guidance on any further actions required to ensure our property is included in the rezoning.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this matter. I am available to discuss this further or provide additional documentation as needed.

Sincerely, James Keith

Managing Member, Midtown Lands
415-317-2039

From: Tricia Powell
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 10:36:19 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Tricia Powell
triciapowell@gmail.com
3270 21st St, 103
San Francisco, California 94110

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	BOS-Operations; Carroll, John (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS); Calvillo, Angela (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Entezari, Mehran (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS)
Subject:	406 Letters Regarding File Nos. 250700, 250701 and 250966
Date:	Wednesday, October 22, 2025 12:43:02 PM
Attachments:	406 Letters Regarding File Nos. 250700, 250701 and 250966.pdf

---

Hello,

Please see attached 406 letters regarding File Nos.:

250700: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan
250701: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan
250966: General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan

Regards,

John Bullock
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-5184
BOS@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

Disclosures: *Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: kaurmona35@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mona Kaur
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Wednesday, October 22, 2025 1:09:33 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Dear elected officials and planning committees,
As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Destroying one neighborhood to give to another is not community building.

Sincerely,
Mona Kaur
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: Carolina Pistone
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Wednesday, October 22, 2025 8:52:21 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Carolina

Carolina Pistone
carolpistone2@gmail.com
1750 Mission Street
San Francisco, California 94103

From: Patrick Marks
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Wednesday, October 22, 2025 9:03:04 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely, Patrick Marks

Patrick Marks
patrickjmarks@sbcglobal.net
4192 24th St
San Francisco, California 94114

From: Sarah Tang
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Wednesday, October 22, 2025 9:20:19 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Sarah

Sarah Tang
sarah.tang62@yahoo.com

San Francisco, California 94134

From: sharongadberry@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sharon Gadberry
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Wednesday, October 22, 2025 10:10:43 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Sharon Gadberry
San Francisco, CA 94118

From: taylorjasper0@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of JASPER TAYLOR GAITHER
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 1:00:33 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
JASPER TAYLOR GAITHER
San Francisco, CA 94102

From: Molly Hayden
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 3:28:10 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Molly Hayden

Molly Hayden
molly.hayden@me.com
144a Scott St
San Francisco, California 94117

From: Christina Gonzalez
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 3:34:00 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Christina Gonzalez

Christina Gonzalez
christygirl17@msn.com
150 Clinton Park
San Francisco, California 94103

From: sumnernicole@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Nicole Sumner
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 3:41:20 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Nicole Sumner
San Francisco, CA 94112

From: Dennis Moninger
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 4:00:06 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Dennis Moninger
democratic1948@gmail.com
1330 bush apt 4k
S.f., California 94109

From: ccwalk5ege@gmail.com
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 4:11:44 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

ccwalk5ege@gmail.com
709 Frederick street
San Francisco , California 94117

From: jgburgess1936@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Janet Burgess
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 5:12:52 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Janet Burgess
San Francisco, CA 94117

From: stephanieteelmusic@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Stephanie Teel
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 6:00:31 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):I can see tearing down the old Motel6 on Lincoln but where else?

Sincerely,
Stephanie Teel

From: Amy Rathbone
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 6:34:54 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Amy Rathbone

Amy Rathbone
amyrathbone@gmail.com
499 Alabama St. #112
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Kevin Eisenstaedt
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 6:58:30 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Kevin Eisenstaedt
kevinonroscoe@hotmail.com
350 Turk Street
SF, California 94102

From: PENNY SULLIVAN
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 7:15:35 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

I am in a wheelchair and must live near my daughter due to a stroke. I cannot find anything as it is. I live near my daughter and have for 5 yeas. Every year the rent goes up! What will happen to me?

Sincerely,
Penny Sullivan

PENNY SULLIVAN
prnnys479@gmail.com
965 Sutter #709
Sanfrancisco , 96081

From: sfwendy@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Wendy Portnuff
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 7:18:55 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Wendy Portnuff
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: alejandragoldstar@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Alejandra Cisnero
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 7:21:55 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Alejandra Cisnero
San Francisco, CA 94124

From: pugaykm@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Karen Pugay
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 8:03:15 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Karen Pugay
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: Imme Staeffler
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 8:11:03 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Imme Staeffler
immestaeffler@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94109

From: jacqueline jones
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 8:14:32 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

jacqueline jones
jackiej2242@gmail.com
91 Blue Creek Overlook
Carbondale, Colorado 81623

From: Katarina Kauftheil
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 8:28:41 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Katarina Kauftheil
kmkauftheil@gmail.com
620 Jones
San Francisco, California 94102

From: Gabriella Seatris
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 8:31:07 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

San Francisco wouldn't be the creative, desirable place it is without affordable home and rent controlled units to protect artists, young entrepreneurs, small business owners, families and more from losing their homes.

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds,

beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Gabriella Seatris
gseatris@gmail.com
2843 geary blvd
San francisco , California 94118

From: Michael Faklis
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 8:34:03 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Michael Faklis
michael_faklis@thelonelliberal.ud

San Francisco, California 94111

From: Melanie Mandich
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 8:35:22 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

I am long-term renter and active volunteer in my City (NERT, DHIC). Displacement would force me to leave the City. I've rented my current apartment since 1982, have no living relatives and depend on my home for security. Having major XSF developers or hedge funds purchase buildings and convert them into condos is unconscionable. There are many more like me...and we all vote! Sincerely, Melanie Mandich

Melanie Mandich
mmandich@comcast.net
390 liberty street, Apt 7
San francisco, California 94114

From: Claudia Molina
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 8:39:34 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Claudia Molina
molinaclaudia21@gmail.com
439 Arlington Street
San Francisco, California 94131

From:	betsy.eddy@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Betsy Eddy
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Tuesday, October 21, 2025 8:48:42 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's Upzoning plan will lead to the destruction of many historic buildings and destroy the character of our neighborhoods so that developer's can make huge amounts of money.

Sincerely,
Betsy Eddy
San Francisco, CA 94131

From: sherrichard@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Daniel ONEill
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 8:48:44 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan and living in the Cow Hollow neighborhood for the past 29 years and previously 35 years in the Richmond district, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors. I was a builder of maximum 4-story apartments and proud to provide housing while keeping the neighborhoods in tact.

I am asking you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement.

Please listen to the people who live here and care about maintaining the homes and small businesses.

Sincerely,
Daniel ONEill
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: Rita Pisciotta
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 8:48:53 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Rita Pisciotta
rbinsf@earthlink.net
2048 Stockton st
san francisco, California 94133-2026

From: sherrichard61@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sherrie Richard
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 8:56:19 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I live in Cow Hollow. I am an owner of 2 rental cindos here. I care about the quality of life my rental units provide and the income it affords me to be retired and living in this great.neighborhood!

I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

Please listen to the people who live in these neighborhoods and have small businesses NOT to someone in an office in City Hall looking at pieces of PAPER!!

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement.

We are real! The paper in the desks of these planners are not real!

Sincerely,
Sherrie Richard
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: Fiona Thao
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 8:58:21 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Fiona Thao
fionathao823@gmail.com
895 Pacific Ave
San Francisco, California 94133

From: neyce@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Janeyce Ouellette
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 9:46:16 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Janeyce Ouellette

From: Jane van Hoven
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 9:54:58 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Real San Franciscans, we who love this city and call it home, are sick of what's been happening to our city. We're sick of seeing our friends and neighbors forced to move and feeling that pressure ourselves while our neighborhoods lose what makes them our neighborhoods. This is a time to take a stand and protect Ssn Francisco.

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening

– the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Jane van Hoven
darkrainbowkittens@gmail.com
1233 California St, Apt 312
San Francisco, California 94109

From: bestevenson1@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Bonnie Stevenson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 10:14:37 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Bonnie Stevenson
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: Sarah Bouldin
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 10:51:10 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Sarah Bouldin

Sarah Bouldin
sbouldin@rainbow.coop
39 Lapidge St
San Francisco , California 94110

From: Maggie Shiple
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 10:52:36 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Maggie Shiple
maggieshiple@gmail.com
1298 Funston Ave, Apt 2
San Francisco , California 94122

From: Evette Mercado
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 11:18:34 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely, Evette Mercado

Evette Mercado
evettem26@gmail.com
801 Sutter St. 108
San Francisco , California 94109

From: steve.t@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Steve Taormina
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 11:40:22 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a small business owner for 23 years in San Francisco. I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, Dont sellout the city to with the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, by transforming our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

Keep the city clean and not more expensive to live in.

Steve

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

As a small business owner for 23 years in San Francisco. I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, Dont sellout the city to with the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, by transforming our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

Keep the city clean and not more expensive to live in.

Steve

Sincerely,
Steve Taormina
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: Heather Black
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 12:18:17 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Heather Black
heathermoonblack@gmail.com
526 Taraval St
San Francisco, California 94116-2510

From: Douglas Freelon
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 12:36:41 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Douglas Freelon
dn.freelon13@gmail.com
1629 Golden Gate Ave
San Francisco, California 94115

From: Abigail Alderson
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 1:12:14 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Abigail Alderson
abagaillalderson@mac.com
1864 48Th Avenue , 4
San Francisco, California 94122

From: Erin Antunez
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 1:48:17 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Erin Antunez
antunezacupuncture@gmail.com
5 Chilton ave
San Francisco , California 94131

From: Marc Bruno
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 1:48:26 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Marc Bruno
marcabruno2025@gmail.com
15 Nobles Alley, Apt. 3
San Francisco, California 94133

From: Jeremi Rebecca Hanson
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 1:49:28 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Jeremi Rebecca Hanson
jeremihanson@gmail.com
3460 16th st, Apt. 2
San Francisco, California 94114

From: Aaron Hopkins
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 2:09:26 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Aaron Hopkins
Ahopkins425@me.com
851 34th Ave
San Francisco, 94121

From: Virginia Barker
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 3:47:10 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Virginia Barker
v.barker@att.net
200 Alhambra St #17
San Francisco, California 94123

From: juithrydell@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Judith Rydell
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 4:14:32 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS I love my neighborhood and purchased a home in this area for a safe peaceful place to live. We are mostly single family homes and some units. It is not congested and I am able to park on my block when I return home. The value of the homes in this area will drop if it turns into a congested area and with no parking. I am an elderly person who would find it difficult if I had to walk up this hill. PLEASE LEAVE OUR AREA AS IS. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Judith Rydell
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: chue33333@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of ed chu
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 4:28:14 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): There are many members of our church who live all over San Francisco, many could use affordable housing. Your upzoning map would disrupt much needed housing for those who need affordable housing. Please keep those people in need when you make your plans. Please keep ALL San Franciscans in mind in your planning.

Sincerely,
ed chu
San Francisco, CA 94131

From: mesa797@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Douglas Gower
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 5:35:03 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

These are the types of rushed changes that have been suggested and in some cases implemented in the past that are either regrettable in their implementation, or thankfully never realized. We don't need a city of stalled projects and vacant lots serving no positive use.

Sincerely,
Douglas Gower
San Francisco, CA 94107

From: Ginger Hamilton
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 5:48:49 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!
I am a stage 4 cancer patient who has been fighting my landlord of 27 years to not evict me.

I'm currently in treatment and can not afford to move. I need to remain in San Francisco to continue my medical treatment. My life depends on renter's right for affordable housing to maintain my housing and chemotherapy treatment. Please help long time residents such as myself to have affordable housing.

Sincerely,
Ginger Hamilton

Ginger Hamilton
gingerhami@earthlink.net
270 Pennsylvania Ave
San Francisco, California 94107

From: jdemeza@yahoo.com
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 7:50:25 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

jdemeza@yahoo.com
160 EDDY STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, California 94102

From: pwchu99@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Patricia Chu
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 8:53:16 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENT: I live near West Portal and it is perfect the way it is. Don't change something that works and isn't broken. Don't make the it harder for the middle class to live in this city where I was born and raised.

Sincerely,
Patricia Chu
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: v.barker@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Virginia Barker
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 10:12:02 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

And this is a betrayal of your duty to work in the best interests of your constituents.

Sincerely,
Virginia Barker
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: ruthwwenzel@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Ruth W. Wenzel
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:01:36 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): We still need homes & jobs for the people already here! Don't take small businesses & the homes of those who work in these places!

Sincerely,
Ruth W. Wenzel
San Francisco, CA 94117

From: LaNiesha Pedroza
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:02:52 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

LaNiesha Pedroza
laniesha@icloud.com
1808 Fulton St, Apt 7
San Francisco, California 94117

From: McKenzie Campagna
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:02:55 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

McKenzie Campagna
renkiyo7@gmail.com
350 Arballo Dr. Apt 9F
San Francisco, California 94132

From: Melanie Dorson
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:03:21 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Melanie Dorson
melanie.dorson@gmail.com
4930 Fulton St. #204
San Francisco, California 94121

From: Catherine Starr
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:04:01 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Catherine Starr

Catherine Starr
cstarr2017@gmail.com
711 Elizabeth St
San Francisco, California 94114

From: Kristin Gifford
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:04:46 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Kristin Gifford
kristingifford@gmail.com
434 8th ave apt 1
San Francisco , California 94118

From: Jennifer Mayugba
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:05:00 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Jennifer Mayugba
mugbug48@gmail.com
1278 Market St
San Francisco, California 94102-4801

From: Leah Hammond
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:05:19 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

So many of my colleagues, friends, and neighbors have been priced out of the city. For many people, rent controlled housing is the only reason they are able to stay in the city that has been their home for decades. Please protect rent controlled housing and the people who rely on it.

Sincerely,
Leah Hammond, District 10

Leah Hammond
leaheve@indra.com

San Francisco, California 94110

From: Elise Fischer-Colbrie
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:06:57 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Elise Fischer-Colbrie
elise.fischercolbrie@gmail.com
1260 broadway
San francisco, California 94109

From: Carolyn Link
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:08:28 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I write to you as a concerned San Francisco renter. Born and raised here, i always hoped to own a home but that is not possible and i can thankfully still afford to love here thanks to rent control. If the goal of upzoning is to make housing more affordable and more plentiful then existing tenants MUST be protected. Otherwise we risk displacing thousands of renters, only to end up with empty luxury apartments that existing renters can't afford, or worse, studio "tech dorms" without actually. Without strong protections for existing tenants, this easily becomes a handout to developers while making the affordability crisis worse.

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve

out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Carolyn Link
link.carolyn@gmail.com
735 11th ave, #3
SF, California 94118

From: janice.bressler@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Janice Bressler
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:12:39 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Janice Bressler
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: Heather Dalrymple
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:13:00 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Heather Dalrymple
hcdalrymple55@gmail.com
2153 Sacramento St, #9
San Francisco, California 94109

From: elizabeth morello
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:14:13 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

elizabeth morello
selizabethmorello@yahoo.com
green street
san francisco, California 94133

From: Christy Vong
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:14:25 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Christy Vong
vong.christy@gmail.com
268 25th Ave
San Francisco, California 94121

From: Lenaya Kimball
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:15:39 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Lenaya Kimball

Lenaya Kimball
lpongan@yahoo.com
2053 Sutter St, Apt 101
San Francisco, California 94115

From: Robert Hall
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:15:47 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Robert Hall
bilgepump100@sbcglobal.net

San Francisco, California 94117

From: foxja24@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Judith Fox
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:16:01 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

This is not what our city needs- affordable housing is a critical unmet need.
ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Judith Fox
San Francisco, CA 94115

From: Devra Edelman
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:16:40 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Devra Edelman
devraimma1@gmail.com
200 Brannan St. #240
San Francisco, California 94107

From: Kathleen Tilt
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:17:01 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Kathleen Tilt
kathleentilt@icloud.com
2261, Market Street # 145
San Francisco, California 94114

From: Mary Menees
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:19:24 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

Please protect tenants like me who have rent control and are over sixty. I've worked in non profits and for SF State my whole career never being able to buy a home. Please don't displace tenants like me. I've been here since 1985 and a tenant in my place for 35 years.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds,

beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Mary Menees

Mary Menees
marymenees@gmail.com
5132 Geary Blvd, APT 3
San Francisco, California 94118

From: clarewafelbakker@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Clare Wafelbaker
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:21:36 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

I live in the Outer Sunset district, I go to yoga in the Richmond area, eat out in the Marina frequently and have been a SF resident for the last 10 years. These plans will have a detrimental impact to the residents and small business owners that live and run their business in these iconic San Francisco neighborhoods. It is your responsibility to see that this does not happen. Thank you for reading.

Sincerely,
Clare Wafelbaker
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: Heather Weeks Sampior
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:21:39 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Heather Weeks Sampior
40+ year S.F. Renter

Heather Weeks Sampior
hkweeks@gmail.com
2050 29th Avenue
San Francisco, California 94116

From: thanehale@gmail.com
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:21:42 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Nathaniel Hale

thanehale@gmail.com
819 Judah St
San Francisco, California 94122

From: Anne morse
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:21:53 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Anne morse
morsemedia@att.net
1462 union st
san Francisco , California 94109

From:	diannrose@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Diann Rose
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 6:22:14 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transforms our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline so we have time to better understand the impact of the plan
- Host town halls in the affected areas to answer questions and inform the public
- Scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps if necessary to be sure the plan meets the city’s needs

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans potentially clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. We need to be certain that these decisions are not taken lightly and rushed through.

We need to be thorough. The City deserves this!

Sincerely,
Diann Rose
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: Nora Scally
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:23:32 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Nora Scally
norascally@gmail.com
2515 Clement St, 1
San Francisco, California 94121

From: timinsf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Timothy Kirsch
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:24:20 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Timothy Kirsch
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: Krystal Mandel
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:25:59 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Krystal Mandel
pinonkrystal@yahoo.com

San Francisco, California 94121

From: Gregg Zywicke
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:26:34 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Gregg Zywicke
chloethewonderdog@hotmail.com
478 Warren
Sean Francisco, California 94131

From: Helen Gilbert
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:32:32 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Helen

Helen Gilbert
hgmelon@gmail.com
1207 32nd Ave
San Francisco , California 94122

From: Austin Willacy
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:35:36 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The disenfranchisement needs to stop here, now.

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more

than ever!

Sincerely,

Austin Willacy
akw@well.com
3240 King Street
Berkeley, California 94703-2448

From: salenaart@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Alessandra Valentini
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:36:38 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): don't sell your soul and the soul of the city to those corporate scums. Have the decency to slow down the taking over of humanity. AI will fall and the bubble burst. No need to run for the cliff too fast. Keep it human

Sincerely,
Alessandra Valentini
San Francisco, CA 94110

From: Sarah Mitrani
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:39:02 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Sarah Mitrani
smmitrani@gmail.com
20 El Sereno Ct., San Francisco CA 94127
San Francisco, California 94127

From: Megan Schneider
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:42:11 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Megan Schneider
meganjoyschneider@gmail.com
4646 Geary Blvd, apt 2
san francisco, California 94118

From: Sirinada Chanthachaiwat
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:43:03 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Sirinada Chanthachaiwat
sirinada1@outlook.co.th

Berkeley, California 94703

From: Karen Langland
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:48:30 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!
Please stop turning our city into a playground for the rich !!!

Sincerely,
Karen Langland

Karen Langland
klangland@earthlink.net
243 4th Ave
San Francisco, California 94118

From: Tiffany Pfeiffer
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:50:42 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Tiffany Pfeiffer
tiffany.pfeiffer@gmail.com
1650 47th Ave
San Francisco, California 94122

From: leejohnj.lee@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Lee
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:51:40 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
John Lee
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: mspunkie47@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Latishia Bess
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:52:06 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Latishia Bess
Emeryville, CA 94608

From: Elizabeth Loomis
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:52:46 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Please don’t ignore the needs of the common folk in San Francisco. We are what make this city so diverse and wonderful,

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Loomis

Elizabeth Loomis
iamapumpkin77@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94121

From: Alexis Lecach
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:54:14 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Alexis Lecach
ajl.diamond@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94114

From: Raymond Cachia
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:56:13 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!
All Rent Controlled Housing Must Be Carved Out Of Mayor's Plan

Sincerely,

Raymond Cachia
rcachiao1@gmail.com
1711 Washington Street
San Francisco, California 94109

From: Gina Hall
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:56:35 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Gina Hall
ginahallg@gmail.com
584 Castro St Apt 325
San Francisco, California 94114

From: Edward Rittenhouse
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 7:02:35 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Ed Rittenhouse

Edward Rittenhouse
Epr928@gmail.com
1105 Bush Street, APT 106
San Francisco, California 94109

From: K Harrar
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 7:08:10 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.

Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.

We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.

Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.

Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.

Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.

Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.

Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening

– the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
K Harrar

K Harrar
errigaleire@yahoo.com

San Francisco, California 94122

From: Courtney Veraldi
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 7:09:53 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Courtney Veraldi
courtneyveraldi@gmail.com
776 bush street
San francisco, California 94108

From: swf1@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Steve Fukuda
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 7:11:14 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Steve Fukuda
San Francisco, CA 94132

From: Jennifer Locke
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 7:12:45 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Jennifer Locke

Jennifer Locke
jennifer.locke@sbcglobal.net
740 35TH AVE
SAN FRANCISCO, California 94121

From: gford212@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Greg Blackford
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 7:14:40 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Greg Blackford
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: Allegra Kelly
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 7:16:39 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need. As a rent control family it is disgraceful that you are trying to displace us more.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Allegra Kelly

Allegra Kelly
allegradeva@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94117

From: Dale Riva
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 7:23:30 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Dale Riva
daleriva@gmail.com
1001 Franklin 13-A
San Francisco, California 94109

From: bascomassociates@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of H Doris Su
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 7:27:39 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
H Doris Su
San Francisco, CA 94132

From: Stephanie Sherman
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 7:36:30 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Stephanie Sherman
stephaniesherma@gmail.com
25 Sharon st
Sf, California 94114

From: Olivia VanDamme
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 7:44:16 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I have been a renter in San Francisco for 8 years in the Outer Sunset and I greatly appreciate my landlord's affordable pricing on our unit and the rent-control that does not allow for a drastic increase in my rent. As a non-profit worker working at small non-profits and in a local museum in Golden Gate Park. My wages at these non-profits would not be able to afford rising costs of rent happening now or for proposed new market rate units. As other friends who are non-profit workers, coaches, educators all pouring into the future generations education and out of school time activities, we deserve affordable housing.

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve

out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Olivia VanDamme
oliviavandamme14@gmail.com
189 Country Club Dr
San Francisco, California 94132

From: Robin Dekkers
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 7:45:44 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Robin

Robin Dekkers
radekkers@gmail.com
144 Grattan St Apt 3
San Francisco, California 94117

From: Banafsheh Jalali
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 7:48:50 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Banafsheh Jalali
banafsheh.jalali@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94123

From: Maleeha Iftekhar
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 7:50:32 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Rent control was the only reason my family could live in SF. We were bought out and have to leave in November; and I will never be able to live in the place I grew up again.

Sincerely,
Maleeha

Maleeha Iftekhar
maleehaiftekhar@bennington.edu
751 48th Avenue
San Francisco, California 94121

From: John Hronowski
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 8:04:37 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

John Hronowski
johnhronowski@mac.com
1539 Clay Street Apt 12
San Francisco, California 94109

From: Amy Perrone
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 8:11:10 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The city is already unaffordable. I've seen the fabric of the city change as musicians, artists, teachers and members of our community have been pushed out because of tech. It's been so sad to see the change from 'anybody can live here in some part of the city' to good luck finding anywhere to live that's affordable. That's no longer the case.We need more affordable options and affecting rent controlled units is not going to help.

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing

strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Amy (rent controlled apartment dweller)

Amy Perrone
amy_m_perrone@yahoo.com
2942 Franklin St
San Francisco , California 94123

From: Kamala Oldham
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 8:12:27 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Kamala Oldham
[Humble renter in Sunset & broke college student]

Kamala Oldham
kamalaoldham@gmail.com
3131 Quintara St
San Francisco, California 94116

From: Philippa Colborne
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 8:15:05 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Philippa Colborne
cal94111@gmail.com
405 Davis Court apt 407
San Francisco, Ca 94111

From: Jeannine Zenti
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 8:16:39 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse. I absolutely disapprove of destroying existing rent controlled housing to build new units. Despite the promises, these are never affordable. We must preserve older structures and update them as necessary. Get creative! Developer driven housing solutions are a disaster. This should be obvious by now.

Sincerely,
Jeannine Zenti

Jeannine Zenti
jzenti@hotmail.com
1319 Florida
San Francisco , California 94110

From: Eckhart Beatty
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 8:16:39 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisor Chan,
The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Eckhart Beatty

Eckhart Beatty
eckhart.c.beatty@gmail.com
110 6th Ave. San Francisco, CA 94118, Apt 3
San Francisco, California 94118

From: lorrainebustamante2@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lorraine Bustamante
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 8:29:13 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):
I am a native San Franciscan and I have seen the many changes to our city that have negatively impacted our communities.
Why don't you consider consulting our community residents and hear what we have to say—and give us an opportunity to speak not in the middle of the day when we're working; And not just one or two times give us a chance to survive this imposition. Please don't behave like Trump is behaving — where it's obvious he doesn't care about us regular hard-working people. Please reconsider.

Sincerely,
Lorraine Bustamante
San Francisco, CA 94112

From: Mahara Espinoza
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 8:36:24 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Mahara Espinoza
maharae@yahoo.com
2210 Stockton St
San Francisco, California 94133

From: erikatargaryen@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Erika Tomlinson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 8:41:53 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a small business owner, Franciscan, and 4th generation Californian, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- DRASTICALLY scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a POSTPONEMENT of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Billionaire developers will never create homes for San Franciscans. I love this city and do not wish it to become another New York or LA. I want it to prosper, but not at the expense of its unique culture and undeniable beauty which are comprised of the multicultural and dynamic residents and striking land and architecture. Embrace what smaller cities like Boston have learned - build 4- story, 10-20 unit buildings with mixed size units, small businesses on the bottom floor, and a residential feel.

Sincerely,
Erika Tomlinson

From: Caroline Ayres
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 8:46:50 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Caroline Ayres
carolineayres6@gmail.com
87 Dolores Street , APT 105
San Francisco , California 94103

From: Darlene Roberts
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 8:50:57 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Darlene Roberts
drob3438@gmail.com
555 Pierce Street
San Francisco, California 94117

From: Ildiko Polony
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 9:01:46 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Ildiko Polony
ildiko.polony@gamil.com
1322 4th ave apt 4
San Francisco, California 94122

From: Chris Moore
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 9:17:21 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Chris Moore

Chris Moore
we3sf@sbcglobal.net
1255 Taylor St, Apt 6
San Francisco, California 94108

From: Rozanna Dyan Garza
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 9:17:34 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Rozanna Dyan Garza
dyangarza60@gmail.com
855 Waller St. apt 5
San Francisco, California 94117

From: Mary Martin
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 9:19:04 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Mary Martin
foreleg.annular.7d@icloud.com
159 Hearst Ave
San Francisco, California 94131

From: Elaine Walker
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 9:25:06 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more

than ever!

Sincerely,

Elaine Walker (born and raised and still living and renting and teaching and being a therapist to SF - still barely affording it here)

Elaine Walker
eeewalker@gmail.com
273 Filbert St
San Francisco, California 94133

From: leon_goncharov@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Leonid Goncharov
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 9:30:13 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Leonid Goncharov
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: Sheryl Leaf
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 9:37:12 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Sheryl Leaf
leaflet7@yahoo.com
1395 Golden Gate Ave
San Francisco, California 94115

From: nyeta@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Richard Charney
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 9:42:07 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Richard Charney
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: Tamila Wong
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 9:48:51 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Tamila Wong
tamilawong@yahoo.com
106 Byxbee St
San Francisco , California 94132

From: Mohua Ibrahim
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 10:12:02 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Mohua Ibrahim
tarot-warble-06@icloud.com
680 Mission Street, #27K
San Francisco, California 94105

From: toluene_gigabit.5l@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Melinda Costello
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 10:19:23 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Melinda Costello
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: Sam Khozindar
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 10:48:15 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Sam Khozindar
samkhozindar@yahoo.com
2697mission street
San Francisco , California 94110

From: jeanine.l.mahl@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jeanine Laman Mahl
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 10:53:15 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS. Upzoning will result in more cars, congestion, & put unacceptable pressure on schools, emergency services, etc. Upzoning will change the character of the neighborhoods. I'm 81 years old and have lived in SF since I was a year old. I have seen it go from always being able to park in front of the house that a normal, working class family could afford to buy, to families being taxed out of their homes (my parents) and to a place where parking is getting harder and harder. It has become a place too expensive for working class families (And I don't mean tech folks) to rent let alone buy. The zoo, the Academy of Sciences, the deYoung, the Tea Garden, etc., were all free. Now they are out of reach for many families. Upzoning will make the affordability crisis worse. Stop trying to change the character of our single family neighborhoods! We don't need more people, cars, traffic, and competition for parking. STOP UPZONING.

Sincerely,
Jeanine Laman Mahl
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: Oksana Clem
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:56:39 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Oksana Clem
oksanakc01@gmail.com
1275 Buchanan St Apt 4
San Francisco, California 94115

From: Geoffrey McNally
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:56:45 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

This is a personal issue for me. I've lived in a rent controlled apartment for the past 19 years. Without rent control I would have to leave my beloved city. Please support rent control!

Sincerely,
Geoffrey McNally

Geoffrey McNally
glmcnally@hotmail.com
1700 Broadway Apt 301
San Francisco , California 94109

From: Judith Stein
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:59:17 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

I urge you to not destroy rent control in this beautiful city of ours. Plans for high-rises in the Richmond and other districts will destroy the neighborhood qualities of these areas. Working class people will be priced out of being able to live in the city. This will affect all the businesses in the city. I urge you to not destroy rent control.

Sincerely,

Judith Stein
judithastein@gmail.com
46 Arlington
San Francisco , California 94131

From: Laura Kerimova
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:59:33 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Laura Kerimova
laurasimone6@gmail.com
1275 Buchanan St Apt 4
San Francisco, California 94115

From:	Stephen Torres
To:	Carroll, John (BOS)
Cc:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	2025.10.20 Letter Re: Family Zoning Plan
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 5:55:49 PM
Attachments:	2025.10.20%20Letter%20to%20Land%20Use%20&%20Transportation%20Re-%20Family%20Zoni.pdf

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

Dear Clerk Carroll,

Please see attached my comments from today's hearing.

Thanks so much,

Stephen Torres

Stephen Torres
Mission-Bernal
San Francisco, California

October 20, 2025

The Land Use & Transportation Committee of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 250
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, California 94102

Chairperson Melgar and Committee Members,

Before you is the disingenuously named *Family Zoning Plan.* The name is disingenuous because, as countless public testimonies and data have detailed, this plan does nothing to actually ensure housing for families. It does little but ensure that developers can now access thousands of residential and commercial parcels with almost no regulation and property owners can sell their property for several times its current value. It is also likely to make thousands of San Franciscans homeless, hundreds of small businesses close, and irrevocably change our city all without adequate funding or infrastructure in the face of serious challenges ranging from transportation to natural disasters to climate change.

Chairperson Melgar, Supervisors Chan, Chen and other supervisors have introduced amendments to mitigate the egregious impacts of this plan, such as the loss of rent controlled housing. I appreciate this work and encourage this committee to pursue those that which ensures that the total of all existing housing stock is protected from demolition, that small businesses are preserved, & that our neighbourhoods and city are preserved, even it requires sending this legislation back.

One recurring claim is that nothing can be done as our elected representatives in Sacramento are holding a gun to our heads with punitive measures and defunding as threats against San Franciscans. I caution against this messaging as it may signal unintended complicity and lack of fortitude. If our local leaders claim to be powerless to stop this kind of deregulation and removal of protections for the people of San Francisco, what can we expect as even more edicts imperiling San Franciscans are handed down from Sacramento or even Washington? To dismiss this, and imply that housing deregulation is hardly the same as the other ways in which San Francisco is being endangered , I would ask that our leaders consider what it is like to be evicted, to be an elder who will die on the street, to have a family business close and lose one's livelihood, or to be displaced from your generational community. The silencing and removal of our City's most vulnerable have historically come in many forms.

To imply that compliance with law, srate or otherwise, regardless of how it targets our most vulnerable sets a dangerous precedent. I implore us to use the same bravery and conviction we do when we decry other bullying and threats made toward San Francisco and apply it to the

legislative coercion being employed by leadership in Sacramento, people who purport to represent us just as you do.

Sincerely,

Stephen Torres
District 8 & 9 Worker
District 9 Resident

From: Elma Caplin
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:59:31 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Elma Caplin
elmacaplin@gmail.com
101 Polk Street Apt 1111, San Francisco CA 94102
San Francisco, California 94102

From: Laura Booth
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:00:14 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Laura Booth

Renter in the Richmond district

Laura Booth
laurasbooth@gmail.com
1900 Cabrillo St., Apt. 2
San Francisco, California 94121

From: Lauren Carara
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:00:26 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Lauren Carara
lcarara@gmail.com
486 Funston Ave, Apt 3
San Francisco, California 94118

From: Cassondra Curiel
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Amend Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Significantly - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:01:02 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Cassondra Curiel
ccuriel@uesf.org
87 Grand View Ave.
San Francisco, California 94114

From: Lauren Mogannam
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:02:06 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Lauren Mogannam
lmogannam@gmail.com
1535 Taraval St, 401
San Francisco, California 94116

From: Luz Mery Betancur Londoño
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:03:29 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Luz Mery Betancur Londoño
betancur1216@icloud.com
474 Natoma 6 street # 207
San Francisco cal , California 94103

From: melissa boyd
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:03:44 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely, Melissa Boyd

melissa boyd
girlwhocandoboth@gmail.com
1538 42nd avenue
San Francisco, California 94122

From: Chagua Camacho-Olguín
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:03:52 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Chagua Camacho-Olguín
chaguis68@gmail.com
182 Granville Way
Sanfrancisco, California 94127

From: Stephen Albair
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:04:15 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Stephen Albair
stephenalbair@gmail.com
150 Page St. #47 Unit #47
San Francisco, California 94102-5837

From: mir49@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Miranda Claggette
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:04:24 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): My family has been living in San Francisco for five generations in the same house since the 1930s. I live on Dewey Boulevard and own another property on Connecticut. If this proposition passes, developers will be able to build an 80 foot high, four story building next-door to my home. As stated above, I am opposed to this plan as it will affect my family in unfavorable ways.

Sincerely,
Miranda Claggette
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: Kirill Mogilev
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:04:33 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Subject: Amend or Reject Blanket Upzoning – Protect Renters and Real Affordability

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission,

As the 150 Font Blvd Tenant Association, we represent renters living in one of San Francisco's largest multifamily communities. We are deeply concerned that the Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will worsen, not solve, the housing crisis by displacing existing renters and encouraging luxury development over affordable homes.

San Francisco's rental market is already at a breaking point — available homes for working people are nearly nonexistent. Without meaningful protections, upzoning will accelerate the loss of rent-controlled housing and push long-term tenants out of the city.

We urge you to adopt amendments that:
Exclude all rent-controlled homes from upzoning.
Require at least 50 % affordable housing on large opportunity parcels.
Raise inclusionary requirements to 20 % on-site BMR.
Protect small and legacy businesses from displacement.
Guarantee local prevailing wages for construction workers.

San Francisco cannot rely on speculative private markets to create affordability. The City must take leadership in protecting renters and ensuring that new housing serves those who already live and work here.

Sincerely,
150 Font Blvd Tenant Association
(With support from WSTA, TANC, and allied community partners)

Kirill Mogilev
kirill.mogilev@gmail.com
150 Font Blvd, 10-L
San Francisco, California 94132

From: Maggie Rummel
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:04:43 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Maggie Rummel
Maggierummel@mac.com

San Francisco, California 94118

From: kelly.l.krause@gmail.com
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:04:45 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

kelly.l.krause@gmail.com
522 Hyde Street
San Francisco, California 94109

From: Jamie Pearlstein
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:05:06 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I have rented in SF for about 15 years. I work, volunteer, and donate time and resources in SF. Please don't make me or other rent controlled residents lose our homes. Put yourself in our shoes.

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds,

beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Jamie Pearlstein
jhpearlstein@hotmail.com
Diamond St #7
San Francisco, California 94114

From: capozzialex@gmail.com
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:06:40 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

capozzialex@gmail.com
4150 Cesar Chavez , Apt 3
San Francisco , California 94131

From: Shanti Zinzi
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:07:56 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Shanti Zinzi
thenatureofthebeast@yahoo.com
Park st
Sf, California 94110

From: Erika Frick
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:08:15 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors,

As a 25-year resident of Nob Hill, I implore you to take action to stop the reckless building of housing that jeopardizes rent controlled tenants and fails to meet the needs of San Francisco citizens.

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis. Without significant amendments, it will make the crisis worse by displacing renters and small businesses and prioritizing luxury development over the affordable housing our communities actually need.

There is a better path forward. We can meet state housing requirements without displacing people and ensure that new housing is truly affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include the following priorities in any upzoning plan:

1. Protect all rent-controlled housing.
The proposal must explicitly carve out ALL of the city's 100,000 rent-controlled homes, which house over 200,000 residents. These homes are the backbone of San Francisco's affordability and must not be upzoned or put at risk. Our local Housing Element prioritizes preserving existing affordable housing, and that commitment must be upheld.

2. Require more affordable housing in all new development.
We must increase affordability requirements, not reduce them. Proposals to swap below-market-rate (BMR) units for market-rate ones should be rejected. Inclusionary zoning should be strengthened to require at least 20 percent affordable units on-site. On large opportunity parcels, at least 50 percent of new housing should be affordable, through the creation of an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD).

3. Phase in new development based on actual need.
New condos and market-rate housing should be introduced gradually, with regular review to ensure they match community needs. Large-scale construction of luxury units without affordability guarantees will only accelerate gentrification and displacement.

4. Protect small businesses.
Preserve San Francisco's certified Legacy Businesses and prohibit their demolition. Developers should be required to provide relocation assistance starting at $150,000, along with turn-key "warm shell" improvements for displaced small businesses.

5. Defend the public waterfront and other legacy areas
Public access and environmental protections must remain in place. Do not support efforts to privatize or develop our protected coastal waterfront.

6. Stop with the out of sync high rises
Do not approve height restrictions that will ruin our legacy neighborhoods from Nob Hill to Fisherman's Wharf to Telegraph Hill to Chinatown. There is no market for these expensive condos and no reason to ruin the beauty of our City.

Our neighborhoods and small businesses cannot afford more displacement. We need development that supports the people who already live here. I urge you to show bold leadership and protect the future of a diverse and affordable San Francisco.

Sincerely,
Erika Frick

Erika Frick
erika.awakening@gmail.com
845 California St., Apt 801
San Francisco, California 94108

From: Samia Afra
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:08:50 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Samia Afra
samurai_10@hotmail.com
525 LEAVENWORTH ST, APT 21
San Francisco, California 94109

From: Carolyn Anderson
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:08:50 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

If this were to happen, my husband and I would be evicted and would have to move out of SF. I would lose my community, neighbors and favorite place in the world. Please don’t let that happen.

Sincerely,
Carolyn Anderson

Carolyn Anderson
zomgitsbear@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94121

From: marcia pourfarrokh
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:09:10 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

marcia pourfarrokh
marci8054@gmail.com
357 4th Avenue
San Francisco , California 94118

From: Sandra Juri
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:10:05 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Sandra Juri (disabled and would be greatly affected by this change)

Sandra Juri
jurisa@sbcglobal.net
2210 Stockton St apt 4061
San Francisco, 94133

From: Stephanie Darling
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:10:41 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Stephanie Darling
irismoonchild0@gmail.com
1226 Grant Ave. #30
San Francisco, California 94133

From: Brandi Valenza
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:10:55 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Brandi Valenza
brandi@thedevilsdesigns.com
167 Dolores Street, Apt 7
San Francisco, California 94103

From: phnxextant2.0@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Owl
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:11:13 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
John Owl
San Francisco, CA 94102

From: spuleta71@gmail.com
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:12:21 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

spuleta71@gmail.com
2690 Great Hwy
San Francisco, California 94116

From: Anja Bircher
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:17:28 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Anja Bircher
anjabircher@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94110

From: Laura Carroll
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:17:35 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

I’m totally sick of working class people, teachers etc being priced out.

Sincerely,

Laura Carroll
Lauramclouds@gmail.com
262 EVELYN WAY
SAN FRANCISCO, California 94127

From: Michelina Matarrese
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:18:39 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to ALL San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. The private market will NEVER do the job our local government should in ensuring San Francisco builds much-needed housing for all. We need your moral integrity and creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Michelina Matarrese
rckstrgrl@me.com
1032 Steiner St
San Francisco , California 94115

From: Melanie Malinas
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:18:47 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for non-rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Melanie Malinas
melaniemalinas@gmail.com
4022 Mission Street
San Francisco, California 94112-1017

From: Eileen Cronin
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:19:13 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Eileen Cronin
ekcronin@earthlink.net
1950 Franklin St #10
San Francisco , California 94109

From: DEMIAN QUESNEL
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:20:21 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Demian Quesnel
Longtime Castro resident [over 50 years].

DEMIAN QUESNEL
dquesnel@usa.net
4084 17Th St, Apt 4
San Francisco, California 94114-1944

From: Susan Mallon
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:21:26 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Susan Mallon
Long-time SF Renter!

Susan Mallon
sfmallon@gmail.com
909 PAGE ST APT 2
SAN FRANCISCO, California 94117

From: Loretta Chavac Ortiz
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:22:48 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Loretta Chavac Ortiz
lchavacortiz77@yahoo.com
821 Jackson St, Apt 2
San Francisco, California 94133

From: David Perry
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:24:28 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

David Perry
perryd1@mac.com
1700 Octavia St. #301
San Francisco, California 94109

From: Michele Simmerer
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:24:34 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Michele Simmerer
colorboxsalon@gmail.com
2777 Bryant Street SF CA 94110
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Michele Simmerer
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:25:02 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Michele Simmerer
colorboxsalon@gmail.com
2777 Bryant Street SF CA 94110
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Allison Sparkuhl
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:26:03 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Allison

Allison Sparkuhl
amsparkuhl@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94118

From: LeLeon Kizine
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:26:40 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

LeLeon Kizine
Kizinel@gmail.com
150 Berry St. #422
San francisco, California 94107

From: Joan Osato
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:26:42 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Joan Osato
joan.osato@gmail.com
743 grove street
San francisco, 994102

From: Taraneh Hemami
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:26:42 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Taraneh Hemami
taraneh.hemami@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94121

From: vanessabrown0316@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of V. Brown
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:26:45 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

We live in the Inner richmond & there is not enough affordable housing nor infrastructure for residents as is. Do not sell us to the highest bidder! Counting on you to fight for us!!

Sincerely,
V. Brown
San Francisco, CA 94118

From: meganwithpapa@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Megan Adams
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:27:28 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Megan Adams
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: chavetch@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Susan Hughes
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:28:43 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisor Chan,

I met you in a neighborhood meeting (Outer Richmond, 45th Avenue).

Please protect our neighborhood from this plan. If it goes through it will ruin it. Also, when the plan says it will add so many affordable units - it's like a joke. Affordable to whom? No person I know can pay for this "affordable" housing. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Susan Hughes
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: lroddan@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lea Ann Roddan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:29:24 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Lea Ann Roddan
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: Hannah Cardenas
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:29:45 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

With gratitude,
Hannah Cardenas, Western Addition resident

Hannah Cardenas
hannah.a.cardenas@gmail.com
1729 Golden Gate Ave
San Francisco, California 94115

From: Randa Talbott
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:30:49 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Randa Talbott
RANDATALBOTT@YAHOO.COM
3030 Turk Blvd
San Francisco, California 94118

From: Sophia Tarantino
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:33:20 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Sophia Tarantino
sophialenschmidt@gmail.com
291 27th Avenue
San Francisco, California 94121

From: Joann Ricci
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:34:18 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Joann Ricci
gravity_helmet_9f@icloud.com
1145 Church St
San Francisco , California 94114

From: Pamela Uberti
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:35:05 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Pamela Uberti
pamelauberti@me.com
2290 Stockton Street, 2108
San Francisco, California 94133-1526

From: Rita Rodriguez
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:35:06 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Rita Rodriguez
ritarodriguez5353@yahoo.com
118 San Jose Ave #A
San Francisco , California 94110

From: adrian101x@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Adrian Truong
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:36:58 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Adrian Truong
San Francisco, CA 94112

From: Ian Blei
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:37:11 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need, won't solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments.
There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Ian Blei

Ian Blei
funk.metalman@yahoo.com

San Francisco, California 94114

From: Angela M. Griffiths
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:37:31 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Angela M. Griffiths
ax3heart@icloud.com
600 Silliman street, Unit A
San Francisco, California 94134

From: Lani Asher
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:38:42 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Lani Asher
laniasher8@gmail.com
1806 church st
San Francisco , California 94131

From: Lorena Lopez
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:38:52 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Lorena Lopez
lo_losart@yahoo.com
768 9th Ave, 16
San Francisco, California 94118

From: dimaseg526@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Dimas Gonzalez
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:39:57 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Dimas Gonzalez
San Francisco, CA 94110

From: Terry Ayyad
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:40:20 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Terry Ayyad
tariq3699@gmail.com
159 23rd avenue 1
San Francisco , California 94121

From: Robert Rowntree
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: public comments - Family zoning plan
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:41:18 PM

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

i tried to sustain the line on monday , to give my comments. After in line 1 hour i had to go. My district 9 staff suggested corresponding w this "bos" address to submit my comment

robert rowntree 2889 24th St, San Francisco, CA 94110

On the zoning plan under consideration -

San Francisco is legally required to permit 82,000 new homes by 2031, and Mayor Lurie's "family zoning" plan—36,000 homes on the north and west sides—is a critical step forward. Without it, the state could take control of our housing approvals.

Up-zoning alone won't solve the problem. Construction costs need to stay in line with the rents tied to Area Median Income. AMI has grown about 4% a year, but construction costs in San Francisco have been rising at twice that rate - a mismatch jeopardizing affordable financially solvent projects over the longer term.

The contrast is stark: public projects like Potrero Block B or 730 Stanyan cost over $1.1 million per unit, while private projects such as 300 DeHaro deliver homes for under $400,000 per unit. High fees, long permitting timelines, and "everything-bagel" regulations are driving California home construction costs through the roof. A 2025 Rand study comparing costs among similar projects in CA, CO & TX focused on the reasons per sq. foot construction in CA is double or more the cost in Colorado and Texas.

Up-zoning and good finance must go hand in hand. That means cutting red tape, speeding approvals, reducing fees, and protecting small businesses and tenants as new housing comes online. If we can cut production costs even partway toward Texas levels, new CA rents could fall by 15%.

I urge you: approve the family zoning plan, weave in Melgar's eviction limitations, pair it with cost containment, and give San Francisco the abundant, affordable housing we desperately need

From: 321dina@gmail.com
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:41:32 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

321dina@gmail.com
76 Deming St, Apt D
San Francisco, California 94114

From: Francis Broome
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:42:12 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Francis Broome
District 5

Francis Broome
Fjbinsf@gmail.com
615 Fillmore street
San Francisco, California 94117

From: Irma Arias-Greedy
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:42:37 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Irma

Irma Arias-Greedy
irmitarias@gmail.com
1361 Broadway
San Francisco , California 94109

From: calihenson@earthlink.net
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:43:36 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

calihenson@earthlink.net
3300 Scott St
San Francisco, California 94123

From: Katherine wells
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:45:48 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Katherine

Katherine wells
kathwwells@yahoo.com

San Francisco, California 94109

From: Patty Cardona
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:48:07 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it continues to create an elist system that serves the ultra rich in this city. While dismantling and displacing the working class.

We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units.

Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. Stand with all social economic communities. Stop privatizing our access housing.

We need bold and common-sense leadership.

Sincerely,
Patty + Family

Patty Cardona
patty_cardona@mac.com
531 Silver Ave
San Francisco, California 94112

From: Jenny Jerez
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:49:43 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Jenny Jerez
jenluv@gmail.com
391 Oak Street
San Francisco, California 94102

From: stacy thompson
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:50:54 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

stacy thompson
stacyt.thompson@gmail.com
120 webster #8
San Francisco, California 94117

From: Rhea Srivats
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:51:33 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Rhea

Rhea Srivats
rhea.srivats@gmail.com
801 Fillmore Street
San Francisco, California 94117

From: Beth Middleworth
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:52:35 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely, Beth Middleworth

Beth Middleworth
bats4bones@gmail.com
4115 , Lincoln Way #12
San Francisco, California 94122

From: Leslie Brand
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:33:52 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Leslie Brand

Leslie Brand
lbrand@me.com
2655 Polk Street, #201
San Francisco, California 94109

From: lygia.stewart@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lygia Stewart
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:34:08 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): don't destroy the great city you represent-
Try to remember WHY we all live here and LOVE San Francusc

Sincerely,
Lygia Stewart
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: Brittany Newell
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:34:17 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Brittany Newell
ratty.writes@gmail.com
770 California St, Apt 504
San Francisco, California 94108

From: Paige Reillt
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:34:41 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Paige Reilly

Paige Reillt
1paigereilly@gmail.com
3090 Vicente Street
San Francisco, California 94116

From: hue_khuu@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Hue Khuu
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:35:06 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Hue Khuu
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: dorit7@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Dorit Grunberger
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:35:18 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Dorit Grunberger

From: Camille Blomgren
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:35:58 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Camille Blomgren

Camille Blomgren
camilleblomgren@gmail.com
2047 Turk Blvd. Apt 3
SAN FRANCISCO, California 94115

From: Madelyn Moseley
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:36:26 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Madelyn Moseley

Madelyn Moseley
madelynmoseley@gmail.com
1454 Taylor St., Apt. 5
San Francisco, California 94133

From: Diana Lacson
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:37:36 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Diana Lacson
dianayak@icloud.con
2396 Pine Street
San Francisco, California 94115

From: fhochschild@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Frances Hochschild
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:38:19 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Please also create building standards which don't seem to be in the current plan. I'm most interested in understanding how the plan will ensure that there is consideration to the patterns and rhythms of our neighborhood will continue - stucco, shingles, craftsmen, Mediterranean, etc.

Sincerely,
Frances Hochschild
San Francisco, CA 94115

From: Jacqueline Ali Cordoba
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:38:22 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Jacqueline Ali Cordoba
jackiealicordoba@gmail.com
1585 Waller Street, Apt. 2
San Francisco, California 94117

From: Laurie Shanaman
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:39:30 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Laurie Shanaman
lshanaman@yahoo.com
78 sycamore
San Francisco , California 94110

From: Ferdinando Penn
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:39:42 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Ferdinando Penn
colors2dream@prodigy.net
1996 Chestnut St
San Francisco , California 94123

From: Karin Parks
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:39:58 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Karin Parks
ksp_designs@hotmail.com
737 Post Street
San Francisco , 9410@

From: Andie Sanchez
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:40:31 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Andie Sanchez

Andie Sanchez
andilyn111@yahoo.com
917 Cole Street
San Francisco , California 94117

From: Erin Gillespie
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:41:08 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Erin Gillespie

Erin Gillespie
gillesee@gmail.com
754 Fell St, A
San Francisco, California 94117

From: Berry Minott
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:41:13 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Berry Minott
b.minott@me.com

San Francisco, California 94107

From: Erin Nederbo
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:41:13 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Erin Nederbo
erinanederbo@gmail.com
669 29th Street
San Francisco, California 94118

From: Linda Blackaby
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:42:07 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Linda Blackaby
lindablacksby@me.com

San Francisco, California 94131

From: Kathleen Smith
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:42:14 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Kathleen Smith
ludasmith@icloud.com
1499 California street
San Francisco , California 94109

From: Wendi Raw
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:42:14 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I've been in San Francisco for many decades and we've seen this before. We've seen the problems that it creates and the lives that are broken. Our city has not gotten better over these decades because of this type of development. In fact, for those of us who have been here long, it has clearly made things worse. The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds,

beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Wendi Raw
wendiraw@gmail.com
3460 16th St
San Francisco, California 94114

From: Mary Bugarin
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:42:17 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Mary Bugarin

Mary Bugarin
maria.bugarin7@gmail.com
1130 Filbert Street
San Francisco , California 94109

From: Erika Shershun
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:42:26 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Erika Shershun
erikashe@me.com
2028 Hyde St Apt 2
San Francisco , California 94109

From: Samantha Bellach
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:42:40 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Samantha Bellach

Samantha Bellach
sambellach@gmail.com
2332 15th St
San Francisco, California 94114

From: VICTOR Antonetti
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:43:09 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Victor

VICTOR Antonetti
cinch_steeple_55@icloud.com

San Francisco, California 94114

From: Karen Schanche
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:43:12 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever! We do not need more greed to be supported in Laurie's plan. Enough already! Think more creatively for the well being of the communities that make up SF, not just the

wealthy but those that are tenants that also contribute… it would be so much more powerful if we can support the collective in a shared common humanity, not just the wealthy few that are lucky enough to be owners.

Thank you

Sincerely,
Karen Schanche

Karen Schanche
karen.schanche2@ucsf.edu
614 Funston ave
SF, California 94118

From: Teresa Shelly
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:43:32 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Teresa

Teresa Shelly
tshelly@gmail.com
65 Sanchez St., Apt. 3
San Francisco, California 94114

From: Michelle Graney
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:43:35 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

I am unemployed. Controlling my rent is all I have. Please do not do this.

Sincerely,
A girl who loves this city
Michelle Graney

Michelle Graney
michelle94109@gmail.com
480 Warren Dr Apt A
SAN FRANCISCO, California 94131

From: Walter Lenci
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:44:09 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

SincerelyWalter Lenci,

Walter Lenci
wlenci@gmail.com
1576 Clay Street
San Francisco , California 94109

From: liz lawton
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:45:38 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

liz lawton
elizabethlawton98@gmail.com
654 castro st apt 1
san francisco , California 94114

From: tika hall
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Stop the evictions- Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:45:55 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Tika Hall

tika hall
tikaelhall@gmail.com
24 Kingston St
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Maya Threadgill
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:46:28 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Maya Threadgill
threadgillmaya@gmail.com
11 Dedman Court
San Francisco , California 94124

From: Christy Smith
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:46:44 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Christy Smith
theivyfox1@gmail.com
7630 Geary Blvd., Apt. 205
San Francisco, California 94121

From: luigianni@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Andrew Kraft
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:46:54 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Andrew Kraft
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: Jennifer Rey
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:47:06 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Jennifer Rey
jennifer.rey@me.com
336 Sanchez Street
San Francisco, California 94114

From: Theresa Schmitter
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:47:11 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Theresa Schmitter
theresaschmitter@hotmail.com
785 Brannan Street apt 508
San Francisco , CA 94103

From: Samantha Zylberman
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:47:13 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Samantha Zylberman

Samantha Zylberman
szylberman@gmail.com
3130 Webster St, #2
San Francisco, California 94123

From: Cathy Asmus
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:47:24 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Cathy Asmus
cathyasmus@gmail.com
1287 Arguello Blvd
San Francisco, California 94122

From: Leonor Melara
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:47:27 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Leonor Melara
leonormelara@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94131

From: Gina Sciarrillo
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:47:29 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Gina Sciarrillo

Gina Sciarrillo
pop_sickle_star@yahoo.com
545 Birch St
San Francisco, California 94102

From: Gioia Everywhere
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:47:31 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Gioia

Gioia Everywhere
abieverywhere@gmail.com
1556 Great Highway, #204
San Francisco, California 94122-2858

From: Paul McCarthy
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:47:44 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I live in a one bedroom studio apartment in your district. I'm 75 years old. Under present San Francisco law I can stay in the apartment so long as I pay the rent. I don't want the city to ok tearing down my apartment building and replacing it with a luxury condo with huge rents.

Paul McCarthy
p_mccarthy@sbcglobal.net
2023 folsom #6
Oakland, California 94612

From: Jennifer Pacheco
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:48:08 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Jennifer Pacheco
minajen@yahoo.com
3330 Cesar Chavez St
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Tara Stroud
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:48:13 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Tara Stroud
taraloo@hotmail.com
2744 Sacramento
Sf, California 94115

From: Beatrix Jones
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:48:38 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Our vibrant city suffers when we prioritize luxury apartments that end up sitting empty over truly affordable housing that enables residents from all walks of life to call San Francisco home.

Sincerely,
Beatrix, a resident of SF district 5

Beatrix Jones
beanotbeah@gmail.com
701 Fell St
San Francisco , California 94117

From: Remyah Nguyen
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:48:44 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Remyah Nguyen
r.liam.nguyen@gmail.com
2238 Hyde Street
San Francisco, California 94109

From: Kelsey Moon
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:48:55 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Kelsey Moon

Kelsey Moon
kcmoon4347@gmail.com

San Francisco , California 94121

From: Joanna Pablo
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:48:57 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Joanna Pablo
joannajpablo@gmail.com
3500 Market St, Apt 102
San Francisco, California 94131

From: Laura Martin
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:49:34 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Laura Martin
a.martin.montero@gmail.com
3256 21st street
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Carla Naylor
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:49:37 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Carla Naylor
carla2naylor@gmail.com
11 Madrid Ct
Novato, California 94949

From: Lina Lucana
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:49:58 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Lina Lucana
ample.87.volleys@icloud.com
750 bacon street
San Francisco, California 94134

From: Sara Brown
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:50:21 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Sara Brown
bsara0896@gmail.com
3929 Mission Street
San Francisco, California 94112

From: Korri Piper
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:50:45 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Korri Piper

Korri Piper
korripiper@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94121

From: mojodugan@comcast.net
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:50:56 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Maureen Dugan RN
California Nurses Association

mojodugan@comcast.net
1454 10th Ave
San Francisco, California 94122

From: Kira Papineau
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:50:57 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Kira Papineau
kirapap@yahoo.com
880 Franklin St
San Francisco, California 94102

From: Amy Petrine
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:51:22 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

SF doesn't need more new market-rate buildings for housing. We need more affordable housing and programs to support our most vulnerable community members. Please remember the true spirit of San Francisco when you vote on this matter. All communities work better when we look out for everyone. Please stay strong for ALL your constituents, not just those who can afford to pour money into your special projects & re-election campaigns. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Amy Petrine
amy.k.petrine@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94121

From: Kathryn Reffell
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:51:37 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. Do your jobs.

Sincerely,

Kathryn.

Kathryn Reffell
LadyActinium@protonmail.com
878 39th Ave, Fulton
San Francisco, California 94121

From: Emily Gifford
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:51:47 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

As a San Francisco renter I am absolutely appalled by the mayor's plan to indiscriminately allow upzoning without protections for renters and small businesses or stronger carve outs for affordable housing. I know that the Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the

private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Emily Gifford
emily.elisabeth127@gmail.con
2515 Clement St. , APT 1
San Francisco, California 94121

From: JOHN CERVANTES
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:51:57 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

JOHN CERVANTES
city10s@pacbell.net
532-28th Avenue , 4
San Francisco , California 94121

From: Lynette Betancur
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:51:58 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Lynette Betancur
lynette.betancur@yahoo.com
67 Lapidge St
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Frishtah Afifi
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:52:01 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Frishtah Afifi
msybi@yahoo.com
78 Johnson Street Apt 518
San Francisco, California 94130

From: stephenzking@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Stephen King
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:52:13 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):please do not implement this plan.

Sincerely,
Stephen King
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: Billie Ferrell
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:52:14 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Billie Ferrell
bhferrell91@gmail.com
1650 Jones Street, Apt 115
San Francisco, California 94109

From: Yuka Kanpuri
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:52:24 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Yuka Kanpuri
Magicways7@yahoo.com
320 Turk
San Francisco , California 94102

From: winds129@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Nelly Soncuya
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:52:54 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Nelly Soncuya

From: Sarah Weidman
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:53:25 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Sarah Weidman
(sf resident for 20 years, full time student that could not afford to live in San Francisco without rent control).

Sarah Weidman
sarahrweidman@ail.com
1618 Polk Street 17
San Francisco , California 94109

From: Julie Dearborn
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:53:39 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Julie Dearborn

Julie Dearborn
juliedearborn@comcast.net
435 22nd Avenue, #3
San Francisco, CA 94131

From: Natalie Waugh
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:53:40 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Natalie Waugh
nataliewaugh@gmail.com
1564 Waller St.
San Francisco, California 94117

From: Karen Khouri-Haddad
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:54:03 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Karen Khouri-Haddad
karehaddad@aol.com
1388 California St, #306A
san Francisco, California 94109

From: Bronwyn Galloway
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:54:16 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Bronwyn Galloway
bkg@awesf.com
601 OFarrell Street , 302
San Francisco , California 94109

From: Abby Van Kirk
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:54:35 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Abby Van Kirk
abbyvk2014@yahoo.com
633 , Grand View Ave
San Francisco , California 94114

From: Danielle Hoang
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:55:17 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Danielle Hoang
brokenpebblejewelry@gmail.com
129 bache street
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Sarah Mehl
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:55:17 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Sarah Mehl
sarahb.mehl@gmail.com
3416 Taraval Street apt 3
San Francisco , California 94116

From: Ellie Vanderlip
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:56:05 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Thank you for taking this seriously.
Sincerely,
Ellie Vanderlip

Ellie Vanderlip
ellie.vanderlip@gmail.com
229 21st Avenue unit 5
San Francisco, California 94121

From: Moira DeNike
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:56:33 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Moira

Moira DeNike
moiradenike@yahoo.com
2 Mizpah St
San Francisco, California 94131

From: priscilla@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Priscilla Marquis
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:56:42 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Priscilla Marquis
San Francisco, CA 94112

From: Brenda Bryant
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:57:21 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Brenda Bryant
brenda-leigh@sbcglobal.net
895 34th Avenue , Apt 1
San Francisco, California 94121

From: Tania Campos
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:57:24 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Tania Campos
tcampos10@yahoo.com
744 Goettingen Street
San Francisco, California 94134

From: Scarlett Bush
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:57:44 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Scarlett Bush
scraffyscarlett@gmail.com
3110 Clay St, Apt 8
San Francisco, California 94115

From: Leah Kennedy
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:57:48 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
1- Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
2- Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should NOT be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
3- We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
4- Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
5- Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
5- Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely, Leah Kennedy

Leah Kennedy
leahelizabethk@gmail.com
844 Baker Street #2
San Francisco, California 94115

From: Tricia Gillespie
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:58:12 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Tricia Gillespie
Chesty.gillespie@gmail.com
227 Sanchez Street, 7
San Francisco, California 94114

From: lananramadan@gmail.com
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:58:26 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

lananramadan@gmail.com
1111 pine st
San Francisco , California 94109

From: Catherine McGinty
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:58:34 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Catherine McGinty
catherinemcginty1@fmail.com
2516 Sacramento st
San Francisco , California 94115

From: okneprak@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Susan Karpenko
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 3:55:53 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Please do not destroy the integrity of our single family homes in family focused neighborhoods. Consider height of dense housing not more than 40ft, parking and not displacing small businesses. There is already a trending of grocery stores being removed from neighborhoods. Geary Street stiires in outer Richmond district are closing and are in accessible due to lack of parking. Taraval has a similar problem 19th ave to Sunset blvd.. San Francisco is a city and County, it is not fair to impose the same housing mandate that the state might impose on Sacramento/ Yolo County or Los Angeles. Scott Weiner who is the Architect of this plan is not trusted. Please consider more nuanced and reasonable dense housing solutions.

Sincerely,
Susan Karpenko
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: lindadellangelica@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Linda Dell"Angelica
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 3:56:01 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Linda Dell'Angelica
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: foggydawg@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Terrie Gigliotti
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 3:56:36 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Terrie Gigliotti
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: djbabe3@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Diana Tam
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 3:56:36 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Diana Tam

From: emilydlr50@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Emily De La Rosa
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 3:56:38 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Emily De La Rosa
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: emilydlr50@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Emily De La Rosa
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 3:57:20 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Emily De La Rosa
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: momo@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Morris Shooer
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 3:58:00 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Morris Shooer
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: Christina Rey
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 3:58:03 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Protect all diversity of all renters on this city benefits all districts.

Sincerely,
Christina Rey

Christina Rey
cvanonselen49@gmail.com
1926 Anza Street, Apt 2
San Francisco, California 94119

From: johnkok@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Kok
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 3:58:05 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
John Kok
San Francisco, CA 94124

From: mkiss52967@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Margaret Kiss
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 3:58:29 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Margaret Kiss
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: LDawydiak@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Leanna Dawydiak
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 3:59:06 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Dear Connie Chan, my supervisor;

As a native born and raised San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

This is pretty much a "canned" message but it displays my sentiments. I want you to know since this started I've been getting calls from people wanting to buy my house as it's on one of the corridors. I have no intention of selling and resent this which is only happening because of this upzoning crap!

Sincerely,
Leanna Dawydiak
San Francisco, CA 94118

From: lisaikeda@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lisa Ikeda
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 3:59:08 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Lisa Ikeda
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: texeira@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lela Texeira
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:01:26 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Lela Texeira
San Francisco, CA 94112

From: mustang77@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Andrew Cohen
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:01:27 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Andrew Cohen
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: stacylgin@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Stacy Gin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:01:47 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Stacy Gin
Daly City, CA 94014

From: sbraa@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sonia Sherard Braa
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:01:54 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):
Why do state legislators have the right to change the liveability and character of entire neighborhoods? What about the desires of the current occupants of those neighborhoods who may not want to live in a dense, dark, concrete jungle? Why are the actual homeowners and residents disenfranchised of their right to say how their neighborhoods will be going forward? It's just wrong and it's unhealthy both for people and wildlife to increase density.

Sincerely,
Sonia Sherard Braa
San Francisco, CA 94110

From: waterwirt@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Wirt Lewis
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:01:57 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Wirt Lewis
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: johnkok@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Kok
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:02:15 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, (5th generation)I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement.

Bring back common sense & quit destroying our city.

Sincerely,
John Kok
San Francisco, CA 94124

From: k_kern@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kevin Kern
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:03:29 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Additionally this plan decimates the character of the sunset. Furthermore why are we even entertaining this plan knowing we have a population decline not only in the usa but specifically San Francisco. It makes zero sense. The argument that if we don't do this the state will take it over is hyperbole. We the people should have the final say of what happens in our neighborhoods. Stop this political madness.

Sincerely,
Kevin Kern
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: tomchen99@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Tom Chen
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:03:41 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Tom Chen

From: dfeifer@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Donald Feifer
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:03:42 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Donald Feifer

From: aliciaberberich@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Alicia Berberich
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:04:08 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):
We will lose the flavors of the neighborhoods and all that makes San Francisco so special. This is short sighted.

Sincerely,
Alicia Berberich
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: raggarwa_1@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Rahul Aggarwal
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:04:28 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Rahul Aggarwal
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: paula@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Paula Lynch
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:05:27 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Paula Lynch
San Francisco, CA 94131

From: 5695ant@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Anthony Regala
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:06:51 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

SF is already unaffordable for so many people who make the city what it is.

Sincerely,
Anthony Regala

From: moorelevander@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of LeVander Brown
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:06:53 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
LeVander Brown
San Francisco, CA 94103

From: zizivaga@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Vivian Imperiale
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:07:20 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):The City should be proud to have several neighborhoods that were built as residential parks. They have such a history and such charm. Don't alter them and destroy part of S.F. history.

parks like Ingleside Terraces

Sincerely,
Vivian Imperiale
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: lg88sf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lise Gutelius
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:07:51 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

I grew up in the Sunset, it's more than just a neighborhood to me, it's home. My parents still live in the home they bought decades ago there, and I've seen firsthand how much this community gives to the people who live in it. This upzoning plan isn't about housing people — it's about profit. Tearing down rent-controlled and affordable homes, displacing longtime residents and small businesses, and handing billions to developers without real investment in infrastructure, transit, schools, or services is not progress — it's destruction. We need thoughtful, community-led planning that protects what makes San Francisco livable and equitable — not luxury towers that push out working families and raise our taxes. Please do not sell out our neighborhoods.

Mayor Laurie is doing a great job in all aspects (for far too long we had a lazy useless mayor whose terms were a complete failure. It was disgusting to know she was an S.F. native), except this.

Sincerely,
Lise Gutelius
San Francisco, CA 94108

From: fpazouki@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Fatemah Pazouki
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:08:55 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Fatemah Pazouki
San Francisco, CA 94131

From: thomas@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Thomas Spielbauer
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:09:20 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Thomas Spielbauer
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: lvngbdy@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lucia Delgado
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:09:57 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Lucia Delgado
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: alburdulis@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Albert Birsulis
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:10:35 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Albert Birsulis
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: soong.sharon@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sharon Soong
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:11:55 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):
We live on Gough at Vallejo. So many beautiful historic homes in this area. This Upzoning will destroy the fabric of this historic neighborhood and others like it. And when does a city become 'saturated'. When is enough, enough? We barely have the necessary infrastructure to support all the residents of SF now. How will it handle thousands more people?

Sincerely,
Sharon Soong
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: juliedearborn@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Julie Dearborn
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:12:42 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

I am a senior citizen living in a rent-controlled apartment near Geary Blvd. I am terrified of losing it. Rent control is what has allowed me to stay in San Francisco. I am skeptical about MayorLurie's assurances that rent controlled buildings will not be demolished. When money is involved, politicians tend to forget about their promises.

Sincerely,
Julie Dearborn
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: judywadesf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Judy Wade
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:12:55 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I fully Mayor Lurie's plan, which will build much needed housing and allow San Francisco to grow to a size that will improve our tax base, support our small businesses, and allow our public schools to thrive as they will be at scale. All neighborhoods will have to sacrifice somewhat to ensure we create a thriving city. San Francisco shops and restaurants used to rely heavily on visitors from the East, North, and South Bay but these areas are now where the destination Shopping malls and economic growth are happening as these regions are of sufficient scale to have a Saks, Eataly and the like.
So let's build housing — affordable, middle income, 8-10 stories and duplexes. Otherwise we risk becoming a shrinking economic base and population.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):
We u

Sincerely,
Judy Wade
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: mjeshia@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Margaret Eshia
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:15:35 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Margaret Eshia
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: alaskadino@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Dennis Thurston
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:19:18 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Dennis Thurston
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: sherrill.foster@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sherrill Foster
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:20:28 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): I have lived in this beautiful city for 68 years (born and raised) and developers and billionaire investors need to do more to help with the homelessness problem for real not just to line their pockets and move on!

Maybe the problem is a billionaire mayor who sees the wrong kind of dollar signs for my city!

Sincerely,
Sherrill Foster
San Francisco, CA 94132

From: Terribel329@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Theresa Belcher
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:22:15 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a native San afranciscan, who lives in the sunset District, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Theresa Belcher
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: eobintalmadge010101@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Robin Talmadge
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:25:29 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Robin Talmadge
San Francisco, CA 94110

From: beaubarlotte@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Charlotte Worcester
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:27:10 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Charlotte Worcester
San Francisco, CA 94131

From: gbirsinl@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Laura Birsinger
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:28:18 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm a second generation San Franciscan and I am very concerned about the impact of the proposed up zoning plan.

We are caving in to Sacramento to pass a plan which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

The requirements for SF are based on outdated population/housing estimates. The affordable housing aspect is not a certainty.

There are tens of thousands units within the city which are in the pipeline for development, but they haven't been counted. How about Candlestick? What's happening there?

Please reconsider. We will remember who represented the people and stood up against the unreasonable mandates from Sacramento.

Sincerely,
Laura Birsinger
San Francisco, CA 94132

From: charleer6@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Charlee Moore
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:28:32 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Charlee Moore
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: sabaseifu93@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Saba Seifu
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:30:12 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Saba Seifu
Schenectady, NY 12345

From: residue.wooden0h@icloud.com
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:30:28 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

residue.wooden0h@icloud.com

San Francisco, California 94102

From: sagaris55@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Laura Short
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:30:32 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Laura Short
San Francisco, CA 94110

From: Kathryn Obertik
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:31:03 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Kathryn Obertik
421 Cornwall St 4
SF CA 94118

Kathryn Obertik
supernova771@gmail.com
421 Cornwall St 4
San Francisco, California 94118

From: Jackie Martell
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:31:08 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Jackie Martell
jmartell095@gmail.com
1335 pacific ave
San Francisco , California 94109

From: Krista Gustaveson
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:31:23 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Krista Gustaveson
kristagustaveson@gmail.com
2460 Chestnut St, Apt 102
San Francisco, California 94123

From: Kelly Sullivan
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:32:53 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Kelly Sullivan
msg_kelly@yahoo.com

San Francisco, California 94109

From: Nicole Seguin-Morris
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:33:21 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Nicole Seguin-Morris
nicosemo@gmail.com
1605 Cabrillo at
San Francisco, California 94121

From: dorit7@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Dorit Grunberger
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:33:47 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Dorit Grunberger

From: maryanntittle@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of MaryAnn Tittle
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 12:08:42 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
MaryAnn Tittle

From: maryanntittle@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of MaryAnn Tittle
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 12:09:27 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
MaryAnn Tittle

From: Regina Islas
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 12:12:08 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

We DO CARE. There is no such thing as trickle down affordable housing, and it's well over time that we hit the bullseye directly. See below for instructions, and follow.

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the

private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Regina Islas
regina.islas@gmail.com
105 Lake St, Apt 12
San Francisco, California 94118

From: maury.raycroft@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Maurice Raycroft
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 12:28:29 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Sincerely,
Maurice Raycroft
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: Vivienne Hay
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 1:02:59 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Vivienne Hay
vivienne.l.hay@gmail.com
1495 Golden Gate Avenue, Apt 207
San Francisco, California 94115

From: dadaray2002@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Linda Ray
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 1:27:39 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision. I feel this whole process is rushed and without adequate public comment and discussion. These zoning changes are the most complex and far reaching and many San Franciscans don't even know they are happening. We should be an example of democratic principals here in San Francisco and not cram things through as is being done at the federal level right now. We can do better. I have lived in San Francisco for 52 years in a number of different neighborhoods and I know that city planning can be done in an intelligent manner or we can go back to the mistakes of the "urban renewal" period of the 50's to early 70's when vibrant communities were destroyed in a discriminatory manner now judged to have been a mistake.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Linda Ray
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: nmorcom@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Neville Morcom
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 1:28:41 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Any limitation of public comment can only be seen by voters as a deliberate attempt to stifle the opinion of residents and to push a decision down our throats.

Sincerely,
Neville Morcom
San Francisco, CA 94111

From: nmorcom@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Neville Morcom
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 1:28:41 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Any limitation of public comment can only be seen by voters as a deliberate attempt to stifle the opinion of residents and to push a decision down our throats.

Sincerely,
Neville Morcom
San Francisco, CA 94111

From: dadaray2002@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Linda Ray
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 1:39:07 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

I have lived in San Francisco for 52 years and feel that this whole process is being rushed so that is can be approved before the residents have a chance to know about it's full implications and have a democratic decision making process. The interests of the super wealthy are now what drives the federal government's priorities, I don't want to see that happen here in San Francisco. We can and must do better for the regular residents that call this city home.

Sincerely,
Linda Ray
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: Scarlett Bush
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 1:43:53 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Scarlett Bush
scarlett.rachel14@gmail.com
3110 Clay Street, Apt 8
San Francisco, California 94115

From: nlfederico@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Nancy Federico
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 2:17:20 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Nancy Federico
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: broazen@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Bernard Roazen
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 3:25:36 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Bernard Roazen
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: sewbig1@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of tracy weiss
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 3:42:41 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
tracy weiss
San Francisco, CA 94107

From: freyason@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of David Corbett
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 3:43:32 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
David Corbett
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: Maykuwatani@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of May Yanagi
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 3:43:48 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
May Yanagi
San Francisco, CA 94118

From: amillerknight@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Alyssa Miller
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 3:43:53 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Alyssa Miller
San Francisco, CA 94121

From:	sophia.woodley@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sophia Katherine Woodley-Von Rothschild
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 3:46:24 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Sophia Katherine Woodley-Von Rothschild
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: bruceolitzky@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Bruce Olitzky
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 3:47:00 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I object to this planned legislation. As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Bruce Olitzky
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: mlogger50@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mary Logger
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 3:47:33 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Mary Logger

From: jeski@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of mike andrewjeski
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 3:47:37 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
mike andrewjeski
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: edmundsrose@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Roselyn Edmunds
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 3:47:55 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):
As a native San Francisco, I love to travel to our distinct and beautiful neighborhoods and support small businesses in those neighborhoods. They create life, blood vitality community and offer the opportunity for small businesses to thrive and help families. To destroy this continues to destroy the fabric of San Francisco in the name of luxury homes That the average San Francisco cannot afford. I urge you with all my heart to keep the integrity and fiber of San Francisco live through small neighborhoods.

Sincerely,
Roselyn Edmunds
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: mrd211@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Michael Dryden
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 3:48:00 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Michael Dryden
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: hjrezvani@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Huda Rezvani
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 3:48:14 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

we do not need more useless buildings in sf. please stop building unnecessary infrastructure and potentially causing a worsening housing crisis in sf

Sincerely,
Huda Rezvani
San Francisco, CA 94103

From: mleontyeva@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mariya Leontyeva
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 3:49:00 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Mariya Leontyeva
San Francisco, CA 94118

From: rosenewton@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Rosemary Newton
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 3:49:54 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Rosemary Newton

From: theharveysofsf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sarah Harvey
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 3:49:55 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): changing the height of buildings to six and eight stories along transit lines is too high. In addition maps showed a working lot on Taraval between 12th/Forest Side and Funston as allowing six story buildings up to 65'. No transit line is in this area. That lot should be removed from proposal. At least.

Sincerely,
Sarah Harvey
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: wertheimlj@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Linda Wertheim
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 3:50:04 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

I support additional and fair priced housing but I don't think the existing plan is a good way to go about it.

Sincerely,
Linda Wertheim
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: kwidoy@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Phyllis Lim
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 3:50:55 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Phyllis Lim
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: dmshea@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Debbie Shea Fox
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 3:51:12 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Debbie Shea Fox
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: sanlyg@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sanly Guan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 3:54:00 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Sanly Guan

From: halog@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Constance Halog
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 3:54:08 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:
Redevelopment has never resulted in more affordable homes, it has gentrified and made unaffordable homes and properties in San Francisco and many other cities. We don't need more luxury condos, we need the neighbourhoods we have now. Stop corporations and developers from buying and destroying existing homes and businesses, and reduce/ eliminate AirBnB short term rentals.

Sincerely,
Constance Halog
San Francisco, CA 94118

From: czyarrow@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Linda Maher
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 3:55:19 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Linda Maher
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: guymbarbaro@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Guy Barbaro
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 3:55:26 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Guy Barbaro
San Francisco, CA 94110

From: Corey Smith
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Wednesday, September 10, 2025 7:55:50 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Corey
California

From: Andrea Yeager
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Wednesday, September 10, 2025 10:23:28 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, and a city employee I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,
Andrea Yeager
Children's Librarian

Andrea
California

From: Sherri Samu
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Sunday, September 21, 2025 5:50:37 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,
Sherri Samu
San Francisco tenant

Sherri
California

From: Jennifer Kroot
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Wednesday, October 1, 2025 8:19:16 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

I'm a bay area native and an SF resident since 1989. I will do everything in my power to stop extreme upzoning. I voted for Lurie because I thought he cared about SF and wanted to try to solve affordability and homelessness. Instead it's the same Developer/Airbnb/billionaire priorities as with Breed.
STOP PRETENDING THAT UPZONING WILL HELP ANYONE EXCEPT THE DEVELOPERS AND THE POLITICIANS THAT THEY SUPPORT.

Sincerely, Jennifer Kroot

Jennifer

California

From: Robin Phillips
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 2:13:58 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Robin Phillips
District 8

Oh, and let Scott Weiner know I'm not going to vote for him against Nancy Pelosi. I met him once in person and he couldn't make eye contact with me.

Robin
California

From: Cathy Asmus
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 2:16:51 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Cathy
California

From: Carolyn Mitsi Hanrahan
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 2:17:11 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Please help us tenants! No displacement of any tenants!

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,
Carolyn MITSI Hanrahan

Carolyn Mitsi
California

From: Courtney Fedorchek
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 3:01:15 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,
Courtney

Courtney
California

From: Calder Lorenz
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 3:11:02 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Calder
California

From: Catherine Butler
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 3:28:16 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,
Catherine Butler

Catherine
California

From: Lauren Kush
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 3:44:18 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Lauren
California

From: Nikolas McConnie-Saad
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 3:55:44 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

The YIMBY/NIMBY characterization of development misrepresents opposition to development under one giant umbrella. It's a bad faith dichotomy cooked up by pro-development at any cost opportunists. San Francisco, like many cities in the USA has a shameful (racist, and classist) history of displacing marginalized and low-income communities under the saccharine guise of "neighborhood renewal/improvement." The Fillmore, SOMA, and Hayes Valley are just a few prime examples of culturally rich neighborhoods with long-standing vibrant communities that were uprooted and kicked out of the city, never to return.

Lurie's plan promises to do the same thing unless tenant protections are baked into the process. You think the homelessness crisis is bad now, just wait until all the aunties and uncles, grandparents, and young(ish) people in non-tech, non-corporate jobs are kicked out of their rent controlled units and are left to fend for themselves. Thinking that just building a bunch of housing will magically ease the housing situation in SF is akin to believing in trickle down economics. This logic sounds sort of plausible at face value, but it's the same load of crap that has led this country to have gilded age levels of wealth inequality.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-

one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including “warm shells”), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Nikolas
California

From: Frania Feldstein
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 4:17:54 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Frania
California

From:	lgpetty
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff
Cc:	Chan, Connie (BOS); SherrillStaff; ChanStaff (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Engardio Staff; BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject:	Supervisors: Time to Write Your Own Zoning Plan to Achieve State AND Public Approval.
Date:	Friday, October 17, 2025 4:56:03 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Re: the Mayor's Family Zoning Plan -
Oct. 20, 2025 Land Use Agenda
Items 1-4, Files 250966, 250700, 250701 & 250785

Dear Land Use Chair Melgar, Vice Chair Chen and Supervisor Mahmood,

This Mayor's Zoning Plan comes to you after many years in the making at the Planning Dept.

It comes in the name of Compliance with State Law, under threat of "something worse."

But is it really compliance? Or is it simply an unpopular mass of severe concessions and capitulations thrown to an insatiably aggressive State Government?

The Mayor's Plan is overstuffed and bloated with all the things we COULD do, rather than what we NEED to do.

We are delivering to U.S. and foreign investors, global corporate developers & speculators -- everything they could ever wish for -- a deregulated hugely desirable ocean-urban landscape to use for a free-for-all no rules game of demolition, buying, selling, and reselling.

It does not have to
be this way.

This is the time for Supervisors to step up-- to shape a Zoning Plan with moderation and common sense -- listening to those most affected, rather than those who will profit from it. And merely offering a few amendments to the Mayor's Plan is not going to transform it into something that fits San Francisco, or wins public support.

The Mayor's Plan plan is controversial, not because it proposes Change. It is opposed by an unusually large and broad coalition of San Franciscans -- renters, homeowners, seniors and young residents, businesspeople, tenant and environmental protectors.

Why? Because they are opposed to Change? No. It is because they are opposed to

Overcompliance. To Overkill. To overly massive unnecessary upheavals with little reward for them or their children, and few protections from exploitation.

It's not too late to fix this; to achieve Compliant Change AND win widespread approval. It's up to you now to create a better way:

Confine upzoning to vacant land, unused or very little-used nearly empty parcels. Dedicate public lands (including Muni properties) to 100 percent affordable housing, with concrete instructions for funding and infrastructure. Limit construction to eight stories for major boulevards. Limit heights on neighborhood commercial streets and other thru-streets to six-story maximums on corner lots only, with no height increases on surrounding streets. Require a minimum of 25 per cent affordable units and 30 per cent family-size units (3 & 4 & 5 bedrooms) in all market rate residential or mixed-use projects.
Ban demolition of rent-controlled units, and remove all of them from upzoning. Prohibit demolition of historical, cultural & landmarked properties, and legacy busineses. Disallow mergers and conversions. Provide tenant protections per Sup. Chen and small business protections per Sups. Melgar and Chan, and make them <u>stronger</u> than they are now.

This "**Board of Supervisors Zoning Plan"** (together with the Pipeline and 4-6-plex legislation) would be sufficient to comply with RHNA building requirements, especially incentivizing affordable housing.

Supervisors, it's up to you, our elected representatives, to write a reasonable, Compliant Zoning plan that responds to State requirements AND the needs of San Franciscans.

We are counting on you to do this.

A good faith first step would be to hold a Full Board hearing on the Mayor's Plan open to public comment.

Thanks for consideration,

Lorraine Petty

D2/5 Senior voter
Affordable housing Advocate
Seniors and Tenants Advocate
Member, SFTU & SDA

From: Karen Grayson
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 5:05:05 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Karen
California

From: Iris Biblowitz
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: All tenants need protection and real affordable housing that"s secure (not threatened with demolition
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 5:09:50 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, an elder, a retired nurse, a long-time renter, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Iris
California

From: Mart Deans
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 5:19:30 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

Please do not let this become another developer money grab like so many housing projects are. We have plenty of luxury and high end real estate in San Francisco. We need housing to support the vibrant communities of all incomes that make this city great.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Mart
California

From: Marquita Wills
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 5:28:19 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,Ms Wills

Marquita
California

From: Greg Cummings
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 5:41:43 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need. This is big bank and billionaires trying to further reduce fair housing options and eliminate rent control.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.

Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.

Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"). Create a vacancy tax for unoccupied properties being held for investment purposes. Create a speculation tax for high dollar property flipping. Protect & strengthen rent control.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,
Greg Cummings
RICHMOND District

Greg
California

From: Lee Heller
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 6:05:41 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Lee
California

From: Laurel Scotland-Stewart
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 6:28:41 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,
Laurel Scotland-Stewart

Laurel
California

From: Alice Polesky
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 7:00:33 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Alice
California

From: Anandi Worden
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 9:00:11 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

District 9 and I vote! Protect tenants rights, we are still here and we still vote

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Anandi
California

From: jgracelewis@gmail.com
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 9:54:32 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I will be devastated and forced to the streets if Laurie's upzoning proposal goes through.

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,
Jeannine Lewis

California

From: Farshid Fakhraei
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 10:33:27 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Farshid
California

From: Tiffany Konyen
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability! Make SF work for Workers!
Date: Saturday, October 18, 2025 10:06:52 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Tiffany
California

From: Neil Meerani
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Saturday, October 18, 2025 10:32:38 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Neil
California

From: mrothe@ccsf.edu
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Sunday, October 19, 2025 1:30:18 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely, Marianne Rothe

California

From: Sasha Gala
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Sunday, October 19, 2025 9:48:32 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan won't fix San Francisco's affordability crisis — it will accelerate displacement of renters and small businesses while incentivizing luxury development over homes our communities actually need.
The Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods — tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates — urges you to support a better path forward.
As a constituent, I ask that any upzoning include:
• Build without displacement — Use creative financing and local union labor to build the already-approved housing pipeline while protecting existing residents.
• Landbank public and soft sites — Reserve them for workforce, senior, family, and community housing.
• Guarantee real affordability — Strengthen inclusionary requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom — including releasing voter-approved housing funds.
• Protect families — Require both minimum and maximum family-size units in "family zones" and eliminate permanent density giveaways.
• Protect small businesses and rent-controlled homes — No demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation at real cost ("warm shells"), and enforce the vacancy tax.
San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-led planning — not rushed deregulation that repeats past mistakes. Please work with us to deliver real housing for families, seniors, and workers.
Sincerely,
Sasha Gala

Sasha
California

From: Eleanor Cox
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Sunday, October 19, 2025 10:31:21 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

-Close the SB 330 loopholes:
+Require 1:1 replacement of rental with rental units (not condos)
+Give all tenants a right to return at their existing rent regardless of their income levels
-Ask the City to identify an office tasked with overseeing and enforcing the tenant protection provisions coming from the new Tenant Protections Ordinance
-Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
-Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
-Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
-Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Eleanor
California

From: Robyn Miles
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Sunday, October 19, 2025 11:17:41 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Robyn
California

From:	Sam Woodworth
To:	Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS)
Cc:	Chan, Connie (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Tanner, Rachael (CPC)
Subject:	Family Zoning Plan Renderings
Date:	Wednesday, October 22, 2025 10:22:19 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors,

I discovered that the renderings -- critical to illustrate my hearing comments on Monday -- did not come through. These are now below. I'm confident you'll agree the result is **horrifying**.

VALPARAISO


VALPARAISO


Fisherman's Wharf Today
Four Stories

Under Proposed "Family" Zoning Plan
6 & 8 Stories

Indeed, I consider the upzoning of the waterfront to be the most irresponsible -- even grotesque -- urban planning proposal of my lifetime. Worse even than building freeways into our downtowns and neighborhoods. It is simply unconscionable.

Justifying this action by reference to the State Density Bonus is a huge mistake. As you may be aware, there is a ballot initiative that will be in qualification over the next year to override all of Sacramento's appallingly undemocratic usurpations of local land use authority. Through incremental and little-noticed changes in state law, the fate of neighborhoods is now almost entirely in the hands of unaccountable bureaucrats far removed from the lives of the people most affected. Those laws can and I'm confident will be erased by the voters through direct democracy. In contrast, this legislation would be very hard to undo, and the most iconic part of San Francisco -- the single most visited and beloved part of the city, which not surprisingly features as your committee's own website backdrop -- would suffer severe and irreparable harm.

This up-zoning of the waterfront, if allowed to proceed, will remain infamous long into the future, and the rapidly expanding number of San Franciscans who know what is happening -- who *will* know what was stolen from the people of San Francisco for the greed of developers -- will never allow this to be forgotten. Do not let this be your legacy.

Sincerely,
Sam Woodworth

On Monday, October 20, 2025 at 09:36:26 AM PDT, Sam Woodworth <samuelwoodworth@yahoo.com> wrote:

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors Land Use and Transportation Committee,

I'm writing to oppose moving the so-called Family Zoning Plan to the full Board. The plan fails to address the affordability crisis. Instead, it hands windfalls to wealthy property owners and turns San Francisco over to developers and speculators. Moreover, from canvasing neighborhoods, appears that less than 10% of residents are even aware of this plan – the most radical and permanent reshaping of San Francisco in its history. This plan will have serious negative effects on San Francisco neighborhoods and commercial streetscapes. Below I've also included renderings of some of the effects on our waterfront. But first I offer thoughts on why this plan is unwarranted and fails to meet its own putative objectives.

1. <u>A flawed premise</u>

The housing numbers driving this plan are based on fiction. According to the State Department of Finance, San Francisco's population is projected to grow by only 16,937 people by 2050. Yet the State's housing mandate requires the City to plan for 82,000 new

units by 2031—enough to house roughly 172,000 new residents.

That's a tenfold mismatch between reality and mandate. No credible economic model supports the idea that private developers will build housing far beyond market demand. The assumption that "supply alone" will bring down prices ignores the data: unaffordability is driven by wealth concentration, not zoning. The "Family" Zoning Plan is founded on the same trickle-down logic that has repeatedly failed in practice.

2. <u>This is not a plan</u>

What's before the public is not a planning document. Even Planning Commissioners have acknowledged that it lacks the essential components of a genuine plan: there's no implementation timeline or construction sequencing; no infrastructure, transportation, or open-space analysis; no comprehensive three-dimensional visualization or urban design framework (indeed the renderings from Planning Commission Staff are quite deceptive, mostly omitting the waterfront towers that the plan calls for – even from views clearly encompassing the relevant areas – while presenting a rosy and largely unchanged view).

This "plan" is a glorified spreadsheet, not a vision. The absence of physical or fiscal planning means this "plan" cannot claim to manage growth responsibly, especially in neighborhoods that already struggle with congestion, outdated utilities, and limited public space.

3. <u>The Inclusion of the Northeast Waterfront and Historic North Beach Commercial Districts Was Improper and Unjustified</u>

The decision to include District 3—and particularly the Northeast Waterfront—was made secretively this spring, without public process or prior technical study. Fisherman's Wharf, Telegraph Hill, and North Beach were never identified as housing opportunity areas in any prior plan. Yet the new maps show widespread height and density increases across some of the City's most visited and historically sensitive areas.

The result is a massive, unvetted upzoning that invites speculative development with no assurance or even likelihood of affordability or infrastructure support. This is not responsible planning—it's a political maneuver that places irreversible pressure on the city's most visible and beloved waterfront.

4. <u>Overcapacity issues</u>

Even if one accepts the State's inflated targets, the City already meets and exceeds them. Under 2023 legislation signed by Mayor Breed, fourplexes and sixplexes are now permitted citywide, creating zoned capacity for roughly 400,000 new homes. Another 70,000 units are already entitled or under construction.

That's six times more than the state's assigned goal. Meanwhile, nearly 46,000 of the required 82,000 units must be affordable—at an estimated cost of $19 billion. The barrier to meeting that goal is financing, not zoning. The Family Zoning Plan does nothing to fund or deliver affordability.

5. <u>The waterfront wall</u>

The proposed upzoning of the Northeast Waterfront is one of the most unwarranted elements of the plan. At Fisherman's Wharf, height limits would rise to 65 feet across at least 11 blocks,

and to 85 feet—eight+ stories—on roughly 17 more. Along Columbus Avenue, height increases would extend for many blocks.

These changes would create a continuous wall of high-rises, three blocks deep and ten blocks wide, severing the city's defining visual and cultural connection to the Bay. Public vistas from the sloping streets of Telegraph and Russian Hills—views that have inspired painters, filmmakers, and millions of residents—would be erased.

Renderings below illustrate the scale of this damage. The claim that these height increases would be "barely visible" is simply a lie. The loss would be permanent and profound.

City officials have at times noted that the State Density Bonus law already allows 8-story buildings, and that this plan is meant as an "off-ramp" to design within City-imposed constraints. This is true in certain circumstances, but the density bonus law presents developers with considerable uncertainty and requires a series of special requirements, whereas the current plan simply puts the City's stamp of approval on walling off the waterfront.

6. Displacement

City staff often insist that rent-controlled buildings are protected and that demolitions are rare. Yet recent legislation has loosened demolition and redevelopment restrictions, and history consistently shows that upzoning accelerates speculation. Higher land values attract luxury developers, not affordable builders, leading to small business closures and tenant displacement.

To frame this community concern as "obstruction" is offensive. Residents are not opposing housing—they are defending the right to build responsibly, with equity and infrastructure in mind.

7. Manufactured "abundance"

Recent events surrounding the Mayor's Sept. 11 rally made clear that this plan lacks public legitimacy. The vast majority of attendees were there to protest, not celebrate. The reality is that the so-called "Family Zoning Plan" allows 75% of new units to be studios or one-bedrooms, while marketing itself as "family housing."

Calling that "family-friendly" is a branding exercise, not a policy. The rhetoric of "abundance" serves as cover for deregulation that benefits a narrow group of developers and investors, not San Franciscans in need of affordable homes.

Mayor Lurie is doing a great job in so many areas, as are you, the Board. We all know that this plan is essentially the handiwork of one person: Scott Wiener. Don't let his seeming nihilistic vendetta against the thriving neighborhoods of San Francisco destroy your legacy.

8. What real solutions look like

San Francisco already has models of what works. North Beach Place, a two-block, 341-unit, 100% affordable community serving families and seniors, is one such example. It integrates mixed incomes, local retail, and livability and enhances neighborhood character.

If the City truly wants to advance affordability, it should invest in projects like these—for example, replacing facilities such as the Pier 39 parking structure with mixed-use affordable housing, rather than upzoning historic neighborhoods for speculative towers.

9. We need leadership

This plan passed the Planning Commission on a 4–3 vote, carried only by the Mayor's recent appointees. That narrow margin speaks volumes about the plan's quality and legitimacy.

The Family Zoning Plan is not a strategy for affordability; it is a developer-driven land giveaway that undermines democratic oversight and jeopardizes the character of San Francisco's most iconic neighborhoods.

I respectfully urge you to:

A. Reject the plan in its current form;

B. Remove Fisherman's Wharf and Columbus Avenue from the upzoning map; and
C. Commit to a genuine housing strategy focused on affordability, infrastructure, and environmental integrity.

San Francisco deserves a plan grounded in real data and public trust—not another political slogan masquerading as policy.

Thank you,

Sam Woodworth

From: Sam Woodworth
To: Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject: Opposition to Current Form of Family Zoning Plan
Date: Wednesday, October 22, 2025 1:32:40 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors Land Use and Transportation Committee,

I'm writing to oppose moving the so-called Family Zoning Plan to the full Board. The plan fails to address the affordability crisis. Instead, it hands windfalls to wealthy property owners and turns San Francisco over to developers and speculators. Moreover, from canvasing neighborhoods, appears that less than 10% of residents are even aware of this plan – the most radical and permanent reshaping of San Francisco in its history. This plan will have serious negative effects on San Francisco neighborhoods and commercial streetscapes. Below I've also included renderings of some of the effects on our waterfront. But first I offer thoughts on why this plan is unwarranted and fails to meet its own putative objectives.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->1. <!--[endif]-->A flawed premise

The housing numbers driving this plan are based on fiction. According to the State Department of Finance, San Francisco's population is projected to grow by only 16,937 people by 2050. Yet the State's housing mandate requires the City to plan for 82,000 new units by 2031—enough to house roughly 172,000 new residents.

That's a tenfold mismatch between reality and mandate. No credible economic model supports the idea that private developers will build housing far beyond market demand. The assumption that "supply alone" will bring down prices ignores the data: unaffordability is driven by wealth concentration, not zoning. The "Family" Zoning Plan is founded on the same trickle-down logic that has repeatedly failed in practice.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->2. <!--[endif]--> This is not a plan

What's before the public is not a planning document. Even Planning Commissioners have acknowledged that it lacks the essential components of a genuine plan: there's no implementation timeline or construction sequencing; no infrastructure, transportation, or open-space analysis; no comprehensive three-dimensional visualization or urban design framework (indeed the renderings from Planning Commission Staff are quite deceptive, mostly omitting the waterfront towers that the plan calls for – even from views clearly encompassing the relevant areas – while presenting a rosy and largely unchanged view).

This "plan" is a glorified spreadsheet, not a vision. The absence of physical or fiscal planning means this "plan" cannot claim to manage growth responsibly, especially in neighborhoods that already struggle with congestion, outdated utilities, and limited public space.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->3. <!--[endif]-->The Inclusion of the Northeast Waterfront and Historic North Beach Commercial Districts Was Improper and Unjustified

The decision to include District 3—and particularly the Northeast Waterfront—was made

secretively this spring, without public process or prior technical study. Fisherman's Wharf, Telegraph Hill, and North Beach were never identified as housing opportunity areas in any prior plan. Yet the new maps show widespread height and density increases across some of the City's most visited and historically sensitive areas.

The result is a massive, unvetted upzoning that invites speculative development with no assurance or even likelihood of affordability or infrastructure support. This is not responsible planning—it's a political maneuver that places irreversible pressure on the city's most visible and beloved waterfront.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->4. <!--[endif]-->Overcapacity issues

Even if one accepts the State's inflated targets, the City already meets and exceeds them. Under 2023 legislation signed by Mayor Breed, fourplexes and sixplexes are now permitted citywide, creating zoned capacity for roughly 400,000 new homes. Another 70,000 units are already entitled or under construction.

That's six times more than the state's assigned goal. Meanwhile, nearly 46,000 of the required 82,000 units must be affordable—at an estimated cost of $19 billion. The barrier to meeting that goal is financing, not zoning. The Family Zoning Plan does nothing to fund or deliver affordability.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->5. <!--[endif]-->The waterfront wall

The proposed upzoning of the Northeast Waterfront is one of the most unwarranted elements of the plan. At Fisherman's Wharf, height limits would rise to 65 feet across at least 11 blocks, and to 85 feet—eight+ stories—on roughly 17 more. Along Columbus Avenue, height increases would extend for many blocks.

These changes would create a continuous wall of high-rises, three blocks deep and ten blocks wide, severing the city's defining visual and cultural connection to the Bay. Public vistas from the sloping streets of Telegraph and Russian Hills—views that have inspired painters, filmmakers, and millions of residents—would be erased.

Renderings below illustrate the scale of this damage. The claim that these height increases would be "barely visible" is simply a lie. The loss would be permanent and profound.

City officials have at times noted that the State Density Bonus law already allows 8-story buildings, and that this plan is meant as an "off-ramp" to design within City-imposed constraints. This is true in certain circumstances, but the density bonus law presents developers with considerable uncertainty and requires a series of special requirements, whereas the current plan simply puts the City's stamp of approval on walling off the waterfront.





<!--[if !supportLists]-->6. <!--[endif]-->Displacement

City staff often insist that rent-controlled buildings are protected and that demolitions are rare. Yet recent legislation has loosened demolition and redevelopment restrictions, and history consistently shows that upzoning accelerates speculation. Higher land values attract luxury developers, not affordable builders, leading to small business closures and tenant displacement.

To frame this community concern as "obstruction" is offensive. Residents are not opposing housing—they are defending the right to build responsibly, with equity and infrastructure in mind.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->7. <!--[endif]-->Manufactured "abundance"

Recent events surrounding the Mayor's Sept. 11 rally made clear that this plan lacks public legitimacy. The vast majority of attendees were there to protest, not celebrate. The reality is that the so-called "Family Zoning Plan" allows 75% of new units to be studios or one-bedrooms, while marketing itself as "family housing."

Calling that "family-friendly" is a branding exercise, not a policy. The rhetoric of "abundance" serves as cover for deregulation that benefits a narrow group of developers and investors, not San Franciscans in need of affordable homes.

Mayor Lurie is doing a great job in so many areas, as are you, the Board. We all know that this plan is essentially the handiwork of one person: Scott Wiener. Don't let his seeming nihilistic vendetta against the thriving neighborhoods of San Francisco destroy your legacy.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->8. <!--[endif]-->What real solutions look like

San Francisco already has models of what works. North Beach Place, a two-block, 341-unit, 100% affordable community serving families and seniors, is one such example. It integrates mixed incomes, local retail, and livability and enhances neighborhood character.

If the City truly wants to advance affordability, it should invest in projects like these—for example, replacing facilities such as the Pier 39 parking structure with mixed-use affordable housing, rather than upzoning historic neighborhoods for speculative towers.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->9. <!--[endif]-->We need leadership

This plan passed the Planning Commission on a 4–3 vote, carried only by the Mayor's recent appointees. That narrow margin speaks volumes about the plan's quality and legitimacy.

The Family Zoning Plan is not a strategy for affordability; it is a developer-driven land giveaway that undermines democratic oversight and jeopardizes the character of San Francisco's most iconic neighborhoods.

I respectfully urge you to:

<!--[if !supportLists]-->A. <!--[endif]-->Reject the plan in its current form;

B. Remove Fisherman's Wharf and Columbus Avenue from the upzoning map; and
C. Commit to a genuine housing strategy focused on affordability, infrastructure, and

environmental integrity.

San Francisco deserves a plan grounded in real data and public trust—not another political slogan masquerading as policy.

Thank you,

Sam Woodworth

From: John Crabtree
To: Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Sciammas, Charlie (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Cooper, Raynell (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject: PUBLIC COMMENT 10/20 LUTC hearing)-Don"t Upzone the Coastal Zone
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 6:13:41 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

I am submitting this as PUBLIC COMMENT for the four agenda items regarding the Family Upzoning Plan, to which I am expressing opposition because the Upzoning Plan makes the crucial error of upzoning in the Coastal Zone. There are many other issuess with this Upzoning Plan, however, I believe that this is the worst and if it is not addressed then no amount of winnowing at the edges will make this upzoning palletable.

Put the Coastal Zone before Upzoning... put infrastrucutre before density... put tenants before developers... put labor unions before developers... c'mon, put people before profits/developers/billionaires for a change... John Crabtree

Don't Upzone the Coastal Zone

A lot of bad ideas in the SF Upzoning Plan, but this one is the worst IMO.

JOHN CRABTREE
OCT 21

I provided an abbreviated version of the following testimony (in-person) to the SF Board of Supervisors Land Use & Transportation Committee at the hearing on these matters on Monday, October 20th. I also provided it today as public comment before the DCCC by electronically submitting it there and I will attend the meeting on 10/22 and do my best to deliver these comments in person. Lastly, I am submitting the comments herewith to the BOS LUTC members and staff.

John Crabtree
1375 35th Ave
The Sunset
San Francisco CA
94122
563-581-2867

City and County of San Francisco

Board of Supervisors

Land Use and Transportation Committee

Re: LUTC 10/20/25 — Genera Plan Amendments – Family Zoning Plan -- Local Coastal Program Amendments – Family Zoning Plan

Position(s): OPPOSE

Supervisors,

My name is John Crabtree; I am a resident of District 4. I am here today to provide comments in opposition to the Family Zoning Plan provisions currently on your agenda – particularly regarding General Plan Amendments to the Western Shoreline Plan and Local Coastal Program Amendments to the Zoning Map and legislation established in the Family Zoning Plan.

Much ado has been made in the media and the debate around the so-called "Family Zoning Plan" — points and counterpoints about whether, or not, the Upzoning Plan will turn the Western Shoreline Coastal Zone into "Miami Beach."

Unfortunately, that debate has become little more than accusation and denial. But there are issues here that cannot be denied. There are General Plan amendments to the Western Shoreline Plan and amendments to create a new Local Coastal Program in the Family Zoning Plan that is being considered here today for submission to the California Coastal Commission.

Whether or not you believe any of these matters have anything to do with turning the Western Shoreline into Miami Beach or Waikiki Beach, it simply cannot be denied that the Family Zoning Plan ***intent*** is to bring upzoning into the Coastal Zone, to create a local coastal zoning program to enhance development in the coastal zone, to create a precedent for upzoning in the coastal zone and create opportunities to develop and increase upzoning in the coastal zone in the future.

The California Coastal Act – was established in 1976 and will turn 50 next year, in 2026. The Coastal Act has, for very nearly half a century, served as a comprehensive policy framework that safeguards California's coastline. The Coastal Act was, in 1976, as it is today a pivotal policy commitment to stewardship of the coast. The Act itself states that the coast is, "a distinct and valuable resource of vital and enduring interest to all the people" and that it must be preserved for future generations.

Fortunately, the existence of the Coastal Zone and Coastal Commission jurisdiction delineates all of the embedded changes within the Family Zoning Plan with a bright line. General Plan changes (e.g. Western Shoreline Plan amendments), Zoning Map changes and the creation of a new Local Coastal (zoning) Program must all be submitted to and approved by the Coastal Commission. I urge you to oppose all such amendments embedded within the Family Zoning Plan.

There is no compelling argument to alter the Western Shoreline Plan nor to upzone in the Coastal Zone. Senator Wiener, at a recent meeting in The Sunset, said that the Coastal Zone needs to be diminished to allow for more development. But his arguments are decidedly NOT compelling.

Supervisors, there is a clear pathway to support the Coastal Zone and the Coastal Act, to defend the Western Shoreline and to preserve and protect, arguably, the greatest natural resource that we have here in San Francisco — Ocean Beach and the Coastal Zone and Western Shoreline.

I urge you to oppose all of the provisions embedded in the Family Zoning Plan that extend upzoning into the Coastal Zone.

Thank you.

Though the Heavens Fall... by John Crabtree is a reader-supported publication. To support my work, consider becoming a subscriber.

From:	Jesse Rawlins
To:	Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject:	Public comment letter for Family Upzoning Plan
Date:	Tuesday, October 21, 2025 4:42:50 PM
Attachments:	Outlook-tndc_logo_.png TNDC Public Comment - Family Upzoning Plan.pdf

---

Hi John,

I am hoping to submit a public comment letter as part of the official record for the Land Use and Transportation Committee's deliberations on the Family Upzoning Plan. I know the first committee meeting was yesterday, but by sending now, would that allow our letter to be for future committee meetings?

Best,

Jesse Rawlins, MSW, Policy and Administration Practice
Policy Manager
email: jrawlins@tndc.org
mobile: (415) 361-0967

Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation (TNDC)
210 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102
www.tndc.org

At TNDC, we believe that everyone deserves to thrive. We support tenants and community members in building transformative communities through Homes, Health, and Voice. Together, we can build a future with economic and racial equity. Join us at tndc.org!

Jesse Rawlins, Policy Manager
Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation
201 Eddy Street
San Francisco, CA 94102

October 20, 2025

Supervisor Myrna Melgar, Chair
Supervisor Chyanne Chen, Vice-Chair
Supervisor Bilal Mahmood, Member
City of San Francisco Board of Supervisors Land Use and Transportation Committee
1 Dr Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

RE: Amendment for Family Upzoning Plan and Future Considerations

Supervisors Melgar, Chen, and Mahmood:

The Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation (TNDC) seeks to provide public comment for the Family Upzoning Plan and urges support for the Affordable Housing Special Use District (AHSUD) proposal and considerations for a future dedicated revenue stream and more equitable housing planning. These recommendations will help achieve affordability in the Family Upzoning Plan and progress local housing policy.

Recommendation No. 1: Affordable Housing Special Use District (AHSUD)

The AHSUD proposal is one tool to better ensure affordability in housing as part of the Family Upzoning Plan. Quite simply, the affordable sector cannot compete with the private housing market with increased zoning. By supporting this amendment, prioritizing and reserving viable parcels of land will allow for affordable housing development to be competitive and possible. Without this provision, the plan's goal of benefitting San Franciscans that face affordability challenges will not be readily achieved.

Recommendation No. 2: New, dedicated revenue stream

While developing a new revenue stream is outside of the Family Upzoning Plan, developing a long-term funding source in the future will be critical to support affordability through increased zoning and more. Previous measures have been piecemeal approaches focused on units in the development pipeline while a long-term, sustainable revenue stream should increase resources to address the larger affordability challenge. A recent National Low Income Housing Coalition (NLIHC) report identified a lack of 169,558 affordable homes locally, and new revenue should be developed to solve that problem and increase affordable housing overall.

Recommendation No. 3: Equitable housing planning

Planning future needs of housing mainly relies on economic factors including income levels. In San Francisco, the largest population increase is for those with the highest incomes, which is used to determine the need for housing. In doing so, a de-facto unaffordable housing system is created. In addition, housing planning does not consider displacement to determine need. Housing planning should not uniquely rely on population increases by income level but should aim to ensure housing allows for diverse income levels and account for displacement.

TNDC requests support to amend the Family Upzoning Plan to incorporate the AHSUD provision and requests future considerations for developing a new revenue stream and ensuring housing planning is equitable. Through these efforts, San Francisco can meet the local housing need that is affordable to all.

Thank you,

Jesse Rawlins, Policy Manager
Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation

From:	Carroll, John (BOS)
To:	"Stephen Torres"
Cc:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Sciammas, Charlie (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Cooper, Raynell (BOS)
Subject:	RE: 2025.10.20 Letter Re: Family Zoning Plan
Date:	Tuesday, October 21, 2025 12:08:00 PM
Attachments:	image001.png 2025.10.20%20Letter%20to%20Land%20Use%20&%20Transportation%20Re-%20Family%20Zoni.pdf

---

Thank you for your comment letter.

I am forwarding your comments to the members of the Land Use and Transportation committee, and I will include your comments in the files for these ordinance matters.

I invite you to review the entire matter on our Legislative Research Center by following the links below:

- Board of Supervisors File No. 250700
- Board of Supervisors File No. 250701
- Board of Supervisors File No. 250966

John Carroll
Assistant Clerk
Board of Supervisors
San Francisco City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415)554-4445

Click here to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The Legislative Research Center provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation and archived matters since August 1998.

Disclosures: *Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: Stephen Torres <stephenjontorres@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 20, 2025 5:55 PM
To: Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>
Cc: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>

Subject: 2025.10.20 Letter Re: Family Zoning Plan

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Clerk Carroll,

Please see attached my comments from today's hearing.

Thanks so much,

Stephen Torres

Stephen Torres
Mission-Bernal
San Francisco, California

October 20, 2025

The Land Use & Transportation Committee of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 250
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, California 94102

Chairperson Melgar and Committee Members,

Before you is the disingenuously named *Family Zoning Plan.* The name is disingenuous because, as countless public testimonies and data have detailed, this plan does nothing to actually ensure housing for families. It does little but ensure that developers can now access thousands of residential and commercial parcels with almost no regulation and property owners can sell their property for several times its current value. It is also likely to make thousands of San Franciscans homeless, hundreds of small businesses close, and irrevocably change our city all without adequate funding or infrastructure in the face of serious challenges ranging from transportation to natural disasters to climate change.

Chairperson Melgar, Supervisors Chan, Chen and other supervisors have introduced amendments to mitigate the egregious impacts of this plan, such as the loss of rent controlled housing. I appreciate this work and encourage this committee to pursue those that which ensures that the total of all existing housing stock is protected from demolition, that small businesses are preserved, & that our neighbourhoods and city are preserved, even it requires sending this legislation back.

One recurring claim is that nothing can be done as our elected representatives in Sacramento are holding a gun to our heads with punitive measures and defunding as threats against San Franciscans. I caution against this messaging as it may signal unintended complicity and lack of fortitude. If our local leaders claim to be powerless to stop this kind of deregulation and removal of protections for the people of San Francisco, what can we expect as even more edicts imperiling San Franciscans are handed down from Sacramento or even Washington? To dismiss this, and imply that housing deregulation is hardly the same as the other ways in which San Francisco is being endangered , I would ask that our leaders consider what it is like to be evicted, to be an elder who will die on the street, to have a family business close and lose one's livelihood, or to be displaced from your generational community. The silencing and removal of our City's most vulnerable have historically come in many forms.

To imply that compliance with law, srate or otherwise, regardless of how it targets our most vulnerable sets a dangerous precedent. I implore us to use the same bravery and conviction we do when we decry other bullying and threats made toward San Francisco and apply it to the

legislative coercion being employed by leadership in Sacramento, people who purport to represent us just as you do.

Sincerely,

Stephen Torres
District 8 & 9 Worker
District 9 Resident

From:	Carroll, John (BOS)
To:	Joe Chmielewdki
Cc:	Marie; Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Sciammas, Charlie (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Cooper, Raynell (BOS)
Subject:	RE: Amend 250966 To Include REAL Tenant Protections
Date:	Tuesday, October 21, 2025 12:08:00 PM
Attachments:	image001.png

Thank you for your comment letter.

I am forwarding your comments to the members of the Land Use and Transportation committee, and I will include your comments in the files for these ordinance matters.

I invite you to review the entire matter on our Legislative Research Center by following the links below:

- Board of Supervisors File No. 250700
- Board of Supervisors File No. 250701
- Board of Supervisors File No. 250966

John Carroll
Assistant Clerk
Board of Supervisors
San Francisco City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415)554-4445

Click here to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The Legislative Research Center provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation and archived matters since August 1998.

Disclosures: *Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: Joe Chmielewdki <jcin506@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, October 20, 2025 12:04 PM
To: Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>
Cc: Joe Chmielewski <jcin506@yahoo.com>; Marie <marieamelie@sbcglobal.net>
Subject: Amend 250966 To Include REAL Tenant Protections

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

To: Clerk John Carroll
Land Use and Transportation Committee

From: Joseph Chmielewski
50 Golden Gate Ave, #506
SF, CA 94102
(mobile): 415.756-2913

Subject: Amend 250966 To Include REAL Tenant Protections

Good Afternoon,

I have lived and voted in San Francisco as a tenant for over 44 years and I am asking that you amend the Mayor's "Family Zoning Plan" (250966) so it brings affordability and real tenant protections to the people of San Francisco:

• Amend the plan to remove all rent controlled parcels.
•Create a Tenant Protection Ordinance that protects all rent controlled housing citywide from demolition and "major alterations" by creating stricter Objective Criteria.

Close the SB 330 loopholes:
•Require 1:1 replacement of rental with rental units (not condos).
•Give all tenants a right to return at their existing rent regardless of their income levels.
•Identity or create an office tasked with overseeing and enforcing the tenant protection provisions coming from the new Tenant Protections Ordinance.
•Show us a concrete plan for affordable housing and back it with ACTUAL FUNDING and expand rent control to new construction.

Mayor Lurie must stand up for our city against Scott Wiener's overreach. his hands are not tied, he can stand up to the State's overreach like many other cities in California have.

The Mayor must engage state representatives Haney, Stefani, Weiner to amend SB 330 to include protections for tenants of all incomes and a lookback period for tenant occupancy longer than 5 years. Stop hiding behind state laws while doing nothing to

change them!

Tell Matt Haney to Repeal Costa Hawkins, Reform the Ellis Act, and Amend the Housing Crisis Act to all protect rent controlled units which he never attempted to do.

Add amendments to the Mayor's "Family Zoning Plan" so it brings affordability and real tenant protections to the people of San Francisco!

Thank you.

Regards,

Joseph Chmielewski

From:	Carroll, John (BOS)
To:	Noah Garcia
Cc:	Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Sciammas, Charlie (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Cooper, Raynell (BOS)
Subject:	RE: Family Zoning Plan public comment
Date:	Tuesday, October 21, 2025 12:08:00 PM
Attachments:	image001.png

Thank you for your comment letter.

I am forwarding your comments to the members of the Land Use and Transportation committee, and I will include your comments in the files for these ordinance matters.

I invite you to review the entire matter on our Legislative Research Center by following the links below:

- Board of Supervisors File No. 250700
- Board of Supervisors File No. 250701
- Board of Supervisors File No. 250966

John Carroll
Assistant Clerk
Board of Supervisors
San Francisco City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415)554-4445

Click here to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The Legislative Research Center provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation and archived matters since August 1998.

Disclosures: *Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: Noah Garcia <noahgarcia80@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 20, 2025 3:12 PM
To: Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>
Subject: Family Zoning Plan public comment

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hi Clerk Carroll,

Please find attached my public comments for the record on the Family Zoning Plan items before the Land Use and Transportation Committee today:

To the members of the committee, thank you for the opportunity to provide comment today. I'm Noah Garcia, I'm a renter in D5, and I respectfully urge a clean approval of a state-compliant Family Zoning Plan before you today.

I really enjoy living in San Francisco, and for that reason, I recognize that the city has to evolve and adapt to change. Average rent is now spiraling upwards over $3,300 a month, which is plainly unaffordable for so many residents that want to keep living here, let alone families that want to find a 2- or 3-bedroom home in the city.

The Family Zoning Plan lays the groundwork to create much needed homes that play to the city's strengths and alleviate the dearth of affordable housing here. By continuing to build near essential services and world-class amenities, we give San Franciscans more choices, not less. By building near some of the best transit systems in the country, we give San Franciscans more opportunities, not less. So let's do more to keep SF within reach for current and future residents by moving forward with a clean approval of the Family Zoning Plan – thank you.

Noah Garcia

From:	Carroll, John (BOS)
To:	Samantha Davis
Cc:	Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Sciammas, Charlie (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Cooper, Raynell (BOS)
Subject:	RE: Land Use Question
Date:	Tuesday, October 21, 2025 12:08:00 PM
Attachments:	image001.png

Thank you for your comment letter.

I am forwarding your comments to the members of the Land Use and Transportation committee, and I will include your comments in the files for these ordinance matters.

I invite you to review the entire matter on our Legislative Research Center by following the links below:

- Board of Supervisors File No. 250700
- Board of Supervisors File No. 250701
- Board of Supervisors File No. 250966

John Carroll
Assistant Clerk
Board of Supervisors
San Francisco City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415)554-4445

Click here to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The Legislative Research Center provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation and archived matters since August 1998.

Disclosures: *Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: Samantha Davis <davissa.sf@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 20, 2025 2:20 PM
To: Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>
Subject: Land Use Question

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Question: Can anyone who has been part of this plan name a development in Hayes Valley or in the Mission that has led to a lower-priced housing effect in those areas? It seems by in large those well meaning new buildings never have the trickle down impact they are advertised to have and only lead to increased price in the housing stock.

Samantha A. Davis
davissa.sf@gmail.com
415.269.5355

From:	Carroll, John (BOS)
To:	Maggie Kuo
Cc:	Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Sciammas, Charlie (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Cooper, Raynell (BOS)
Subject:	RE: Support for the Family Zoning Plan
Date:	Tuesday, October 21, 2025 12:08:00 PM
Attachments:	image001.png

Thank you for your comment letter.

I am forwarding your comments to the members of the Land Use and Transportation committee, and I will include your comments in the files for these ordinance matters.

I invite you to review the entire matter on our Legislative Research Center by following the links below:

- Board of Supervisors File No. 250700
- Board of Supervisors File No. 250701
- Board of Supervisors File No. 250966

John Carroll
Assistant Clerk
Board of Supervisors
San Francisco City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415)554-4445

Click here to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The Legislative Research Center provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation and archived matters since August 1998.

Disclosures: *Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: Maggie Kuo <maggie.kuo761@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 20, 2025 10:57 PM
To: Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>
Subject: Support for the Family Zoning Plan

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted

sources.

Hello Mr. Carroll and Supervisor Melgar,

I'm writing to express my support of the family zoning plan. It will go a long way to alleviate the housing affordability crisis we have in the city! My partner and I currently live in the Sunset, both make a six-figure salary, and yet, a median-priced home in San Francisco is out of our reach. We could buy one in Pleasant Hill, but we'd be looking at a two-hour commute each way during rush hour. We love living in the city and all the vibrant culture it has to offer, more than a life lived in cars for a house in the suburbs, so here we are! After reading the plan and attending the public comment session, I came away convinced that this plan was designed with utmost care to minimize the impact to all stakeholders involved, (not an easy task!) and will meaningfully increase the housing supply and help bring prices down.

Another benefit that most of the residents who are opposed haven't really thought about is -- the ability to keep their children and grandchildren in the city and give them property. Under the new zoning plan, they could build an additional unit in their backyards and have their family stay. I know that keeping family close by is an important value to Asian American families, an ethnic and cultural group that I belong to.

As for fears that the zoning plan will lead to Hong Kong style buildings, considering the average residential building in Hong Kong is 30 stories, I'm not worried. Because it's not realistic. What we're proposing is just the right height and density for the Sunset, and where they make sense -- along transit lines.

Another thing the city might want to consider to help open the housing stock even further - consider taxing overseas investors who buy up property and just let them sit empty! And use that money for tenant assistance who are affected by the relocation. Thank you!

Sincerely,
Maggie Kuo

From:	Carroll, John (BOS)
To:	"Prodan Statev"
Cc:	Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Sciammas, Charlie (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Cooper, Raynell (BOS)
Subject:	RE: Support Mayor Lurie"s Family Zoning Plan for Families
Date:	Tuesday, October 21, 2025 12:08:00 PM
Attachments:	image001.png

Thank you for your comment letter.

I am forwarding your comments to the members of the Land Use and Transportation committee, and I will include your comments in the files for these ordinance matters.

I invite you to review the entire matter on our Legislative Research Center by following the links below:

- Board of Supervisors File No. 250700
- Board of Supervisors File No. 250701
- Board of Supervisors File No. 250966

John Carroll
Assistant Clerk
Board of Supervisors
San Francisco City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415)554-4445

Click here to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The Legislative Research Center provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation and archived matters since August 1998.

Disclosures: *Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: Prodan Statev <pstatev94@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 20, 2025 1:38 PM
To: Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>
Subject: Support Mayor Lurie's Family Zoning Plan for Families

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors Land Use Committee,

As a 41-year-old renter who has called San Francisco home for 17 years, I've witnessed firsthand the struggles that families face in our city. I currently live in a multi-generational household, caring for both my children and elderly family members. The housing crisis has pushed many families like mine to the brink, and I believe that Mayor Lurie's Family Zoning Plan offers a glimmer of hope.

Opening single-family zones to duplexes, triplexes, and small apartments is a crucial step toward keeping working families in San Francisco. This plan not only promotes affordability but also embraces the diversity that makes our community vibrant.

And yet, the plan **doesn't go far enough**. I wished to see a more ambitious rezoning in the Western parts of the city, along with a significant and substantial permitting reform. I urge you to advocate for an amendment which will make building housing in San Francisco faster, cheaper and more predictable.

Let's work together to create an inclusive and equitable city where families can flourish.

Sincerely,
Prodan
District 1 Resident, 94121

From:	Andy Katz
To:	Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Andy Katz
Subject:	Family Zoning Legislation Needs Much More Work To Be Acceptable
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 4:05:53 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors:

My name is Andy Katz and I am a lifetime native of North Beach. I am here to support our small scale village community and to oppose the developer and real estate speculator driven Lurie, Weiner, Sauter so called "family plan". This plan will cause great harm to our neighborhoods despite the various proposed amendments to date.

First of all, remove all of the rent-controlled buildings from the up zoning plan. The proposed amendment does not exempt all rent-controlled buildings as it should. This is vital to support workers and the elderly in our City and address their fear that they won't be able to stay in their homes. The plan does not focus on affordable housing but instead on market rate development which we need more of like a hole in the head. The required affordable housing percentages are too low. House our SF workers hanging on by their fingernails rather than building still more housing for the rich and investors. Many already built existing luxury units sit empty as we speak.

Preserve our history and protect our neighborhoods by forcing Mayor Lurie and the state to recognize the North Beach Historic District. Some of us have been working lovingly on these efforts for more than 20 years. Development should be created to scale in the neighborhoods it which it is placed with respect for our rich history, architectural context and our existing small businesses. Many of these are legacy businesses.

The production of this plan is forcing extremely complex and far ranging proposals and consequences through an expedited process which is the equivalent of putting a gun to everyone's collective head. Only developers and realtors win this way. San Franciscans must be heard and truly valued.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Andy Katz
andywkatz@gmail.com
SF, CA 94133

From: Robin Phillips
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 2:13:58 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Robin Phillips
District 8

Oh, and let Scott Weiner know I'm not going to vote for him against Nancy Pelosi. I met him once in person and he couldn't make eye contact with me.

Robin
California

From: Cathy Asmus
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 2:16:51 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Cathy
California

From: Carolyn Mitsi Hanrahan
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 2:17:11 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Please help us tenants! No displacement of any tenants!

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,
Carolyn MITSI Hanrahan

Carolyn Mitsi
California

From: Courtney Fedorchek
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 3:01:15 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,
Courtney

Courtney
California

From: Calder Lorenz
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 3:11:02 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Calder
California

From: Catherine Butler
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 3:28:16 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,
Catherine Butler

Catherine
California

From: Lauren Kush
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 3:44:18 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Lauren
California

From: Nikolas McConnie-Saad
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 3:55:44 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

The YIMBY/NIMBY characterization of development misrepresents opposition to development under one giant umbrella. It's a bad faith dichotomy cooked up by pro-development at any cost opportunists. San Francisco, like many cities in the USA has a shameful (racist, and classist) history of displacing marginalized and low-income communities under the saccharine guise of "neighborhood renewal/improvement." The Fillmore, SOMA, and Hayes Valley are just a few prime examples of culturally rich neighborhoods with long-standing vibrant communities that were uprooted and kicked out of the city, never to return.

Lurie's plan promises to do the same thing unless tenant protections are baked into the process. You think the homelessness crisis is bad now, just wait until all the aunties and uncles, grandparents, and young(ish) people in non-tech, non-corporate jobs are kicked out of their rent controlled units and are left to fend for themselves. Thinking that just building a bunch of housing will magically ease the housing situation in SF is akin to believing in trickle down economics. This logic sounds sort of plausible at face value, but it's the same load of crap that has led this country to have gilded age levels of wealth inequality.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-

one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including “warm shells”), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Nikolas
California

From: Frania Feldstein
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 4:17:54 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Frania
California

From:	lgpetty
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff
Cc:	Chan, Connie (BOS); SherrillStaff; ChanStaff (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Engardio Staff; BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject:	Supervisors: Time to Write Your Own Zoning Plan to Achieve State AND Public Approval.
Date:	Friday, October 17, 2025 4:56:03 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Re: the Mayor's Family Zoning Plan -
Oct. 20, 2025 Land Use Agenda
Items 1-4, Files 250966, 250700, 250701 & 250785

Dear Land Use Chair Melgar, Vice Chair Chen and Supervisor Mahmood,

This Mayor's Zoning Plan comes to you after many years in the making at the Planning Dept.

It comes in the name of Compliance with State Law, under threat of "something worse."

But is it really compliance? Or is it simply an unpopular mass of severe concessions and capitulations thrown to an insatiably aggressive State Government?

The Mayor's Plan is overstuffed and bloated with all the things we COULD do, rather than what we NEED to do.

We are delivering to U.S. and foreign investors, global corporate developers & speculators -- everything they could ever wish for -- a deregulated hugely desirable ocean-urban landscape to use for a free-for-all no rules game of demolition, buying, selling, and reselling.

It does not have to
be this way.

This is the time for Supervisors to step up-- to shape a Zoning Plan with moderation and common sense -- listening to those most affected, rather than those who will profit from it. And merely offering a few amendments to the Mayor's Plan is not going to transform it into something that fits San Francisco, or wins public support.

The Mayor's Plan plan is controversial, not because it proposes Change. It is opposed by an unusually large and broad coalition of San Franciscans -- renters, homeowners, seniors and young residents, businesspeople, tenant and environmental protectors.

Why? Because they are opposed to Change? No. It is because they are opposed to

Overcompliance. To Overkill. To overly massive unnecessary upheavals with little reward for them or their children, and few protections from exploitation.

It's not too late to fix this; to achieve Compliant Change AND win widespread approval. It's up to you now to create a better way:

Confine upzoning to vacant land, unused or very little-used nearly empty parcels. Dedicate public lands (including Muni properties) to 100 percent affordable housing, with concrete instructions for funding and infrastructure. Limit construction to eight stories for major boulevards. Limit heights on neighborhood commercial streets and other thru-streets to six-story maximums on corner lots only, with no height increases on surrounding streets. Require a minimum of 25 per cent affordable units and 30 per cent family-size units (3 & 4 & 5 bedrooms) in all market rate residential or mixed-use projects.
Ban demolition of rent-controlled units, and remove all of them from upzoning. Prohibit demolition of historical, cultural & landmarked properties, and legacy busineses. Disallow mergers and conversions. Provide tenant protections per Sup. Chen and small business protections per Sups. Melgar and Chan, and make them <u>stronger</u> than they are now.

This "**Board of Supervisors Zoning Plan"** (together with the Pipeline and 4-6-plex legislation) would be sufficient to comply with RHNA building requirements, especially incentivizing affordable housing.

Supervisors, it's up to you, our elected representatives, to write a reasonable, Compliant Zoning plan that responds to State requirements AND the needs of San Franciscans.

We are counting on you to do this.

A good faith first step would be to hold a Full Board hearing on the Mayor's Plan open to public comment.

Thanks for consideration,

Lorraine Petty

D2/5 Senior voter
Affordable housing Advocate
Seniors and Tenants Advocate
Member, SFTU & SDA

From: Karen Grayson
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 5:05:05 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Karen
California

From: Mart Deans
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 5:19:30 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

Please do not let this become another developer money grab like so many housing projects are. We have plenty of luxury and high end real estate in San Francisco. We need housing to support the vibrant communities of all incomes that make this city great.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Mart
California

From: Greg Cummings
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 5:41:43 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need. This is big bank and billionaires trying to further reduce fair housing options and eliminate rent control.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.

Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.

Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"). Create a vacancy tax for unoccupied properties being held for investment purposes. Create a speculation tax for high dollar property flipping. Protect & strengthen rent control.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,
Greg Cummings
RICHMOND District

Greg
California

From: Lee Heller
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 6:05:41 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Lee
California

From: Laurel Scotland-Stewart
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 6:28:41 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,
Laurel Scotland-Stewart

Laurel
California

From: Alice Polesky
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 7:00:33 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Alice
California

From: Anandi Worden
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 9:00:11 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

District 9 and I vote! Protect tenants rights, we are still here and we still vote

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Anandi
California

From: jgracelewis@gmail.com
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 9:54:32 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I will be devastated and forced to the streets if Laurie's upzoning proposal goes through.

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,
Jeannine Lewis

California

From: Farshid Fakhraei
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 10:33:27 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Farshid
California

From: Tiffany Konyen
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability! Make SF work for Workers!
Date: Saturday, October 18, 2025 10:06:52 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Tiffany
California

From: Neil Meerani
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Saturday, October 18, 2025 10:32:38 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Neil
California

From: mrothe@ccsf.edu
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Sunday, October 19, 2025 1:30:18 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely, Marianne Rothe

California

From: Sasha Gala
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Sunday, October 19, 2025 9:48:32 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan won't fix San Francisco's affordability crisis — it will accelerate displacement of renters and small businesses while incentivizing luxury development over homes our communities actually need.
The Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods — tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates — urges you to support a better path forward.
As a constituent, I ask that any upzoning include:
• Build without displacement — Use creative financing and local union labor to build the already-approved housing pipeline while protecting existing residents.
• Landbank public and soft sites — Reserve them for workforce, senior, family, and community housing.
• Guarantee real affordability — Strengthen inclusionary requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom — including releasing voter-approved housing funds.
• Protect families — Require both minimum and maximum family-size units in "family zones" and eliminate permanent density giveaways.
• Protect small businesses and rent-controlled homes — No demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation at real cost ("warm shells"), and enforce the vacancy tax.
San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-led planning — not rushed deregulation that repeats past mistakes. Please work with us to deliver real housing for families, seniors, and workers.
Sincerely,
Sasha Gala

Sasha
California

From: Eleanor Cox
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Sunday, October 19, 2025 10:31:21 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

-Close the SB 330 loopholes:
+Require 1:1 replacement of rental with rental units (not condos)
+Give all tenants a right to return at their existing rent regardless of their income levels
-Ask the City to identify an office tasked with overseeing and enforcing the tenant protection provisions coming from the new Tenant Protections Ordinance
-Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
-Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
-Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
-Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Eleanor
California

From: Robyn Miles
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Sunday, October 19, 2025 11:17:41 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Robyn
California

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	BOS-Operations; Carroll, John (BOS); Calvillo, Angela (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Entezari, Mehran (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS)
Subject:	RE: 97 Letters Regarding File Nos. 250700, 250701 and 250966
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 12:10:50 PM
Attachments:	97 Letters Regarding File Nos. 250700_701_966.pdf

Hello,

Please disregard previous attachment. Correct 97 letters attached.

Regards,

John Bullock
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-5184
BOS@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

Disclosures: *Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Sent: Monday, October 20, 2025 12:07 PM
To: BOS-Supervisors <bos-supervisors@sfgov.org>; BOS-Legislative Aides <bos-legislative_aides@sfgov.org>
Cc: BOS-Operations <bos-operations@sfgov.org>; Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>; Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; De Asis, Edward (BOS) <edward.deasis@sfgov.org>; Entezari, Mehran (BOS) <Mehran.Entezari@sfgov.org>; Mchugh, Eileen (BOS) <eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org>; Ng, Wilson (BOS) <wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org>; Somera, Alisa (BOS) <alisa.somera@sfgov.org>
Subject: 97 Letters Regarding File Nos. 250700, 250701 and 250966

Hello,

Please see attached 40 letters regarding File Nos.:

250700: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan
250701: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan
250966: General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan

Regards,

John Bullock
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-5184
BOS@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

Disclosures: *Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From:	Christopher Pederson
To:	Melgar, Myrna (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; Carroll, John (BOS)
Cc:	Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC); Tanner, Rachael (CPC); Chen, Lisa (CPC); Andrews, Michelle (BOS)
Subject:	Support the Family Zoning Plan - Land Use & Transportation Committee Agenda Items 1-4 (Oct. 20, 2025)
Date:	Friday, October 17, 2025 8:19:49 AM
Attachments:	Letter to BoS Land Use Comm re Family Zoning Plan.pdf

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Attached is the comment letter of the San Francisco League of Conservation Voters in support of the Family Zoning Plan.
Sincerely,
Christopher Pederson
President
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters

San Francisco
League of
Conservation
Voters

October 17, 2025

Re: Support the Family Zoning Plan, Agenda Items 1-4

Dear Chair Melgar, Vice Chair Chen, and Supervisor Mahmood:

The San Francisco League of Conservation Voters urges the Land Use and Transportation Committee to recommend that the Board of Supervisors pass the proposed ordinances to implement Mayor Lurie's Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco and California as a whole face a climate crisis and a housing crisis. Transportation is the largest source of greenhouse gas emissions from both the city and the state. The scarcity and high price of housing in coastal cities such as San Francisco, however, are forcing families to locate on the fringes of metropolitan areas where the automobile is the primary and, too often, the only viable mode of transportation.Those inland suburban and exurban areas have more extreme climates, encroach on threatened natural habitat and agricultural lands, and face high wildland fire hazards. To address the state's climate and housing crises, then, coastal cities and the state must promote much more multi-family housing located near major transit lines, employment centers, and commercial districts and in walkable, transit-oriented neighborhoods.

By virtue of San Francisco's mild climate, its extensive public transit network, its concentration of major employment centers, its walkability, and its density, San Francisco is among the most environmentally appropriate locations in the entire state for new multi-family housing. On a per capita basis, San Franciscans drive less, use less energy and water, and occupy less land than other Californians. Providing more multifamily housing for people to live in San Francisco is therefore a crucial step for addressing the state's and city's climate and housing crises.

The Mayor's Family Zoning Plan, by allowing more multifamily housing along major transit lines and close to commercial districts does exactly this. Given that the city has previously rezoned much of the eastern half of the city to allow more multifamily housing, it is appropriate for the Family Zoning Plan to concentrate on western and northern neighborhoods that have provided little new multifamily housing in recent decades. Those northern and western

neighborhoods are also mostly higher resource neighborhoods where potential concerns about displacement and gentrification are minimal.

The SFLCV understands that upzoning can raise concerns about the displacement of small businesses and rent-controlled housing. The SFLCV supports addressing those concerns, but any such measures should not undercut the Family Zoning Plan's strategy of promoting significantly more multifamily housing close to major transit lines, employment centers, and commercial districts.

Sincerely,

Christopher Pederson
President
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters

From: bridget.maley@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Bridget Maley
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 8:04:51 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

This is a series of confusing maps...not a plan. We need thoughtful urban planning that responds to the unique neighborhoods that make San Francisco vibrant. Further, issuing an Addendum to the EIR is not adequate environmental review under CEQA. A full EIR, recirculated for public review, is required for intervention of this magnitude in our city.

Sincerely,
Bridget Maley
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: lori.ottolini.geno@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Margaret Geno
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 8:11:06 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:
Please zone smartly, insure accountability, understand the real needs facing the City and County of San Francisco, this requires the full Board of Supervisors and San Francisco residents to fully understand what the "Family Zoning Plan" would mean to the future of San Francisco.

Sincerely,
Margaret Geno
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: donna.howe@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Donna Howe
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 8:32:15 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments: Thoughtful changes to zoning require not just mandates but also constituent support. Constituents want their city representatives to honor historic elements already recognized. Historic eligible buildings and neighborhoods should be celebrated and the proposed zoning changes must both protect them and encourage only new builds that are culturally and architecturally compatible with existing buildings in those neighborhoods. It's of vital importance that the Board of Supervisors recognize this and be willing to hear in public comment the views of all their constituents. Five generations if my family, beginning with my Sicilian immigrant grandparents, have lived in Ingleside Terraces. They have all valued and appreciated the street design, the architecture, and the historic context that created its layout. They want assurances that it will be preserved beyond the current zoning discussion so that future generations will see it, appreciate it, and maintain it.

Sincerely,
Donna Howe
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: byobwcrew@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Frog Gilmore
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 8:36:26 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Please please please hold a Committee of The Whole hearing for this upzoning proposal.

Hey ya'll. Frog here. Yep, that's my name. You may have heard about an event I help with called Bring Your Own Big Wheel. That's not to brag but I'm proud to say I'm here to help keep SF creative, the city of possibilities that used to be for *all*. I've lived in SF for 26 sometimes nerve-wracking years. I say that because through these years I've been subject to an illegal owner eviction and I've watched friends and beloved artists pushed out of the city and bay area altogether through the waves of the dot com boom and bust and the current tech tide of startups and AI gold panning.

We must plan for responsible growth here, we must must must have protections for our renters and artists and non traditional earners in our city, we must keep the flavor in our beautiful Rice O Roni town.

What these upzoning plans DON'T have is clear protections for our most vulnerable renters, for our mom and pop business, and they don't have plans for infrastructure to support the increase in humans and their pets to certain areas. And why are we not discussing developing the empty spaces downtown in FiDi, that are already tall heights and near public transportation?

Thanks if you've read this far. I really want responsible growth in our city.

The formal wording is below:

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Frog Gilmore
San Francisco, CA 94110

From: juliedearborn@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Julie Dearborn
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 9:25:51 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Do more to protect tenants and small businesses. ALL rent-controlled buildings should be safe from developers.

Sincerely,
Julie Dearborn
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: cyerge@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of colleen yerge
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 9:32:56 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
colleen yerge
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: Jeff Kline
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Support a functional city, protect families, keep SF moving!
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 9:46:22 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent Jeff Kline

Email kline.jb@gmail.com

Support a functional city, protect families, keep SF moving!

Message:

Dear Supervisor,

I'm disappointed that you did not incorporate critical balancing amendments to the "Street Safety Act," or, more commonly known as Vision Zero 2.0. Please bring these ideas to the table as a separate resolution.

As written the Street Safety Act is not about safety and will not achieve that goal. It is also onerous and oppressive to the majority of San Franciscans.

Proposed RECITALS:

WHEREAS, The streets of San Francisco are used by all San Franciscans for all modes of transportation, including but not limited to, walking, scootering, bicycling, motorcycling, driving, and public transit; and

WHEREAS The use of city streets inevitably involves some unavoidable risk; and

WHEREAS All users of city streets share in the responsibility for their own safety, as well as for conducting themselves in a manner safe for themselves and others; and

WHEREAS Street design involves unavoidable tradeoffs that should balance the efficacy of the

various transportation modes; and

WHEREAS All users of San Francisco streets have a legitimate expectation that their use will be facilitated, including drivers of motor vehicles, and not unreasonably impeded, complicated, or disadvantaged; and

WHEREAS More than half of the pedestrian, bicycle, and personal conveyance deaths on San Francisco streets in the last three years were preventable by the deceased by following existing traffic laws; and

WHEREAS San Francisco's surface street traffic moved at the second slowest average speed in the country in 2024 at 14 mph; and

Proposed RESOLUTIONS:

Be it RESOLVED, That all decisions involving street design shall be made with balanced consideration to the needs of all transportation modes; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That all street redesign projects that are significant, including but not limited to, speed limit reductions, speed hump installations, removal of a traffic lane, removal of parking spaces, and significant reconfiguration of traffic flow, shall require a cost/benefit review and report from an outside firm nationally recognized to be a non-partisan engineering expert in such matters, retained and managed by the San Francisco Controller's office; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED That the SFMTA shall identify the core motor vehicle traffic corridors throughout the city, shall prioritize these corridors for motor vehicle traffic, and shall publish a report by December 2026 outlining prioritized projects to increase traffic throughput on these corridors with the goal of average motor vehicle speeds of no less than 5mph lower than currently posted speeds; this report and project shall be given no less prominence, time, attention, budget, and priority than the Biking and Rolling Plan, the Northstar Network, and Vision Zero (and related programs) plans, reports, and activities.

Sincerely,

From: georgesery@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of George Sery
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 10:57:03 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
George Sery
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: jeanettetraverso@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jeanette Traverso
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 11:59:07 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

My family & I have lived in North Beach for decades. We own a three-unit residential building. We support affordable housing. Upzoning is misguided--it will not create affordabel housing & it will destroy the character of SF neighborhoods. We should be making use of the existing buildings for affordable housing. I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Thanks for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Jeanette Traverso
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: jeanettetraverso@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jeanette Traverso
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 12:06:54 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Upzoning would be an irreversible disaster. Upzoning will not create affordable housing. Upzoning will destroy the cherished character of our San Francisco neighborhoods. Let's use existing buildings to create affordable housing.

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Thank you for taking into account the views of the people who have lived in SF for decades.

Sincerely,
Jeanette Traverso
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: clivy@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Tom McG
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 5:35:10 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Property tax payers should be able to have a say on changes in their neighborhoods.

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Tom McG

From: mwais@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Michael Wais
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 11:24:00 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments: my wife and I live and have raised our son in an area that will be impacted significantly if this plan proceeds and urge the full committee to take part in considering the consequences of these changes for future families in San Francisco.

Sincerely,
Michael Wais
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: pmulholl@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Patrice Mulholland
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Saturday, October 18, 2025 10:10:15 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors. Do not give in to wealthy developers. Listen to the citizens of San Francisco before you act.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

San Francisco needs real low-income housing, not expensive buildings that have only a small portion set aside for affordable rents which are not really affordable to the majority of the workers in San Francisco.

Please not go blindly forward and ruin a beautiful city.

Sincerely,
Patrice Mulholland
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: kenvogg@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Ken Vokenski
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Saturday, October 18, 2025 3:37:51 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): SF is good the way it is, stop trying to ruin it. There are many different ways of virtue signaling that don't disrupt people's lives.

Sincerely,
Ken Vokenski
San Francisco, CA 94118

From: samuelwoodworth@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Samuel Woodworth
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Sunday, October 19, 2025 7:50:37 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential, and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. In time in will make many beloved and iconic parts of the city almost unrecognizable, yet most of the public is just finding out about it or still doesn't know.

This drastic plan should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is totally unacceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote.

Sincerely,
Samuel Woodworth
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: jscattini@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of JANICE SCATTINI
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Sunday, October 19, 2025 8:12:55 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
JANICE SCATTINI
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: sf.lorna@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lorna Walker
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Sunday, October 19, 2025 11:23:29 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): Please protect San Francisco from speculative development that doesn't lower housing costs.

Sincerely,
Lorna Walker
San Francisco, CA 94115

From: mary.pickering@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of mary pickering
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Sunday, October 19, 2025 12:24:03 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

I'm a fourth generation San Franciscan. This policy will damage our city, destroying its uniqueness and making it less attractive to both residents and tourists. The unsheltered will never be able to afford living in North Beach or Pacific Heights. This is an excuse to enable developers to grow richer.

Sincerely,
mary pickering
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: amontuori@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Alfonso Montuori
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Sunday, October 19, 2025 1:19:35 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

The Embarcadero Freeway is widely considered the ugliest thing San Francisco ever built and a huge mistake. What is being planned today, essentially throwing out everything we learnt from that horror and from the Fontana Complex debacle, will be even more disastrous and promises to drastically change the way San Francisco looks. And remember, San Francisco is a city renowned for its beauty all over the world. Tourists come here from all over the world to be in and look at our beautiful city.

Do we really want to drastically change San Francisco? Of course not. Do we really believe this effort will provide affordable or family housing in any substantive way? Of course not. Do we believe other locations in the City with much more open land were skipped because they are not that appealing to the developers? Of course. Do we believe San Francisco's leadership is kowtowing to developers? Of course.

Furthermore, over the last months it's become apparent that the areas included in the “Family Zoning Plan” keep changing and growing, and nobody is willing to give citizens an idea of what this will actually look like and how it will impact neighborhoods. In other words, we are in the dark about what this will do to our neighborhoods, and given the way the leadership has communicated, and based on its actions, we can only imagine that it will be the worst case scenario.

Do you really want to be remembered as the Mayor and Board of Supervisors that sold our beautiful city to the developers?

I hope not.

Push back against developers. Push back against the State.

Insist on alternative scenarios!

San Francisco is a world-renowned city. Let's act like one and show some self-respect.

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie’s “Family Zoning Plan”.

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco’s history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Sincerely,
Alfonso Montuori

San Francisco, CA 94133

From: amontuori@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Alfonso Montuori
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Sunday, October 19, 2025 1:28:14 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

The Embarcadero Freeway is widely considered the ugliest thing San Francisco ever built and a huge mistake. What is being planned today, essentially throwing out everything we learnt from that horror and from the Fontana Complex debacle, will be even more disastrous and promises to drastically change the way San Francisco looks. And remember, San Francisco is a city renowned for its beauty all over the world. Tourists come here from all over the world to be in and look at our beautiful city.

Do we really want to drastically change San Francisco? Of course not. Do we really believe this effort will provide affordable or family housing in any substantive way? Of course not. Do we believe other locations in the City with much more open land were skipped because they are not that appealing to the developers? Of course. Do we believe San Francisco's leadership is kowtowing to developers? Of course.

Furthermore, over the last months it's become apparent that the areas included in the “Family Zoning Plan” keep changing and growing, and nobody is willing to give citizens an idea of what this will actually look like and how it will impact neighborhoods. In other words, we are in the dark about what this will do to our neighborhoods, and given the way the leadership has communicated, and based on its actions, we can only imagine that it will be the worst case scenario.

Do you really want to be remembered as the Mayor and Board of Supervisors that sold our beautiful city to the developers?

I hope not.

Push back against developers. Push back against the State.

Insist on alternative scenarios!

San Francisco is a world-renowned city. Let's act like one and show some self-respect.

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Alfonso Montuori
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: tomacruz@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Frances Tomacruz
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Sunday, October 19, 2025 3:52:35 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Frances Tomacruz
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: kathyhoward@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Katherine Howard
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Sunday, October 19, 2025 7:07:57 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

This is probably the most important vote you will take during your term of office. This will decide your legacy. Do you represent protecting and preserving San Francisco or do you represent the bulldozers that will show up if our City if not protected?

PLEASE hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Sincerely,
Katherine Howard
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: kathyhoward@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Katherine Howard
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Sunday, October 19, 2025 7:12:27 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, the destruction of the historic character of San Francisco, and transformation of our neighborhoods into cookie-cutter, unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline
- Protect Category A historic properties and our cultural heritage.

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Katherine Howard
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: gmsunset@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Greg Miller
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Sunday, October 19, 2025 7:12:55 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Greg Miller
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: bklynbrn1826@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Rosemary Bell
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Sunday, October 19, 2025 7:18:58 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I live on Emerson St, a quiet dead-end street behind Public Storage. Building a 240 ft. housing unit at the end of this street will create a major headache not just for the residents, but small businesses such as Davita Dialysis Center, Sagebrook Assisted Living, and the American Terrazzo works that has been on Wood street for over 100 years.

Please, we, the residents of Emerson and Wood Street call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Contact me at my email address if you want to visit the neighborhood to discuss our concerns.

Sincerely,
Rosemary Bell
San Francisco, CA 94118

From: gek555sf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Gretchen Tallon
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Sunday, October 19, 2025 7:54:57 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a citizen of the Outer Sunset, we are directly affected by the upzoning in both positive and negative manners.

The Westerly is a huge screw you to that neighborhood. The community fought this project and with good reason. There is NO retail in any of the space to date, it looks in disrepair and has yet to be full. The project at 3945 Judah is another screw you to us. According to the owner of the building, this project has been going on for 13 years! Its still a mess. Slowly nearing completion. Due to the nature of the construction there is no mechanical shaft allowing for a restaurant. And where the 2600 sq ft of shared open space will be located is anyone guess. This adds to the detractions of this upzoning project. It stinks.

A project seemingly successful is the Shirley Chisholm Village. This project met with the neighborhood, listened to the neighborhood and then created a project that both adds much needed housing for our teachers (I am a parent of a SFUSD student) and adds beauty to the neighborhood. They kept their promise to keep the essense of Playland with the shared opens pace, the building height does not overpower the neighbors and the buildings blend with our current architecture.

Additionally, in 2024 voters failed to pass Prop L to support MUNI. MUNI is in trouble, yet we are building like gangbusters near transit?

And truly who are we building for? This really will not reach the people they believe it will. If you read Bay Area Business Times, there is not growth truly happening here. I do not want to cater to AI after we allowed Google, Facebook, Salesforce, Twitter, etc to come here and fail to pay their fair share in taxes - where are these companies now?

Why don't you work with Park Merced? There is a huge amount of housing which is crumbling and because its private land, it can just sit there? What about the abysmal zoo? Close it, send the animals to zoo's who can actually care for them (its well documented, the issues with the SF Zoo) and build like crazy there. You have ocean front views, parking and very few neighbors.

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Sincerely,
Gretchen Tallon
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: don.ayers@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Don Ayers
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Sunday, October 19, 2025 8:19:34 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Governance is about people, not about numbers.

When I look at the continued expansion of Outside Lands, I hear politicians crowing the dollars that are supposedly flowing in, and not talking or thinking about how San Franciscans are now locked out of a public park, a public resource, for longer and longer times each year, and pounded with volume that would never be tolerated from a business or citizen.

Likewise, this issue is about the public quality of life that we have to chosen this city for. Those that benefit will be contractors and folks who already most likely have more money than they will ever need, and the quality of life here will deteriorate from this plan.

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Sincerely,
Don Ayers
San Francisco, CA 94118

From: kaurmona35@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mona Kaur
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 9:14:48 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Dear Mayor and elected officials, I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Sincerely,
Mona Kaur
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: peterboothlee@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Peter Lee
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 9:20:31 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Peter Lee
San Francisco, CA 94118

From: cyerge@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of colleen yerge
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 9:40:15 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
colleen yerge
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: janesmalley1@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jane E Smalley
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 9:41:42 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments: I love San Francisco. Please don't obliterate the beauty of the existing architecture and neighborhoods.

Sincerely,
Jane E Smalley
San Francisco, CA 94118

From: sjgorskilaw@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Stephen Gorski
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 9:47:33 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

I have lived in D4 for over 45 years and an active community member who has voted in all local elections. D4 is not a place for the proposed upzoning. We urge you to allow full public comment at a Board of Supervisors' meeting to afford all residents to have full accountability.

Sincerely,
Stephen Gorski
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: gb_andrews@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Gandhia Andrews
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 9:55:49 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Gandhia Andrews
San Francisco, CA 94132

From: info@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of SON-SF - SAVE OUR NEIGHBORHOODS SF
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 10:02:42 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
SON-SF - SAVE OUR NEIGHBORHOODS SF
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: linda@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of linda howell
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 10:05:12 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history.

Additional comments:
I live in Jordan Park and right next to Clement Street--we would be greatly effected because we are between 2 transit corridors. These historic neighborhoods of San Francisco are the "soul " of our City and need to be protected. More affordable housing is needed but this plan does not do it properly. The Devil is in the Details and those haven't been worked out!

This upzoning proposal has been presented by the Mayor's office as the best of all possible alternatives for San Francisco. IF, in fact, he state will impose the state plan if we don't submit this before the January 2026 deadline, I understand it is in our best interest, Is there still a possibility it can be revised either before or after the deadline? Most citizens were not aware of this proposal until way too late. It's a mess and all supervisors need to put their heads together on such an important issue for our CIty.

Sincerely,
linda howell
San Francisco, CA 94118

From: mkjanis@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of janis kaempfe
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 10:06:16 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am a lifetime resident of the North Beach District and the proposed EXTREME upzoning is a real threat to my continuing to live here. In the last 10 years I have known renters (without fault) who have literately died from the stress of being forced to move from where they had lived for most of their lives. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

This proposal will also remove the charm and livability for residents and tourists who support our small businesses that are a life line of San Francisco's economy So, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

Mayor Lurie' is imposing permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Please:
- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent.

Sincerely,
janis kaempfe
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: Jason Wright
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 10:14:59 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in the Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

I've been in my rent controlled apartment for a long time, located on Church Street above Dolores Park in District 8. Although it's listed as being in a "transit corridor" on Church Street, it's located where the J Church MUNI cuts through the middle of the block (the right of way between 20th and 22nd Streets) and does not pass directly in front of my building. My building sold to a developer a year ago, and it's a 2-unit building, so I'm very concerned...even scared...of being vulnerable and losing my apartment. Even with some of the proposed amendments already, I think people like me (and my roommate) would fall through the cracks. If I lost my apartment, I'm afraid I'd be forced to move out of San Francisco. Please protect all rent-controlled units in these proposed zones.

Sincerely,
Jason Wright
Resident of District 8

Jason Wright
jasonkennethwright@gmail.com
851 Church Street
San Francisco, California 94114

From: cdmccoy@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Casey McCoy
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 10:17:37 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Zoning laws are unique: If other laws prove undesirable, they can be removed without enduring impact on a community, but once a high-rise is installed among single-family homes, there's no undoing it. When Nordic countries need new housing, they build out new infrastructure and transit, and then build up in the new areas to whatever heights they need, so they're not betraying existing residents of established neighborhoods. If they can do things the right way, then we can do things the right way.

Sincerely,
Casey McCoy

From: asmeyer13@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Amy Meyer
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 10:18:50 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Please keep the 40 foot limit so all of us can continue to enjoy the vistas that make San Francisco beautiful! Our neighborhoods are the best all over the city.

Sincerely,
Amy Meyer
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: ccwrite1@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Carolyn Constantino
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 10:25:58 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

It is APPALLING and DISAPPOINTING that you are trying to ram this through like Donald Trump forces his will on the people. Shame on you! I will not vote for anyone who supports this unnecessary "plan." We need more AFFORDABLE housing, not more millionaires.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Carolyn Constantino
San Francisco, CA 94117

From: noguera@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Hatun Noguera
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 10:27:58 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Hatun Noguera
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: jeanbbarish@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jean Barish
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 10:28:58 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Jean Barish
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: pete@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Peter Solvik
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 10:32:48 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

The upzoning will affect historic neighborhoods in San Francisco and is being moved forward without serious consideration of alternatives that would spread out lower height zoning increases more broadly along more transit corridors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Peter Solvik
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: tinamcgovern3@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Christina McGovern
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 10:33:00 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Christina McGovern
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: ferrante.lynn@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lynn Ferrante
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 10:38:46 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I live on Union Street close to Van Ness Ave. on the Russian Hill side. I am deeply disturbed by the proposed height, increases not only on Van Ness, but that go up along the adjacent blocks of Van Ness. These cross streets are currently almost entirely small residential with duplexes, triplexes and some six plexes. This is a significant and irreversible land use change without precedent. Hear your constituents please! There are other ways to address housing.

I have many concerns:
- The scale of buildings proposed will radically change neighborhoods that do not have the infrastructure to support them, cause the loss of existing businesses along Polk Street, add traffic and noise to residential neighborhoods already overwhelmed by diversion of traffic to streets like Union St during the bus lane on Van Ness construction period
- Van Ness is only just recovering from the multi years of construction of a median bus lane. This decimated many businesses. Additional construction on Van Ness, with multiple cement trucks and heavy cranes, will discourage people from frequenting Van Ness businesses and cause traffic fiascos and deterioration of the roadway
-Why is the no affordable housing included?
- Why not allow residential units on the ground floor of larger buildings which would increase the number of housing units? We do not need any more Pilates businesses.
- yes, developers want to build big, and get prime $ for multiple high floor units with Bay views. However, you are just catering to developers and taking away from your existing constituents by lowering the value of smaller buildings with existing views without compensation. You say “views do not count in land use squabbles” but you are forgetting the financial component which is a big + for developers and a big minus for others

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie’s plan. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Do not turn San Francisco into Miami.

Sincerely,
Lynn Ferrante
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: audreycrls@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Audrey Carlson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 10:43:59 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments: I am very concerned that any plan will simply be overridden by our very own State Senator Weiner's legislation. We need a guarantee from Weiner that he won't overturn this.

Sincerely,
Audrey Carlson
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: knbnknk@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Barbara Hori
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 10:45:28 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history.
I was born and raised in San Francisco, so I am disturbed and upset by these proposed changes to my neighborhood, my city.

It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Sincerely,
Barbara Hori
San Francisco, CA 94132

From: mpegdietz@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Margaret Dietz
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 10:46:44 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:
I want to know why, if this is about AFFORDABLE HOUSING, the Upzoning Plan targets parcels that are currently RENT CONTROLLED BUILDINGS, (ie, Affordable Housing), for heights that double the current buildings' height, thereby incentivizing the demolition of rent-controlled housing. Rent controlled buildings must be zoned at their current height to remove this perverse incentive.

Second, this Upzone Plan offers the same old remedy for achieving more Affordable Housing - a fund that developers pay into in lieu of actuallyproviding Affordable units for sale or rent. Where is that money? How much money has been paid in? How much money has been spent, and where and how?

Third, does the Upzoning Plan plan for the maximum number of units that can be sustained in a drought?

Sincerely,
Margaret Dietz
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: bapresta@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Barbara Presta
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 10:47:58 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Other solutions exist that are not this drastic. San Francisco is currently a unique beautiful city. This will not longer be true if high rises
pop up in our neighborhoods.

Sincerely,
Barbara Presta
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: kielygomes@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Karen Schwartz
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 10:49:44 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:
In my neighborhood (D8, Market Street and Noe) we have about 500 new units in several big new buildings. We have done our part for density increase already! Preservation keeps our city intact, beautiful and attractive.

Sincerely,
Karen Schwartz
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: shoshod5623@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of shoshanah dobry
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 10:49:57 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Dear Mayor Lurie & Supervisors:

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Living in D10 I have witnesses the major disuse & abuse of one district due to a lack of political pull & monied interests. We & the rest of the City don't need this real estate & building power grab by Mayor Lurie & Scott Weiner. It doesn't work & we need a more measured approach to our housing issues. This being said I am in no way advocating for less housing/building. I would ask that a more district by district approach with the burden being spread equally across the City.

Sincerely,
shoshanah dobry
San Francisco, CA 94124

From: judydoanesf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Judy Doane
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 10:52:09 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Judy Doane
San Francisco, CA 94115

From: esens123@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Erik Sens
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 10:52:36 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Erik Sens
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: mail@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Josie Brown
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 10:54:24 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I strongly urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It certainly should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors. All elected officials who are responsible for the loss of affordable housing should be on record so that we may vote them out.

Ergo, limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is NOT acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments: Your standing in this issue will be noted for the record as will any subsequent remuneration you receive.

Sincerely,
Josie Brown
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: disp006@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Terrence McKenna
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 10:55:51 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:I don't understand why developed neighborhoods are being targeted. At the foot of Geneva at Bayshore there is hundreds of acres of undeveloped land which would provide room for several new neighborhoods yet this area isn't even being discussed

Sincerely,
Terrence McKenna
San Francisco, CA 94112

From: erika.awakening@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Erika Frick
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 10:56:12 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors,

As a 25-year resident of Nob Hill, I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan," which I vehemently oppose. The stated reasons for these radical changes to our beautiful City do not hold water, as exemplified by the struggle 875 California St has had in selling even a limited number of condos since they blotted out views six and a half years ago!

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

- These condos will uglify our beautiful city for no reason!

- San Francisco's population growth does not justify this radical increase in housing.

- Very few affordable units are included. There is nobody to buy these mostly very expensive condos.

- As I understand it, the proposed housing is way beyond anything the state requires.

- All over social media, we see the real people of SF opposing this reckless building, yet Supervisors do not appear to be listening to the will of the People.

- Building should occur gradually with continuous reassessment of impact and actual needs. 875 California's difficulty selling units for YEARS already shows that our opposition years ago was well founded.

Please put a halt to this madness.

Sincerely,
Erika Frick
San Francisco, CA 94108

From: karenannbash@gmail.com
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 10:57:01 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,
Karen Bash

California

From: peterboothlee@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Peter Lee
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 11:01:47 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Peter Lee
San Francisco, CA 94118

From: schuttishtr@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Georgia Schuttish
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 11:03:49 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Dear President Mandelman, Chair Melgar, Members of the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Lurie:

As a resident of San Francisco since 1979 and as someone who has attended every meeting on the Rezoning at the Planning Commission and the one on June 16th at the LUT, I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This is a complicated piece of legislation that will determine the direction of San Francisco for the next 50 years.

Now there are going to be new amendments to the FZP.

The public needs to learn about these new amendments and be able to digest them and then comment on them.

Many people are just becoming aware of the Rezoning or have only become aware of the Rezoning in the past year.

Please schedule a Committee of the Whole Hearing prior to the Thanksgiving and all the end of the year holidays.

Thank you.

Georgia Schuttish

Sincerely,
Georgia Schuttish
San Francisco, CA 94131

From: nuptial.51.boxes@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of stephanie de maria
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 11:04:32 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

We need community input and the chance to state our concerns to the full board before the vote. Preserve all the historical neighborhoods in SF

Sincerely,
stephanie de maria
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: jmhurabiell1@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Judi Hurabiell
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 11:07:56 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Judi Hurabiell

From: kumasong@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Karen Kirschling
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 11:10:32 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Karen Kirschling

From: bilgepump100@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Robert Hall
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 11:13:08 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Robert Hall
San Francisco, CA 94117

From: redpl@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Renee Lazear
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 11:15:01 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Renee Lazear
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: benjamin.kuslits@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Ben Kuslits
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 11:18:20 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Hello,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

I have lived in the city for 12 years, and cherish the character and identity of its unique neighborhoods. The mayor's plan will irreparably damage neighborhoods, does little to remediate constituent concerns or demonstrate how the plan would actually create affordable housing, and will primarily benefit private developers.

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Sincerely,
Ben Kuslits
San Francisco, CA 94117

From: elemjw@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lin Joe
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 11:18:56 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

We love our City and feel you do too. Listen to your constituents! Hear our voices and concerns!

In my humble opinion, Our Shared Vision of San Francisco's Future Development will in most instances result in a better outcome for all.

Sincerely,
Lin Joe
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: glish.lauren@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lauren Glish
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 11:19:39 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:
Everything I have read about SB 79 and this new SF zoning plan has led me to conclude that the plan is irresponsible, would cause grave, irreversible harm to the city and is not what your residents, including myself, actually want.

Earlier this summer I sent an email expressing how devastated I would be to see this zoning plan go through. I've leased an apartment in the Marina district for over a decade — and the additional zoning plans along Lombard, Chestnut, Fillmore, and in Pacific Heights will permanently destroy the views and non-high rise charm of this beautiful area that I love. And the same holds true for almost all other neighborhoods impacted by the proposed zoning map.

All of the other San Francisco residents I have spoken to about this are in agreement that they would not want to stay in San Francisco either during the construction, or after the construction of all these new high-rise buildings.

As our elected officials, it is unacceptable to move this forward without all 11 supervisors hearing all public concerns. And I believe that failing to do this will cause many of Lurie's current supporters to turn against him.

Sincerely,
Lauren Glish
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: guybristow@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Guy Bristow
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 11:19:53 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Guy Bristow
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: stevenaflamm@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Steven Flamm
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 11:20:23 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Steven Flamm
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: kathygee606@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kathleen Gee
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 11:20:25 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Kathleen Gee
San Francisco, CA 94118

From: eliseravel3@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Elise Ravel
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 11:20:28 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Elise Ravel
San Francisco, CA 94131

From: lbkerester@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Laurie Berk
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 11:20:31 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

The existing proposed upzoning plan is flawed in many ways and feels like a developer's give-away. Views from the north toward the City will be negatively impacted with high rise buildings in the Marina, affecting the beauty of this City admired by residents and visitors alike. The north side of the City may not have seen the most recent density development, but it is one of the most densely populated parts of the City - it is just that building took place years ago. There are many high rises in Pacific Heights in particular, especially east of Fillmore along Vallejo, Broadway, Pacific, Jackson and more. More citizen input needs to considered before this proposed plan is approved.

Sincerely,
Laurie Berk
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: brainz_ca@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Karin Hu
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 11:21:34 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

I have lived in SF for decades. I plan to stay in SF forever and am alarmed at how new money, trendy Tech culture, and real estate development companies aim to change our neighborhoods from family homes to studios & small 1 BD apartments.

Families want homes with at least 2-3 BR bedrooms and yard space. Don't support the destruction of these homes in SF, making families move to suburbs and other cities.

I want to hold ALL Supervisors accountable for their vision of San Francisco and how they represent the goals of their constituents.

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Sincerely,
Karin Hu

From:	Sandra Monk
To:	BOS-Supervisors
Subject:	Please Amend the Mayor"s Redevelopment Plan-- It does nothing for housing affordabilty for so many San Franciscans.
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 11:23:30 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's "one size fits all" upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the basic housing construction we need throughout the city.

Here is a better plan, designed by real housing advocates
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.

Workers who provide CCSF services and build housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government.

We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Sandra Monk
sandra.monk@ucsf.edu
2425 MISSION ST APT C
San Francisco, California 94110-2414

From: kathygrogan@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kathy Grogan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 11:23:32 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Kathy Grogan
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: dahlems@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Monica Dahlem
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 11:23:33 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Please do not strip away our local voices.
The current plan has a lack of safeguards in our communities and is proceeding without public comment, thoughts, votes.
There are no guardrails for this, which may result in unintended consequences.
What makes SF so vibrant and wonderful is the ability to be seen and heard, and this current plan as it stands, is taking away that ability with one swoop.

Sincerely,
Monica Dahlem
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: bilgepump100@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Robert Hall
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 11:24:39 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Robert Hall
San Francisco, CA 94117

From: ckutler2@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Caroline Kutler
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 11:25:40 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

My family and I live in Jordan Park and the lack of nuance and detail in this plan is astounding. We have two massive developments already approved in our neighborhood (the CPMC Hospital on California and 3333 California - BOTH by the Pardo Group). These developments together are slated to add nearly 1300 units to our neighborhood. That is a massive increase in a small historic community without any consideration of how that impacts local infrastructure. The current upzoning plans do not take these existing and APPROVED developments into consideration when allowing for massive height increases in development. This is a thoughtless and reckless plan that is being shoved down our throats without any consideration for impact on communities. I completely agree that we need to increase housing in SF but a one size fits all blanket approach is not the way to do it.

Sincerely,
Caroline Kutler
San Francisco, CA 94118

From: sharon_purewal@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sharon Purewal
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 11:26:29 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Sincerely,
Sharon Purewal
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: judydoanesf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Judy Doane
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 11:27:38 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Judy Doane
San Francisco, CA 94115

From: madrider317@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Thomas Jordan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 11:28:05 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Thomas Jordan
North Hollywood, CA 91605

From: bapresta@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Barbara Presta
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 11:28:39 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments: Other solutions are possible to increase affordable housing. Solutions that do not destroy our neighborhoods.
I believe this can be accomplshed within the current 40 foot height limit in neighborhoods, with increased height buildings in the downtown area where buildings of these heights already exist.

Sincerely,
Barbara Presta
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: Jacqueline Rios
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 11:29:08 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,
Jacqueline Rios SF tenant

Jacqueline
California

From: gfpedler@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Gary Pedler
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 11:30:26 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Sincerely,
Gary Pedler
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: ericajoykatrak@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Erica Katrak
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 11:30:27 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Please hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on the Family Zoning Plan. Isn't this a government that cares about its residents' voices? A model for the rest of the country on how to build smart, resilient cities that address actual needs because their residents are actively involved in shaping it?

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors. It should not steamroll others into implementation because a handful of people with power are willing it to be so. It needs to be nuanced and shaped by the people who call this place home and hope to for a very very long time.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable, nor wise. It doesn't help San Francisco continue to meet the needs of its people, it overrides their voices. Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Erica

Sincerely,
Erica Katrak
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: elaine@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Elaine Katzenberger
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 11:31:37 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Elaine Katzenberger
San Francisco, CA 94112

From: ehirst1603@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Eileen Hirst
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 11:31:38 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am a 50+ year resident of San Francisco and have lived on Russian Hill for more than 30 years. At the D3 Democratic Club meeting where Planning staff presented this plan, there was a fair amount of pushback. Planning staff sought to reassure the crowd by saying that almost none of this housing will ever be built, and that this is a 50-year plan.

In other words, this plan is not going to produce the workforce, family-appropriate housing needed right now. And, the Planning Department knows it.

Mayor Lurie, you are so proud of the 40-person SFPD recruitment class, but you can look forward to those new members leaving San Francisco as soon as they advance in ranks, couple up and start families. They will buy affordable houses on the edges of the Bay Area and put up with a punishing commute until they transfer to a public safety agency close to their home. Your plan expects them to wait until private developers build lots and lots of luxury housing, so many that all housing will go down in price. By that time, if it ever happens at all, that recruit class will be ready for retirement.

This plan needs to go back to Planning with a directive to identify parcels ripe for development, with no displacement of tenants or businesses. Then, the City should partner with developers to acquire financing and streamline permitting, and get housing built in time for that recruit class to move into it.

Supervisors, I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan". The entire Board needs to hear that there is a better way to meet the state mandate, one that will actually produce housing.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Eileen Hirst
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: sm4art2@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Suzanne Martin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 11:33:29 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments: please protect all rent controlled apartments. Please do not demolish all rent controlled apartments. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Suzanne Martin
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: maureen@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Maureen Holt
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 11:37:32 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

We live in D2, one of the districts that, at least in its historical intent, speaks to the uniqueness and quirkiness of what SF has always represented - to those of us who live here and those who choose to come visit here. This is why our neighborhoods are desired tourist destinations. People do not come to SF to see Manhattan sized buildings. People do not choose to live in SF for Manhattan height apartments. The entire premise of "needing" multi-tier high rises in traditional/historical family neighborhoods reeks of disingenuousness. Creating canyons of unnecessary high rises not only diminish light, one of the key variables which affect both quality of life and perceived happiness but also flies in the face of the purported objective of creating "affordable housing". A 16th floor apartment on Lombard with unadulterated views will NEVER be "affordable housing" - neither will a 2nd floor apartment in the same building. We all know that and it is insulting for communications to keep delivering that message. Meanwhile, we have plenty of unused space all over downtown that we are all supposed to believe cannot be adapted for housing, if that is indeed what we are after. Residents are seriously disappointed in the direction that BOS/Planning Dept/Committees are taking that show little respect for this city we all love.

Sincerely,
Maureen Holt
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: mmshea03@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Maureen Mullane
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 11:37:53 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We implore you to take this slowly and thoughtfully.

Do not rush into legislation that you can not reverse.

You represent the people of San Francisco so listen to us.

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Think this through.

Sincerely,
Maureen Mullane
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: info@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Renee Lazear
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 11:42:09 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

October 20, 2025

To: Board of Supervisors' Land Use and Transportation Committee
Re: Upzoning Plan - Oppose

I am Renee Lazear, a longtime/multi-generation resident of District 4 (D4) and Outer Parkside, a 5th generation Californian, a co-founder of SON-SF (Save Our Neighborhoods SF) and a member of NUSF. I am opposed to the current Map proposals for Upzoning for the multiple reasons that have been shared at several meeting and/or hearings that will ruin our Communities & Neighborhoods.

In D4, we have already begun to feel the consequences of these reckless plans.

Though not directly associated with Upzoning, the closure of Great Highway has increased traffic on our streets along with the associated risks and if this plan passes the traffic will only increase even more without another proper traffic management plan.

Those of us who are opposed to this upzoning plans have been called "NIMBY" and unaccepting of change by certain people, but my family has been in the same home for half this City's history. We've lived through significant change & not shied from it but learned to differentiate progress from dumping. We aren't about nothing in our back yards but: what is to be placed there, what purpose it serves, what benefit it brings for the costs it extorts, in short, we're reasonable.

There are many other options currently available to provide Housing, such as revitalizing Downtown and converting offices into residential, to name a few options.

This City's not the sum of its monuments but the layers fashioned by generations into neighborhoods and the working communities that are inseparable from them.

Modern history has many examples of someone else's idea of the future that lasted barely two decades but destroyed permanently, many functioning neighborhoods.

Upzoning as proposed is a reactionary political expediency, no different than the Urban Renewal that plowed working communities into towering failures. I ask that the current Upzoning Map proposal be rejected and that going forward a real effort is made to engage the local public in reasonable discussions for reasonable plans.

Thank you,
Renee Lazear, Co-founder
SON-SF ~ Save Our Neighborhoods SF

Sincerely,
Renee Lazear
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: lareinatitania@gmail.com
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 11:49:28 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!
Most of us are not millionaires, cannot afford to buy new housing that is "affordable" and will

end up homeless and dead too soon if this continues as planned.
Thank you.

Sincerely,
Marsha Henderson

lareinatitania@gmail.com
4304 18th St.
San Francisco, California 94114

From: Joe Chmielewski
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 11:50:36 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Joseph Chmielewski

Joe Chmielewski
jcin506@yahoo.com
50 Golden Gate Ave #506
San Francisco , California 94102

From: ribeiromarie@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Marie Ribeiro
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 11:52:15 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Here in Glen Park we are ALREADY OVERLOADED as a transportation hub. Oursmall street infrastructure DOES NOT support 6 story housing in CENTRAL DOWNTOWN GLEN PARK . (Chenery @ Diamond and Kern St specifically.)

Doing so puts PEDESTRIANS and BIKE RIDERS. ALREADY AT RISK into MORE DANGEROUS RISK.

OUR SMALL STREET INFRASTRUCTURE demands a more individualized look at each specific neighborhood into affordable housing projects. ONE SIZE FIT ALL DOES NOT SERVE ANYONE.

Trying to fix the mistakes of the past with the same kind of blanket /sweeping regulations WILL NOT WORK. WE SHOULD NOT HAVE TO PAY FOR THE MISTAKES OF THOSE IN CHARGE.

PLEASE VOTE AGAINST THIS

Sincerely,
Marie Ribeiro

From: carole.glosenger@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of carole glosenger
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 11:52:57 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments: the upzoning plan is theworst idea for San Francisco. large apartment buildings in low height neighborhoods will be ugly and disruptive. If this plan goes through in the future people will say "who the hell let that happen" it looks like the "projects". They will say " That was Mayor Lurie".

Sincerely,
carole glosenger
San Francisco, CA 94117

From: Doug Woods
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 11:55:48 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Doug Woods
dwoods999@comcast.net
999 Fell St.
San Francisco, California 94117

From:	Carroll, John (BOS)
To:	"Elizabeth Madrigal"
Cc:	Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Sciammas, Charlie (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Cooper, Raynell (BOS)
Subject:	RE: 10/20 San Francisco Land Use and Transportation Committee - MidPen Housing Letter in Support of Family Zoning Plan - BOS File Nos. 250700 250701 250966
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 11:44:00 AM
Attachments:	MidPen Housing Letter on Family Zoning Plan, Land Use Committee.pdf image001.png

---

Thank you for your comment letter.

I am forwarding your comments to the members of the Land Use and Transportation committee, and I will include your comments in the files for these ordinance matters.

I invite you to review the entire matter on our Legislative Research Center by following the links below:

- Board of Supervisors File No. 250700
- Board of Supervisors File No. 250701
- Board of Supervisors File No. 250966

John Carroll
Assistant Clerk
Board of Supervisors
San Francisco City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415)554-4445

Click here to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The Legislative Research Center provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation and archived matters since August 1998.

Disclosures: *Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: Elizabeth Madrigal <elizabeth.madrigal@midpen-housing.org>
Sent: Monday, October 20, 2025 10:52 AM

To: Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>
Subject: 10/20 San Francisco Land Use and Transportation Committee - MidPen Housing Letter in Support of Family Zoning Plan

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Good morning,

Attached you will find MidPen's Housing's letter in support of the Family Zoning Plan, regarding item #2 at today's Land Use and Transportation committee meeting.

Please confirm receipt.

Best,

Elizabeth Madrigal | Policy Manager
MidPen Housing Corp.
275 Main Street, Suite 204, Watsonville, CA 95076
c. 831.240.8853
She | Her | Hers

MidPen HOUSING

Building Communities. Changing Lives.

October 20, 2025

Land Use and Transportation Committee
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Subject: Letter of Support for Family Zoning Plan

Dear Supervisors Melgar, Chen and Mahmood,

MidPen Housing is pleased to write to you in support of the Family Zoning Plan. We appreciate the time and care that has gone into developing this rezoning program with the intent of it leading to the production of desperately needed multifamily affordable housing in all neighborhoods throughout San Francisco.

MidPen Housing is one of the nation's leading nonprofit developers, owners, and managers of high-quality, affordable housing and onsite resident services. Since MidPen was founded in 1970, we have developed 139 communities and over 10,000 homes for low-income families, seniors and those with supportive housing needs throughout Northern California. In San Francisco, our team recently developed Shirley Chisholm Village which includes 135 affordable homes with a preference for SFUSD educators. Shirley Chisholm Village was the first 100% affordable housing development to break ground in the Sunset District in the last decade. Of the three affordable housing projects in the pipeline for District 2, two of them are developments of ours which will add 167 new affordable homes to the area.

The City and County of San Francisco's Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) sets a goal of 82,069 new homes by 2031. Over half of these homes have a target of being affordable to residents making 80% of the Area Median Income (AMI) and below. In order to meet these goals, San Francisco must utilize all tools at its disposal to increase multifamily housing development and ensure that production benefits everyone across the income spectrum. Drawing from deep experience working with jurisdictions across the Bay Area on housing element policy, our team published a guide on best practices.

The Family Zoning Plan is an important step toward remedying historic patterns of segregation by dismantling hallmarks of exclusionary zoning and by allowing denser multifamily housing in northern and western neighborhoods. These well-resourced neighborhoods represent more than 50% of the city's total land but only 10% of all new housing built in the last 15 years. Our team is glad to be actively contributing towards building affordable housing in Housing Opportunity Areas to meet the city's mandate of Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing.

Thank you for your leadership and ongoing commitment to the production of affordable housing. Please feel free to contact Nevada V. Merriman, Vice President of Policy & Advocacy, with any questions at 650-477-6195 or nmerriman@midpen-housing.org.

Best Regards,

Nevada V. Merriman
Vice President of Policy and Advocacy

CC: Matthew O. Franklin, President and CEO, MidPen Housing
Elizabeth Madrigal, Policy Manager, MidPen Housing

From:	Carroll, John (BOS)
To:	George Wooding
Cc:	Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Sciammas, Charlie (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Cooper, Raynell (BOS)
Subject:	RE: 250966, 250700, 250701
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 11:44:00 AM
Attachments:	Housing Alert v2.docx image001.png

Thank you for your comment letter.

I am forwarding your comments to the members of the Land Use and Transportation committee, and I will include your comments in the files for these ordinance matters.

I invite you to review the entire matter on our Legislative Research Center by following the links below:

- Board of Supervisors File No. 250700
- Board of Supervisors File No. 250701
- Board of Supervisors File No. 250966

John Carroll
Assistant Clerk
Board of Supervisors
San Francisco City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415)554-4445

Click here to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The Legislative Research Center provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation and archived matters since August 1998.

Disclosures: *Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: George Wooding <gswooding@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, October 19, 2025 9:41 PM

To: Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>; George Wooding <gswooding@gmail.com>
Subject: 250966, 250700, 250701

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

October 19, 2025

Dear Mr Carroll,

Please submit the attached letter, regarding the San Francisco Land Use October 20 Land Use Committee as written testimony.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,

Housing Alert

Notice of potential rezoning of height and or density in San Francisco. Please stop this bad zoning law by attending the September 11 Planning Commission meeting, testifying against this zoning proposal, and/or writing a letter.

Why didn't the San Francisco Land Use and Transportation Committee's District seven (D7) Committee Chair, Myrna Melgar want to notify San Francisco residents of the massive rezoning changes to the planning code that would impact their neighborhoods? The Committee was counting on an uninformed public. Public ignorance is political bliss.

In opposition, Sup. Connie Chan (D1) introduced legislation that would require the Planning Department to send a notice by US mail to every residential or commercial tenant and every property owner within 300 feet of a proposed zoning change. Chan's legislation won at the Board of Supervisors on an eight to three vote. The three votes against the legislation were Myrna Melgar (D7), Bilal Mahmood(D11) and Matt Dorsey (D6).

Melgar said that the rezoning notification to the public is "not necessary." Why would Melgar be worried about 300,000 notifications? Well, maybe 200,000 residents might be concerned and another 50,000 residents might be angry. For the D7 supervisor who represents a moderate district with the most residential housing, Melgar is starting to act more like a YIMBY (Yes In My Back Yard) every day. It might be time for her to have lunch with Scott Wiener and Joel Engardio to discuss strategy.

"In the neighborhoods I represent, many have a lot of concerns and doubts about displacement," Chan said. "Not just tenants, but small businesses and aging homeowners, are worried they could fall victim to speculative real estate investors and be displaced."

Replacement of Demolished Units: For rent-controlled units in areas targeted for increased density and potential demolition under the plan, there are stipulations requiring that any demolished rent-controlled unit be replaced with another rent-controlled unit, and that the displaced tenants have the right to return to the new building. Residents cannot afford to wait while their housing is torn down and rebuilt.

Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning" plan in San Francisco is a subject of intense debate, with concerns raised about its potential impact on existing tenants. While the plan aims to increase housing availability and affordability, opponents argue that it will lead to displacement.

Lurie's plan will only succeed in making developers rich, while diminishing the quality of life in San Francisco. Rent and housing prices will increase—not decrease because of the scarcity of land, less affordable housing will be built and fewer small businesses will remain open. There will be less affordable housing—not more.

In 48 Hills, August 3 article, titled "Small Business Commission rejects (for now) Lurie's upzoning plan" Calvin Welsh states, "This isn't an affordable housing program. This is a real-estate development plan, a plan for speculators. … Haight Street will see the displacement of roughly 50 percent of neighborhood businesses. There is nothing in this plan to preserve neighborhood serving retail.

Further, "If you want it in this plan, this commission [Planning Commission] must come up with the language. … You should amend the plan to require preservation of neighborhood businesses and neighborhood shopping districts." Calvin Welsh is right.

The upzoning plan is difficult to understand. So…this provides the simplest explanation of Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning plan. Developers and billionaires run San Francisco (Lurie is a billionaire). Billionaires and developers donate to local politicians and this gives them immense power over City Planning---ask former Planning Director Rich Hillis who stated on his May 3rd resignation letter, "I'm looking forward to taking some time off and thinking about what is next for me."

The Family Zoning plan was never about affordability. The Planning Department was ordered to create as much height and square footage as possible for developers. The plan was designed to demolish huge chunks of residential housing and Neighborhood Districts (NCDs). The demolision zones are permanent. Now that most of Planning's permit and CEQA and building guidelines have been removed or reduced, developers can do just about anything that they want to.

Developers can also get rid of affordable housing by paying an inclusionary housing fee or In Lieu fees to the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD). By paying these fees, Developers can now purchase the Planning Departments permission to build much more profitable Market-Rate structures. Developers will make a fortune as they carve-up San Francisco's NCDs and residential housing.

The Mayor's "Family Zoning Plan" should be renamed "The Developer's Demolition and Displacement of NCDs and Residential Neighborhoods" plan

Over 50% of San Francisco's storefronts have already closed: A San Francisco Chamber of Commerce study from August 2020 revealed that 54% of storefront businesses in San Francisco had closed due to COVID-19, with approximately 1,300 closures.

Data from the city planning department suggests that a significant number of small businesses in neighborhood commercial districts (NCDs) could face displacement under Mayor Lurie's plan to allow more housing density. Developers might be encouraged to demolish existing small buildings, which often house small businesses, to build larger residential structures. San Francisco's small business community may start to face extinction.

No small business can survive waiting for four years to have its location rebuilt. Some San Francisco Supervisors are discussing creating a small business relocation fund. Where will the business go and what will it cost to relocate. How much money would a developer be charged? Supervisor Myrna Melgar is trying to create legislation to develop this fund.0}

It's important to note that the Mayor's plans are multifaceted, and some aspects can potentially displace existing residents. Where will these residents go?

Under San Francisco's 2022 housing element and state law, the city must expand housing affordability and availability. This proposed citywide rezoning may increase the height and/or density limits of your neighborhood or others in your neighborhood.

The main purpose of this massive rezoning was to build more affordable housing. The only affordable housing that will be built will be subsidized by the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD). The MOHCD is broke. Developers will not want to build new affordable housing because it will not be profitable.

Under existing planning guidelines, developers can pay the city extra money (inclusionary housing fees and/or in lieu fees) to not build affordable housing. Thus, the city makes money on projects that do not abide by affordable housing guidelines, and developers sell residential units at market-rate prices.

Sadly, San Franciscans with an average median Income (AMI) of $150,000 or less could not afford to purchase any affordable housing without being subsidized. Yimby's members will still be living in their parent's basement.

Delete44444/Dlete[The Family Zoning Plan is only partially about height and density; the real purpose is to create permanent demolition zones throughout San Francisco—especially on the Westside. }

"This rezoning legislation is a key step toward meeting our state housing goals. We are laying the foundation for small and midsize housing projects in areas of the city where we have seen little housing production, allowing us to welcome new residents while supporting long-term tenants and small businesses," said **Sarah Dennis Philips, Director of San Francisco Planning Department**. "The mayor's Family Zoning plan effectively balances the preservation of our city's character with the necessary flexibility to ensure San Franciscans across all income levels can continue to call this great city home." Phillips was appointed by Lurie to be the new planning director in June.

Phillips statements regarding the Mayor's Family Zoning Plan is puffery The Family Zoning Plan is only partially about height ////density and affordability; the real purpose is to create permanent demolition zones throughout San Francisco—especially on the Westside.

DeleteThe Planning Department's demolition maps and guidelines will be designed to make as much money for developers as possible. These developers, in turn, will make contributions to local politicians.}

Ninety percent of the Planning Department's revenue comes from issuing permits.

The endgame is ////////"Density Decontrol" in San Francisco. Density Decontrol is a zoning policy being proposed in San Francisco that would remove unit limits on properties, allowing developers to build as many or as few residential units as possible within a building's height and space limitations. This proposal is a key part of San Francisco's efforts to address its housing crisis and meet state-mandated housing targets.

Residents should certainly be aware of Mayor Lurie's Family Zoning Plan, especially if they wish to save San Francisco's small businesses, residential housing, and special character of our neighborhoods, and be allowed to respond before the legislation becomes law.

If you love San Francisco, please don't support Mayor Lurie's housing plan. Neighborhood character will be destroyed as 40-foot-high housing will be allowed in residential mid-block streets and 55+ foot residential housing will be built on corner lots. NCD's will be built at 65', -140'+.

Every homeowner and renter should attend these two meetings:

-The D4/D7 Town Hall on Sep 4th is to ensure west side residents are aware of what's happening with the rezoning, and energize them, ***after*** they receive the public notices (week of Aug 11) and ***ahead*** of the Sept 11 Planning Commission Vote & Sept 16 D4 Recall Election of Joel Engardio. There will be press coverage and potentially a live stream, to ensure reach.
Location: Irish Cultural Center (Thursday, Sept 4, 6 pm)

For questions or to request a meeting with the planning department on the family zoning plan email: sf.housing.choice@sfgov.org

PLANNING COMMISSION HEARING DATE:

Thursday, September 11, 2025

Place:

City Hall, 1 Dr. Carleton B. Goodlett Place, Room 400, 12:00pm (noon)

CASE TYPE:

Planning Code and zoning map amendment

San Francisco Planning Commission

Project Name:

San Francisco zoning plan (Housing Element Rezoning program)

Case# 20021-00587CWP

QR Code Link: https://sfplanning.org/sf-family-zoning-plan

Board File Nos: 250700 and 25076

George Wooding

From:	Carroll, John (BOS)
To:	Quintin Mecke; Lurie, Daniel (MYR)
Cc:	Segal, Ned (MYR); Chen, Lisa (CPC); Tanner, Rachael (CPC); Bonde, Aly (MYR); White, Ben (MYR); Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Sciammas, Charlie (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Cooper, Raynell (BOS)
Subject:	RE: Affordability in the Proposed Family Zoning Plan - BOS File Nos. 250700 250701 250966
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 11:44:00 AM
Attachments:	CCHO Letter, Affordability in Family Zoning Plan.pdf image001.png

---

Thank you for your comment letter.

I am forwarding your comments to the members of the Land Use and Transportation committee, and I will include your comments in the files for these ordinance matters.

I invite you to review the entire matter on our Legislative Research Center by following the links below:

- Board of Supervisors File No. 250700
- Board of Supervisors File No. 250701
- Board of Supervisors File No. 250966

John Carroll
Assistant Clerk
Board of Supervisors
San Francisco City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415)554-4445

Click here to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The Legislative Research Center provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation and archived matters since August 1998.

Disclosures: *Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: Quintin Mecke <quintin@sfccho.org>
Sent: Monday, October 20, 2025 11:24 AM

To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>
Cc: Segal, Ned (MYR) <ned.segal@sfgov.org>; Chen, Lisa (CPC) <lisa.chen@sfgov.org>; Tanner, Rachael (CPC) <rachael.tanner@sfgov.org>; Bonde, Aly (MYR) <aly.bonde@sfgov.org>; White, Ben (MYR) <ben.white1@sfgov.org>; Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC) <sarah.dennis-phillips@sfgov.org>
Subject: Affordability in the Proposed Family Zoning Plan

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Lurie,

On behalf of the Council of Community Housing Organizations (CCHO) and our member agencies, we write to express deep concern that the proposed Family Zoning Plan, while well-intentioned, lacks a clear and realistic pathway to producing affordable housing in San Francisco.

Our coalition has decades of collective experience developing, financing, and building affordable housing across the city. Based on that experience, we think it's critical to provide a plausible pathway for achieving the affordability outcomes our city desperately needs.

We recognize the importance of submitting a zoning-compliant map to the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) that demonstrates theoretical capacity.

However, as currently drafted, the Family Zoning Plan offers no meaningful mechanism for actually delivering the affordable homes required to meet San Francisco's Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) goals.

The private market is simply not designed or fiscally equipped to produce deeply affordable units, and there are no provisions that enable affordable housing developers to acquire land, access financing, or build at the scale required.

Affordability Is San Francisco's Defining Challenge

Affordability is the single most urgent issue facing San Franciscans today. Yet the Family Zoning Plan—like many initiatives before it—relies heavily on the private market to deliver affordability. This approach has failed. No scale of market-rate development will generate the deeply affordable housing needed, and inclusionary Below Market Rate (BMR) requirements or in-lieu fees, while important, produce only a fraction of the housing needed and cannot meet the deep affordability mandates set by the state.

In fact, 57% of the rezoning capacity still needed under RHNA—20,300 of the remaining 36,200 units—must serve low-income households. Market-rate development priced at $3,400 for a one-bedroom unit will not meet the needs of San Francisco's low-income families. More than half of family-household residents in the

city are low- or very low-income, including approximately 36% who earn less than 50% of Area Median Income (AMI).

The adopted Housing Element offers a rare opportunity to create a bold, proactive citywide vision for affordable housing—one that the private market cannot and will not deliver. Affordable housing solutions must be implemented citywide and west-side rezoning should prioritize affordable housing, especially in areas that are vulnerable to displacement.

Our Recommendations

To ensure the Family Zoning Plan becomes a meaningful tool for affordability—not simply a symbolic gesture to satisfy state requirements—we urge the following:

1. Amend the legislation to include an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD).

Establish a clear framework to incentivize and prioritize 100% affordable housing, including additional height, density, or streamlined approvals for nonprofit and community developers.

Mapping and reserving feasible parcels now will ensure that affordable housing remains a viable and competitive land use even as property values rise. Without targeted site identification, the benefits of upzoning will accrue primarily to private market developers, undermining the Plan's stated intent to support families and low-income residents.

2. Prioritize publicly owned sites for 100% affordable housing.

Designate feasible public parcels—such as **Kirkland Yard**—for 100% affordable projects to ensure that upzoning results in equitable development, not speculative private gain.

3. Commit to a 2026 Affordable Housing Funding Measure.

Pair zoning reforms with public investment. A voter-approved 2026 housing bond or equivalent funding measure is essential to unlock the 17,675 affordable units currently in the development pipeline. These projects are ready to build, but they cannot move forward without financing.

A Call for Leadership

San Franciscans expect real solutions to the affordability crisis. We need a plan that reflects how housing actually gets built, not just where it could be built.

We urge your administration to work closely with us to deliver that plan—one that strengthens communities, stabilizes families, and keeps San Francisco a city for everyone.

We appreciate your leadership and stand ready to collaborate in refining the Family Zoning Plan so it truly delivers on its promise of affordability and equity.

Sincerely,

The member agencies of the Council of Community Housing Organizations (CCHO):

-
-
- Bernal Heights Neighborhood Center
-
-
-
- Bill Sorro Housing Program
-
-
-
- Chinatown Community Development Center
-
-
-
- Episcopal Community Services
-
-
-
- Homeownership SF
-
-
-
- HomeRise
-
-
-
- One Treasure Island
-
-
-
- People Organized to Demand Environmental and Economic Rights (PODER)
-
-
-

- Progress Foundation
-
-
-
- San Francisco Community Land Trust
-
-
-
- San Francisco Housing Development Corporation
-
-
-
- Self-Help for the Elderly
-
-
-
- Senior and Disability Action
-
-
-
- South of Market Community Action Network (SOMCAN)
-
-
-
- Swords to Plowshares
-
-
-
- Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation (TNDC)
-
-
-
- Young Community Developers
-

Quintin Mecke (he/him)

Executive Director
Council of Community Housing Organizations
quintin@sfccho.org

CCHO COUNCIL OF COMMUNITY HOUSING ORGANIZATIONS

October 20, 2025

Mayor Daniel Lurie
San Francisco City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

CC: San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Re: Ensuring Affordability in the Proposed Family Zoning Plan

Dear Mayor Lurie,

On behalf of the Council of Community Housing Organizations (CCHO) and our member agencies, we write to express deep concern that the proposed Family Zoning Plan, while well-intentioned, lacks a clear and realistic pathway to producing affordable housing in San Francisco.

Our coalition has decades of collective experience developing, financing, and building affordable housing across the city. Based on that experience, we think it's critical to provide a plausible pathway for achieving the affordability outcomes our city desperately needs.

We recognize the importance of submitting a zoning-compliant map to the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) that demonstrates theoretical capacity. However, as currently drafted, the Family Zoning Plan offers no meaningful mechanism for actually delivering the affordable homes required to meet San Francisco's Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) goals.

The private market is simply not designed or fiscally equipped to produce deeply affordable units, and there are no provisions that enable affordable housing developers to acquire land, access financing, or build at the scale required.

Affordability Is San Francisco's Defining Challenge

Affordability is the single most urgent issue facing San Franciscans today. Yet the Family Zoning Plan—like many initiatives before it—relies heavily on the private market to deliver affordability. This approach has failed. No scale of market-rate development will generate the deeply affordable housing needed, and inclusionary Below Market Rate (BMR) requirements or in-lieu fees, while important, produce only a fraction of the housing needed and cannot meet the deep affordability mandates set by the state.

In fact, 57% of the rezoning capacity still needed under RHNA—20,300 of the remaining 36,200 units—must serve low-income households. Market-rate development priced at $3,400 for a one-bedroom unit will not meet the needs of San Francisco's low-income families. More than half of family-household residents in the city are low- or very low-income, including approximately 36% who earn less than 50% of Area Median Income (AMI).

The adopted Housing Element offers a rare opportunity to create a bold, proactive citywide vision for affordable housing—one that the private market cannot and will not deliver. Affordable housing solutions must be implemented citywide and west-side rezoning should prioritize affordable housing, especially in areas that are vulnerable to displacement.

Our Recommendations

To ensure the Family Zoning Plan becomes a meaningful tool for affordability—not simply a symbolic gesture to satisfy state requirements—we urge the following:

1. Amend the legislation to include an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD).

Establish a clear framework to incentivize and prioritize 100% affordable housing, including additional height, density, or streamlined approvals for nonprofit and community developers.

Mapping and reserving feasible parcels now will ensure that affordable housing remains a viable and competitive land use even as property values rise. Without targeted site identification, the benefits of upzoning will accrue primarily to private market developers, undermining the Plan's stated intent to support families and low-income residents.

2. Prioritize publicly owned sites for 100% affordable housing.

Designate feasible public parcels—such as **Kirkland Yard**—for 100% affordable projects to ensure that upzoning results in equitable development, not speculative private gain.

3. Commit to a 2026 Affordable Housing Funding Measure.

Pair zoning reforms with public investment. A voter-approved 2026 housing bond or equivalent funding measure is essential to unlock the 17,675 affordable units currently in the development pipeline. These projects are ready to build, but they cannot move forward without financing.

A Call for Leadership

San Franciscans expect real solutions to the affordability crisis. We need a plan that reflects how housing actually gets built, not just where it could be built.

We urge your administration to work closely with us to deliver that plan—one that strengthens communities, stabilizes families, and keeps San Francisco a city for everyone.

We appreciate your leadership and stand ready to collaborate in refining the Family Zoning Plan so it truly delivers on its promise of affordability and equity.

Sincerely,

The member agencies of the Council of Community Housing Organizations (CCHO):

- Bernal Heights Neighborhood Center
- Bill Sorro Housing Program
- Chinatown Community Development Center
- Episcopal Community Services
- Homeownership SF
- HomeRise
- One Treasure Island
- People Organized to Demand Environmental and Economic Rights (PODER)
- Progress Foundation
- San Francisco Community Land Trust
- San Francisco Housing Development Corporation
- Self-Help for the Elderly
- Senior and Disability Action
- South of Market Community Action Network (SOMCAN)
- Swords to Plowshares
- Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation (TNDC)
- Young Community Developers

Council of Community Housing Organizations
325 Clementina St. San Francisco, CA • ccho@sfccho.org

From:	Carroll, John (BOS)
To:	"Kelly Groth"
Cc:	Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Sciammas, Charlie (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Cooper, Raynell (BOS)
Subject:	RE: Letters for File No. 250701 - BOS File Nos. 250700 250701 250966
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 11:44:00 AM
Attachments:	LUT Committee File No. 250701 Letters 10.20.25.pdf image001.png

---

Thank you for your comment letter.

I am forwarding your comments to the members of the Land Use and Transportation committee, and I will include your comments in the files for these ordinance matters.

I invite you to review the entire matter on our Legislative Research Center by following the links below:

- Board of Supervisors File No. 250700
- Board of Supervisors File No. 250701
- Board of Supervisors File No. 250966

John Carroll
Assistant Clerk
Board of Supervisors
San Francisco City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415)554-4445

Click here to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The Legislative Research Center provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation and archived matters since August 1998.

Disclosures: *Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: Kelly Groth <kelly@sfccho.org>
Sent: Monday, October 20, 2025 10:59 AM

To: Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>
Subject: Letters for File No. 250701

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Good morning Clerk Carroll,

Please see attached letters to be included in File No. 250701 - Family Zoning Plan.

Thank you,
Kelly

Kelly Groth (she/her)
Policy & Communications Director

October 17, 2025

Please support Supervisor Chan's Affordable Housing SUD amendments

Chair Melgar and Land Use Committee Members,

On behalf of the Council of Community Housing Organizations (CCHO), I urge your support for Supervisor Chan's proposed amendment to the Family Zoning Plan, to create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD).

This amendment keeps public land working for the public: it prioritizes city-owned parcels for 100% affordable housing, maps and reserves feasible sites, and gives nonprofit/community builders a viable path with modest height/density and expedited approvals. Without these guardrails, broad upzoning will invite speculation, drive up land costs, and make it financially impossible for affordable developers to compete, especially on sites like Kirkland Yard. The SUD aligns rezoning with our regional housing affordability needs and focuses production where deep affordability is actually achievable.

Without an Affordable Housing SUD, the plan won't deliver deeply affordable homes.

Thank you for ensuring the Family Zoning Plan results in actual affordable homes, not just theoretical capacity.

Signed,
F. Joseph Butler, AIA Emeritus
San Francisco, CA 94133

October 17, 2025

Support affordable housing amendment to the Mayors plan

Dear Supervisors:

The Mayors family rezoning plan does not protect affordable housing units. Please vote to amend the plan with Supervisor Chan's affordable housing amendments. These proposals are critical to actually achieving the affordable housing needs of the city.

Thank you.

Regina Sneed
San Francisco, CA 94109

October 17, 2025

Keep affordable housing in Family Zoning Plan

Please add anti-displacement clauses, and provide affordability clauses in the final draft of the Family Zoning Plan or delay this measure until there is enough protections to keep all San Franciscans to be able to live in the future of our great city.

-Michael Nulty
Writing on behalf of Tenants Associations Coalition of San Francisco

San Francisco, CA 94142

October 20, 2025

Include Affordable Housing in Family Zoning

Honorable members of the Land Use and Transportation Committee,

I write to you today in support of 3 amendments to the Family Zoning plan proposed by the Council of Community Housing Organizations:

1) Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD): Give nonprofit/community developers the height, density, and fast-track approvals needed to build 100% affordable homes
2) Prioritize public land for public good: Prioritize publicly owned sites (including places like Kirkland Yard) for 100% affordable projects
3) Pair Zoning with Public Investment: Commit to a 2026 Affordable Housing Funding Measure to unlock 17,000+ affordable homes already in the pipeline.

57% of the rezoning capacity still needed under RHNA, 20,300 of the remaining 36,200 units, must serve low-income households. These 3 strategies provide us a realistic roadmap to meet that goal.

Thank you for your work on this important issue.

Mitch Mankin
San Francisco Housing Development Corporation

From:	Carroll, John (BOS)
To:	"Dian Blomquist"
Cc:	Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Sciammas, Charlie (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Cooper, Raynell (BOS)
Subject:	RE: NO to Destructive Zoning on Fisherman's Wharf - BOS File Nos. 250700 250701 250966
Date:	Monday, October 20, 2025 11:44:00 AM
Attachments:	image001.png

Thank you for your comment letter.

I am forwarding your comments to the members of the Land Use and Transportation committee, and I will include your comments in the files for these ordinance matters.

I invite you to review the entire matter on our Legislative Research Center by following the links below:

- Board of Supervisors File No. 250700
- Board of Supervisors File No. 250701
- Board of Supervisors File No. 250966

John Carroll
Assistant Clerk
Board of Supervisors
San Francisco City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415)554-4445

Click here to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The Legislative Research Center provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation and archived matters since August 1998.

Disclosures: *Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: Dian Blomquist <blomquist.dian@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 20, 2025 8:27 AM
To: Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>

Subject: Fwd: NO to Destructive Zoning on Fisherman's Wharf

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Begin forwarded message:

From: Dian Blomquist <blomquist.dian@gmail.com>
Subject: NO to Destructive Zoning on Fisherman's Wharf
Date: October 20, 2025 at 8:13:39 AM PDT

Please vote NO today on the upzoning plans. Please don't let specious promises destroy our beautiful city! Promoted by the unworkable demands put through the California legislature by the same people in the name of greed and not affordable housing!

Thank you,

Dian Blomquist
1632 Taylor Street
San Francisco 94133

From: Liam Hennessy
To: Sauter, Danny (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; Carroll, John (BOS)
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 11:17:28 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

October 20, 2025

Good morning,
My name is Liam Hennesy and I am a native San Franciscan who has taught Special Education in SFUSD for 32 years. I am writing to you from my 1907 flat in North Beach asking you to not include North Beach in the Up Zoning plan.

This little flat of mine has lots of history to it as did many of the other places that I occupied in North Beach before finding this "forever home". I have had a long love affair with North Beach ever since I was a little boy. My grandfather was a waiter at The Tivoli, an Italian family restaurant which now is called Savoy Tivoli. I remember going to St. Francis church(the Irish Church in a mostly Italian neighborhood) and then going to meet my grandfather at the restaurant. He was also the head waiter at Julius Castle which hangs on the side of Montgomery Street overlooking the bay; as if it really was a castle and royalty lived there. The walk up the hill to reach it was an adventure for me as a child (still is) with all the hidden gardens, incredible architecture, magnificent views and Coit tower haunting me as I climbed. I still marvel at the beautiful area that we call North Beach.

Each and every day I walk and rediscover the beauty of North Beach. I love to look at the architecture of buildings that Willis Polk, Pflüger, Mabeck, Julian Morgan and others built in North Beach. Not only do I see these beautiful buildings but I get to appreciate the memories of my youth with going to grab coffee at Cafe Trieste each and every day.
The history of the Italians, the Irish, the Chinese make North Beach a beautiful melting pot of which people from all over the world come to visit.

I have swum in the San Francisco bay for more years than I would like to express but I have been a Dolphin Club member for over 40 years. The club's history was passed on to me from the "old timers" who were mostly Italian and Irish. They also passed on the rich history of North Beach and why they felt it was the "Crown Jewel" of San Francisco.
Every day I am grateful to live in "Our City" but most grateful to live in the part that is the Crown Jewel.

Increasing the height limit will ruin the iconic neighborhood that so many people from around the world come to see. They come for all the reasons I mentioned above as well as many not listed.

Please keep it the Crown Jewel of San Francisco by not increasing the height limit. San Franciscans and others deserve to keep the beauty of North Beach intact.

Sincerely,

Liam Francis Hennessy
169 Pfeiffer Street,
San Francisco CA 94133

From: Liam Hennessy
To: Melgar, Myrna (BOS); ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; Carroll, John (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS)
Subject: No Up Zoning in North Beach
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 10:59:43 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

October 20,2025

Good Morning,

My name is Liam Hennessy and I have lived in North Beach since 1985. I reside in a flat on Pfeiffer and Stockton streets. My neighborhood was not originally included in any upzoning plan until our Supervisor Danny Sauter decided to add it. Why? He has never answered this question or many others that neighbors such as myself have tried to get him to answer.

I am very upset that without so much as a public meeting or notification, North Beach was put into this reckless plan even though the neighborhood is already one of the densest in our beautiful city. The creators and backers of this plan never took into account any of the concerns of the neighborhood's residents! Mayor Lurie and Supervisor Sauter even postponed the voting on North Beach becoming a Historic Neighborhood, in hopes I am sure, that it would not get in the way of his "Family Zoning Plan" proposal being adopted.

There has not been enough collaboration with the people who are going to be most affected by this proposal. This Family Zoning plan was not created to enrich the lives of individuals who want to live in North Beach or for those that already do or for those that will be pushed out because of it. This is not an easy fix to our housing crisis. We need to be more creative with our approach to our housing needs. However, those approaches Should Not Come from the Big Developers trying to get a HUGE WINFALL or POLITICIANS WHO ARE BOUGHT in order to climb the political ladder BUT by the people of North Beach. We have a huge stake in this and this decision will change the neighborhood forever. Once it is done there is no going back. Remember the Redevelopment Era?

The plan to include North Beach into Lurie's Upzoning proposal was a blatant lie to all of the residences and businesses in North Beach by politicians that used their power to hide the fact that their ambition for power/money is more important than the community that elected them.

Making decisions about the fate of a person's neighborhood behind a facade of wanting to create more housing for the working people is disingenuous, especially since it was all hidden from the constituents. High Rise Condominiums all along the Wharf, splattered around North Beach, Telegraph Hill, etc will not be affordable to the individuals that this proposal is trying to house. It will only be affordable to the rich, It will ruin the neighborhood and it will create another redevelopment nightmare with horrible consequences.

Danny Sauter and his YIMBY lobbyists along with the Planning Department have not involved the neighborhood residents, businesses etc. in the decision to replace our incredible neighborhood, which tourists travel the world to see, with a Miami Beach one instead. This plan was not done with the constituents' needs in mind, but rather with those of developers and Mr. Sauter’s donors instead(and in secret). It is not what is best for North Beach or the City at large.

Please make significant changes to the Up Zoning map because it will destroy North Beach. As a native, as a retired San Francisco Unified School teacher I plead that you really take a hard look at what is being proposed, how it will impact North Beach and the City at large, maybe even go to St. Peters and Paul's and pray on it… you never know.

Onwards,
Liam Hennessy
169 Pfeiffer Street
San Francisco Ca 94133

From: Romalyn Schmaltz
To: Sauter, Danny (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject: General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan — BOS File No. 250966
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 9:57:32 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

October 20, 2025

From: Romalyn Schmaltz, North Beach resident

To: myrna.melgar@sfgov.org, chyanne.chen@sfgov.org, bilal.mahmood@sfgov.org, daniel.lurie@sfgov.org, danny.sauter@sfgov.org, john.carroll@sfgov.org

Chair Myrna Melgar
Supervisors Chyanne Chen, Bilal Mahmood,
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Land Use and Transportation Committee
c/o Clerk John Carroll
Cc: Mayor Daniel Lurie, D3 Supervisor Danny Sauter

Subject: General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan — BOS File No. 250966

Dear Chair Melgar and Supervisors Chen and Mahmood:

Thank you Supervisors, especially Supervisors Chen and Chan for offering meaningful amendments to a “Family Zoning Plan” that isn’t at all about families and, as Commissioner Moore stated at the Planning Commission hearing on 9/11, isn’t even a plan by any Planning standards. It’s more of a press release turned policy. And that’s consistent with the personalities pushing this non-plan: marketers-turned-legislators, billionaires who use money like a carpenter uses caulk, and luxury real-estate lobbyists.

I’m Romalyn Schmaltz, 20-year resident of North Beach and working artist, and I like quoting Leonard Cohen. *Everybody Knows* this deal is rotten, and our D3 constituency is bereaved and furious that our D3 Representative sworn to protect us straightaway began selling our most precious public assets to private developers while lining up our lives to be demo’d and displaced. Anyone who’s done any time in land use policy knows this is true. The working class and artists will not survive this degree of upzoning. Families will not find housing. And many small businesses will

definitely be gone with the construction dust. All while our waterfront is walled off from residents and visitors.

So please adopt all of Chen and Chan's salient amendments today including:

ZERO evictions from rent-controlled apartments. Tens of thousands of vulnerable people live in duplexes too.

The Housing Element implementation must focus on affordable housing first. Create Chan's Affordable Housing Special Use District.

Serious protections for our small businesses, like one-to-one replacement.

And please, for the love of your own legacies, land on the right side of history and protect our waterfront from mid-rise development. Fisherman's Wharf is a great location for much-needed housing, but this non-plan will absolutely crush our public waterfront vistas—the reason so many people visit us in the first place. Everybody Knows the scene will be dead without them, and it would be forever named after those who made it so.

Thank you,

Romalyn Schmaltz
North Beach Resident

From:	paul erickson
To:	Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject:	General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan — BOS File No. 250966
Date:	Sunday, October 19, 2025 10:07:08 PM
Attachments:	Apollo Land Use letter - Google Docs.pdf

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Chair Melgar and Supervisors Chen and Mahmood:
I'm Apollo, a working musician living in North Beach. I'm that guy developers sound so excited about—a new San Franciscan! Before that, I lived in Los Angeles, New York City, and Minneapolis. I love them all, but nothing compares to the human scale, community, open-air sunshine, and free public views of the water from everywhere in my new neighborhood. I can't believe anyone would voluntarily destroy it for any amount of money.
I've also lived in and toured in enough cities to know upzoning kills creative communities. It's true in Austin, which became unaffordable for artists and the working class. Same with Vancouver BC and Portland. In fact, there's no example of a city where upzoning did anything but displace thousands, raise rents, and flatten culture.
Nothing in the proposed "Family Zoning Plan" will make it easier for actual working families or artists like me to live in my neighborhood. It's mostly luxury or market-rate studios and 1-bedrooms.
So please approve all of Supervisors Chen's and Chan's amendments, especially the protection of all rent-controlled units. I'm in a Victorian triplex, so I get to stay under the mayor's amendment, but our neighbors — actual families — in the rent-controlled duplexes nearby can get evicted???

That's wrong, and that alone will displace thousands. Please protect them and the last of the rent-controlled housing that keeps communities together. And please honor all their amendments for real affordable housing and small business protections.
And please seize this opportunity to be remembered as a heroic legacy legislator — PLEASE SPARE OUR WATERFRONT FROM UPZONING. Walling it off is a disgrace no one wants, but everyone will remember.
Thank you,
Paul Erickson
North Beach Resident

October 6, 2025

From: Paul Erickson, North Beach renter

To: myrna.melgar@sfgov.org, chyanne.chen@sfgov.org, bilal.mahmood@sfgov.org, daniel.lurie@sfgov.org, danny.sauter@sfgov.org, john.carroll@sfgov.org

Chair Myrna Melgar
Supervisors Chyanne Chen, Bilal Mahmood,
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Land Use and Transportation Committee
c/o Clerk John Carroll
Cc: Mayor Daniel Lurie, D3 Supervisor Danny Sauter

Subject: General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan — BOS File No. 250966

Dear Chair Melgar and Supervisors Chen and Mahmood:

I'm Apollo, a working musician living in North Beach. I'm that guy developers sound so excited about—*a new San Franciscan!* Before that, I lived in Los Angeles, New York City, and Minneapolis. I love them all, but nothing compares to the human scale, community, open-air sunshine, and free public views of the water from everywhere in my new neighborhood. I can't believe anyone would voluntarily destroy it for any amount of money.

I've also lived in and toured in enough cities to know upzoning kills creative communities. It's true in Austin, which became unaffordable for artists and the working class. Same with Vancouver BC and Portland. In fact, there's no example of a city where upzoning did *anything but* displace thousands, raise rents, and flatten culture.

Nothing in the proposed "Family Zoning Plan" will make it easier for actual working families or artists like me to live in my neighborhood. It's mostly luxury or market-rate studios and 1-bedrooms.

So please *approve all* of Supervisors Chen's and Chan's amendments, especially the protection of *all* rent-controlled units. I'm in a Victorian triplex, so I get to stay under the mayor's amendment, but our neighbors — actual families — in the rent-controlled duplexes nearby *can get evicted???*

That's wrong, and that alone will displace thousands. Please protect them and the last of the rent-controlled housing that keeps communities together. And please honor *all* their amendments for *real* affordable housing and small business protections.

And please seize this opportunity to be remembered as a heroic legacy legislator — ***PLEASE SPARE OUR WATERFRONT FROM UPZONING*****.** Walling it off is a disgrace no one wants, but *everyone will remember*.

Thank you,

Paul Erickson
North Beach rResident

From:	Lily Wong
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); ChenStaff; Sciammas, Charlie (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Cooper, Raynell (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Logan, Samantha (BOS)
Cc:	Jessica Ho; Li Miao Lovett; Manson Leung; Lamar Heystek; Ben Wong; Kimberly Szeto; Leon Chow; Gabi W.
Subject:	General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan BOS File No. 250966
Date:	Sunday, October 19, 2025 7:42:37 PM
Attachments:	10.20.25 SCCD LUT Committee Letter Zoning.pdf

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors, Aides and Mr. Carroll,

Please see attached letter for the Sunset Chinese Cultural District's letter regarding the Family Zoning Plan, file No. 250966.

Lily

Lily Wong 黃麗瑜
Director of Community Engagement 社區聯繫總監
Sunset Chinese Cultural District Director 日落區中華文化區總監

1400 Judah Street
San Francisco, CA 94122
415-665-4212 | *wahmei.org*
sfsccd.org
Direct: (707) 653-5813

SUNSET CHINESE CULTURAL DISTRICT
日落區中華文化區

October 19. 2025

TO: Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors Land Use and Transportation Committee
FROM: Sunset Chinese Cultural District Housing Sub-Committee

SUBJECT: Proposed Family Zoning Amendments – **The Critical Need for Funding**

Honorable Supervisors,

I submit this comment regarding the zoning changes under consideration, on behalf of the **Sunset Chinese Cultural District (SCCD)'s Housing Sub-Committee.**

We recognize and strongly support that zoning reform is an essential step toward addressing San Francisco's deep-seated housing and affordability crisis. However, while new zoning maps and increased density are necessary, they are not, on their own, sufficient to protect and stabilize communities like the Sunset District.

Impact on the Sunset District

The Sunset is a unique, historic, and culturally rich community, home to a significant population of working-class families, seniors, and Chinese American residents. The Cultural District's 2025 July Westside Housing Convening highlights the primary concerns of residents: a fear of displacement, the loss of essential culturally competent small businesses, and inadequate infrastructure (such as parking and transit) to support increased density.

We recognize that zoning modifications are a part of the mix of solutions that help drive housing affordability. However, **protective measures for existing situations are critical to a sustainable neighborhood and would better align with community interests for its legislative passage.** Without the targeted protective measures and resources required to implement them, we create a fertile environment for land speculation, potentially leading to the demolition of buildings that house our long-standing small businesses and the very heart of SCCD's placemaking efforts. As the Cultural District's work, including the community feedback received in the 2025 July 26 Housing Convening, underscores, these are not just houses; they are the infrastructure that supports the cultural and economic lives of hundreds of families.

Support for Essential Amendments

We commend and **strongly support the proposed amendments and legislation by Supervisors Melgar, Chen, and Chan** that seek to mitigate these exact risks. Specifically:

- **Protecting Vulnerable Populations and Commitment to 100% Affordable Housing (Supervisor Chen):** Amendments that include protections for priority equity geographies, standards for family-size dwelling units, and due diligence to evaluate 100% affordable housing alternatives on public land, ensuring that the family zoning plan has specific measures to support San Francisco's families can thrive without displacement.
- **Tenant and Anti-Displacement Safeguards (Supervisor Melgar):** Amendment making it ineligible for rent-controlled buildings with 3+ units from the local program. That helps protect tenants by diminishing the speculation and creates shield walls against predatory development tactics that target vulnerable tenants and families.
- **Small Business and Legacy Protections (Supervisor Chan):** Legislation file number 250808 focuses on protecting storefronts and legacy businesses is vital. These businesses, such as the local bakeries, markets, and social service providers, are irreplaceable assets that define the Cultural District. We must ensure that new housing is built *with* them, not *over* them.

The Missing Piece: Funding and Implementation

While these zoning changes and protective amendments represent excellent public policy, **we must emphasize that the vision of the Sunset Chinese Cultural District will not be effective or impactful without dedicated funding tied directly to these efforts.**

Zoning is a regulatory tool; it is not a funding mechanism. The promise of new housing is hollow for the Sunset's low- and moderate-income residents unless there is a concurrent financial commitment to:

1. **Small Business Stabilization:** Creating a dedicated fund for small business relocation, lease assistance, and capital improvements, as proposed by some supervisors, is mandatory to prevent displacement along corridors like Irving and Taraval.
2. **Affordable Housing Production:** Dedicated funding for land acquisition and the creation of **100% affordable housing** projects—particularly on public or faith-based sites—is the only way to guarantee that the new units meet the needs of the working families and seniors who are currently struggling to stay in the neighborhood.
3. **Prioritizing Infrastructure Upgrades:** Investing in essential public transit, utilities, and community services (as raised during the SCCD's convenings) must be an integral part of the holistic rezoning effort, ensuring quality of life keeps pace with density.

We urge the Land Use Committee to advance this legislation while working actively with the Mayor's Office and the Budget and Finance Committee to ensure that the vital policies crafted to

protect the Sunset are financially empowered for real-world impact. The community deserves not just a plan, but the resources to make that plan equitable and successful.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Lily Wong
Director, Sunset Chinese Cultural District

Cc: SCCD Housing Sub-Committee
Benson Wong, Wah Mei School
Gabi Wu
Jessica Ho
Kimberly Szeto, ASIAN, Inc.
Lamar Heystek, ASIAN, Inc.
Li Miao Lovett
Manson Leung, Self Help for the Elderly

From:	Judy Irving
To:	Melgar, Myrna (BOS); ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff
Cc:	Carroll, John (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS)
Subject:	Upzoning and demolitions, etc.
Date:	Sunday, October 19, 2025 5:56:55 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

One of the rationalizations I've heard over and over at meetings concerning the proposed upzoning is that

"Since there have been very few demolitions in the past few years, there are bound to be few in the future."

But in this case history will not repeat itself, because local zoning controls and other restrictions that have kept demolitions in check will be thrown out the window. De-regulation will *incentivize* demolitions because land values will rise so precipitously:

"Buy that building! Tear it down! Build a highrise! Make a ton of money!" From a developer standpoint, it's irresistible.

Don't be taken in by assurances that existing housing for middle-income San Francisco residents will be immune from developer greed.

This is not a "family" plan — it's actually a "wealthy singles" plan, since 75% of new units will be studios and one-bedrooms. How can anyone believe that building highrise condos for well-off tech workers will somehow benefit families?

You can turn this around by refusing to accept the YIMBY lobbyists' rhetoric. You can be proud of the fact that you stood up for small businesses, working-class tenants, and historic buildings by insisting on adaptive re-use of existing structures and 100% affordable development. The proposed amendments to this plan don't do nearly enough. Don't look back a few years from now and say to yourself, "I helped ruin a world-class city."

Thank you.

From:	Jean Barish
To:	Carroll, John (BOS)
Cc:	ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; MahmoodStaff; MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS)
Subject:	Re: Land Use & Transportation Committee Meeting - October 20, 2025
Date:	Sunday, October 19, 2025 5:26:41 PM
Attachments:	25_10_18 Letter to LUC.docx

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mr. Carroll,

Attached is a letter to the Land Use and Transportation Committee regarding the Oct. 20, 2025 meeting. Please include this in their information packet.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Jean

Jean B Barish
jeanbbarish@hotmail.com
President, Planning Association for the Richmond

October 18, 2025

Board of Supervisors Land Use and Transportation Committee
City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Re: Land Use and Transportation Committee Meeting, October 20, 2025
Agenda Items 1 – 4, Family Zoning Plan

Dear Supervisors Melgar, Chen, and Mahmood;

I am writing on behalf of Planning Association for the Richmond ("PAR"), an organization representing hundreds of Richmond District residents, regarding Items 1, 2, 3, and 4 on the October 20, 2025, LUC Agenda. These are Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan" Agenda Items that will significantly amend the City's General Plan, Planning Code, Zoning Map and Implementation Program and Land Use Plan of the City's certified Local Coastal Program. For the reasons set forth below, PAR strongly opposes all of these Agenda items.

Little or No New Housing is Needed

A recent audit conducted by the office of the California State Auditor has determined that the Regional Housing Needs Assessment ("RHNA") that the data Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) uses to provide key housing guidance for the State's local governments is not accurate. Data entry is flawed; HCD could not demonstrate that it considered all the factors that state law requires; and HCD could not support its use of healthy housing vacancy rates. Additionally, the HCD assessment relies on unsubstantiated projections of future housing needs. (https://information.auditor.ca.gov/reports/2021-125/index.html)

Additionally, there are many empty units in San Francisco as well as many other units in the construction pipeline. Planning Department data shows a pipeline of over 70,000 new units. Meanwhile, the city's population has declined by over 31,000 since 2020, with thousands of vacant units. The housing market in San Francisco does not follow conventional laws of supply and demand. A body of research shows that increasing construction, especially of market-rate housing, does not decrease housing prices. This is especially true here since most of the new units will be market rate, not affordable.

The entire foundation on which the Mayor's "Family Housing Plan" is built is fatally flawed.

5758 Geary Blvd., #356 San Francisco, CA 94121-9804
415-541-5652 Voicemail
sfparpresident@gmail.com

The Plan Does Not Meet the City's Need for Affordable Housing

The proposed upzoning plan fuels speculative development, threatening to replace existing affordable housing with luxury condominiums lived in their apartments for decades. The City should focus on ways to finance the over 72,000 approved, community-backed housing units awaiting construction. Additionally, the City should advocate for State recognition of housing capacity recently permitted by four-plexes and six-plexes on single-family lots -- the preferred housing type.

The current upzoning Plan will lead to more evictions, higher rents, and the loss of cherished open spaces. This is unacceptable.

The Plan Will Harm Small Businesses

Many small businesses, including over 400 Legacy Businesses that make San Francisco's neighborhoods so unique, are at risk. Commercial tenants, almost all of them small independent businesses, will get nothing in return for being displaced, since California does not allow commercial rent control or commercial displacement protections. A small community-serving business that is displaced for new construction will likely never come back.

Since there is no commercial rent control in California, and 90% of business owners in San Francisco do not own their buildings, every new building that replaces a pre-existing one will result in the loss of one or more small businesses. In addition, there are no requirements in the Plan to have new commercial space sized so that it would be affordable, pricing out local businesses by speculative property flips and rising commercial rents. This would have an unacceptable, impermissible impact on the very heart of San Francisco. It must be prevented.

Density Decontrol Throughout the Residential Neighborhoods Is Unacceptable

The plan includes a "sea of blue" throughout many neighborhoods of single-family and two- or three-unit buildings.
https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/6e0e399f9c82456dbda233eacebc433d/#data_s=id%3AdataSource_3-195febbfca6-layer-24-195fe855951-layer-20%3A104373

Those areas are identified as sites where density decontrol could apply. Specifically, corner homes and mid-block buildings on lots over 8,000 square feet could be converted to multi-unit buildings up to 65 feet tall. And all the other homes on these residential streets could be converted into 4 story buildings with ten, twelve, or perhaps even more units. The net effect of this density decontrol is that up to 800,000 units could be built if this Plan is accepted.

5758 Geary Blvd., #356 San Francisco, CA 94121-9804
415-541-5652 Voicemail
sfparpresident@gmail.com

This is absurd on its face. It could result in the addition of over ten times the number of units mandated by the State. This density decontrol is part of a 50-year plan, not the 8-year plan required by the State. Common sense mandates it must be rejected.

Mitigations for Increased Infrastructure and the Environmental Impact of this Plan are Inadequate

The Family Housing Plan does not include a clear plan for infrastructure improvements, including water, sewer, emergency services, road upgrades and signals, transit, and schools and medical facilities. Higher density developments will have many impacts that are not mitigated in this legislation. More waste will be generated, the collection of which must be provided for; there will be more pressure on electrical systems; greenhouse gas emissions will increase; there are no provisions for accommodating the increased demand for parking; and there will be a need for more fire and police protection. The impact of these and other infrastructure issues has not been adequately studied.

Not only must infrastructure needs be considered, but the Plan will radically alter the neighborhood character of the Richmond District, impacting the quality of life for its residents as well as the quality of the environment. Towering buildings in our neighborhoods will cast long shadows, block sunlight, erase historic character, and disrupt the human-scale streetscapes that define San Francisco's unique identity. Further, the Plan allows 80% lot coverage, threatening greenbelts, tree canopy, and neighborhood character, with no updated environmental review.

There will be significantly more congestion and environmental pollution; views will be blocked; and beloved neighborhood corridors will be transformed into luxury enclaves for investors—not homes for working families. All these issues must be thoroughly considered and plans for mitigations of these impacts must be in place before this Plan can be approved.

There are Alternatives to Extensive Upzoning

PAR does not oppose all development. But instead of a massive blanket upzoning and density decontrol plan that will create a great deal of disruption, displacement, and environmental damage, PAR favors a more precise approach to, and submits the following recommendations:

- targeted rezoning and development.
- community participation in all development decisions
- protections for tenants and businesses
- the revitalization of downtown San Francisco by converting offices to residences.
- consideration of environmental issues, the need for sound infrastructure and transit planning, and the importance of maintaining community character.

5758 Geary Blvd., #356 San Francisco, CA 94121-9804
415-541-5652 Voicemail
sfparpresident@gmail.com

Conclusion

The Family Housing Plan is a betrayal to many San Franciscans, who will face disruption, financial loss, and a compromised environment and quality of life. It is merely a generous gift to developers and investors who will get streamlined approvals and massive profits.

In view of the foregoing, PAR urges you to oppose the Agenda Items 1, 2, 3, and 4 as currently written.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Jean B Barish

Jean B Barish
President, Planning Association for the Richmond

cc: Mayor Daniel Lurie
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Director, SF Planning Department Sarah Dennis-Phillips
John Carroll, Clerk

5758 Geary Blvd., #356 San Francisco, CA 94121-9804
415-541-5652 Voicemail
sfparpresident@gmail.com

From:	Greg Holzman
To:	Sauter, Danny (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); Lurie, Daniel (MYR)
Subject:	Stop the upzoning. Don't ruin our waterfront
Date:	Sunday, October 19, 2025 4:36:16 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Folks
I have lived on N Point St for over 40 years. I swim at Aquatic Park for 40 years (proud member of the SERC).
Please don't ruin our waterfront. It is the life's blood of our tourist dollars not to mention its character.
In a former career, I built SF Renaissance, a painting and construction company renovating Victorians. Now and for the last 30 plus years, I have built companies that sell organic fruits and juices.
I moved from NYC in 1976. I have tried to be a part of this city and its heart since then. This is still the prettiest city in the USA. Please: Don't Screw it up
Sincerely
Greg

Greg Holzman
Managing Member
TerraFresh Organics
Cell 415 999 2355

From: lgpetty
To: Carroll, John (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff
Cc: Chan, Connie (BOS); SherrillStaff; ChanStaff (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Engardio Staff; BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Supervisors: Time to Write Your Own Zoning Plan to Achieve State AND Public Approval.
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 4:55:52 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Re: the Mayor's Family Zoning Plan -
Oct. 20, 2025 Land Use Agenda
Items 1-4, Files 250966, 250700, 250701 & 250785

Dear Land Use Chair Melgar, Vice Chair Chen and Supervisor Mahmood,

This Mayor's Zoning Plan comes to you after many years in the making at the Planning Dept.

It comes in the name of Compliance with State Law, under threat of "something worse."

But is it really compliance? Or is it simply an unpopular mass of severe concessions and capitulations thrown to an insatiably aggressive State Government?

The Mayor's Plan is overstuffed and bloated with all the things we COULD do, rather than what we NEED to do.

We are delivering to U.S. and foreign investors, global corporate developers & speculators -- everything they could ever wish for -- a deregulated hugely desirable ocean-urban landscape to use for a free-for-all no rules game of demolition, buying, selling, and reselling.

It does not have to
be this way.

This is the time for Supervisors to step up-- to shape a Zoning Plan with moderation and common sense -- listening to those most affected, rather than those who will profit from it. And merely offering a few amendments to the Mayor's Plan is not going to transform it into something that fits San Francisco, or wins public support.

The Mayor's Plan plan is controversial, not because it proposes Change. It is opposed by an unusually large and broad coalition of San Franciscans -- renters, homeowners, seniors and young residents, businesspeople, tenant and environmental protectors.

Why? Because they are opposed to Change? No. It is because they are opposed to Overcompliance. To Overkill. To overly massive unnecessary upheavals with little reward for them or their children, and few protections from exploitation.

It's not too late to fix this; to achieve Compliant Change AND win widespread approval. It's up to you now to create a better way:

Confine upzoning to vacant land, unused or very little-used nearly empty parcels. Dedicate public lands (including Muni properties) to 100 percent affordable housing, with concrete instructions for funding and infrastructure. Limit construction to eight stories for major boulevards. Limit heights on neighborhood commercial streets and other thru-streets to six-story maximums on corner lots only, with no height increases on surrounding streets. Require a minimum of 25 per cent affordable units and 30 per cent family-size units (3 & 4 & 5 bedrooms) in all market rate residential or mixed-use projects.
Ban demolition of rent-controlled units, and remove all of them from upzoning. Prohibit demolition of historical, cultural & landmarked properties, and legacy busineses. Disallow mergers and conversions. Provide tenant protections per Sup. Chen and small business protections per Sups. Melgar and Chan, and make them <u>stronger</u> than they are now.

This "**Board of Supervisors Zoning Plan"** (together with the Pipeline and 4-6-plex legislation) would be sufficient to comply with RHNA building requirements, especially incentivizing affordable housing.

Supervisors, it's up to you, our elected representatives, to write a reasonable, Compliant Zoning plan that responds to State requirements AND the needs of San Franciscans.

We are counting on you to do this.

A good faith first step would be to hold a Full Board hearing on the Mayor's Plan open to public comment.

Thanks for consideration,

Lorraine Petty

D2/5 Senior voter
Affordable housing Advocate
Seniors and Tenants Advocate
Member, SFTU & SDA

From:	Peter Dwares
To:	Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Lurie, Daniel (MYR)
Subject:	Housing
Date:	Friday, October 17, 2025 4:00:00 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Housing the poor, homeless is not affordable. Affordable for Police and Teachers is correct but possible without subsidy.

I have lived on the Filbert Steps Telegraph Hill since 1975. I am for historic preservation, for not tampering with North Beach or Telegraph Hill. It works. Let's not mess it up. Focus on what was deteriorating affected with too little policing, sacrificing safety for Wokeism, permissive druggies on Market Street and Union Square and other parts of the City. Let's build where we need buildings and let's require charm. High rises have no place here in traditional neighborhoods.

Peter Dwares
Dwares Group
331 Filbert Street
San Francisco, CA 94133

415-986-5885 - work
415-986-5893 fax
415-260-6530 cell

***Dictated but not reviewed.**

From:	Keith Robert Saggers
To:	Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Myra.Melgar@sfgov.org; Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); carollynandkeith@yahoo.com
Subject:	Upzoning
Date:	Friday, October 17, 2025 2:16:32 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Lurie,

I fully support your plan to upzone the Fisherman's Wharf area between Columbus and Embarcadero, Jefferson Street and Bay Street,

To 60ft. and 80ft.

Please follow thru, I live here and it is not historical like North Beach, the area needs redeveloping.

Keith Saggers
2310 Powell St.3462
San Francisco
CA94133

Sincerely,
Keith Robert Saggers
San Francisco, CA 94133

From:	Yan, Calvin (BOS)
To:	seankim4@gmail.com
Cc:	Chan, Connie (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS)
Subject:	FW: GBMA Support Letter for Supervisor Connie Chan"s amendment
Date:	Friday, October 17, 2025 12:58:49 PM
Attachments:	20251016_GBMA_support letter_Connie Chan"s Amendment.pdf

---

Hi Sean,

Thank you so much for your email and letter of support.

I am copying Jen from Chair Melgar's Office and Clerk Carroll for the inclusion of your letter to the file.

Calvin Yan 甄錦浩
Office of Supervisor Connie Chan, District 1
市參事陳詩敏辦公室, 第一區

From: Sean Kim <seankim4@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 16, 2025 5:07 PM
To: Yan, Calvin (BOS) <calvin.yan@sfgov.org>
Cc: Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>
Subject: GBMA Support Letter for Supervisor Connie Chan's amendment

> This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hi Calvin,

This is Sean Kim, Vice President of Geary Blvd Merchants Association.
Could you forward this support letter to Land Use and Transportation Committee?
Thanks

Regards,

Sean Kim

Vice President of Greater Geary Blvd Merchants and Property Owners Association

Mobile : 415-827-4220
email : seankim4@gmail.com
Website :
https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___www.gearyblvd.org___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzo5MTFlYTc5ODA5N2IxMzUzOTc4ZWVkYjEyNzFkYmRjZTo3OjEwNTA6YmYzNmUwNzExNWY0MzE0NjM5MjQ3ODg5OGNjYjdmMWZhZTUwNTFhNzg2NTYzOWJjM2ZhNjk0ZDlmYzk1OGYyZTp0OlQ6Tg

Date: 10/16/2025

Land Use and Transportation Committee
City Hall, Room 250
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Chair and Members of the Land Use and Transportation Committee,

On behalf of the Geary Boulevard Merchants Association (GBMA) and the small businesses we represent along Geary Boulevard, we express strong support for Supervisor Connie Chan's amendment requiring Conditional Use Authorization before replacing a Legacy Business in Neighborhood Commercial Districts.

Upzoning grants major new value to developers but offers no protection to the long-standing businesses that built and sustained our neighborhoods. Financial programs such as grants or rent relief are helpful but cannot cover the real costs of displacement — moving out, temporary space, another build-out for a permanent location, and years of lost revenue and customers.

Supervisor Chan's amendment restores fairness and accountability. It does not block redevelopment but creates a process for communication and planning between developers, landlords, and Legacy Businesses before permanent displacement occurs.

Legacy Businesses are more than economic anchors. They are part of San Francisco's cultural and community fabric. This is a land use decision about what kind of city San Francisco wants to be: one that grows with its people, not apart from them.

We respectfully urge you to advance this amendment to the full Board of Supervisors and support its adoption.

Sincerely,

David Heller
President
Geary Boulevard Merchants Association

Sean Kim
Vice President
Geary Boulevard Merchants Association

From:	David Harrison
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); ChenStaff; ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS)
Subject:	Coalition Letter re: Family Zoning Plan
Date:	Friday, October 17, 2025 10:57:52 AM
Attachments:	Outlook-A black an.png LAND USE RE_ Coalition Letter of Support for San Francisco's Family Zoning Plan.pdf

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hello,

Please find the attached coalition letter in support of the family zoning plan proposal.

All the best,

David Harrison *(He/Him)*
Director of Public Policy
(O) 415-352-8803 (C) 202-262-5860
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
235 Montgomery Street, Suite 760
San Francisco, CA 94104

October 17, 2025

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Land Use and Transportation Committee
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

RE: Business Community Support for San Francisco's Family Zoning Plan

Dear Chair Melgar, Vice-Chair Chen, and Supervisor Mahmood,

As leaders in the San Francisco business community, representing employers of all sizes and industries, we know that a strong economy depends on sufficient housing for workers and families. We, the undersigned organizations, write to express our strong support for Mayor Daniel Lurie's Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco continues to face a severe housing shortage that impacts workers, families, and businesses across the city. Too many employees who power our economy are forced to live far from their jobs, enduring long commutes that strain families, limit career opportunities, and weaken connections to our neighborhoods. The Family Zoning Plan helps address this challenge by expanding opportunities for family-sized housing in more neighborhoods while providing safeguards for small businesses and keeping San Francisco eligible for critical state housing and infrastructure funding.

Economic Benefits for Businesses of All Sizes

Building enough housing to meet our city's needs could generate nearly $5.6 billion in new spending at local businesses. By concentrating new homes near commercial corridors, this plan will drive new foot traffic, create opportunities for ground floor retail, and provide a stable customer base for neighborhood-serving businesses. These benefits extend across industries,

strengthening our ability to attract and retain talent and ensuring San Francisco remains a competitive place to grow jobs.

Protecting and Supporting Small Businesses

We recognize that land use changes can raise important questions for small businesses. Importantly, the vast majority of new housing will be built on underutilized sites such as parking lots, gas stations, or vacant buildings. This will preserve existing storefronts while revitalizing parcels that present the best opportunities for redevelopment.

In the limited cases where relocation may be necessary, the Family Zoning Plan includes important safeguards such as early notification, relocation assistance, waived permit fees, and incentives to relocate existing or legacy businesses in new projects. We also support Chair Melgar's proposed Small Business Mitigation Fund, which will provide assistance to small businesses while still moving forward with housing that will strengthen our City's economic foundation.

Shared Vision for San Francisco's Future

The Family Zoning Plan is a critical step toward addressing our city's housing needs while ensuring that small businesses, large employers, and working families all have a path to thrive. By making it possible for more workers to live near their jobs, San Francisco will strengthen its workforce, reduce congestion and pollution from long commutes, and create a healthier and more equitable city for everyone. When our workforce can afford to live in our city, employers are better able to retain talent and reduce turnover, making San Francisco a more attractive and competitive place to do business.

We appreciate your leadership in advancing this legislation with urgency and care, and we stand ready to work alongside you in building a more economically inclusive, vibrant, and strong San Francisco.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
Rodney Fong, President & CEO

Bay Area Council
Matt Regan, Senior Vice President, Public Policy

SPUR
Sujata Srivastava, Chief Policy Officer

Advance SF
Wade Rose, President and CEO

Hospital Council Northern and Central California
Michon Coleman, Regional Vice President, San Francisco Section

Golden Gate Restaurant Association
Laurie Thomas, Executive Director

Building Owners & Managers Association San Francisco
John Bryant, CEO

SF New Deal
Simon Bertrang, Executive Director

San Francisco Apartment Association
Janan New, Executive Director

East Cut Community Benefit District
Andrew Robinson, Executive Director

Kate Robinson
Chair, San Francisco Benefit District Alliance

Ben Blieman
President, California Nightlife Association

Cynthia Huie
President, Small Business Commission

Sharky Laguana
Former President, Small Business Commission & CEO, Bandago

Teddy Kramer
CEO and Founder, NEON

Manny Yekutiel
Owner, Manny's

Cc: Honorable Members and Staff, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

From:	Christopher Pederson
To:	Melgar, Myrna (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; Carroll, John (BOS)
Cc:	Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC); Tanner, Rachael (CPC); Chen, Lisa (CPC); Andrews, Michelle (BOS)
Subject:	Support the Family Zoning Plan - Land Use & Transportation Committee Agenda Items 1-4 (Oct. 20, 2025)
Date:	Friday, October 17, 2025 8:19:56 AM
Attachments:	Letter to BoS Land Use Comm re Family Zoning Plan.pdf

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Attached is the comment letter of the San Francisco League of Conservation Voters in support of the Family Zoning Plan.
Sincerely,
Christopher Pederson
President
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters

San Francisco
League of
Conservation
Voters

October 17, 2025

Re: Support the Family Zoning Plan, Agenda Items 1-4

Dear Chair Melgar, Vice Chair Chen, and Supervisor Mahmood:

The San Francisco League of Conservation Voters urges the Land Use and Transportation Committee to recommend that the Board of Supervisors pass the proposed ordinances to implement Mayor Lurie's Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco and California as a whole face a climate crisis and a housing crisis. Transportation is the largest source of greenhouse gas emissions from both the city and the state. The scarcity and high price of housing in coastal cities such as San Francisco, however, are forcing families to locate on the fringes of metropolitan areas where the automobile is the primary and, too often, the only viable mode of transportation.Those inland suburban and exurban areas have more extreme climates, encroach on threatened natural habitat and agricultural lands, and face high wildland fire hazards. To address the state's climate and housing crises, then, coastal cities and the state must promote much more multi-family housing located near major transit lines, employment centers, and commercial districts and in walkable, transit-oriented neighborhoods.

By virtue of San Francisco's mild climate, its extensive public transit network, its concentration of major employment centers, its walkability, and its density, San Francisco is among the most environmentally appropriate locations in the entire state for new multi-family housing. On a per capita basis, San Franciscans drive less, use less energy and water, and occupy less land than other Californians. Providing more multifamily housing for people to live in San Francisco is therefore a crucial step for addressing the state's and city's climate and housing crises.

The Mayor's Family Zoning Plan, by allowing more multifamily housing along major transit lines and close to commercial districts does exactly this. Given that the city has previously rezoned much of the eastern half of the city to allow more multifamily housing, it is appropriate for the Family Zoning Plan to concentrate on western and northern neighborhoods that have provided little new multifamily housing in recent decades. Those northern and western

neighborhoods are also mostly higher resource neighborhoods where potential concerns about displacement and gentrification are minimal.

The SFLCV understands that upzoning can raise concerns about the displacement of small businesses and rent-controlled housing. The SFLCV supports addressing those concerns, but any such measures should not undercut the Family Zoning Plan's strategy of promoting significantly more multifamily housing close to major transit lines, employment centers, and commercial districts.

Sincerely,

Christopher Pederson
President
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); BOS-Operations; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject:	Family Zoning Plan File Nos 250700, 250701, 250966 -17 letters
Date:	Friday, October 17, 2025 9:06:54 AM
Attachments:	17 letters - Family Zoning.pdf

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the attached 17 letters regarding File Nos:

250700: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan
250701: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan
250966: General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan

Regards,

Richard Lagunte
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Voice (415) 554-5184 | Fax (415) 554-5163
bos@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

Pronouns: he, him, his

Disclosures: *Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors' website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: brideynewman@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Bridget Newman
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 16, 2025 9:46:14 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

In 2022, the Budget and Legislative Analyst's Policy Analysis Report stated "With . . . one year remaining to meet RHNA goals for 2015-2023, San Francisco is 10,617 units short for affordable housing, but has produced 6,000 units with market rate housing in excess of RHNA target. In 2020, only 20% of 4,044 housing units added were for very low, low or moderate income households." What provisions in the Family Zoning Plan, with its generous give-aways to developers who build BIGGER prevent the occurrence of this same scenario?

Additionally, if rent-controlled housing is demolished to make way for new condo towers (more human warehouses than "homes"), even IF some of the units are for very low, low or moderate income, what will happen to the rental protections for those tenants displaced?

Very perfunctory research indicates that the diverse, eclectic neighborhoods of San Francisco are among the top five reasons tourists come to our city. If they all become filled with boxes of undifferentiated, characterless tall towers that block the sky and foster wind tunnels, what will there be to see in our neighborhoods?

Finally, transit has been cut back; many of these planned behemoths offer little to no parking. What kind of terrible tangle and road rage does this presage for our streets?

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Bridget Newman
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: natashjadewolf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Natashja Dewolfe
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 16, 2025 3:17:55 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments: I have lived in San Francisco since 1971 and I have never seen such a horrible, detrimental plan. Please, this is not tenable! Don't ruin San Francisco!

Sincerely,
Natashja Dewolfe
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: KAYECHANDLEY@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kaye Handley
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 16, 2025 3:18:56 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:
My husband and I recently bought an apartment in Cow Hollow area which would be severely impacted by high rises and signifcantly increased density.
WE chose the neighborhood for its character and do not want a dense city landscape.
We also don't see how this type of new high rises in affluent neighborhoods will do anything to alleviate the homeless situation.
We ask you to respect and preserve the character of ours and other neighborhoods by reducing new height limits and crating true affordable housing in areas where it can make economic sense.

Sincerely,
Kaye Handley
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: barbara.barbhand@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Barbara Handler
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 16, 2025 3:22:51 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am immmediately affected by the so-called "Family Zoning Plan" as my picture window looks out on what will soon be a 6 story buildig thanks to Scott Weiner's actions. There needs to be a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan". San Franciscans do not want the Manhattanization of our communities!

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Barbara Handler
San Francisco, CA 94110

From: noguera@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Hatun Noguera
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 16, 2025 3:25:30 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments: "recall fever" is still spreading.

Sincerely,
Hatun Noguera
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: bilgepump100@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Robert Hall
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 16, 2025 3:52:30 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Robert Hall
San Francisco, CA 94117

From: khoegger2@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Ken Hoegger
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 16, 2025 4:02:41 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:As a realtor broker for 45 years, I foresee the Laurie-Weiner "Family Zoning Plan".as creating a Gold Rush for speculators; many of which will be corporate interests with limited concerns for San Francisco's community interests. We need a plan that addresses affordability and retains the unique character of each of our neighborhoods.
Many options exist for achieving the above goals while meeting the State Housig Mandate: up-zoning intense transit corridors, incentivizing ADU's especially for seniors, City bond programs to finance affordability.
SanFrancisco has historically been a leader in innovation, let us continue to be proud of our heritage.

Sincerely,
Ken Hoegger
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: neil@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of neil maclean
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 16, 2025 4:42:37 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Up Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's modern history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is a way of hiding from the public.
Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

I was born in this city and I am proud of how we contribute to regional and national politics. Our rent, health and environmental protections set us apart from the rest of country. This move, should it pass, models our city after Las Vegas.

Sincerely,
neil maclean
San Francisco, CA 94110

From: rosenstein.jacob@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of JACOB ROSENSTEIN
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 16, 2025 4:53:37 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): As a Noe Valley resident, I'm alarmed that demolished homes of charm may destroy the quaint nature of my neighborhood. I urge you to reject the extreme upzoning plan of the State of California.

Sincerely,
JACOB ROSENSTEIN
San Francisco, CA 94131

From: margaret@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of margaret bradley
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 16, 2025 5:18:30 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Dear SF Leadership,

We are very concerned for the entire city, it appears the due diligence necessary to make such sweeping changes hasn't been addressed. The ingress/egress issues along major arteries into and out of the city are already challenging, especially on 19th Ave and Lombard. The subsidence issues with building weights is also of big concern, especially when it comes to the sewer system in the city. See Wired Magazine article (May 23, 2023) regarding irreversible issues on the east coast:

New York City Is Sinking. It's Far From Alone

Subsidence is a hidden vulnerability for coastal cities—models that project how much sea levels will rise in a given area don't yet take it into account. By 2050, average sea levels in the US will go up a foot, and by that time, 70 percent of the world's people will be urbanites, up from 56 percent today. In coastal cities, that boom will exacerbate the issue because more people will need to extract more groundwater and will need more buildings and roads, which will in turn increase the pressure on sediments.

"If that coastal migration correlates with building new infrastructure along the coast, it's very likely that we will see a change in land elevation," says Virginia Tech environmental security expert Manoochehr Shirzaei, who did the previous study of subsidence on the East Coast. (He wasn't part of this research team but reviewed their paper for the journal.)

A major concern for coastal areas, Shirzaei says, is the deformation of floodplains. "The area has to have a certain slope, so if there is heavy precipitation, water drains," Shirzaei says. "But when you have structures that create localized subsidence, it temporarily changes the slope of the floodplains. So it means that water would sit there for longer periods of time." This essentially creates a great big bowl for heavy rainfall to fill, which can flood roads and buildings. Even worse, climate change is already causing fiercer rainfall and hurricanes, along with stronger storm surges that push walls of water inland.

And this article in
Wired Magazine on Jan 5, 2025

Critical Infrastructure Is Sinking Along the US East Coast
Up and down the Atlantic Coast, the land is steadily sinking, or subsiding. That's destabilizing levees, roads, and airports, just as sea levels are rising.

We are also having a hard time understanding why we would give away our local power to address an issue as important as this one. Developers, we fear, will be the only ones to win.

We are all for affordable housing but the developers I know say this isn't the answer for affordable housing, it's a coup for luxury.

We also understand there are many projects in the pipeline negating the need to build as much housing that is required by the state.

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Thank you for your thoughtful consideration on such an important matter.

Sincerely,
margaret bradley
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: marlabastienknight@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Marla Knight
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 16, 2025 5:57:05 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Marla Knight
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: jim-connelly@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of jim connelly
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 16, 2025 6:28:41 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

The current Upzoning Plan and recently passed SB 79 could be devastating for our Cow Hollow neighborhood impacted by both Bills.

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
jim connelly
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: kielygomes@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Karen Schwartz
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 16, 2025 6:57:37 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Karen Schwartz
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: kcogorman@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of KEVIN O"GORMAN
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 16, 2025 7:22:37 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Please hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

The current proposal is not weell vetted by many homeowners effected. It decimates the character of neighborhoods, does not alleviate low-income access, overbuilds, and paves the way for the kind of demolition we still regret fron the 60s 'development' fiasco. Thousands of homeowners are unaware of the impact of this plan due to tepid outreach. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
KEVIN O'GORMAN
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: zano999@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Martin Zanfardino Zanfardino
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 16, 2025 9:25:35 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

The Mayor"s plan in conjunction with Scott Weiner and Danny Sauter is completely flawed. Sauter without any input from his constituents added North Beach and surrounding areas to the up zoning plan. He also halted the long ongoing appeal for North Beach and Telegraph Hill to be designated Historic Districts as is Jackson Square. I have been to meetings where Sauter totally disregards constituents questions and concerns and seems to power through his self serving political agenda. He obviously does not understand the specific special spirit of the District. Rather than ruin the waterfront of Fishermans Wharf and the character of NB and Telegraph Hill he has made it obvious he is in support of the developers (local and not) rather than preserving the History of his neighborhood. Lifting the special use protections for the area is also another travesty.

Sincerely,
Martin Zanfardino Zanfardino
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: frankblanket@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Derrick Scocchera
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 16, 2025 9:27:16 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

It's essential to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's disastrous "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Sincerely,
Derrick Scocchera
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: nicolelambrou@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Nicole Lambrou
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 16, 2025 11:40:00 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am a 25+ year resident of SF, a clinical and school psychologist - working in leadership and organization development and living in Clarendon Heights. I am VERY concerned and saddened about this upzoning proposal. I am not against development - and support affordable housing but this proposal is negligent and doesn't consider factors which played a big part in many people moving to and staying in San Francisco - including quality of life - clean air, beauty, being able to see the sky and overall physical and psychological health. I moved from NY city - manhattan in 2002 and was so relieved to be in a city that was affordable, beautiful and valued quality of life. That has changed significantly - our skyline of downtown has completely changed - and the city has been overtaken by the wealthy - but there's still time to make important changes. Let's not become the next Athens, Greece - which was destroyed by the developers in the 60's by antiparochi and now residents continually complain about the destruction, pollution and terrible quality of life.
https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/__https://www.bbc.com/culture/article/20191011-the-surprising-story-of-athens-offbeat-architecture__.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzplZGNlNGEyZTZmMGIxN2VlNDYxODkyODYxMDAwN2E0ODo3OjIjMjM6ZDlhZWJhY2Y3MjY3OGNiM2E5ZTQ3MmUwYTAzNmQzYjUwMTkzOWZiYmM1MzM5YzkyOTI3OTJkNjQ0ZGJjYTM1ODpwOlQ6Tg
https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/__https://www.theguardian.com/cities/2017/sep/12/athens-modern-heritage-austerity-neoclassical-architecture-acropolis-greece__.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzplZGNlNGEyZTZmMGIxN2VlNDYxODkyODYxMDAwN2E0ODo3OmE3Yzk6ZGNiY2JlZTc3YTU2MGU3YjZmMDY3MjkyNWQzYTAzNTBiMDYzMWYwOTliMTUxYjhmYjk3MTRkMjQ4YmYyYzdmNTpwOlQ6Tg

Don't sell out to developers and Scott Weiner. They don't understand and appreciate what makes San Francisco unique and are only concerned about their profits and political careers.

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Nicole Lambrou
San Francisco, CA 94114

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Entezari, Mehran (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject:	FW: Public Comment: Requested Amendments to Mayor Lurie"s Upzoning Plan
Date:	Thursday, October 16, 2025 3:01:38 PM

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the below communication regarding File Nos:

250700: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan
250701: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan
250966: General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan

Thank you.

Eileen McHugh
Executive Assistant
Office of the Clerk of the Board
Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689
Phone: (415) 554-7703 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org| www.sfbos.org

From: Lydia Bruno <lydia.e.bruno@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 16, 2025 2:53 PM
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; BOS-Supervisors <bos-supervisors@sfgov.org>; BOS-Legislative Aides <bos-legislative_aides@sfgov.org>
Subject: Public Comment: Requested Amendments to Mayor Lurie's Upzoning Plan

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hello,

My partner and I are longtime residents and District 4 voters. We've lived in SF for almost 2 decades and in our current home for almost 15 years. We are deeply active in our community, volunteering in our local parks almost every weekend and organizing free bird field trips. We

know our neighbors by name, shop regularly at local businesses and belong to the local community garden.

Rent control has allowed us to remain in SF and in our beloved home and find stability and community. We've truly found our place in the world and built a life in SF grounded deeply in community service.

We urge the board of supervisors to ensure Mayor Lurie's upzoning plan includes the affordable housing requirements below.

1. Prohibit the demolition of rent controlled buildings and buildings with small businesses
2. Expand rent control
3. Enforce the vacancy tax
4. Landbank public sites for affordable housing for seniors, families and the public workforce
5. Build pipelines for local employment using prevailing wage requirements, and pipelines for creative financing

Remember, there are over 40,000 vacant units in San Francisco and 8,000 unhoused people. We have the housing, we just need it to be affordable, accessible and stable!

Thank you for making sure SF communities are not displaced!

Lydia Bruno & Travis Smith
District 4 Residents

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); BOS-Operations; Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject:	FW: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan - File Nos. 250700, 250701, 250966
Date:	Thursday, October 16, 2025 12:26:09 PM

Dear Supervisors,

Please see below, from Jason Zhang, regarding File Nos:

250700: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan
250701: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan
250966: General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan

Regards,

Richard Lagunte
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Voice (415) 554-5184 | Fax (415) 554-5163
bos@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

Pronouns: he, him, his

Disclosures: *Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors' website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: Jason Zhang <noreply@adv.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Wednesday, October 15, 2025 7:45 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Jason Zhang
jasonz0762@gmail.com
520 Cayuga St
San francisco , California 94112

From:	Bullock, John (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	BOS-Operations; Carroll, John (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS); Calvillo, Angela (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Entezari, Mehran (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS)
Subject:	40 Letters Regarding File Nos. 250700, 250701 and 250966
Date:	Wednesday, October 15, 2025 4:04:55 PM
Attachments:	40 Letters Regarding File Nos. 250700_701_966.pdf

---

Hello,

Please see attached 40 letters regarding File Nos.:

250700: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan
250701: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan
250966: General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan

Regards,

John Bullock
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-5184
BOS@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

Disclosures: *Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From:	JANIS and BOB HARRER
To:	Carroll, John (BOS)
Cc:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC); Tanner, Rachael (CPC); Chen, Lisa (CPC); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); Mary Jane Large
Subject:	Land Use and Transportation Committee Meeting on Family zoning Plan
Date:	Wednesday, October 15, 2025 2:28:24 PM
Attachments:	BOS Land Use Com 10152025.pdf

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

On behalf of the Barbary Coast Neighborhood Association, I am forwarding the attached letter to the Land Use and Transportation Committee. The letter provides comments on the Family Zoning Plan, which we understand will be discussed at the Committee's meeting on Monday October 20. Thank you for your consideration.

Regards,
Bob Harrer
BCNA board member

BARBARY COAST NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION

BCNA
PO Box 2045
San Francisco, CA 94126
BCNA@bcnasf.org
www.bcnasf.org

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

OFFICERS

Mary Jane Large, Pres.
Marcy Albert, 1st VP
Michele Hennessey, 2nd VP
Philippe Sonne, Treas.
Bill Hannan, Secy.

MEMBERS AT LARGE

David Albert
Bob Harrer
Lee Robbins
James Seff
Diana Taylor

October 15, 2025

Via email

Board of Supervisors Land Use and Transportation Committee
1 Dr. Carlton Goodlett Place
City Hall
San Francisco CA, 94102-4689
c/o Clerk John Carroll
John.Carroll@sfgov.org

Re: Land Use and Transportation Committee, October 20, 2025 Hearing
Item: Family Zoning Plan

Dear Supervisors Melgar, Chen and Mahmood:

On behalf of the Barbary Coast Neighborhood Association (BCNA), this letter submits our comments on the most recent September 30, 2025, version of the Family Zoning Plan (the Plan) issued by the Planning Commission and posted on its website. BCNA serves the residents and businesses in the northeastern waterfront along the Embarcadero from Bay Street to Clay Street. The residents of our densely populated, mixed use neighborhood live in a wide variety of housing, including the Gateway, one of San Francisco's largest rent-controlled apartment complexes, the income-restricted Broadway Cove and 735 Davis Street offering housing for families and seniors, the Broadway Family Apartments and the Broadway Sansome complex, as well as an array of market rate condominiums, apartments and flats. In a very real sense, the BCNA neighborhood has been living and exemplifying the announced goals of the Plan for many years.

Backing onto the Embarcadero as we do, our membership takes great enjoyment and pride in our location along one of the nation's, if not the world's, most scenic waterfronts. Since our formation, we have been very active in issues impacting the entire northeastern waterfront, and especially have sought to protect the expansive views and feeling of openness provided by the Embarcadero's unique promenade for both residents and tourists alike. This has included continuing support for the existing 40-foot height limit along the City's waterfront. It is our concern for the protection of the Embarcadero and the northeastern waterfront that leads BCNA to make a very targeted request of the Land Use and Transportation Committee. For the reasons set forth below, we request that the block labeled #4 on the accompanying map be removed from coverage by the Family Zoning Plan entirely and be zoned to exclude the construction of any housing on it.

Our September 9, 2025, initial comment letter to the Planning Commission on the Family Zoning Plan centered on the impact that the July 29 version of the Plan would have had on the triangle of lots bordered by the Embarcadero, Bay Street and Powell Street. We continue to believe, as expressed in that letter, that the best way to protect the unique importance of the Embarcadero is with a firm 40-foot height limit for all housing within that triangle. We appreciate and wish to commend the September 30 version of the Plan on its implicit acknowledgment of the importance of protecting of the Embarcadero and the northeastern waterfront embodied in its:

1. Reduction of the base height for that entire triangle to 40 feet; and
2. Removal of the lots numbered 1-3 on the attached map from coverage by the Plan altogether.

However, we remain seriously concerned about the Plan's treatment of the block labeled #4 on the enclosed map. That block sits directly across the Embarcadero from the major tourist attractions of Pier 39 and the Plaza de California. While we appreciate that the September 30 version of the Plan now lowers the proposed local program height limit on block #4 from 85 feet to 65 feet, we don't believe that is sufficient to protect this unique location. Left unchanged, applying the state program's 100% density bonus to the 40-foot base height in combination with density decontrol could allow a 12-story tower on block #4. Density decontrol is available because it accompanies the block's inclusion in a proposed commercial/mixed use district. We view this as an unnecessary and unacceptable threat to the preservation of the human scale and singular attractiveness of the Embarcadero promenade. A 12-story tower would be a particular affront to, and an unfortunate greeting for, Pier 39 visitors and those arriving at the Cruise Ship Terminal, who come expecting the welcoming human scale and street level ambiance that make San Francisco San Francisco. As the Supervisors are well aware, tourism is a vital contributor to San Francisco's economy and brought in over $9 billion last year, per SF Travel.

We therefore are requesting that Block #4 be removed from coverage of the Family Zoning Plan and that the construction of residential units on Block #4 be expressly prohibited. We recognize that this request may appear unusual. However, given the impact density decontrol could have on this critical location, and the resultant potential for an inadvertent disadvantage to the local program vis a vis the state program, we fail to see any other approach that will bring the appropriate level of certainty that the future built environment of block #4 will not mar this vital section of the Embarcadero and the waterfront.

There can be no doubt that strong protection of the Embarcadero and the waterfront is of vital interest to all San Franciscans. Starting with public opposition to the Fontana Towers in the early 1960's through the removal of the Embarcadero Freeway to the comments received by the Port of San Francisco in Spring 2024 on its draft Waterfront Resilience Program that "[t}he Embarcadero Promenade is viewed as a critical asset and there is a strong desire to preserve and enhance it", San Francisco voters have made it clear that they do not support development that diminishes access to and enjoyment of the expansiveness of the Embarcadero and its connection to the Bay.

The mantra regarding real estate from time immemorial has been "location, location, location". Real estate is not a fungible asset where one parcel is the functional equivalent of another. For better or worse, the Family Zoning Plan will impact thousands of parcels across San Francisco. But only a very few of those parcels can negatively impact the experience of San Francisco's incomparable Embarcadero. Block #4 is one of those parcels. Mayor Lurie, various members of the Board of Supervisors and other city officials in recent days have stressed that passage of the Family Zoning Plan is the only way for San Francisco to maintain local control over building decisions and to use local knowledge to guide thoughtful residential development. But deciding where <u>not</u> to build also can be an important exercise of local control and knowledge. Protection of the irreplaceable public asset of the Embarcadero and the northeastern waterfront is a value historically held by all San Franciscans, and

we therefore urge the Land Use and Transportation Committee to express that value by removing Block #4 from coverage by the Family Zoning Plan and by prohibiting the construction of any residential units on that block in the future.

We further request this letter be entered into the record of the Land Use and Transportation's October 20 hearing on the Family Zoning Plan. Please contact Bob Harrer with questions or comments on our request and this comment letter.

Sincerely,

BCNA Board of Directors, by
Mary Jane Large, President
maryjanelarge@me.com

Robert Harrer, Former President and Board Member
theharrers@aol.com

cc: All other members of the Board of Supervisors, Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
Sarah Dennis-Phillips, Planning Director, sarah.dennis-phillips@sfgov.org
Rachael Tanner, Planner rachael.tanner@sfgov.org
Lisa Chen, Planner lisa.chen@sfgov.org
Michelle Andrews, legislative aide, Supervisor Sauter, Michelle.Andrews@sfgov.org

Family Zoning Plan Zoning Map Ordinance: Proposed Local Program Height Limits

September 30, 2025

Supervisorial District 3



From:	Kleanthes Koniaris
To:	SauterStaff
Cc:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); Bell, Tita (BOS)
Subject:	District 3 zoning impact – Bay St. 105-foot height limit
Date:	Friday, October 10, 2025 7:34:55 PM
Attachments:	Screenshot 2025-10-10 at 18.33.24.png

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor Sauter and Colleagues,

I live at 222 Francisco Street in District 3. My building sadly lost a lot of value during COVID that hasn't come back. It still has its north-facing water view, however.

Under the Mayor's proposed *Family Zoning Plan*, parcels directly north of me are slated for **105-foot buildings**. If those are built, my view of the water will be entirely blocked. Based on comparable sales data in similar circumstances, I estimate this would result in an additional **30% loss in property value**. I've attached a zoning map illustrating the issue.

I understand that the intent of the plan is to increase housing, but this **dramatic height increase** seems both unnecessary and harmful to the neighborhood. Developers will naturally build to the maximum allowed height, especially on parcels so close to the waterfront — locking in their own views while everyone south loses theirs. Meanwhile, this area already faces severe transportation constraints (the Embarcadero and Bay Street are chokepoints), so additional density would bring more congestion, less parking, and a lower overall quality of life.

I respectfully ask that you **either oppose the Family Zoning Plan in its current form** or **amend it to reduce the 105-foot height limit north of Bay Street**. In my case, SB 79 would actually be less damaging.

I believe many of my neighbors share these concerns, and that there is room for a **reasonable zoning compromise** that allows for growth without devastating existing communities.

Best Regards,

Kleanthes Koniaris

222 Francisco Street

San Francisco, CA 94133



From: Zack Subin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Sunday, October 12, 2025 9:06:15 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors & Commissioners,

As a D11 resident, I am excited to see more homes near Ocean Ave to support our small businesses and transit!

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Zack Subin
zack.subin@fastmail.fm
192 Caine Ave
San Francisco, California 94112

From: Barbara Heffernan
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 13, 2025 1:22:30 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,
Barbara Heffernan

Barbara
California

From:	Allison Ettenger
To:	Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS)
Cc:	Tanner, Rachael (CPC); Chen, Lisa (CPC); Segal, Ned (MYR); Bonde, Aly (MYR); Calvillo, Angela (BOS)
Subject:	District 8 Resident Supporting Family Zoning Plan
Date:	Tuesday, October 14, 2025 11:40:13 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hello Supervisor Mandelman,

I recently moved into District 8 with my family after living in District 9 (where I lived for 10 years). We love living in District 8 (Upper Noe Valley) and that we can access Muni lines (the J, 24, 36, and many others) and also can walk to my daughter's preschool and Upper Noe Recreation Center. We nearly relocated to the East Bay this past year due to a lack of suitable housing options. But we're so glad we stayed in SF, and I am looking forward to finding a kindergarten program for my daughter in SFUSD (hopefully at Alvarado or Dolores Huerta) to keep deepening our roots in the community.

I'm writing to ask you to support the Family Zoning Plan which is coming to the Board of Supervisors soon. By allowing small- and mid-scale apartments across more neighborhoods—especially along safe, transit-served corridors—it helps deliver the types of homes families actually use: multi-bedroom units close to childcare, after-school programs, and open space. This is essential to keeping families tied to the community and increases our well-being.

My friends and neighbors (in Districts 8 and 9, both current and former) are following this legislation closely. We are hopeful you and your colleagues can make real progress on the city's housing shortage.

Many thanks for your time.

Sincerely,
Allison Ettenger

From:	Tim Omi
To:	Lurie, Daniel (MYR)
Cc:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); Segal, Ned (MYR); alyssa@talaryabrands.com; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Tang, Katy (ECN); commissionstreamlining
Subject:	SFCDMA Support for the Mayor's Family Zoning Plan
Date:	Friday, October 10, 2025 10:33:38 AM
Attachments:	CDMA Letter of Support Family Zoning .pdf

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Timothy Omi
tim@sfcdma.org
1-415-590-0930
President, San Francisco Council of District Merchants Associations
President, Fillmore Merchant Association

Dear Mayor Lurie and Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to inform you that the San Francisco Council of District Merchants Associations (SFCDMA) has formally voted to support the Mayor's Family Zoning Plan. After extensive deliberation and numerous conversations with the Planning Department, Supervisors, and Mayors office a majority of our board reached consensus in favor of this important measure.

Back in August, SFCDMA proposed three key additions to the Family Zoning Plan aimed at mitigating small business displacement and reducing the potential negative impacts of large construction projects on our commercial corridors. These corridors form the backbone of San Francisco's neighborhoods — they are where small businesses give our city its identity, culture, and sense of community.

We deeply appreciate the collaborative process that has allowed merchants and community leaders to engage directly with the Mayor's Office and members of the Board. The open dialogue and responsiveness we have experienced mark a positive new chapter in how small businesses participate in shaping city policy.

We are also encouraged that Supervisor Melgar's proposals — including restaurant displacement assistance, expanded buildout support, and an increase to the small business displacement cap — will be incorporated into the plan. Additionally, we urge the City to move quickly to establish a Small Business Displacement Fund in good faith and to implement the incentive for in-kind commercial space replacement within the developer incentive program, as discussed with the Planning Department.

Thank you for your partnership and for ensuring that San Francisco's growth continues to include — and protect — the small businesses that make our city vibrant.

Sincerely,
Timothy Omi
President
San Francisco Council of District Merchants Associations

From: Justin Truong
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Saturday, October 4, 2025 10:21:19 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors & Commissioners,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Justin Truong
justintruong56@gmail.com
33 Junior Terrace
San Francisco, California 94112

From: natashjadewolf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Natashja Dewolfe
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stand With Your Constituents! {Files: 250700, 250701, 250966}
Date: Sunday, October 5, 2025 8:58:34 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's upzoning map is fundamentally flawed. Blanket upzoning will not deliver affordability — it will fuel speculation, displacement, and higher housing costs.

The city needs more time to get this right. Rushing a permanent land use change without full public awareness is reckless and unacceptable.

As the largest rezoning and wealth redistribution in San Francisco's history, I urge you to withhold support unless the map is significantly revised to reflect your constituents' concerns.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Natashja Dewolfe
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: natashjadewolf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Natashja Dewolfe
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Sunday, October 5, 2025 8:58:45 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Natashja Dewolfe
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: kielygomes@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Karen Schwartz
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Sunday, October 5, 2025 9:04:01 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Karen Schwartz
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: diana.giampaoli@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Diana Giampaoli
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stand With Your Constituents! {Files: 250700, 250701, 250966}
Date: Sunday, October 5, 2025 9:36:42 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's upzoning map is fundamentally flawed. Blanket upzoning will not deliver affordability — it will fuel speculation, displacement, and higher housing costs.

The city needs more time to get this right. Rushing a permanent land use change without full public awareness is reckless and unacceptable.

As the largest rezoning and wealth redistribution in San Francisco's history, I urge you to withhold support unless the map is significantly revised to reflect your constituents' concerns.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): It will not be low income. It will just take away light and bring in more empty storefronts ruining our beautiful neighborhoods. Just making the builders richer and they don't care about anything but themselves. So many empty buildings in SF to fix and house people. Teachers, etc won't be able to afford these buildings.

Sincerely,
Diana Giampaoli
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: esens123@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Erik Sens
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stand With Your Constituents! {Files: 250700, 250701, 250966}
Date: Sunday, October 5, 2025 10:39:01 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's upzoning map is fundamentally flawed. Blanket upzoning will not deliver affordability — it will fuel speculation, displacement, and higher housing costs.

The city needs more time to get this right. Rushing a permanent land use change without full public awareness is reckless and unacceptable.

As the largest rezoning and wealth redistribution in San Francisco's history, I urge you to withhold support unless the map is significantly revised to reflect your constituents' concerns.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Erik Sens
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: symondspaula@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Paula Symonds
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Sunday, October 5, 2025 11:13:16 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): As a San Franciscan of 80+ years i know that our city has been known around the world for its jewel like beauty. We can add affordable housing without turning San Francisco into a high rise jungle. We need parks and trees. We do not need towers. We can find ways to add affordable housing using creativity but the bash and burn of our leaders seems to them to be easier. There is no imagination in this plan only ways for the rich to get richer.

Sincerely,
Paula Symonds
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: zano999@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of martin zanfardino
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stand With Your Constituents! {Files: 250700, 250701, 250966}
Date: Sunday, October 5, 2025 10:23:33 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's upzoning map is fundamentally flawed. Blanket upzoning will not deliver affordability — it will fuel speculation, displacement, and higher housing costs.

The city needs more time to get this right. Rushing a permanent land use change without full public awareness is reckless and unacceptable.

As the largest rezoning and wealth redistribution in San Francisco's history, I urge you to withhold support unless the map is significantly revised to reflect your constituents' concerns.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
martin zanfardino
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: jlzsf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of judith zimrin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stand With Your Constituents! {Files: 250700, 250701, 250966}
Date: Sunday, October 5, 2025 10:23:51 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's upzoning map is fundamentally flawed. Blanket upzoning will not deliver affordability — it will fuel speculation, displacement, and higher housing costs.

The city needs more time to get this right. Rushing a permanent land use change without full public awareness is reckless and unacceptable.

As the largest rezoning and wealth redistribution in San Francisco's history, I urge you to withhold support unless the map is significantly revised to reflect your constituents' concerns.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
judith zimrin
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: PhilD0210@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Phil Dillard
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Sunday, October 5, 2025 11:32:05 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Phil Dillard
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: mark.r.berwick@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mark Berwick
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stand With Your Constituents! {Files: 250700, 250701, 250966}
Date: Monday, October 6, 2025 8:04:52 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's upzoning map is fundamentally flawed. Blanket upzoning will not deliver affordability — it will fuel speculation, displacement, and higher housing costs.

The city needs more time to get this right. Rushing a permanent land use change without full public awareness is reckless and unacceptable.

As the largest rezoning and wealth redistribution in San Francisco's history, I urge you to withhold support unless the map is significantly revised to reflect your constituents' concerns.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): Please consider the long term implications of this plan and strongly question the flawed justifications being used to push it through. The consequences of allowing this plan to move forward are huge for residents and the future of the city. From everything I've read, we don't need these more units to comply with the state's requirements (we need to look more closely at what's available), the growth forecasts being used are completely disconnected with reality of our city's growth in recent years (which is actually shrinking), and simply adding units has not proven to be an effective means to improve affordability. Please give this further consideration and diligently review the assumptions, the need and the resulting indelible changes we'll all suffer.

Sincerely,
Mark Berwick
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: gfpedler@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Gary Pedler
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stand With Your Constituents! {Files: 250700, 250701, 250966}
Date: Tuesday, October 7, 2025 10:51:40 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's upzoning map is fundamentally flawed. Blanket upzoning will not deliver affordability — it will fuel speculation, displacement, and higher housing costs.

The city needs more time to get this right. Rushing a permanent land use change without full public awareness is reckless and unacceptable.

As the largest rezoning and wealth redistribution in San Francisco's history, I urge you to withhold support unless the map is significantly revised to reflect your constituents' concerns.

As passed by the Planning Commission, the plan would do little to provide reasonably priced housing, force people out of existing housing, overburden the infrastructure, and destroy the character of a city that earns a lot of money as a place tourists want to visit.

I urge you to scale this plan back drastically and find a more measured, step-by-step approach to the issue.

Sincerely,
Gary Pedler
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: Jared Boot-Haury
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 7, 2025 6:25:56 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors & Commissioners,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Jared Boot-Haury
jwboot3@icloud.com
351 King St, Unit 122
San Francisco, California 94158

From: Derek Gendvil
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 7, 2025 6:27:47 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors & Commissioners,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Derek Gendvil
dgendvil@gmail.com
9030 w. Sahara ave. #360
Las Vegas , Nevada 89117

From: Sandy Carter
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 7, 2025 6:36:36 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors & Commissioners,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Sandy Carter
carters989@gmail.com
740 Anza Street
San Francisco, California 94118

From: Noah Garcia
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 7, 2025 6:38:52 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors & Commissioners,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Noah Garcia (D5 Resident)

Noah Garcia
noahgarcia80@gmail.com
564 Fell St
San Francisco, California 94102

From: Samah Shah
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 7, 2025 6:53:06 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors & Commissioners,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

I've lived in the Richmond of 6 years and this neighbourhood especially urgently needs more homes. We have not built enough housing for our residents and the people who work here, but this plan finally moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Samah Shah
samahsemail@gmail.com
1732 Anza St Apt 3
San Francisco, California 94118

From: Casey Frost
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 7, 2025 7:02:32 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors & Commissioners,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Casey Frost
caseyfrost13@gmail.com
111 Monterey Blvd
San Francisco, California 94131

From: Leah Loversky
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 7, 2025 7:22:15 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors & Commissioners,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Leah Loversky
ldloversky@gmail.com
1207 CHESTNUT ST APT 10
San Francisco, California 94109

From: Mark Goldberg
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 7, 2025 7:27:26 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors & Commissioners,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Mark Goldberg
mark.goldbergsf@gmail.com
2362 Bay Street
San Francisco, California 94123

From: Teresa Dal Santo
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 7, 2025 7:30:50 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors & Commissioners,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Teresa Dal Santo
dalsantot@gmail.com
2031 Powell Street,
San Francisco, California 94133

From: teeeets@gmail.com
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 7, 2025 7:42:55 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors & Commissioners,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

teeeets@gmail.com
838 Anza St
Sf, California 94118

From: Anthony Criscione
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 7, 2025 8:42:39 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors & Commissioners,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Anthony Criscione
acriscione1997@gmail.com
145 San Jose Avenue
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Justin Truong
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 7, 2025 11:23:52 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors & Commissioners,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Justin Truong
justintruong56@gmail.com
33 Junior Terrace
San Francisco, California 94112

From: shsetterfield@gmail.com
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 7, 2025 11:59:21 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors & Commissioners,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

shsetterfield@gmail.com
88 Hoff St, #206
San Francisco, California 94110

From: John Steponaitis
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Wednesday, October 8, 2025 12:54:31 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors & Commissioners,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

John Steponaitis
steponaj@gmail.com
910 Geary 20
San Francisco, California 94109-7095

From: Shane Booth
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Wednesday, October 8, 2025 6:52:46 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors & Commissioners,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Shane Booth
shanerama@gmail.com
112 Delano Ave
San Francisco, California 94112

From: Patrick Le
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Wednesday, October 8, 2025 8:03:09 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors & Commissioners,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Patrick Le
patrickle1994@gmail.com
511 Eureka St
San Francisco, California 94114

From: James Lemaire
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Wednesday, October 8, 2025 9:22:20 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors & Commissioners,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

James Lemaire
james.roderick.lemaire@gmail.com
3685 17th St
San Francisco, California 94114

From: Irene Koo
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Wednesday, October 8, 2025 10:36:03 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors & Commissioners,

As a resident of D1 Inner Richmond, I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan. I especially hope my own Supervisor Connie Chan hears our voices in support of this plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

I imagine raising a family here in SF, and I'd love for it to be in the Inner Richmond and in a city where the Family Zoning Plan is making the city we love, even better.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Irene Koo
irenekoo08@gmail.com
157 8th Avenue
San Francisco, California 94118

From: Brandon Jackson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Wednesday, October 8, 2025 8:11:21 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors & Commissioners,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan. I live South of Market, and by far the majority of housing built in recent decades in San Francisco has been around my neighborhood. But much of this housing is not suitable for families or mixed-age households.

Meanwhile, the west side of the city has built very little housing in recent decades, and has continually resisted even modest proposals to increase housing. We do not need drastic upzoning of the west side in order to improve this situation. The changes proposed in the Family Zoning Plan will go a long way to achieving this goal, and I urge you to support this for the benefit of ALL San Franciscans.

Respectfully,
Brandon Jackson

Brandon Jackson
brandonmjackson77@gmail.com
68 Harriet Street, Unit 7
San Francisco, California 94103

From: Westside Observer
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Lurie"s Zoning Plan • Streamlining"s Double-Cross • 29-Sunset Bus Line • Zoo"s Fundraiser • Diamond Heights Tower • High School Hookey •
Date: Thursday, October 9, 2025 9:58:26 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

A Future for Westside Neighborhoods?

Six Fatal Flaws in Lurie's Rezoning Plan

**The recall of Engardio sent shock waves through Lurie's supporters on the Board of Supervisors —
Sherrill (Marina), Sauter (North Beach, Chinatown), and Melgar in District 7 — face large-scale opposition to the proposal.**

The Planning Commission passed the proposal on a 4-3 vote. Its failure to get one vote from any of the supervisor-appointed commissioners shows the distinctly partisan character of the proposal.

The growing opposition to the proposal was starkly shown at a press

conference the same day when Lurie was booed for extended periods during his remarks.

by Calvin Welch

Read More

Move Fast — Break Things?

Voters Double-Crossed at Commission Streamlining Task Force

Hey Task Force — Prop D LOST. Implement Prop. E! It Won.

Weakening commissions is precisely what the Task Force is doing to hand Mayor Lurie more strong mayor authority. While it was supposed to be a "hedge" against a "strong mayor" the Task Force recommends implementing the opposite.

by Patrick Monette-Shaw

Read More

Navy's Final Insult

Plan to "Explode" Toxic Site Endangers Neighbors

The Navy exhibits poor behavior. Can we really trust their judgment that the buildings located on Parcel G are safe for demolition by explosion?

An explosion will create a dust cloud that will impact the Palou Avenue neighborhood, with playgrounds, schools, churches and transit lines. And worse, the toxic debris must be removed — traveling down numerous side streets to Third Street, exposing all those passing by to heavily poisonous dust.

by Glenn Rogers

Read More

Planners want to eliminate 12 stops for SF's longest bus route

Makeover for 29-Sunset Line

The 29-Sunset bus line, notorious for being jampacked with students heading to and from school, may soon get some much-needed help. SFMTA wants to remove bus stops at a dozen intersections that do not meet standards—800 feet minimum distance between stops.

by Jason Chinn

Read More

More Information

City's planners approve 104-foot tower in Diamond Heights despite broad community opposition.

Neighborhood Finds It Hard to Battle AT&T

The final vote was typical of the Planning Commission today: four Mayoral appointees voted yes. All three Supes appointees voted no

The "monopole" would soar over existing trees and create a major new element on the skyline in a part of town where most construction is limited to four stories.
The neighborhood was organized, and speakers at the commission meeting were 100 percent against the proposal (although 13 people in

the neighborhood wrote to support the plan, with 83 opposed). Speakers noted that the tower would be an eyesore—but also a potential fire threat.

by Tim Redmond

Read More

Moving captive wild animals such as gorillas, like Cecil, across the country continues the cycle of artificial, high-stakes social manipulation

Animal Rights Activists Cold-Shoulder Zoo's Gala Fundraiser

Behind the feel-good PR lies a disturbing truth says Barker. This isn't about animal welfare. It's about control, breeding quotas, and the illusion of progress

The Zoo is eagerly preparing for its annual Gala Fundraiser this October 18. The recent arrival of newest resident Cecil the Zoo's new male silverback Western lowland gorilla, is in the spotlight. He was born at the Cincinnati Zoo in Ohio. His arrival in San Francisco at 27 years old marks his third place of residence within a zoo establishment.

by Jonathan Farrell

Read More

Truency Is A Serious Problem for California Schools

In the 2024–25, SFUSD students lost an estimated 4.4 million hours of learning and SFUSD lost over $60 million in state funding due to student absences. In California, school funding is based on attendance. If a student does not show up, the district loses money.

by Carol Kocivar

Read More

Earthquake Brace + Bolt program *Extended*

CRMP EXTENDS EARTHQUAKE GRANT APPLICATION DEADLINE

Extension through October 17 aligns with California Great ShakeOut to boost
earthquake preparedness awareness. Grants of up to $3000 are available for eligible homeowners in our area.

Sign Up

The Things That Make Us Grumpy

Quinten expands on the recall of Supervisor Joel Engardio, Prop 50, even Trump's announcement last month that he would award one-time mayor Rudy Giuliani the highest US civilian honor, the Presidential Medal of Honor.

Read More

PLEASE SUPPORT LOCAL NEWS REPORTING!

Got an opposing view? We seek to represent all sides of the discussion.

Your Feedback Is Welcome

Please subscribe! Subscription is Free

But as a Sustaining Subscriber at $5 a month, we'll make your 16¢ a day go a long way! Or become a benefactor. We count on you to keep us online

— thanks!

Subscribe / Donate

The Westside is blessed with all kinds of opinions. We try to show all sides of a question. Got an opposing position? Let us know. We're here for you.

Copyright © 2025 Westside San Francisco Media, All rights reserved.
You are receiving this email because you opted in via our website.

Our mailing address is:
Westside San Francisco Media
PO Box 170524
San Francisco, CA 94117-0524

Add us to your address book

Want to change how you receive these emails?
You can update your preferences or unsubscribe from this list.

From: johnpmurray415@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Murray
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 9, 2025 2:09:15 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
John Murray
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: sptsantilis@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Senta Tsantilis
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 9, 2025 5:22:57 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Senta Tsantilis

From:	Carroll, John (BOS)
To:	JANIS and BOB HARRER; Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Sciammas, Charlie (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Cooper, Raynell (BOS)
Cc:	Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC); Tanner, Rachael (CPC); Chen, Lisa (CPC); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); Mary Jane Large
Subject:	RE: Land Use and Transportation Committee Meeting on Family zoning Plan - BOS File No. 250700, 250701, 250966
Date:	Thursday, October 16, 2025 9:14:00 AM
Attachments:	BOS Land Use Com 10152025.pdf image001.png

Thank you for your comment letter.

I am forwarding your comments to the members of the Land Use and Transportation committee, and I will include your comments in the files for these ordinance matters.

I invite you to review the entire matter on our Legislative Research Center by following the links below:

- Board of Supervisors File No. 250700
- Board of Supervisors File No. 250701
- Board of Supervisors File No. 250966

John Carroll
Assistant Clerk
Board of Supervisors
San Francisco City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415)554-4445

Click here to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The Legislative Research Center provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation and archived matters since August 1998.

Disclosures: *Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: JANIS and BOB HARRER <theharrers@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 15, 2025 2:27 PM
To: Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>
Cc: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC) <sarah.dennis-phillips@sfgov.org>; Tanner, Rachael (CPC) <rachael.tanner@sfgov.org>; Chen, Lisa (CPC) <lisa.chen@sfgov.org>; Andrews, Michelle (BOS) <michelle.andrews@sfgov.org>; Mary Jane Large <maryjanelarge@me.com>
Subject: Land Use and Transportation Committee Meeting on Family zoning Plan

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

On behalf of the Barbary Coast Neighborhood Association, I am forwarding the attached letter to the Land Use and Transportation Committee. The letter provides comments on the Family Zoning Plan, which we understand will be discussed at the Committee's meeting on Monday October 20. Thank you for your consideration.

Regards,
Bob Harrer
BCNA board member

BARBARY COAST NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION

BCNA
PO Box 2045
San Francisco, CA 94126
BCNA@bcnasf.org
www.bcnasf.org

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

OFFICERS

Mary Jane Large, Pres.
Marcy Albert, 1st VP
Michele Hennessey, 2nd VP
Philippe Sonne, Treas.
Bill Hannan, Secy.

MEMBERS AT LARGE

David Albert
Bob Harrer
Lee Robbins
James Seff
Diana Taylor

October 15, 2025

Via email

Board of Supervisors Land Use and Transportation Committee
1 Dr. Carlton Goodlett Place
City Hall
San Francisco CA, 94102-4689
c/o Clerk John Carroll
John.Carroll@sfgov.org

Re: Land Use and Transportation Committee, October 20, 2025 Hearing
Item: Family Zoning Plan

Dear Supervisors Melgar, Chen and Mahmood:

On behalf of the Barbary Coast Neighborhood Association (BCNA), this letter submits our comments on the most recent September 30, 2025, version of the Family Zoning Plan (the Plan) issued by the Planning Commission and posted on its website. BCNA serves the residents and businesses in the northeastern waterfront along the Embarcadero from Bay Street to Clay Street. The residents of our densely populated, mixed use neighborhood live in a wide variety of housing, including the Gateway, one of San Francisco's largest rent-controlled apartment complexes, the income-restricted Broadway Cove and 735 Davis Street offering housing for families and seniors, the Broadway Family Apartments and the Broadway Sansome complex, as well as an array of market rate condominiums, apartments and flats. In a very real sense, the BCNA neighborhood has been living and exemplifying the announced goals of the Plan for many years.

Backing onto the Embarcadero as we do, our membership takes great enjoyment and pride in our location along one of the nation's, if not the world's, most scenic waterfronts. Since our formation, we have been very active in issues impacting the entire northeastern waterfront, and especially have sought to protect the expansive views and feeling of openness provided by the Embarcadero's unique promenade for both residents and tourists alike. This has included continuing support for the existing 40-foot height limit along the City's waterfront. It is our concern for the protection of the Embarcadero and the northeastern waterfront that leads BCNA to make a very targeted request of the Land Use and Transportation Committee. For the reasons set forth below, we request that the block labeled #4 on the accompanying map be removed from coverage by the Family Zoning Plan entirely and be zoned to exclude the construction of any housing on it.

Our September 9, 2025, initial comment letter to the Planning Commission on the Family Zoning Plan centered on the impact that the July 29 version of the Plan would have had on the triangle of lots bordered by the Embarcadero, Bay Street and Powell Street. We continue to believe, as expressed in that letter, that the best way to protect the unique importance of the Embarcadero is with a firm 40-foot height limit for all housing within that triangle. We appreciate and wish to commend the September 30 version of the Plan on its implicit acknowledgment of the importance of protecting of the Embarcadero and the northeastern waterfront embodied in its:

1. Reduction of the base height for that entire triangle to 40 feet; and
2. Removal of the lots numbered 1-3 on the attached map from coverage by the Plan altogether.

However, we remain seriously concerned about the Plan's treatment of the block labeled #4 on the enclosed map. That block sits directly across the Embarcadero from the major tourist attractions of Pier 39 and the Plaza de California. While we appreciate that the September 30 version of the Plan now lowers the proposed local program height limit on block #4 from 85 feet to 65 feet, we don't believe that is sufficient to protect this unique location. Left unchanged, applying the state program's 100% density bonus to the 40-foot base height in combination with density decontrol could allow a 12-story tower on block #4. Density decontrol is available because it accompanies the block's inclusion in a proposed commercial/mixed use district. We view this as an unnecessary and unacceptable threat to the preservation of the human scale and singular attractiveness of the Embarcadero promenade. A 12-story tower would be a particular affront to, and an unfortunate greeting for, Pier 39 visitors and those arriving at the Cruise Ship Terminal, who come expecting the welcoming human scale and street level ambiance that make San Francisco San Francisco. As the Supervisors are well aware, tourism is a vital contributor to San Francisco's economy and brought in over $9 billion last year, per SF Travel.

We therefore are requesting that Block #4 be removed from coverage of the Family Zoning Plan and that the construction of residential units on Block #4 be expressly prohibited. We recognize that this request may appear unusual. However, given the impact density decontrol could have on this critical location, and the resultant potential for an inadvertent disadvantage to the local program vis a vis the state program, we fail to see any other approach that will bring the appropriate level of certainty that the future built environment of block #4 will not mar this vital section of the Embarcadero and the waterfront.

There can be no doubt that strong protection of the Embarcadero and the waterfront is of vital interest to all San Franciscans. Starting with public opposition to the Fontana Towers in the early 1960's through the removal of the Embarcadero Freeway to the comments received by the Port of San Francisco in Spring 2024 on its draft Waterfront Resilience Program that "[t}he Embarcadero Promenade is viewed as a critical asset and there is a strong desire to preserve and enhance it", San Francisco voters have made it clear that they do not support development that diminishes access to and enjoyment of the expansiveness of the Embarcadero and its connection to the Bay.

The mantra regarding real estate from time immemorial has been "location, location, location". Real estate is not a fungible asset where one parcel is the functional equivalent of another. For better or worse, the Family Zoning Plan will impact thousands of parcels across San Francisco. But only a very few of those parcels can negatively impact the experience of San Francisco's incomparable Embarcadero. Block #4 is one of those parcels. Mayor Lurie, various members of the Board of Supervisors and other city officials in recent days have stressed that passage of the Family Zoning Plan is the only way for San Francisco to maintain local control over building decisions and to use local knowledge to guide thoughtful residential development. But deciding where <u>not</u> to build also can be an important exercise of local control and knowledge. Protection of the irreplaceable public asset of the Embarcadero and the northeastern waterfront is a value historically held by all San Franciscans, and

we therefore urge the Land Use and Transportation Committee to express that value by removing Block #4 from coverage by the Family Zoning Plan and by prohibiting the construction of any residential units on that block in the future.

We further request this letter be entered into the record of the Land Use and Transportation's October 20 hearing on the Family Zoning Plan. Please contact Bob Harrer with questions or comments on our request and this comment letter.

Sincerely,

BCNA Board of Directors, by
Mary Jane Large, President
maryjanelarge@me.com

Robert Harrer, Former President and Board Member
theharrers@aol.com

cc: All other members of the Board of Supervisors, Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
Sarah Dennis-Phillips, Planning Director, sarah.dennis-phillips@sfgov.org
Rachael Tanner, Planner rachael.tanner@sfgov.org
Lisa Chen, Planner lisa.chen@sfgov.org
Michelle Andrews, legislative aide, Supervisor Sauter, Michelle.Andrews@sfgov.org

Family Zoning Plan Zoning Map Ordinance: Proposed Local Program Height Limits

September 30, 2025

Supervisorial District 3



From:	Vladimir Vlad
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS)
Cc:	HVNA President; HVNA Vice President; Cooper, Raynell (BOS); Villarreal, Fernando (MYR)
Subject:	HVNA - Letter of Support - Family Zoning Plan
Date:	Tuesday, October 14, 2025 11:09:38 AM
Attachments:	2025 10 13 HVNA Family Zoning Plan.pdf

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hi John,

Please find attached HVNA's letter of support for the Family Zoning Plan ahead of the Land Use & Transportation meeting on the 20th.

Thanks,

Vladimir

October 13, 2025

Myrna Melgar, Chair
Chyanne Chen, Vice Chair
Bilal Mahmood
Land Use and Transportation Committee

RE: HVNA Support of Family Zoning Plan

Dear Chair Melgar, Vice-Chair Chen, and Supervisor Mahmood,

On behalf of the **Hayes Valley Neighborhood Association (HVNA)**, we are writing to express our support for the proposed **Family Zoning Plan (FZP)**.

HVNA views this plan as a crucial, well-balanced measure necessary to increase San Francisco's housing supply, support our city's diverse family base, and ensure housing availability for future generations. The Family Zoning Plan represents a thoughtful, incremental approach to density that aligns perfectly with the established character and successful mixed-use environment of Hayes Valley.

1. **Alignment with Existing Neighborhood Character:** Hayes Valley is already a dense, walkable, and transit-rich neighborhood. The FZP encourages **gentle density** by allowing up to four units in single-family zones. This density increase is consistent with the scale and character of our blocks, allowing for greater housing production without the radical height or bulk increases that often cause neighborhood opposition.
2. **Addressing Family Needs:** San Francisco is facing a critical loss of families and a dwindling supply of units appropriate for households with children. The FZP specifically targets this imbalance by encouraging multi-bedroom units through density bonuses, helping to retain the very families that enrich our public schools and local businesses.
3. **Increasing Supply in High-Opportunity Areas:** By allowing greater housing production in historically exclusive single-family areas, the FZP contributes to city-wide housing goals and promotes equitable distribution of housing in areas with excellent access to jobs, transit, and open space.

HVNA recognizes that addressing the city's housing shortage requires shared responsibility. We believe the Family Zoning Plan is a modest, necessary, and strategic step forward that will deliver meaningful results while preserving the livability and beauty of San Francisco's diverse neighborhoods for residents of all backgrounds.

We support the Board of Supervisors tasked with approving a responsible and HCD compliant plan such as **the Family Zoning Plan.**

Sincerely,

Vladimir Vlad, Chair HVNA Transportation & Planning Committee

Vladimir Vlad

David Robinson, President, HVNA

Joe Maloney, Vice President, HVNA

From:	Erin Elliott
To:	Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS)
Cc:	Sauter, Danny (BOS)
Subject:	Reject Upzoning plan
Date:	Sunday, October 5, 2025 2:52:15 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Greetings all.

I live in 94133 and I am against the proposed changes in the Upzoning plan.

Please reject this initiative!

Kindly,

Erin Elliott
Erin@erins.org

From: cdmccoy@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Casey McCoy
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stand With Your Constituents! {Files: 250700, 250701, 250966}
Date: Thursday, October 2, 2025 11:31:14 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's upzoning map is fundamentally flawed. Blanket upzoning will not deliver affordability — it will fuel speculation, displacement, and higher housing costs.

The city needs more time to get this right. Rushing a permanent land use change without full public awareness is reckless and unacceptable.

As the largest rezoning and wealth redistribution in San Francisco's history, I urge you to withhold support unless the map is significantly revised to reflect your constituents' concerns.

Zoning laws are not just random legislation among thousands of laws; they're paramount to the feel of a place, the quality of life in a society, the amount of sky that meets the eye. They're the promise that a factory or a high-rise won't suddenly appear among single-family homes. They constitute a sacred obligation which a government has to its residents, the willful abandonment of which is an unforgivable betrayal.

Nordic countries, when they need more housing, build out new infrastructure and transit in areas that have not been residential, and then build upward in those "new" areas. In this way, current residents are not betrayed. If they can do this, so can San Francisco and California - the world's 4th biggest economic power.

Sincerely,
Casey McCoy
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: phil.lumsden999@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Philip Lumsden
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 2, 2025 9:47:39 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Philip Lumsden
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: alicefw@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Alice Williams
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 2, 2025 8:13:35 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Everyone wants a separate entrance home. Nothing good can happen putting many people in a small space. What kind of infrastructure did you plan to increase? How many more police do you plan to hire?

San Francisco is dense enough. If I wanted to live in NYC I would have moved there!
Surely someone has calculated the capacity for this small 7 by 7 mile piece of land?

Sincerely,
Alice Williams
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: jennkroot@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jennifer Kroot
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Wednesday, October 1, 2025 8:08:57 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

I will do everything I can to stop extreme upzonging. I voted for Lurie and I'm incredibly disappointed. I thought that he cared about SF more than billionaires and developers. WE ALL KNOW THAT UPZONING WILL NOT SOLVE HOMELESSNESS OR HELP WITH AFFORDABILITY. Developers, Airbnb and tech billionaires own this city.

Sincerely,
Jennifer Kroot
San Francisco, CA 94117

From: jherrod9@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Julie Herrod-Lumsden
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Wednesday, October 1, 2025 7:02:28 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan and 30-year resident of North Beach, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's and Supervisor Sauter's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and FAMILIES and small businesses, and the transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We DEMAND that you:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's and Sauter's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's and Sauter's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as development.

These plans also clear the way for a MASS EXODUS OF RESIDENTS—YOUR CONSTITUENTS. Why are you so foolishly intent on eliminating us? Don't you kinda need resident voters so you can push your weight around?

Think about it (if you're able). WHY BITE THE HAND THAT FEEDS YOU?

Be careful.

HANDS OFF OUR NEIGHBORHOODS!!!

Sincerely,
Julie Herrod-Lumsden
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: epml@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Michael Larsen
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stand With Your Constituents! {Files: 250700, 250701, 250966}
Date: Wednesday, October 1, 2025 2:55:26 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's upzoning map is fundamentally flawed. Blanket upzoning will not deliver affordability — it will fuel speculation, displacement, and higher housing costs.

The city needs more time to get this right. Rushing a permanent land use change without full public awareness is reckless and unacceptable.

As the largest rezoning and wealth redistribution in San Francisco's history, I urge you to withhold support unless the map is significantly revised to reflect your constituents' concerns.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Michael Larsen
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: randymazzei@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Randall Mazzei
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Wednesday, October 1, 2025 2:21:13 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Randall Mazzei

From: shop@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of beth weissman
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stand With Your Constituents! {Files: 250700, 250701, 250966}
Date: Wednesday, October 1, 2025 4:20:20 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's upzoning map is fundamentally flawed. Blanket upzoning will not deliver affordability — it will fuel speculation, displacement, and higher housing costs.

The city needs more time to get this right. Rushing a permanent land use change without full public awareness is reckless and unacceptable.

As the largest rezoning and wealth redistribution in San Francisco's history, I urge you to withhold support unless the map is significantly revised to reflect your constituents' concerns.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): The destruction of this northern/western part of SF will be permanent and we will never again have the unique flavor that makes SF special. Walk around Broadway from Webster towards Van Ness and you'll see the truly brutal high rises that were allowed there. The beauty of the area can never be regained. SF population is not growing, and rushing around adding ugly housing makes no sense. Please vote no.

Sincerely,
beth weissman
San Francisco, CA 94115

From: cutelynx@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Qi Wolf
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stand With Your Constituents! {Files: 250700, 250701, 250966}
Date: Tuesday, September 30, 2025 7:17:54 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's upzoning map is fundamentally flawed. Blanket upzoning will not deliver affordability — it will fuel speculation, displacement, and higher housing costs.

The city needs more time to get this right. Rushing a permanent land use change without full public awareness is reckless and unacceptable.

As the largest rezoning and wealth redistribution in San Francisco's history, I urge you to withhold support unless the map is significantly revised to reflect your constituents' concerns.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Qi Wolf
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: esinsf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Eihway Su
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Tuesday, September 30, 2025 6:05:57 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan who lives on Parnassus Avenue in Cole Valley, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors. I love San Francisco's community that cares about people who have not been economically privileged, our diversity, as well as our beautiful, old buildings.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Eihway Su
San Francisco, CA 94117

From: bilgepump100@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Robert Hall
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stand With Your Constituents! {Files: 250700, 250701, 250966}
Date: Tuesday, September 30, 2025 5:32:49 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's upzoning map is fundamentally flawed. Blanket upzoning will not deliver affordability — it will fuel speculation, displacement, and higher housing costs.

The city needs more time to get this right. Rushing a permanent land use change without full public awareness is reckless and unacceptable.

As the largest rezoning and wealth redistribution in San Francisco's history, I urge you to withhold support unless the map is significantly revised to reflect your constituents' concerns.

Perhaps you'll get the Engardio treatment for promoting this dreadful plan.

Sincerely,
Robert Hall
San Francisco, CA 94117

From: leah606@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Roselyn De Jesus
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stand With Your Constituents! {Files: 250700, 250701, 250966}
Date: Tuesday, September 30, 2025 5:18:06 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's upzoning map is fundamentally flawed. Blanket upzoning will not deliver affordability — it will fuel speculation, displacement, and higher housing costs.

The city needs more time to get this right. Rushing a permanent land use change without full public awareness is reckless and unacceptable.

As the largest rezoning and wealth redistribution in San Francisco's history, I urge you to withhold support unless the map is significantly revised to reflect your constituents' concerns.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):
Please stop selling SF and its residence out. I like how our pockets of different communities have developed; and how we find a way to work with each other, no matter what part of San Francisco we happen to live. Don't destroy the soul of my favorite city.

Sincerely,
Roselyn De Jesus
San Francisco, CA 94122

From:	David Lehr
To:	Lurie, Daniel (MYR)
Cc:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); jengardio@gmail.com; MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); FielderStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS); ChenStaff; So, Lydia (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Braun, Derek (CPC); Campbell, Amy (CPC); Imperial, Theresa (CPC); Mcgarry, Sean (CPC); Williams, Gilbert A (CPC); Ionin, Jonas (CPC); Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC); Tanner, Rachael (CPC); Switzky, Joshua (CPC); Chen, Lisa (CPC); Gibson, Lisa (CPC); Segal, Ned (MYR); Jones, Ej (MYR)
Subject:	Strongly Opposed to Mayor Lurie"s Upzoning Plan
Date:	Tuesday, September 30, 2025 4:50:12 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Lurie,

I've been proud to call District 2 my home for over 20 years. As a longtime San Franciscan, I'm deeply concerned and strongly opposed to Mayor Lurie's plan. It threatens to tear down cherished homes, push out renters and small businesses, and reshape our neighborhoods into exclusive corridors of unaffordable luxury high-rises.

This plan isn't just about development—it's about displacement disguised as progress. It puts the interests of wealthy developers and billionaire investors far ahead of the families and communities who have built this city over decades.

We urgently ask you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Call for a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

The Mayor's upzoning maps would permanently alter San Francisco's land use in ways that go well beyond what's necessary—and without any guarantees that housing will be affordable for everyday residents.

Together, we must protect the heart and soul of our city from these sweeping changes that threaten to silence community voices and erase the vibrant neighborhoods we love.

Thank you for considering my input as you make this critical decision for San Francisco's future.

Dave Lehr

District 2 Resident

From: susanmackowski@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Susan Mackowski
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Tuesday, September 30, 2025 3:57:31 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Susan Mackowski
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: irismvbucchioni@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Iris Vahrenhorst-Bucchioni
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Tuesday, September 30, 2025 3:12:54 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Please safe the unique character of San Francisco with it's distinctly different neighborhoods. Don't make our city look the same everywhere you go.

Sincerely,
Iris Vahrenhorst-Bucchioni
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: donna.howe@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Donna Howe
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Tuesday, September 30, 2025 2:42:20 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): As a resident of Ingleside Terraces, one of the few remaining intact Historic Garden Neighborhoods, I implore you to exempt historic category A properties from the current upzoning map. According to recent tabulations based on the city survey, removing these properties will not significantly impact the the required number of new homes desired by the State of California. It is absolutely possible to both meet future housing goals and embrace the past. By further modifying the proposed zoning map, you can gain the support of many of your constituents, particularly homeowners and landlords who contribute significantly to city coffers trhough payment of property taxes.

Sincerely,
Donna Howe
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: donna.howe@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Donna Howe
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stand With Your Constituents! {Files: 250700, 250701, 250966}
Date: Tuesday, September 30, 2025 2:31:05 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a longtime resident of the Westside, but one who has also lived and worked in many sections of our wonderful city, I believe Mayor Lurie's upzoning map is fundamentally flawed. Blanket upzoning will not deliver affordability — it will fuel speculation, displacement, and higher housing costs.

The city needs more time to get this right. Rushing a permanent land use change without full public awareness is reckless and unacceptable.

As the largest rezoning and wealth redistribution in San Francisco's history, I urge you to withhold support unless the map is significantly revised to reflect your constituents' concerns.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):I am concerned about this week's attempt to adopt construction guidelines for single family homes that may not jive with historical architectural elements. Further, by trying to eliminate the HPC or to allow the Planning Department to assume the role of historic preservation, more necessary guardrails will be circumvented. Such manipulation does not engage the community in meaningful ways. Having already removed environmental reviews, how will the city ensure that new and modified builds will be transparent and in line with the exiting city plan?

Sincerely,
Donna Howe
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: noguera@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Hatun Noguera
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Tuesday, September 30, 2025 2:14:46 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Hatun Noguera
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: timepuzzle@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Robert Smith
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Tuesday, September 30, 2025 2:13:59 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
John Robert Smith
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: noguera@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Hatun Noguera
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stand With Your Constituents! {Files: 250700, 250701, 250966}
Date: Tuesday, September 30, 2025 2:13:24 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's upzoning map is fundamentally flawed. Blanket upzoning will not deliver affordability — it will fuel speculation, displacement, and higher housing costs.

The city needs more time to get this right. Rushing a permanent land use change without full public awareness is reckless and unacceptable.

As the largest rezoning and wealth redistribution in San Francisco's history, I urge you to withhold support unless the map is significantly revised to reflect your constituents' concerns.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Hatun Noguera
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: ericajoykatrak@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Erica Katrak
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Tuesday, September 30, 2025 11:12:20 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Please don't destroy our magical city. As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors. In 2023, four- and six-plex legislation was signed into law, which created the capacity for ~400,000 units. Add the ~70,000 units in the pipeline, and San Francisco has way more than the net units required by the state's rashly passed quotas and this is all already transforming our city with not enough thought and careful city planning.

The State Department of Finance projects only ~17,000 new residents by 2050 and there are still ~40,000 vacant units sitting empty. In my neighborhood, there are luxury McMansions and condos that have been for sale and vacant for over a year. Lurie's upzoning scheme is unnecessary, excessive, and counterproductive to achieving real affordability in San Francisco. It seems like a blatant gift to wealthy development firms, who destroy our city's history and character and put up huge, personality-devoid buildings in place of it. They have been destroying irreplaceable places and rent controlled dwellings and affordable starter homes for years. On top of all that, did you know that a third of our country's landfills are filled with construction debris? There's no angle to this path that makes any sense to me. Let's do better than this.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps. Why do we need this at all? Who is asking for it?
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline.

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees and barely any protections for historic places that cannot be replaced. Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement and the erasing of culture and identity disguised as progress. It reminds me heavily of the "urban renewal" programs of the 60s and 70s. Let's please find better, smarter, more thoughtful ways forward. This is an iconic and diverse and creative and beautiful city, and we need to put care into keeping it that way.

Sincerely,
Erica Katrak

From: chrisverplanck@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Christopher VerPlanck
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, September 29, 2025 2:58:57 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Christopher VerPlanck
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: Jack Eidson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Family Zoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, September 29, 2025 1:28:33 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hello,

I am writing to express my strong support for Mayor Lurie's Family Zoning Plan, and to encourage the Board of Supervisors to pass it urgently.

I am a resident of District 8, and would gladly welcome more neighbors and more vitality to my neighborhood, the Castro. The Family Zoning Plan puts both my neighborhood and the full city on a stronger path toward recovery and growth.

It should also not be discounted that passing a measure like the Family Zoning Plan is required by the state in order to stay in compliance with California law. Any supervisor who ignores that reality is unfit to serve this city.

Thanks,
Jack Eidson (94114)

From: paulagiants@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Paula Katz
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Sunday, September 28, 2025 8:26:45 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Hello,

I am a resident of District 4. I want to add that I supported Prop K, love Sunset Dunes, and opposed recalling Joel Engardio. However, as a San Franciscan resident and taxpayer, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

I have lived in the Sunset for over 30 years. There are many other ways to increase housing in San Francisco without ruining our neighborhood. The Mayor's up zoning plan is wrong for San Francisco.

Sincerely,
Paula Katz
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: Justin Daulton
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended!
Date: Sunday, September 28, 2025 7:06:24 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – must be amended! There are other area's in need of redevelopment and revitalization in the city, especially downtown in Union Square and reaching outwards. This should be counted towards requirements and needs.

The current plan takes away the charm, vibe and character of existing established neighborhoods that are are not in need (nor they should be) of redevelopment. As a resident for over 20 years, and whom has fully planted roots in the Richmond distrcit, I whole heartedly appeal to modify this plan to not so serverly upzone established neighborhoods and instead focus on vacant areas that are in need of redevelopment.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

Sincerely, Justin

Justin
California

From: joringer67@gmail.com
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Saturday, September 27, 2025 2:51:13 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

California

From: maryanntittle@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of MaryAnn Tittle
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Saturday, September 27, 2025 9:24:22 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
MaryAnn Tittle

From: maryanntittle@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of MaryAnn Tittle
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Saturday, September 27, 2025 9:23:09 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
MaryAnn Tittle

From: kirinp@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kirin Parmar
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Friday, September 26, 2025 7:41:47 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am a proponent of affordable housing who would like to see the proposed SF Upzoning Mandate be fine-tuned to meet holistic needs.
I hold a B. Arch (Hons), M. City Planning and MS (Transportation Engineering). I am also a certified Breakthrough Coach with good communication skills and a natural mediation ability. I grew up mostly in Singapore (tops in building affordable housing and supporting infrastructure) and did my grad studies at Berkeley. I recently hosted an impressive and high-level representative for Lima, Peru's most successful social housing development company called Besco, which is a for-profit private developer. Despite variations in what we can replicate, we have resources to learn from that further include the experiences of Auckland, NZ, Portland, OR and Seattle, WA. We will have to adjust to 1) what our local culture will tolerate within reason, 2) the heightened need for EQ safety and evacuation routes, 3) the limited space to expand making it much harder to meet desirable setbacks, 4) the limits of the existing supportive infrastructure. And 5) last but not least, how we can retain enough of the heart and soul of what makes San Francisco the local, national and global draw that it is. Singapore saved costs by having the government act as developer. Besco in Lima was able to lower costs and create enough profit by the scale of the contracts they keep winning due to their holistic follow-up services business model (in addition to an enforced non-corruption mandate). (Some of the aspects they provide that do not fit the limitations of SF could fit other CA cities, something to pass on to our Senator and Governor). I would like to see more inclusive and thus hopefully more creative brainstorming of a model for affordable building that keeps costs down and gets more buy-in from residents. Also, people tend to be more accepting of change when they feel heard and validated about their feelings and views first. They have been heard at the Planning Commission Hearing, but not actually validated or shown empathy which has further escalated fears and thus opposition. I think it is important that the public feels they have had adequate time to participate in the possible solutions. Things shift when the opposing forces have their worst-case scenario fears allayed, and come to their own conclusions about the possible measures to meet parameters as a result of being part of the brain-storming. I'd like to see the soliciting of views evolve from the negative inducing-mindset focus of what we don of what we do not want, to the pro-active, positive engagement over what we want in order to reach the 36,000 mandated units. Having non-political independent experts weigh in is also crucial. Who can we invite? Retired experts are potentially a great resource. There is such an important psychological element to getting buy-in. I conclude by asking where I can further contribute with my relevant insights, expertise or resourcefulness. I have been active on Nextdoor where over 2,600 folk (at an early count) viewed my post soliciting support in understanding what is going on. After more than 160 comments, things calmed down with the inclusion of my explanation that we genuinely do have a housing crisis that is part of a global housing crisis, and why the impetus to solve this had to come from the State. I personally do not want under the current political environment, to have it look like our governor and senator are doing something that feels like a betrayal as has been implied by the genuinely alarmed. But I do agree that the SF mandate such as it is to-date, is cause for alarm. It lacks clarity on density bonuses, a sense of control over maximum buildout within the up-zoned areas, sensitivity to other important parameters that would ensure we don't destroy cherished public spaces with gloomy shaded or wind-channeling tunnels, and assured preservation or continuity of cherished architecture and small businesses.

Sincerely,
Kirin Parmar
San Francisco, CA 94132

From: chamaret@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jun Ishimuro
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, September 24, 2025 8:46:46 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Views and historic neighborhoods are our city's important resource as one of the top tourist destinations in the world. Tourist industry hire 60000 people and it is a common summer time job for San Francisco resident students. Like all national parks, we have responsbility to preserve our city's view and historic neighborhoods for our future which will also generate revenues for the city and its residents.

Sincerely,
Jun Ishimuro
San Francisco, CA 94114

From:	Carroll, John (BOS)
To:	Liam Hennessy
Cc:	Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Sciammas, Charlie (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Cooper, Raynell (BOS)
Subject:	RE: Up Zoning Plan - BOS File Nos. 250700, 250701, and 250966
Date:	Wednesday, September 24, 2025 3:01:00 PM
Attachments:	image001.png

Thank you for your comment letter.

I am forwarding your comments to the members of the Land Use and Transportation committee, and I will include your comments in the file for these ordinance matters.

I invite you to review the entire matter on our Legislative Research Center by following the links below:

-

Board of Supervisors File No. 250700

Board of Supervisors File No. 250701

Board of Supervisors File No. 250966

John Carroll
Assistant Clerk
Board of Supervisors
San Francisco City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415)554-4445

Click here to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The Legislative Research Center provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation and archived matters since August 1998.

Disclosures: *Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: Liam Hennessy <dolbay@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 22, 2025 7:13 PM
To: Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>
Subject: Up Zoning Plan

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors,

My name is Liam Hennessy and I am a long-time resident of North Beach and a recent retired San Francisco Unified School teacher. My neighborhood was not originally included in any upzoning plan until our Supervisor Danny Sauter decided to add it. Why? He has never answered this question or many others that neighbors such as myself have tried to get him to answer.

I am very upset that without so much as a public meeting or notification, North Beach was put into this reckless plan even though the neighborhood is already one of the densest in our beautiful city. The creators and backers of this plan never took into account any of the concerns of the neighborhood's residents! Mayor Lurie and Supervisor Sauter even postponed the voting on North Beach becoming a Historic Neighborhood, in hopes I am sure, that it would not get in the way of his "Family Zoning Plan" proposal being adopted.

There has not been enough collaboration with the people who are going to be most affected by this proposal. This Family Zoning plan was not created to enrich the lives of individuals who want to live in North Beach or for those that already do or for those that will be pushed out because of it. This is not an easy fix to our housing crisis. We need to be more creative with our approach to our housing needs. However, those approaches Should Not Come from the Big Developers trying to get a HUGE WINFALL or POLITICIANS WHO ARE BOUGHT in order to climb the political ladder, BUT by the people of North Beach. We have a huge stake in this and this decision will change the neighborhood forever. Once it is done there is no going back. Remember the Redevelopment Era?

The plan to include North Beach into Lurie's Upzoning proposal was a blatant lie to all of the residences and businesses in North Beach by politicians that used their power to hide the fact that their ambition for power/money is more important than the community that elected them.
Making decisions about the fate of a person's neighborhood behind a facade of wanting to create more housing for the working people is disingenuous, especially since it was all hidden from the constituents. High Rise Condominiums all along the Wharf, splattered around North Beach, Telegraph Hill, etc. will not be affordable to the individuals that this proposal is trying to house. It will only be affordable to the rich, It will ruin the neighborhood and it will create another

redevelopment nightmare with horrible consequences.

Danny Sauter and his YIMBY lobbyists along with the Planning Department have not involved the neighborhood residents, businesses etc. in the decision to replace our incredible neighborhood, which tourists travel the world to see, with a Miami Beach one instead. This plan was not done with the constituents' needs in mind, but rather with those of developers and Mr Sauter's donors instead(and in secret). It is not what is best for North Beach or the City at large.

Please make significant changes to the Up Zoning map because it will destroy North Beach. As a native, as a retired San Francisco Unified School teacher I plead that you really take a hard look at what is being proposed, how it will impact North Beach and the City at large, maybe even go to St. Peters and Paul's and pray on it… you never know.

Onwards,
Liam Hennessy
169 Pfeiffer Street
San Francisco Ca 94133

Member, Board of Supervisors
District 7

City and County of San Francisco

MYRNA MELGAR

DATE: November 24, 2025

TO: Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

FROM: Supervisor Myrna Melgar, Chair, Land Use and Transportation Committee

RE: Land Use and Transportation Committee
COMMITTEE REPORTS

Pursuant to Board Rule 4.20, as Chair of the Land Use and Transportation Committee, I have deemed the following matters are of an urgent nature and request them be considered by the full Board on Tuesday, December 2, 2025.

File No. 240637	**Planning Code, Zoning Map - Central Neighborhoods Large Residence SUD, Corona Heights Large Residence SUD** Sponsor: Mandelman
File No. 250966	**General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan**
File No. 250700	**Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan** Sponsors: Mayor; Sauter, Mahmood and Dorsey
File No. 250701	**Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan** Sponsor: Mayor

These matters will be heard in the Land Use and Transportation Committee at a Regular Meeting on Monday, December 1, 2025.

City Hall · 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244 · San Francisco, California 94102-4689 · (415) 554-6516
TDD/TTY (415) 554-5227 · E-mail: Myrna.Melgar@sfgov.org